

THE OXFORD HANDBOOK OF  
**DELIBERATIVE  
DEMOCRACY**



THE OXFORD HANDBOOK OF

---

**DELIBERATIVE**

**DEMOCRACY**

---

*Edited by*  
ANDRÉ BÄCHTIGER  
JOHN S. DRYZEK  
JANE MANSBRIDGE  
*and*  
MARK E. WARREN

**OXFORD**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

**OXFORD**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,  
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of  
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Oxford University Press 2018

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted

Impression: 1

First Edition published in 2018

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in  
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the  
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted  
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics  
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the  
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the  
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form  
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press  
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: [To come]

ISBN 978-0-19-874736-9

Printed and bound by [To come]

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and  
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials  
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

## PREFACE

*THE Oxford Handbook of Deliberative Democracy* began with a conversation between John Dryzek and André Bächtiger in Canberra in February 2014, when John declared that it is about time for a *Handbook* on this crucial topic. While John and André agreed that there is clear demand for a comprehensive treatment of deliberative democracy, both felt that given the breadth and complexity of deliberative democracy today, the editorial team needed reinforcement. They asked Mark Warren and Jenny Mansbridge to join them, and both Jenny and Mark immediately and enthusiastically agreed. The editorial team then had a number of skype discussions about the topics to be covered in such a *Handbook*, leading to a proposal to Oxford University Press in Northern summer 2014. After signing the contract, we were overwhelmed with the positive reactions to our call for contributing to the *Handbook*: almost all authors we contacted responded positively and enthusiastically. What followed was a process of intensive engagement with the more than one hundred authors of this volume, involving deliberations between the editors and the authors, but also within the editorial team itself. It also involved, as any good process of deliberation, a lot of mutual learning. For example, none of us were aware of the full dimensions of the plural origins of the deliberative approach. When reading and engaging with the chapters as they arrived, we realized that there is far less unity in the origins of deliberative democracy than commonly thought. We have been impressed with the multiple “discoveries” of deliberative politics across disciplines that were not initially in discourse with one another—disciplines as diverse as urban planning, law, criminology, dispute resolution, economics, communications, legislative studies, public policy analysis, sociology, and environmental governance. Not all of them initially used the terms “deliberation” and “deliberative democracy,” though commonalities eventually became evident. And even though we speak—for structuring and clarifying purposes—of first- and second-generation models of deliberation in the introduction to this volume, we recognize that some first-generation pioneers (including Jürgen Habermas) had already adopted second-generation concepts in the 1990s. In a way, theoretical unity was more what students of deliberation imagined in the 2000s rather than what the theoretical pioneers had in mind when developing the concept in the 1980s and 1990s.

We hope (and believe) that the *Oxford Handbook of Deliberative Democracy* provides a landmark statement of a field which has grown enormously over the past few decades in size and importance. The publication of this volume does not, of course, mean that controversies surrounding the concept of deliberation and deliberative democracy are settled; quite the contrary. A good example are the persisting

differences (some might even say disagreements) in defining deliberation. To give some examples from the *Handbook*: in their chapter on catastrophic risks, Ryan Gunderson and Thomas Dietz refer to “analytical deliberation,” which draws directly from Habermas’s notion of rational discourse and emphasizes well-justified argumentation and the “forceless force of the better argument.” Similarly, in their chapter on legislatures, governments, and courts, Paul Quirk and co-authors speak of “institutional deliberation” which puts a premium on the careful evaluation of alternatives and the epistemic quality of the resulting policy decisions. By contrast, describing deliberative processes among citizens and in everyday talk, Francesca Polletta and Beth Gharrity Gardner as well as Pamela Conover and Patrick Miller make a strong case for including stories, personal experiences, and emotions in the conceptual apparatus of good deliberation in order “to make it possible for people to overcome some of the barriers to deliberation in everyday life” (Polletta and Gardner, this volume, Chapter 4). Focusing on conflict resolution, Lawrence Susskind and co-authors define deliberation as a “potentially cooperative enterprise rather than simply a battle over fixed goods or opposing values,” geared towards determining the public interest. Put differently, good deliberation here is a social process of shared and creative problem-solving. This view of deliberation contrasts with Quirk et al. who claim that while social elements of deliberation (such as mutual respect) may be potentially relevant for learning and finding agreement, they are less relevant in “institutional deliberation” where epistemic quality frequently trumps deliberation’s social dimensions. We think that the exact form of deliberative engagement depends on the goals and contexts of deliberation. It makes a difference whether the primary goals of deliberative interactions are achieving agreement or maximizing the chances of a correct decision (see Estlund and Landemore, this volume, Chapter 7); whether experts or citizens deliberate with one another; or whether deliberation happens around a kitchen table or within a legislature. Nonetheless, there is still considerable overlap among the various definitions of deliberation in the *Handbook*: all authors agree that good deliberation is about giving reasons (albeit that can happen in very different forms) and listening to each other’s claims, arguments, and experiences. We hope that our minimalist definition of deliberation (see our Introduction), which we conceptualize as *mutual communication that involves weighing and reflecting on preferences, values and interests regarding matters of common concern*, allows encapsulating the variety of deliberative forms in different contexts and for different purposes, without abandoning the idea that deliberative interactions have normatively valuable qualities that should be protected, supported, and institutionalized.

Finally, we are greatly indebted to all contributors to this volume, for their passion and diligence in writing the chapters but also for their patience in interacting with us (and reacting to our criticisms and manifold suggestions). We are particularly grateful to Jürgen Habermas, Bob Goodin, and Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson who accepted our invitation to reflect critically on the state of the art in deliberative democracy

---

(including their own work). Moreover, we are immensely grateful to Seraphine Arnold who carefully edited all fifty-eight chapters of the *Handbook* and helped us in putting the whole volume together. Last but not least, we are also indebted to Dominic Byatt, Sarah Parker, and Olivia Wells from Oxford University Press who accompanied the production of this huge volume from beginning to end.

AB, Stuttgart  
JSD, Canberra  
JM, Cambridge (MA)  
MEW, Vancouver





# CONTENTS

<i>List of Figures and Tables</i>	xv
<i>List of Contributors</i>	xvii

1. Deliberative Democracy: An Introduction	1
ANDRÉ BÄCHTIGER, JOHN S. DRYZEK, JANE MANSBRIDGE, AND MARK E. WARREN	

## PART I ROOTS OF THE DELIBERATIVE APPROACH

2. The Origins of the Deliberative Turn	35
ANTONIO FLORIDIA	
3. The Philosophic Origins of Deliberative Ideals	55
SIMONE CHAMBERS	
4. The Forms of Deliberative Communication	70
FRANCESCA POLLETTA AND BETH GHARRITY GARDNER	
5. Deliberative Ideals Across Diverse Cultures	86
JENSEN SASS	
6. Indigenous Spheres of Deliberation	100
MARTIN HÉBERT	

## PART II THEORY OF DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY

7. The Epistemic Value of Democratic Deliberation	113
DAVID ESTLUND AND HÉLÈNE LANDEMORE	
8. Deliberation and Justice	132
STEFAN RUMMENS	

## x CONTENTS

9. Deliberation and Equality	144
EDANA BEAUVAIS	
10. Deliberative Democracy and Multiculturalism	156
MONIQUE DEVEAUX	
11. Deliberation and Representation	171
MARK B. BROWN	
12. Deliberation and Participatory Democracy	187
STEPHEN ELSTUB	
13. Religious Reasons in Public Deliberation	203
ANDREW F. MARCH AND ALICIA STEINMETZ	
14. Deliberation and Voting Entwined	218
GERRY MACKIE	
15. Listening and Deliberation	237
MICHAEL E. MORRELL	
16. Deliberation and Long-Term Decisions: Representing Future Generations	251
MICHAEL K. MACKENZIE	
 <b>PART III DELIBERATION IN FORUMS, PUBLICS, AND SYSTEMS</b>  	
17. Institutional Deliberation	273
PAUL J. QUIRK, WILLIAM BENDIX, AND ANDRÉ BÄCHTIGER	
18. Mini-Publics and Deliberative Democracy	300
MAIJA SETÄLÄ AND GRAHAM SMITH	
19. Deliberative Polling	315
JAMES FISHKIN	
20. Scaling Up Deliberative Effects—Applying Lessons of Mini-Publics	329
SIMON NIEMEYER AND JULIA JENNSTÅL	
21. Deliberative Media	348
ROUSILEY C. M. MAIA	

22. Online Deliberation	365
KIM STRANDBERG AND KIMMO GRÖNLUND	
23. Taking Everyday Political Talk Seriously	378
PAMELA JOHNSTON CONOVER AND PATRICK R. MILLER	
24. Deliberation in Protests and Social Movements	392
DONATELLA DELLA PORTA AND NICOLE DOERR	
25. Governance Networks	407
CAROLYN M. HENDRIKS AND JOHN BOSWELL	
26. Deliberation and Citizen Interests	420
JOHN FERREJOHN	
27. Deliberative Systems	432
JOHN PARKINSON	
28. Politics in Translation: Communication Between Sites of the Deliberative System	447
MICHAEL A. NEBLO AND AVERY WHITE	

#### PART IV DELIBERATIVE APPROACHES WITHIN DISCIPLINES AND FIELDS

29. Democratic Deliberation and Social Choice: A Review	463
CHRISTIAN LIST	
30. Deliberative Democracy and Comparative Democratization Studies	490
NICOLE CURATO AND JÜRIG STEINER	
31. Deliberation in Communication Studies	502
JOHN GASTIL AND LAURA W. BLACK	
32. Arguing and Deliberation in International Relations	518
THOMAS RISSE	
33. The Political Psychology of Deliberation	535
CHRISTOPHER F. KARPOWITZ AND TALİ MENDELBERG	
34. Deliberation and Framing	556
THOMAS J. LEEPER AND RUNE SLOTHUUS	

35. Deliberation in Sociology	573
ERIK SCHNEIDERHAN AND SHAMUS KHAN	
36. Deliberative Policy Analysis	584
FRANK FISCHER AND PIYAPONG BOOSSABONG	
37. Deliberative Planning Practices Without Smothering Invention: A Practical Aesthetic View	595
JOHN FORESTER	
38. Deliberative Law	612
DAVID L. PONET AND ETHAN J. LEIB	
39. Deliberative Constitutionalism	625
HOI KONG AND RON LEVY	
40. Deliberative Democracy and Science	640
ALFRED MOORE	

## METHODS

41. A Preface to Studying Deliberation Empirically	657
ANDRÉ BÄCHTIGER	
42. Deliberation and Experimental Design	663
KEVIN M. ESTERLING	
43. Qualitative Assessment of Deliberation	678
MARK BEVIR AND QUINLAN BOWMAN	

## PART V PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

44. Deliberative Democracy as a Reform Movement	697
JANETTE HARTZ-KARP, LYN CARSON, AND MICHAEL BRIAND	
45. Deliberative Democracy and Public Dispute Resolution	710
LAWRENCE SUSSKIND, JESSICA GORDON, AND YASMIN ZAERPOOR	
46. Deliberative Negotiation	728
DANIEL NAURIN AND CHRISTINE REH	
47. Deliberation in Deeply Divided Societies	742
IAN O'FLYNN AND DIDIER CALUWAERTS	

- 
48. Deliberative Democracy and the Environment 755  
 WALTER F. BABER AND ROBERT V. BARTLETT
49. Deliberation and Catastrophic Risks 768  
 RYAN GUNDERSON AND THOMAS DIETZ

**PART VI DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY  
 AROUND THE WORLD**

50. Deliberative Democracy in East Asia: Japan and China 791  
 BEIBEI TANG, TETSUKI TAMURA, AND BAOGANG HE
51. Deliberative Democracy in India 805  
 RAMYA PARTHASARATHY AND VIJAYENDRA RAO
52. Africa and Deliberative Politics 819  
 EMMANUEL IFEANYI ANI
53. Deliberative Democracy in Latin America 829  
 THAMY POGREBINSCHI
54. Deliberation Constrained: An Increasingly Segmented European Union 842  
 ERIK O. ERIKSEN AND JOHN ERIK FOSSUM
55. Transnational and Global Deliberation 856  
 WILLIAM SMITH

**PART VII REFLECTIONS**

56. Interview with Jürgen Habermas 871  
 SEPTEMBER 2016, TRANSLATED BY CIARAN CRONIN
57. If Deliberation Is Everything, Maybe It's Nothing 883  
 ROBERT E. GOODIN
58. Reflections on Deliberative Democracy: When Theory Meets Practice 900  
 AMY GUTMANN AND DENNIS THOMPSON

- Index* 913



# LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

---

## FIGURES

---

29.1	The aggregative model	464
29.2	The pure deliberative model	469
29.3	The mixed model	469
29.4	Single-peaked preferences	472
29.5	Non-single-peaked preferences	472
29.6	Deliberation as preference transformation	476

## TABLES

---

1.1	Standards for good deliberation	4
12.1	Conceptions of democracy	191
18.1	Types and characteristics of mini-publics	301
29.1	A profile of individual judgments in the court example	483
29.2	A profile of individual judgments in the expert-committee example	483
45.1	Spectrum of processes for collaboration and consensus-building in public decisions	721





## LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

- Emmanuel Ifeanyi Ani** Senior Lecturer in Philosophy, University of Ghana
- Walter F. Baber** Professor in the Graduate Center for Public Policy and Administration, California State University, Long Beach
- André Bächtiger** Professor of Political Theory, University of Stuttgart
- Robert V. Bartlett** Gund Professor of the Liberal Arts, Department of Political Science, University of Vermont
- Edana Beauvais** SSHRC Postdoctoral Research Fellow, Centre for the Study of Democratic Citizenship, McGill University
- William Bendix** Associate Professor of Political Science, Keene State College
- Mark Bevir** Professor of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley
- Laura W. Black** Associate Professor, School of Communication Studies, Ohio University
- Piyapong Boossabong** Assistant Professor of Policy Analysis and Planning, Mahasarakham University
- John Boswell** Associate Professor in Politics, University of Southampton
- Quinlan Bowman** Postdoctoral Fellow, School of Social Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
- Michael Briand** Communications Director, CivicEvolution, and Contributing Editor, The Transpartisan Voice, Australia
- Mark B. Brown**, Professor of Political Science, California State University, Sacramento
- Didier Caluwaerts** Assistant Professor of Public Policy, Vrije Universiteit, Brussels
- Lyn Carson** Former Professor of Applied Politics, University of Sydney Business School, Honorary Professor, US Studies Centre at University of Sydney, and Adjunct Professor at Western Sydney University Associate, Centre for Deliberative Democracy and Global Governance, University of Canberra
- Simone Chambers** Professor of Political Science, School of Social Sciences, University of California, Irvine

AQ: Please  
provide Cronin  
detail?

**Pamela Johnston Conover** Distinguished Professor of Political Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**Nicole Curato** ARC Discovery Early Career Research Fellow, University of Canberra

**Monique Deveaux** Professor of Philosophy, University of Guelph

**Thomas Dietz** Distinguished Professor of Sociology and Environmental Science and Policy, Michigan State University

**Nicole Doerr** Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Copenhagen

**John S. Dryzek** Centenary Professor, ARC Laureate Fellow, University of Canberra

**Stephen Elstub** Lecturer in British Politics, Newcastle University

**Erik O. Eriksen** Director ARENA and Professor of Political Science, University of Oslo

**Kevin M. Esterling** Professor, Department of Political Science and Professor, School of Public Policy, University of California—Riverside

**David Estlund** Lombardo Professor of the Humanities, Brown University

**John Ferejohn** Professor of Law and Politics, New York University

**Frank Fischer** Distinguished Professor of Politics and Global Affairs, Rutgers University

**James Fishkin** Professor of Communication and Political Science, Stanford University

**Antonio Floridia** Director of the “Policies for Citizen Participation” Sector of Tuscany Region and President of the Italian Society of Electoral Studies

**John Forester** Professor, Department of City and Regional Planning, Cornell University

**John Erik Fossum** ARENA, Professor of Political Science, University of Oslo

**Beth Gharrity Gardner** Postdoctoral Researcher, Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences Centre for Citizenship, Social Pluralism and Religious Diversity, University of Potsdam

**John Gastil** Professor of Political Science, Pennsylvania State University

**Robert E. Goodin** Distinguished Professor of Philosophy, Australian National University

**Jessica Gordon** PhD candidate in Environmental Policy and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

**Kimmo Grönlund** Professor of Political Science, Åbo Akademi University

**Ryan Gunderson** Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology and Gerontology, Miami University

**Amy Gutmann** Professor of Political Science, Philosophy, Education, and Communication, University of Pennsylvania

**Jürgen Habermas** Professor Emeritus, University of Frankfurt

**Janette Hartz-Karp** Professor, Sustainability Policy Institute, Curtin University

**Baogang He** Alfred Deakin Professor and Chair in International Relations, Deakin University

**Martin Hébert** Professor, Department of Anthropology, Université Laval

**Carolyn M. Hendriks** Associate Professor of Public Policy and Governance, Australian National University

**Julia Jennstål** Postdoctoral Researcher, Department of Government, Uppsala University

**Christopher F. Karpowitz** Associate Professor of Political Science, Brigham Young University

**Shamus Khan** Associate Professor of Sociology, Columbia University

**Hoi Kong** Associate Professor, Faculty of Law, McGill University

**Hélène Landemore** Associate Professor of Political Science, Yale University

**Thomas J. Leeper** Associate Professor in Political Behaviour, London School of Economics

**Ethan J. Leib** Professor of Law, Fordham University

**Ron Levy** Senior Lecturer in Law, Australian National University

**Christian List** Professor of Political Science and Philosophy, London School of Economics

**Michael K. MacKenzie** Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Pittsburgh

**Gerry Mackie** Associate Professor of Political Science, University of California, San Diego

**Rousiley C. M. Maia** Professor at the Department of Social Communication, Federal University of Minas Gerais, Brazil

**Jane Mansbridge** Adams Professor of Political Leadership and Democratic Values, Harvard University

**Andrew F. March** Associate Professor of Political Science, Yale University

- Tali Mendelberg** Professor of Politics, Princeton University
- Patrick R. Miller** Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Kansas
- Alfred Moore** Lecturer in Political Theory, Department of Politics, University of York
- Michael E. Morrell** Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Connecticut
- Daniel Naurin** Professor of Political Science, University of Oslo
- Michael A. Neblo** Associate Professor of Political Science and Philosophy, Ohio State University
- Simon Niemeyer** Associate Professor, University of Canberra
- Ian O’Flynn** Senior Lecturer in Political Theory, Newcastle University
- John Parkinson** Professor of Policy and Democracy, Griffith University
- Ramya Parthasarathy** PhD candidate, Stanford University
- Thamy Pogrebinski** Associate Professor of Political Science, State University of Rio de Janeiro and Senior Researcher, WZB Berlin Social Science Center
- Francesca Polletta** Professor of Sociology, University of California
- David L. Ponet** Parliamentary Specialist, UNICEF
- Donatella della Porta** Professor of Sociology, European University Institute
- Paul J. Quirk** Professor of Political Science, University of British Columbia
- Vijayendra Rao** Lead Economist, Development Research, World Bank
- Christine Reh** Reader in European Politics, School of Public Policy, UCL
- Thomas Risse** Professor of International Relations, Freie Universität Berlin
- Stefan Rummens** Professor of Moral and Political Philosophy, KU Leuven
- Jensen Sass** Postdoctoral Research Fellow, Centre for Deliberative Democracy and Global Governance, University of Canberra
- Erik Schneiderhan** Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Toronto
- Maija Setälä** Professor in Political Science, University of Turku
- Rune Slothuus** Professor of Political Science, Aarhus University
- Graham Smith** Professor of Politics, University of Westminster
- William Smith** Associate Professor, Department of Government and Public Administration, Chinese University of Hong Kong

**Jürg Steiner** Professor Emeritus of Political Science, University of North Carolina and University of Bern

**Alicia Steinmetz** PhD student, Yale University

**Kim Strandberg** Academy research fellow, Academy of Finland, Åbo Akademi University

**Lawrence Susskind** Professor of Environmental and Urban Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

**Tetsuki Tamura** Professor of Political Science, Graduate School of Law, Nagoya University

**Beibei Tang** Associate Professor and Deputy Head of Department of China Studies, Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University

**Dennis Thompson** Alfred North Whitehead Professor of Political Philosophy, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University

**Mark E. Warren** Professor of Political Science, University of British Columbia

**Avery White** PhD candidate, Ohio State University

**Yasmin Zaerpoor** PhD candidate, Environmental Policy and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology



## CHAPTER 10

.....

# DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY AND MULTICULTURALISM

.....

MONIQUE DEVEAUX

THERE is much in deliberative democracy that is conducive to an inclusive and diverse public sphere. The theory's grounding in communicative as opposed to strategic and instrumental action (Habermas 1984) requires that we respect citizens' moral differences and not seek to remove these from democratic political life. The requirement that political decision-making be based on public deliberation and the respectful exchange of shared reasons—rather than on mere interests or sheer power—ought to encourage citizens to share their different values and seek mutually acceptable agreements. Deliberative democracy's core commitments to political equality and mutual respect in public discourse, and to the principle that legitimate outcomes are ones that all participants to deliberation can accept, arguably helps to enfranchise people who hail from disempowered communities—including racialized and (some) cultural minorities. Finally, the acknowledgement in deliberative democracy theory of an informal public sphere, in addition to the formal public sphere of constitutional democratic politics (Habermas 1996), has the potential to open up additional pathways for democratic participation for marginalized social groups (Williams 1998; Young 1990; 2000).

## MULTICULTURALISM AND PROBLEMS OF DELIBERATIVE INJUSTICE AND EXCLUSION

.....

Despite its seeming advantages, critics have argued that deliberative democracy may throw up obstacles to the political participation of some social groups, thus hampering efforts to deepen democratic inclusion in multicultural liberal societies. These concerns, which have prompted numerous proposed amendments to deliberative democracy, can be distilled into four clusters of problems.

## Deliberative Inequalities

Proponents of deliberative democracy have long acknowledged that social and economic inequalities negatively impact people's deliberative capacities and standing (Bohman 1996; Young 1990). Just as low income and socio-economic standing are widely understood to track low political participation rates in many democracies, so is social disadvantage thought to impact citizens' capacities and opportunities to deliberate in political life—their deliberative “capabilities”. This leads to a condition of “political poverty”—“a group-related inability to make effective use of opportunities to influence the deliberative process” (Bohman 1996, 125)—deriving from the fact that “the material prerequisites for deliberation are unequally distributed” (Sanders 1997, 349). Where socio-economically disadvantaged status tracks ethnic or racial minority status, deliberative inequalities are compounded. To the extent that socially disadvantaged racialized and cultural minority groups have less access to educational and political resources, their members may lack the deliberative skills of more privileged citizens to engage in reasoned public deliberation (Bohman 1996; Sanders 1997; Young 1990), as well as opportunities to do so.

Group-based structural inequalities reflecting historical injustices like colonialism and slavery also give rise to contemporary status differentials that affect whose voice carries in deliberation, and whose does not (Williams 1998). This second aspect of the problem of deliberative inequalities—how one's social status or standing enhances, or decreases, one's deliberative inclusion and impact—is bound up with ongoing practices and structures of racial and gender discrimination. Young argues that status differentials and accompanying “inequalities of power and resources” (Young 2000, 54) give rise to both external and internal forms of exclusion. Deliberative democracy has arguably tried to address the most visible forms of external exclusion affecting aggregative democracy, which “concern how people are kept outside the process of discussion and decision-making” (Young 2000, 55). But many models of deliberation may fail to prevent internal exclusion, manifesting, for example, as an attitude of dismissal and disrespect towards those with lesser social and economic power and status (55). While there is evidence that special efforts are made to include linguistic minorities in some formal deliberative settings by making frequent reference to their interests and concerns (Pedrini, Bächtiger, and Steenbergen 2013), the same cannot be said for racialized and subordinated [minorities](#).

## Cultural Group Differences and Deliberative Styles

Deliberative inequalities affecting ethnocultural and racial minorities do not only arise as a result of socio-economic disadvantage per se. Members of communities with social experiences, worldviews, or values far from the mainstream—among them indigenous peoples, some cultural (including immigrant) identity groups, and racialized



minorities—may find their views simply dismissed or “discounted” (Young 2000, 55) in seemingly democratic forums. Quasi-deliberative public hearings or consultations sometimes block more radical perspectives on social problems by deeming certain concerns outside the scope of their mandate. In Québec, the Taylor–Bouchard Commission on “reasonable accommodation” insisted that its sole focus was the challenges posed by religious and ethnocultural diversity to integration into Québec society and democratic political life; accordingly, it excluded justice claims relating to *aboriginal* identity and status, and sidelined those pertaining to racism and racialization (Bouchard and Taylor 2008). Such boundary-setting moves arguably lead to a failure of democratic legitimacy insofar as those groups that are excluded or marginalized from political deliberation are nonetheless impacted by the outcome: “they are the legal addressees of the deliberative agreements over which they have no real influence or public input” (Bohman 1996, 125–6).

Members of cultural and religious minorities may also have styles of political communication that contrast sharply with the modes of communication assumed or stipulated by norms of deliberative democracy. ~~These include~~ engaging in formal public dialogue and deliberation, and providing publicly accessible and (in some sense) impartial reasons. Some ethnocultural minorities and *Aboriginal* peoples balk at the requirement that they “translate” their claims into terms demanded by idealized models of moral dialogue, expressing a sense of alienation in response to demands that they give reasons that are universalizable (Coulthard 2010; Deveaux 2000; Young 2000). Indeed, such demands are arguably unjust insofar as they require “one party to set aside its culturally specific ways, while the other party has the luxury not only of having its style of conflict prevail but of believing that its style is culturally unmarked and universally applicable” (Kahane 2004, 42). Racialized and cultural minority groups with styles of political speech and argumentation may therefore face significant disadvantages. This has led some deliberative democrats to propose that communication in deliberative contexts should be expanded to include less formal modes of speech, such as storytelling, narrative, and testimony (Sanders 1997; Young 2000). Yet it has become clear that to fully respond to group-based deliberative inequalities and the justice claims of ethnocultural and religious communities, core norms of deliberative democracy will need to be critically rethought and revised. For example, three categories of validity claims set out by Habermas (1984, 1996)—those relating to truth and facts; norms; and sincerity or self-expression—do not capture the full range of speech that should be considered *prima facie* valid in moral and political discourse (Bohman 2004; Deveaux 2000; Young 2000). Traditional and indigenous societies in particular make claims that interweave myth, storytelling, and oral histories, many of which do not readily fit into any of these existing categories of validity claims (Young 2000; Hemmingsen 2016). On some interpretations, the publicity demand requires that citizens treat their identities as constructed and contestable, thereby disadvantaging indigenous peoples (Coulthard 2010; 2014). Critical interventions by those concerned about securing democratic justice for ethnocultural and racialized groups have thus led some theorists to move away from an orthodox version of discourse ethics and towards what Urbinati has called “an agonistic form of deliberative democracy” (2000, 774).

## Identity Group Claims and Deliberative Virtues

To better understand calls for a shift towards an agonistic form of deliberative democracy, it is useful to consider which deliberative virtues are required by more traditional approaches to discourse ethics, and how these might be expected to disadvantage different social groups in multicultural and racially diverse societies. Melissa Williams (1998) has argued that the requirement that deliberative participants refrain from appealing to self-interest affects members of cultural minority groups asymmetrically and unjustly. This demand, which stems from a commitment to deliberative virtues of impartiality and universalizability, “hamper(s) marginalized group representatives’ capacity to conform to the standards of public discourse while also effectively representing their constituents’ perspectives and interests. Indeed, the status of marginalized groups as marginalized reflects, by definition, the fact that some of their fundamental interests are now systematically and unjustifiably neglected” (Williams 1998, 144). This leads Williams to conclude, rightly in my view, that “any discursive process in which that neglect can come to light must make space for the expression of group-specific interests” (144).

The valid interests that some cultural minorities may potentially seek to introduce into deliberation may include claims about the value of their group identity and particular traditions and practices; about the importance of a specific territory (e.g. in the case of Aboriginal peoples); and about the need for special group representation, or other special political arrangements up to and including sovereignty, in light of their historical exclusion. Indeed, the validity of a range of cultural group-based justice claims in multicultural societies has been persuasively defended by (non-deliberative) democratic theorists on the grounds of equality and individual autonomy (see especially Kymlicka 1995). It is not hard to see how the presentation and defense of these cultural group claims is hampered by a prohibition on appeals to (individual or group) self-interest. The requirement that cultural identity and its preservation be treated as fully contestable in the context of deliberation—as demanded by Benhabib’s deliberative democratic approach, for example—also flows from norms of universalizability and impartiality (Benhabib 1996; 2000). Coulthard has suggested (2014) that this requirement may disadvantage Aboriginal participants to deliberation, given the central importance of identity claims in their justice struggles.

A related deliberative virtue that has come under scrutiny in light of cultural group-based interests and justice claims is that of reciprocity. Pedrini, Bächtiger, and Steenbergen (2013) argue that the “burden of reciprocity” ought not to be demanded equally of linguistic minorities and majorities: “it is legitimate for minorities to be less responsive to majorities and do politics in a slightly more adversarial and passionate way when their vital interests are affected” (508). Their research on the Swiss political system also suggests that at least in some political contexts, when linguistic majorities reference linguistic minorities’ group interests frequently, this may lead to greater deliberative inclusion and interaction across linguistic cleavages. The more agonistic, contestatory

approach to deliberative democracy advocated by Urbinati (2000), Deveaux (2006), and others permits appeals to group-based interests and advocacy within political deliberation more readily than do models of deliberation that equate any reference to interests with aggregative politics.

## The Ideal of a Common Good

A much-touted advantage of Habermas's model of discourse ethics over Rawls's conception of political deliberation is that it does not seek to limit the scope of citizens' contributions in advance of actual deliberation. Those liberal theories of justice in which citizens' deliberations figure prominently—including Rawls's later writing—appeal to unrevised norms of impartiality and public reason that arguably pose barriers to the inclusion of cultural minority citizens in political deliberation on terms that are acceptable to them; these models require that citizens bracket or translate their identity-related interests in the course of making justice claims. Relatedly, Young (1990; 1996; 2000) argues that some deliberative democratic norms contribute to an ideal of the public sphere that demands an implausible and unnecessary unity. Appeals to unity or to a notion of the common good may require participants in public dialogue to set aside their identity-based differences and treat “difference itself [as] something to be transcended, because it is partial and divisive” (Young 2000, 42). While the idea of a common good is reflected in some communitarian approaches to deliberative democracy, it has been widely rejected by many deliberative democrats as incompatible with respect for concrete (as opposed to abstract) pluralism (Bohman 1995; 1996; 2010; Deveaux 2000; 2006; Festenstein 2005; Mansbridge 2012; Parekh 2006; Young 2000).

An adjacent ideal, shared public reason, is, however, still widely endorsed by deliberative democracy theorists. But as with the notion of a common good, this norm may be taken to require that members of cultural minorities treat their identity-related claims as contestable and negotiable in deliberation (thus rendering their claims consistent with commitments to norms of impartiality and shared public reason). This seemingly reasonable norm may therefore unwittingly compound existing colonial structures of power and privilege (Coulthard 2010; 2014). For similar reasons, a deep commitment to respect for cultural pluralism may require that we revisit strong moral consensus (Gutmann and Thompson 1996; 2004) as a goal of democratic communication; and indeed, there are good grounds to abandon consensus in favor of an ethic or ideal of compromise (Bohman 1996; Deveaux 2006). The advantages of compromise over consensus for deep moral conflicts are obvious: compromise allows citizens with significantly disparate viewpoints or worldviews to reach some form of agreement without resorting to (unjust) coercion. Where processes of moral argumentation and public discourse are expected to culminate in moral consensus, deliberative participants may be pressured to set aside identity-based claims or demands that challenge the political status quo.

## REVISING DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY IN RESPONSE TO MULTICULTURAL CHALLENGES

Shifting away from consensus and towards compromise—and possibly a more agonistic model of deliberation—may make deliberative democracy more receptive to the justice claims of indigenous and cultural minority groups. Deep cultural conflicts in particular may be more readily acknowledged through such shifts: it may be that “in the more difficult cases of intercultural disagreement, it will suffice that participants believe they have equitably influenced the deliberative process and agree to continue to cooperate in good faith in future deliberations” (Valadez 2001, 5). For some deliberative democrats, compromise is still primarily construed as a moral process rather than as a strategic process akin to bargaining (Festenstein 2005; Bohman 2010). Presenting public reasons is essential on this account of deliberative compromise, which may be either procedural (relating to proposed changes to deliberation or decision making itself) or else substantive in nature (Bohman 2010, 99). Yet there is also reason to think that deliberative democracy ought to embrace negotiation (Mansbridge et al. 2010; Mansbridge 2012; Warren and Mansbridge et al. 2016) and even bargaining (Deveaux 2006; Habermas 1996; James 2004), despite the association of these mechanisms with what Mansbridge (1996) refers to as the “adversary tradition” of democracy. Negotiation and bargaining could in some circumstances require participants to make more transparent (and so to confront) their strategic interests, including in the context of intracultural disputes (Deveaux 2003; 2006). A more political conception of compromise recognizes that deep disagreements are often of a political rather than moral nature, as in the case of the conflicts arising in the reconciliation process between aboriginal peoples and settlers in Australia (Iverson 2010, 133).

Importantly, more moralized conceptions of discourse ethics, such as that represented by Habermas’s (1984) earliest elaboration of communicative ethics, are more vulnerable to the multicultural challenges set out above than are more political accounts of deliberative democracy. Helpful here is Bächtiger et al.’s (2010) distinction between two types of deliberation, one faithful to Habermas’s theory of communicative action—with its emphasis on proceduralism and rational discourse—and the other encompassing “more flexible forms of discourse, more emphasis on outcomes versus process, and more attention to overcoming ‘real world’ constraints on realizing normative ideals” (Bächtiger et al. 2010, 33). Along with a number of other deliberative democrats, I have argued that deliberative democracy conceived of as a political (and moral) dialogue between citizens of diverse cultural and religious communities is crucial to the construction of a more just, democratic polity (Benhabib 1996; 2002; Bohman 1996; Deveaux 2000; 2006; Mansbridge 1999; 2010; Tully 1996; Williams 1995; 1998; Young 1990; 2000).

In response to concerns about the consequences of discourse-ethical norms of publicity and impartiality for the inclusion of diverse cultural communities, a number of deliberative democracy theorists have urged a shift to a more “pluralistic ideal of deliberation” (Bohman 2010, 110) consisting in a more inclusive or plural conception of public reason. Theorizing in this vein corresponds to Bächtiger et al.’s Type II deliberation in that it emphasizes “outcomes versus process” and “incorporates alternative forms of communication, such as rhetoric or story-telling” (2010, 33–4). A more expansive public sphere, with a wider view of what can count as potentially acceptable political communication—moving beyond discourse ethics’ existing categories of validity claims and forms and styles of discourse—arguably opens politics up to the discursive styles of some cultural and religious minority citizens. Nor is this opening limited to the domain of politics; law, too, can be deployed in efforts to construct more inclusive discursive norms. For example, some democratic theorists point to the Supreme Court of Canada’s decision in *Delgamuukw v. British Columbia* (Benhabib 2002, 140–1; Bohman 2010), which established the legal validity of indigenous oral tradition and history as evidence in court cases, as an example of how legal changes to evidentiary norms can propel broader norms of public discourse in a more democratic direction (though for a more pessimistic and critical view of this case, see Coulthard 2007, 451).

But significant challenges remain. Might the worldviews and discursive modes of some communities within liberal democracies, such as traditional religious groups, be so incommensurable that not even democratic processes guided by a pluralistic account of public reason will suffice to enfranchise these groups? What of situations in which there is no common commitment to norms of democratic legitimacy and universal political equality? Then there is the matter of social and political inequality: how do entrenched disadvantages that track ethnocultural, racialized, or recent immigrant status in liberal democracies prevent members of such groups from participating in democratic deliberation (Bohman 1996, 105; Valadez 2001; Young 2000)? And how might these injustices be reversed? One way forward is suggested by Young’s idea of treating group-based differences as a *resource* in democratic communication and deliberation (Young 1999; 2000). Focusing on the non-ideal context that actually exists in liberal constitutional democracies rather than that supposed by discourse ethics’ ideal speech situation or ideal liberal and republican theories, Young argues that background social-structural injustices exist that powerfully shape the opportunities and perspectives of social groups (2000, 97). These “structural groups sometimes build on or overlap with cultural groups, as in most structures of racialized differentiation or ethnic-based privilege” (Young 2000, 98). Rather than viewing “situated knowledges” (Young 2000, 114) as an impediment to public deliberation, we should treat them as a powerful deliberative resource in democratic communication. By including these socially-situated perspectives in democratic deliberation and decision-making a plurality of perspectives—especially those of socially marginalized persons and cultural and racial minorities—we can help to counter the imposition of the status quo views of those with social privilege (Young 1999, 399).

The intertwining of social inequality with cultural or religious minority status may demand more radical revisions to deliberative democracy theory and practice than Young envisaged, however. Social inequality and disadvantage need to be borne in mind when asking what deliberative mechanisms could help to more fully (and authentically) include minority citizens in public dialogue, and how diverse citizens' deliberative capacities might be developed in a multicultural and multiracial context (Song 2007, 70). To genuinely ensure the inclusion of citizens that are not only cultural, racial, or religious minorities, but also disadvantaged in socio-economic terms, we will need to move past well-meaning visions of difference-friendly dialogue. In particular, it will require tangible measures to equalize access to the resources and capacities that citizens need to participate effectively in deliberative forums: Valadez, for example, proposes a number of concrete steps that states could take to ensure what he calls "epistemological egalitarianism" in deliberation (Valadez 2001, 7). And as suggested above, it may be that shifting away from consensus and towards compromise might better serve the goal of including cultural and religious minority citizens, regardless of the question of socio-economic disadvantage. Similarly, as we saw, we ought arguably to include interests within deliberation, rather than bracketing them, so long as these are constrained by "ideals of mutual respect, equality, reciprocity, mutual justification, the search for fairness, and the absence of coercive power" (Mansbridge et al. 2010, 94; Mansbridge 1996).

Developing more deeply democratic and inclusive forms of public deliberation depends, at least in part, on a deeper welcoming of diverse citizens' values, perspectives, interests, and styles of political communication. The demand that cultural minority citizens bracket their identity-related interests in order to make normative claims consistent with public reason and impartiality is, in some contexts at least, problematic and even unjust. These diverse and situated perspectives are valuable for public deliberation—a resource for democratic communication, and ultimately, democratic justice (Young 1999; 2000; Tully 1996). Legitimate interests evolve from the situated perspectives of those who experience disadvantage and even oppression, and these may need to be asserted in order to challenge one's very marginalization. An important task for deliberative democracy theory, then, is to "[parse] out the appropriate normative and practical relationships between a politics aimed at forging a common good and a politics aimed at legitimately pursuing and negotiating conflicting self-interests" (Mansbridge 2012, 790).

Including interests within the domain of public deliberation opens up the possibility of using some of the components associated with adversarial politics. Negotiation and even bargaining may, in some contexts, serve to make deliberative democracy more inclusive of the diverse worldviews and reasoning of cultural minority citizens is of course a controversial one. Despite Habermas's own acknowledgment that contexts of deep pluralism may warrant the use of bargaining and compromise (Habermas 1996: 165–6), some deliberative democrats see such mechanisms as at odds with the process of public reasoning. They worry that negotiation and bargaining, and indeed political compromise in general, deny the authority of moral argumentation and so have more in common with coercive politics than discourse (Benhabib 1996, 79). But it is not clear that this is so. Arguably, reasons can and should be given to support and justify



identity-related reasons for wanting particular cultural rights or access to resources, for example (Eisenberg 2009). But these reasons need not necessarily refer to deep moral differences, such as fundamental ethical conflicts; rather, reasons could speak to a range of what political scientists refer to as “ideational” factors as well as practical, real-world interests.

Where negotiation, bargaining, and compromise are used in political deliberation, it is important that agreements be treated as revisable. This is especially important in cases where deliberative decision-making is used to mediate intra-cultural conflicts (Deveaux 2003; 2006)—for example, around the status of religious personal or family law for settling legal disputes within a religious minority community. Revisability allows the positions of members of communities to change over time, and does not leave members beholden to a particular agreement or compromise in perpetuity—especially to agreements which may later be rejected as unsuitable or unjust.

The shifts within deliberative democracy theory that I have described and defended here have largely been propelled by demands for cultural recognition and inclusion. They move us towards a more political, less procedurally orthodox approach to public deliberation (Bächtiger et al. 2010) that permits a wider variety of styles and forms of political discourse; acknowledges a broader range of validity claims than Habermas’s model does; replaces strong moral consensus with compromise (as the goal of deliberation); and admits the legitimate role that (self-) interests may play in dialogue and decision-making—including bargaining and negotiation in relation to these. Crucially, this revised version of deliberative democracy recognizes the frequent intertwining of cultural minority status, socio-economic disadvantage, and relative political powerlessness.

These changes, which are more characteristic of theorizing that corresponds to Bächtiger et al.’s Type II deliberation, may appear to push deliberative democracy closer to the political approaches of its main rivals—aggregative interest-based and adversarial models of politics—than some would like. Explicitly political conceptions of public deliberation do, after all, incorporate mechanisms—bargaining, negotiation, polling, and voting—that early iterations of discourse ethics eschewed as at odds with moral argumentation. But it may well be that incorporating “both deliberative and aggregative characteristics” makes sense from the vantage point of concerns about cultural pluralism, for all of the reasons discussed above, and because “bargaining and voting [etc.] may be needed to reach collective decisions in a plural polity” (James 2004, 51–2).

Not surprisingly, the affinities between deliberative democracy and agonistic theories of politics (Chambers 2003) become more apparent when we consider these proposed revisions to public deliberation as driven by multicultural challenges. It remains the case, of course, that even accounts of political deliberation that foreground interests, bargaining, and negotiation remain committed to the use of normative reason and the principle of communicative (as opposed to strategic) action in politics. But on the more political conception of deliberative democracy I have outlined here, conflict—including interest-based conflict—is no longer treated as something (necessarily) to be sidestepped, sublimated, or even necessarily transcended. Rather, conflict is seen as part

and parcel of an understanding of democracy as a process that includes struggle (Young 2000, 50).

## THE USES OF PUBLIC DELIBERATION FOR RESOLVING INTERCULTURAL DISPUTES

Concrete political practices have evolved that exemplify the application of deliberative mechanisms to conflicts or disagreements involving cultural or religious minority communities. There are three main domains in which deliberative democracy has been applied to concrete issues: cultural accommodation or intercultural disputes.

- (i) The emergence of indigenous cultural dispute resolution models, which combine indigenous emphases on mutual decision-making and consensus with elements of deliberative democracy (Kahane and Bell 2004). In Canada, these indigenous approaches have influenced dispute resolution processes involving indigenous land claims, and have also contributed to the shaping of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission concerning the legacy of Canada's residential school system for aboriginal children.
- (ii) Deliberative democratic principles have been proposed as a way of reconciling differences in liberal yet deeply divided societies, in which national religious or linguistic minorities have a deep historical mistrust of one another and/or the state. Examples of such societies include countries with different national linguistic communities, such as Belgium, and those with significant religious cleavages, such as Northern Ireland and Lebanon (Dembinska and Montambeault 2015; Dryzek 2005; Luskin et al. 2014; O'Flynn 2006). For more discussion of the application of deliberative mechanisms to divided societies, see Chapter 47 in this volume by Ian O'Flynn and Didier Caluwaerts on "Deliberation in Deeply Divided Societies."
- (iii) Deliberative democracy mechanisms have been proposed as a means of addressing policy disagreements concerning the status (or permissibility) of social/cultural practices or arrangements in culturally plural democratic societies; I elaborate on this below.

It is easy to see the appeal of a deliberative democratic approach to resolving conflicts between cultural or religious minority groups and the state. Rather than issuing an ultimatum to groups whose social practices or arrangements run afoul of the liberal state's norms and laws, a deliberative democratic approach makes possible a respectful dialogue based on the exchange of mutually shared reasons. Democratic legitimacy and respect for cultural groups' own processes of internal reform also point in favor of resolving disputes through dialogical and deliberative processes. Deliberative



consultations—such as government and para-governmental deliberative hearings and consultations on policy matters affecting cultural and religious communities—and intercultural, dialogue-based legal dispute resolutions are a few examples of mechanisms that have been advanced and (in some jurisdictions) implemented.

A dialogical intercultural approach to amending and negotiating contemporary constitutions in multination and plural societies is defended by Tully (1996) as an infinitely more just process of constitution-building than non-dialogical ones. Song has also argued for a broadly deliberative approach to mediating inter- and intracultural justice conflicts; situated on the liberal end of the spectrum of deliberative democracy proponents, Song insists that deliberation in all cases must be bound by a strong commitment to liberal principles of (substantive) political equality and individual freedom (2007, 69). She urges a strong role for government in ensuring that the rights and other requirements associated with these principles are met, and *urges* against leaving such matters up to groups themselves. The propensity of some cultural and religious groups to subordinate or discriminate against their own members is Song's primary concern here; she also contends that the lack of political equality in a deliberative process necessarily undermines its democratic legitimacy. Concerns about whether women's voices in particular are adequately included in deliberative processes have been raised by a number of theorists: Mahajan (2005, 109), for example, warns that in India "the inclusion of women in the deliberative process is by no means enough for altering existing community practices and making Personal Laws more just to women."

I share these concerns about whether women and other "minorities-within-minorities" (such as religious minorities and LGBT persons) may face discrimination and obstacles to participation in deliberative democratic processes. Yet it is not clear that merely insisting that core liberal principles be applied to deliberative designs solves these difficult problems. The insistence on seemingly uncontroversial liberal norms, such as that of gender equality—the precise meaning of which is highly contested—is unlikely to be effective if stipulated in advance of meaningful consultations with the community in question. Deliberative processes that pay no heed to processes internal to cultural or religious communities for deciding on matters related to the reform of social practices and arrangements also fail to accord them equal respect.

Arguably, more minimalist norms—those of non-domination, political inclusion, and revisability—are more relevant and just norms to guide both inter- and intracultural democratic deliberation (Deveaux 2006, 114–17). The advantages of these norms (unlike "thicker" deliberative norms like shared public reason and impartiality) is that they demand that deliberative processes that impact cultural communities meet a high standard of democratic legitimacy—whether these concern inter- or intracultural matters. Unlike deliberative liberals like Song, I contend that deliberative outcomes may still be democratically legitimate even if they affirm policies or practices/arrangements that stand in some tension with some of the normative principles of liberalism. I came to this conclusion through studying the (partial) success of deliberative democratic processes directed at the legal reform of certain cultural practices. One of these concerned the deliberative consultations and negotiations organized by the South African Law

Commission in 1998 regarding how best to reform customary marriage in the country. The consultations, which included diverse stakeholders from different national communities, ultimately yielded legal reforms that improved yet still permitted the continuation of customary marriage under African customary law (Deveaux 2003; 2006). The country's 1996 Constitution, which accorded protection to women's sexual equality right yet also recognized the validity of African customary law in matters of marriage and inheritance, could not resolve the clear tension between the two. Negotiation, bargaining, compromise, and revisability were crucial to the ~~amended form of~~ deliberation that I identified at work there, and made possible wide agreement on new laws governing customary marriage.

When thinking about the promise and perils of deliberative approaches to conflict resolution within cultural communities and between those communities and the state, it is of course essential to ask hard questions about whose voices are heard and how decisions are ultimately made. But equally, it is important to remember that public deliberation need not be confined to the traditional political forums conceived by deliberative democrats, and that ~~this~~ broader scope of democratic activity bodes well for less powerful group members. I noted at the outset of this chapter that activity in the informal public sphere may serve to advance democratic inclusion. For instance, the political activities of certain cultural or religious associations may help to foster greater participation in formal political processes on the part of minority citizens (Deveaux 2006; Song 2007). However, as in the case of the formal public sphere, there exist tangible barriers to the meaningful participation of marginalized subgroups within even informal political spaces. Resources are required in order to enhance the deliberative capacities of minority communities, and internal minorities within these communities, as well as to help ensure that democratic activities in the informal sphere contribute to political decision-making in formal institutions.

## CONCLUSION

The modifications proposed in response to the challenges of multiculturalism have not satisfied all critics, or defenders, of deliberative democracy theory. Those who reject the theory's framing of multicultural politics as chiefly problems of misrecognition and lack of inclusion—rather than of colonial power and domination—are unlikely to be satisfied by these changes (Coulthard 2014). At the other end of the spectrum, some see a basic tension between deliberative democracy's core aspirations and a politics driven by cultural group claims (James 2004). According to this view, a model of democratic inclusion which views recognition in terms of the acknowledgement of so-called authentic group identities risks *excluding* many voices within minority communities, for it demands deference from both members and nonmembers (McBride 2005).

Despite these and other valid concerns, there are good reasons to think that deliberative democratic theory and practice will continue to inform debates about how

to make liberal constitutional democracies more open and inclusive of ethnocultural and religious minorities. Nor is this just a matter of applying deliberative democratic tools developed within a Western philosophical framework to conflicts within liberal societies. Deliberation in non-Western societies is becoming an important subject of study, as democracy theorists attempt to understand the extent to which political deliberation is universal and the particular forms it takes in diverse societies (Dryzek and Sass 2014; see also Chapter 5 by Sass in this volume). Just as the challenge from multicultural groups within liberal democracies pushed the boundaries of deliberative democracy in the past, it seems likely that alternative deliberative forms *outside* in other parts of the world will stretch the frontiers of this theory still further—perhaps even extending its relevance outside of the realm of democracy, as conventionally understood.

## REFERENCES

- Bächtiger, A., Niemeyer, S., Neblo, M., Steenbergen, M., and Steiner, J. (2010). Disentangling Diversity in Deliberative Democracy: Competing Theories, Their Blind-Spots, and Complementarities. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 18: 32–63.
- Benhabib, S. (1996). Toward a Deliberative Model of Democratic Legitimacy. In *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, ed. S. Benhabib (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press), 67–94.
- Benhabib, S. (2002). *The Claims of Culture* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Bohman, J. (1995). Public Reason and Cultural Pluralism. *Political Theory*, 23: 253–79.
- Bohman, J. (1996). *Public Deliberation: Pluralism, Complexity, and Democracy* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).
- Bohman, J. (2004). Realizing Deliberative Democracy as a Mode of Inquiry: Pragmatism, Social Facts, and Normative Theory. *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 18: 23–43.
- Bohman, J. (2010). Multiculturalism, Pluralism and Democracy. In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Multiculturalism*, ed. D. Ivison (Farnham: Ashgate), 141–58.
- Bouchard, G. and Taylor, C. (2008). *Building the Future: A Time for Reconciliation*. Commission de Consultation sur les Pratiques d'Accommodement Reliées aux Différences Culturelles (Québec: Gouvernement de Québec).
- Chambers, S. (2003). Deliberative Democracy Theory. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 6: 307–26.
- Coulthard, G. (2007). Subjects of Empire: Indigenous Peoples and the “Politics of Recognition” in Canada. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 6: 437–60.
- Coulthard, G. (2010). Resisting Culture: Seyla Benhabib’s Deliberative Approach to the Politics of Recognition in Colonial Contexts. In *Deliberative Democracy in Practice*, ed. D. Kahane, Weinstock, D., Leydet, D., and Williams, M. (Vancouver: UBC Press), 138–54.
- Coulthard, G. (2014). *Red Skin, White Masks* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press).
- Dembinska, M. and Montambeault, F. (2015). Deliberation for Reconciliation in Divided Societies. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 11: 1–35.
- Deveaux, M. (2000). *Cultural Pluralism and Dilemmas of Justice* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

- Deveaux, M. (2003). A Deliberative Approach to Conflicts of Culture. *Political Theory*, 31: 780–807.
- Deveaux, M. (2006). *Gender and Justice in Multicultural Liberal States* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Dryzek, J. (2005). Deliberative Democracy in Divided Societies: Alternatives to Agonism and Analgesia. *Political Theory*, 33: 218–42.
- Dryzek, J. and Sass, J. (2014). Deliberative Cultures. *Political Theory*, 42: 3–25.
- Eisenberg, A. (2009). *Reasons of Identity: A Normative Guide to the Political and Legal Assessment of Identity Claims* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Festenstein, M. (2005). *Negotiating Diversity: Culture, Deliberation, Trust* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Gutmann, A. and Thompson, D. (1996). *Democracy and Disagreement* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Gutmann, A. and Thompson, D. (2004). *Why Deliberative Democracy?* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action*, vol. 1: *Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, trans. T. McCarthy (Boston, MA: Beacon Press).
- Habermas, J. (1996). *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*, trans. W. Rehg (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).
- Hemmingsen, M. (2016). Constructing a Global Account of Reason: Discourse, Moral Engagement, and Ecological Truth. PhD dissertation, McMaster University.
- Iverson, D. (2010). Deliberative Democracy and the Politics of Reconciliation. In *Deliberative Democracy in Practice*, ed. D. Kahane, D. Weinstock, D. eydet, and M. Williams (Vancouver: UBC Press), 115–37.
- James, M. R. (2004). *Deliberative Democracy and the Plural Polity* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas).
- Kahane, K. (2004). What is Culture? Generalizing About Aboriginal and Newcomer Perspectives. In *Intercultural Dispute Resolution in Aboriginal Contexts*, ed. D. Kahane and C. E. Bell (Vancouver: UBC Press), 28–56.
- Kahane, D. and Bell, C. E. (eds) (2004). *Intercultural Dispute Resolution in Aboriginal Contexts* (Vancouver: UBC Press).
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Luskin, R., O’Flynn, I., Fishkin, J. S., and Russell, D. (2014). Deliberating Across Deep Divides. *Political Studies*, 62: 116–35.
- Mahajan, G. (2005). Can Intra-Group Equality Co-Exist with Cultural Diversity? Re-Examining Multicultural Frameworks of Accommodation. In *Minorities Within Minorities*, ed. A. Eisenberg and J. Spinner-Halev (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 90–112.
- Mansbridge, J. (1996). Using Power/Fighting Power: The Polity. In *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, ed. S. Benhabib (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press), 46–66.
- Mansbridge, J. (1999). Everyday Talk in the Deliberative System. In *Deliberative Politics: Essays on Democracy and Disagreement*, ed. S. Macedo (New York: Oxford University Press), 211–39.
- Mansbridge, J., with Bohman, J., Chambers, S., Estlund, D., Føllesdal, A., Fung, A., Lafont, C., Manin, B., and Martí, J. L. (2010). The Place of Self-Interest and the Role of Power in Deliberative Democracy. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 18: 64–100.

- Mansbridge, J. (2012). Conflict and Commonality in Habermas's Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. *Political Theory*, 40: 789–801.
- McBride, C. (2005). Deliberative Democracy and the Politics of Recognition. *Political Studies*, 53: 497–515.
- O'Flynn, I. (2006). *Deliberative Democracy and Divided Societies* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).
- Parekh, B. (2006). *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Pedrini, S., Bächtiger, A., and Steenbergen, M. (2013). Deliberative Inclusion of Minorities: Patterns of Reciprocity among Linguistic Groups in Switzerland. *European Political Science Review*, 5: 483–512.
- Sanders, L. (1997). Against Deliberation. *Political Theory*, 25: 347–76.
- Song, S. (2007). *Justice, Gender, and the Politics of Multiculturalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Tully, J. (1996). *Strange Multiplicity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Urbinati, N. (2000). Representation as Advocacy: A Study of Democratic Deliberation. *Political Theory*, 28: 758–86.
- Valadez, J. (2001). *Deliberative Democracy, Political Legitimacy and Self-Determination in Multicultural Societies* (Oxford: Westview Press).
- Warren, M. E. and Mansbridge, J., with Bächtiger, A., Cameron, M. A., Chambers, S., Ferejohn, J., Jacobs, A., Knight, J., Naurin, D., Schwartzberg, M., Tamir, Y., Thompson, D., and Williams, M. (2016). Deliberative Negotiation. In *Political Negotiation: A Handbook*, ed. J. Mansbridge and C. J. Martin (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press), 141–96.
- Williams, M. (1995). Justice towards Groups: Political not Juridical. *Political Theory*, 23: 67–91.
- Williams, M. (1998). *Voice, Trust, and Memory: Marginalized Groups and the Failings of Liberal Representation* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Young, I. M. (1996). Communication and the Other: Beyond Deliberative Democracy. In *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, ed. S. Benhabib (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press), 120–35.
- Young, I. M. (1999). Difference as a Resource for Democratic Communication. In *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics*, ed. J. Bohman and W. Rehg (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press), 383–406.
- Young, I. M. (2000). *Inclusion and Democracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).