

TITLE:

Translating Deliberative Democracy Theory into Practice: Five Essential Principles Applied to the Case of a City Council Meeting in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

AUTHOR:

Copyright 2013  
Garrett Richards  
PhD Student  
School of Environmental Studies  
University of Victoria

ABSTRACT:

Finding areas of political consensus and making collective policy decisions is difficult under modern democracies. Deliberative democratic theory seeks to address these issues by transforming the system of public discussion from one of strategy, influence, and self-interest to one of authentic communication, critical thinking, and public participation. Its foundational principles are straightforward, but the specific guidelines for actually implementing the high-level ideas of academics like Rawls and Habermas are often confusing and contradictory. In order to translate the strengths of deliberative theory into practice, this paper distills the arguments of deliberative democrats into five independent principles (or lenses) that might be more accessible and meaningful to practitioners and the public than the abstract arguments of academics: accessibility, public reasoning, validity testing, group polarization, and power dynamics. To investigate whether such lenses are a useful foundation for practical deliberative analysis, the paper applies them to a public city council debate on recycling services in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, suggesting ways the discussion facilitation might have been more effective. For example, the principle of power dynamics suggests that the chair should strictly enforce speaking rules for councillors as they do for the public – doing so would save time and increase the legitimacy of the meeting. Because the lenses were able to facilitate common-sense suggestions for deliberative design and because they were able to operate somewhat independently of one another (rather than requiring a holistic theoretical understanding), they are likely an effective way of translating deliberative theory into an accessible yet grounded understanding for practitioners and the public.

KEY TERMS:

deliberative democracy, theory and practice, accessibility, public reasoning, validity testing, group polarization, power dynamics, city council

## INTRODUCTION:

Controversy has always been a defining characteristic of politics. In particular, modern democracies, confronted with cultural pluralism, vast inequities of power, and ideological biases, have degenerated into tactical arenas where citizens become mere competitors with few commitments beyond their own limited self-interests (Baber and Bartlett 2005, p. 5); finding areas of consensus and making collective decisions is difficult. At the same time, contemporary society is faced with increasingly complex political problems which are difficult to solve democratically under such conditions of strategic gamesmanship. Environmental issues, for instance, tend to transcend temporal and geographical boundaries, meaning that only a fraction of those who might be affected by a policy decision have any ability to influence that decision, and if they behave in a self-interested manner, the interests of the other stakeholders (and hence, of the collective) is undermined. Addressing such problems effectively means giving greater centrality to community interests. It is crucial to change the democratic arena from one of strategy and influence to one of authentic communication, where selfish positions are easily exposed and collective-oriented arguments are able to endure (Dryzek 1997, p. 200). One school of thought on how to alter the conditions of democracy in this way, and thus mitigate some of the problems with political controversy, is that of deliberative democracy.

Essentially, theories of deliberative democracy argue that generally thoughtful and discursive public participation in decision-making will produce more just and rational policy outcomes for society as a whole (Baber and Bartlett 2005, p. 3). This hypothesis is elaborated through both normative and positive evidence. The concept of enlarged thinking, for instance, explains that when a deliberative process thoroughly exposes participants to the breadth of the issue at hand in a non-confrontational manner, interests other than their own (e.g. those of non-human others and future generations) are necessarily called to mind (Dryzek 2000, p. 152). In turn, deliberative polling experiments, where randomly selected citizens are charged with discussing a social issue in a workshop format over a few days, have illustrated substantial shifts in the opinion of participants toward the collective good, such as more willingness to pay for energy conservation programs (Ackerman and Fishkin 2003, p. 22). While the basic philosophy of, and evidence for, deliberative democracy is straightforward and persuasive, most of its key tenets actually comprise more specific guidelines for achieving this ideal form of social discussion, which are considerably more complicated and lead to much disagreement among deliberative theorists.

Deliberative democracy is touted as a way to address the complexity of policy-making for contemporary social issues, but it is controversial and complex in itself. Many questions persist in the debate among deliberative scholars – for example, “Should deliberation permit rhetorical strategies or risk disenfranchising

groups that rely upon them?”, “Are there some kinds of communication (perhaps prejudiced, racist, or sectarian) that should be ruled out in advance?”, and “Should deliberation be oriented to consensus, or is it just a prelude to voting?”(see Dryzek 2000 and Young 2001). These questions, among others, have led to the development of very different conceptions of deliberative democracy across the field. Habermas’ ideal discourse, Rawls’ public reason, and Gutmann’s and Thompson’s five principles (see Baber and Bartlett 2005 and Gutmann and Thompson 1996) are each a comprehensive theory that answers some of the above questions, but they sometimes contradict one another and are not easily dissected into their constituent parts. Many scholars of deliberation turn their attention from this high-level philosophical debate to real-world implementation, conducting elaborate experiments such as deliberative polls, partisan and non-partisan forums, and citizen assemblies to test the efficacy of deliberative democracy (see Fishkin 1997, Hendriks et al. 2007, and Pilon 2009). Overall, it seems that little attention is paid to the more general uses of deliberation; everyday decision-makers may have difficulty extracting useful lessons from controversial debates, comprehensive theories, and grandiose experiments about deliberative democracy. Bridging this gap will enable more political actors to understand social problems from a deliberative perspective, better equipping them to deal with arising controversy effectively.

Some authors have already attempted to bridge the gap between deliberative theory and practice explicitly. For instance, they have reviewed and revealed the practical application of deliberative democracy to diverse fields of study, have operationalized deliberative principles into a measurable index, and have distilled deliberative theory into descriptive and normative components to clarify the differences between its theoretical and empirical goals (see Chambers 2003, Neblö 2005, and Steiner et al. 2004). However, while such scholars recognize there is a problem with adapting deliberative theory for different applications, they generally focus on how it can contribute to empirical research, still an academic domain, rather than what it could mean for the everyday practice of policy practitioners. The scholars that do deal explicitly with deliberation for everyday practice (e.g. Robert et al. 2011), while providing highly applicable guidelines for deliberative assemblies, are still challenging to decipher and do not ground their rules in much argument, theory, or philosophy, leaving them somewhat inflexible and closed to reflection. Certainly, there is room for improvement in translating deliberative democracy for practical uses.

As such, the purpose of this paper is to extract general principles from deliberative democratic theory and illustrate their potential application to everyday policy problems through a case study of recycling services in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada. In this light, the sections of this paper will accomplish the following: elaborate the background literature to demonstrate the complexity of

the current state of the deliberative field, draw out and describe a set of independent principles that encompass the shared tenets of the various conceptions of deliberative democracy (i.e. create a set of deliberative ‘lenses’), describe the methods used in collecting relevant data on public discussions about Saskatoon’s recycling services as a case study, present and analyze the results using the extracted principles, and conclude by explaining how the lenses could be applied in other policy contexts.

#### BACKGROUND LITERATURE:

Deliberative democracy is a complex field. Its principles may thus be difficult for non-experts to understand and apply to real-world issues. The in-field controversy among deliberative theorists, the existence of which should be unsurprising in a discipline struggling with complicated questions of human behaviour and ethics, is one cause of this gap. While such academic debate is a crucial step in developing robust theory, it can serve to further isolate non-experts if it persists beyond the point of simplifying the issue to generating additional difficult-to-resolve questions. Dryzek (2000), for instance, asks 16 questions about deliberation at the beginning of his book, which he feels remain contentious and worthy of discussion – to name just a few of them: “Is the proper location of deliberation the existing representative institutions and legal system of liberal democracy, or should deliberation extend more broadly throughout society? Might existing representative institutions prove inhospitable to effective deliberation, such that alternative locations should be sought? Should deliberation be constrained by constitutional specifications that rule out in advance particular outcomes of deliberation?” (pp. 6-7). Such questions are certainly important, especially in academic circles within the field, but answering them is not a necessary prerequisite for the basic application of deliberative principles in any context and might, in fact, discourage non-experts from doing so by portraying the discipline as new, uncertain, and experimental.

Similarly, Young (2001) depicts deliberative democracy as the essential opposite of activism, as she “constructs a dialogue between two ‘characters’ with... differing approaches to political action, a deliberative democrat and an activist” (p. 670). Her article perpetuates a tension between the two, suggesting that deliberative democracy generally struggles to facilitate progressive political change and address underlying power structures. While such a comparison could be instructive for academics, encouraging them to refine deliberative guidelines to deal with a broader array of social problems, it may intimidate non-experts who are looking for ready-to-use principles. Young seems to indicate that embracing deliberation requires a normative judgement against activism, so political actors concerned with power inequity might see deliberative democracy as incompatible with their goals. It would be better to present principles of deliberation as flexible

instead of subscribing to any one stereotype (the controversy, itself, should demonstrate the various conceptions of deliberative democracy that exist). Overall, asking further theoretical questions and perpetuating controversy might be useful for discussion within the field of deliberation, but there remains an unexploited potential to encourage non-experts (e.g. everyday politicians and policy-makers) to make use of deliberative principles.

Another factor potentially contributing to a gap between deliberative theorists and non-experts is the bounty of high-level, comprehensive frameworks put forward by authors who seek to resolve some of the above debates and accommodate the complexity of deliberative democracy. Many of them have written entire books cataloguing their own independent guidelines for effective deliberation, but such works tend to be somewhat dense, theoretical, and ideological, and are often contradictory of one another. Rawls' approach to social discourse, for example, is called *public reason* (see Baber and Bartlett 2005, p. 50). It is a pure and ideal form of deliberation where the participants eliminate their personal interests from the process in favour of reasoning from the original position – that is, they should reason as if they are unaware of their own position in society (Ibid, p. 36), favoring an equitable distribution of costs and benefits. With this approach in mind, Rawls believes that participants in discourse will be able to, through common sense, arrive at consensus positions on fundamental questions that serve as binding pre-commitments for future discussion on more specific issues (Ibid, p. 49); deliberation in this case is used primarily to adjudicate questions of value. Interests and experts are not considered important in making basic decisions. Public reason as a whole, then, while fairly simple in summary, is an idealistic approach that may be difficult to apply to everyday policy problems – keeping experts and interests out of the process and aiming for a unanimous consensus may appear as a pipe dream to non-experts who are more concerned with the practical than the philosophical.

The *ideal discourse* model of Habermas (see Ibid, p. 50) is perhaps more concrete than Rawls' approach (i.e. there is a role for interests and experts), but a number of idealistic expectations are still present within its tenets. Like Rawls, Habermas puts forward a prerequisite for reasoning, that there must be “a shared commitment to the use of public reasons (reasons not derived from particular ethical or religious perspectives)” (Ibid, p. 38). Under this condition, citizens should put forward and debate competing validity claims of opinions and norms which arise out of interests and are tested by experts when necessary. “In such a discourse, the force of one's argument is the only permissible form of compulsion and the cooperative search for truth is the only permissible motive” (Habermas 1973, cited in Ibid, p. 45). The idea of citizens generating persuasive truth claims from public reason, debating them, and using experts to bring the debate to resolution is attractive, but Habermas, like Rawls, still expects deliberative

democrats to buy into some fairly naïve expectations for society, which seem to ignore the power struggles and self-interests prevalent in all manner of political controversies. How are non-experts supposed to apply ideal discourse to a real-world situation if there exists no shared commitment to public reason and the search for truth? Again, the prevailing theoretical guidelines for deliberation seem idealistic,<sup>1</sup> and are perhaps useful primarily to philosophers and high theorists in their present state.

Departing from the philosophical idealism of Rawls and Habermas, Gutmann's and Thompson's *full liberalism* (see Ibid, p. 50) or *five principles* approach does not demand group consensus on the same position for the same reasons. Rather, competing interests are realistically accepted as an inalienable part of the process; "differences in interest among individuals are not ultimately resolved so much as they are reconciled for the present" (Ibid, p. 48). However, the manner in which the five principles fold into one another portrays an overall set of guidelines for deliberative democracy that is fairly comprehensive and involved, which might also be daunting to everyday political actors. Gutmann and Thompson (1996) argue that "both liberty and opportunity are necessary, though not sufficient, for a democratic perspective that adequately deals with moral disagreement. Appropriately ordered and interpreted, liberty and opportunity join reciprocity, publicity, and accountability as the constitutional principles of a deliberative democracy" (p. 199). While the five principles seem straightforward at face value, their proponents devote chapters to the complex moral and philosophical questions under each one. More importantly, they imply a dependency between the principles such that deliberative guidelines founded on only one or two of them seem woefully inadequate. While a non-expert could probably become familiar with employing one of these principles in practice, it might be unreasonable to expect them to understand, or buy into, the entire set of prescriptions. Altogether, while the existing work on deliberative democracy is robust in a theoretical sense, there remains an opportunity to bridge the apparent gap between it and the political actors who could benefit most from its teachings.

The contemporary work in the field of deliberation is not all theoretical, however. Many grandiose social experiments have been proposed and conducted to test the value of deliberative democracy, most of which involved hundreds of participants and took place over several days. *National issues forums* invite self-selected stakeholders and interest group representatives to engage in direct debate over a given policy question; theories of mediation and negotiation suggest guidelines for the forum. The goal is to have factions on opposing sides identify areas of agreement and reconcile their competing understandings of the issue. For

---

<sup>1</sup> Indeed, these authors no doubt conceived of their constructs as normative ideals perhaps not suitable for direct application to real-life situations. But such a concession still leaves open the question: how can these good ideas concretely contribute to deliberation in practice?

example, consider Germany's national policy dialogue on agriculture gene technology throughout 2001 and 2002 (see Hendriks et al. 2007, p. 364). Traditionally, the field of deliberation has been more interested in *deliberative polling* experiments, though. While these forums still follow deliberative guidelines, they involve randomly selected citizens (usually controlled for demographic diversity) instead of self-selected stakeholders, resulting in a more objective dialogue. In Canada, such forums have been constructed to make recommendations on issues of electoral reform, notably in British Columbia and Ontario (see Pilon 2009, p. 1). More broadly, particularly in the United Kingdom, deliberative polls have tackled a number of policy issues such as crime, government structures, foreign policy, and utility pricing; the first deliberative poll took place in Manchester over three days in April of 1994, focusing on questions of prison sentencing and the procedural rights of criminal defendants (see Fishkin 1997, appendices A and D).<sup>2</sup> While these projects are interesting, they are a rare and very specific utilization of deliberative principles, criticized for their highly-controlled experimental conditions (Chambers 2003, pp. 319-320). Even the more empirical side of the deliberation field, then, seems difficult to put into common practice.

There are some scholars, however, who recognize the gap between the theory of deliberative democracy and deliberation-in-practice and attempt to reconcile it. Chambers (2003) evaluates deliberative theory as it has been applied in practice to a number of research areas, including public law, international relations, policy studies, empirical research, and identity studies. She argues that deliberative democracy has transitioned from merely a theory to a "working theory" (p. 307) and uses these contributions as evidence. More concretely, Steiner et al. (2004) develop a "Discourse Quality Index" which can measure the quality of deliberation for an institution and its mechanisms based on deliberative theory; they use it to assess the quality of discussion in parliamentary debaters, showing how deliberative democracy can contribute to institutional design. Finally, Neblo (2005) breaks deliberative theory into separate normative and descriptive components – he identifies two normative constraints: everyone affected by a decision has a right to deliberate about it, and participants must engage in rational, authentic debate rather than threats or manipulation (pp. 174-175). These are all important steps in translating deliberative theory into practice, but they are insufficient to solve the problem, general seeing the transition as one from theory to empirical research, which still falls within the somewhat inaccessible academic realm, rather than from theory to everyday practice – Chambers (2003) and Neblo (2005) talk about empirical research explicitly, and

---

<sup>2</sup> It is worth noting that most of these experiments were indeed successful in proving the power of deliberation to change a person's position through argument. Appendix D in Fishkin's (1997) book documents the substantial transformations in the opinions of deliberative poll participants.

Steiner et al. (2004), while they do discuss the practical issue of institutional design, put forward a tool that is not particularly accessible to the everyday policy practitioner and not very applicable to everyday deliberations.<sup>3</sup> Even those who acknowledge some of the problems with deliberative theory, then, have failed to address them substantially.

Deliberative democracy, while purported as a potential solution for some of the most complex social problems of the day, may fail to connect with the everyday political actors that would most be able to put its principles into practice. Perpetual debates within the field, the idealistic and rigid nature of the theory, the impractical scope and scale of the existing empirical work, and the incompleteness of existing efforts to address practical concerns are all factors contributing to the estrangement of non-experts. However, this paper is not the first to make such an observation. Shapiro (1999), for instance, agrees that existing models of deliberation have fallen short of the high standards set for them by theorists such as Gutmann and Thompson (pp. 28-29). Similarly, Goodin (2003) challenges deliberative democrats to adapt their ideals to large-scale society (p. 55) – that is, the field needs to find a way to use its principles more broadly, instead of assuming controlled discussion settings where all participants are only given a voice when they buy into a set of prescribed guidelines. Realistically, most social problems are addressed in more chaotic processes where time and organization are limited, and the facilitators are not perfectly familiar with the theories of deliberative democracy.<sup>4</sup> If deliberative principles are to be applied to such problems, they must be made more flexible and comprehensible.

#### THE DELIBERATIVE LENSES:

How might the field of deliberation be presented in a way that is not only insightful and organized, but also relevant and practical? Simon's (1999) characterization of Gutmann and Thompson's work is instructive; he notes that they "suggest three broad substantive principles as starting points—liberty, basic opportunity, and fair opportunity. These principles are supposed to be definite

---

<sup>3</sup> Of course, there exists some literature which is specifically devoted to deliberation-in-practice, like the *Rules of Order* of Robert et al. (2011). While such works are much more applicable to everyday deliberative situations and are, in some ways, more straightforward than deliberative theory, it can still take a lot of effort to become familiar with and understand all the rules that are put forward, not to mention how they interact. More importantly, such rules are generally not accompanied by much philosophical or theoretical justification, which hampers flexibility, self-reflection, and deliberative design.

<sup>4</sup> We must acknowledge, however, that many social issues, on a larger scale, are highly complex and have yet to be addressed effectively in any context. Many of these debates require the comprehensive, nuanced approach of the existing theories. The simplification of these theories will not resolve such debates, although it may better equip political actors to have meaningful discussions about these issues.



enough to help us frame issues but not so definite as to constitute a program” (p. 49). In this case the proposed principles still seem fairly generic and open-ended, which may undermine their appeal to everyday decision-makers. However, the conception of the field as a collection of independent principles has merit. If each principle could, on its own, be applied effectively to political controversies of the day, then non-experts could partially utilize deliberative democracy without having to access and understand the entire field. Thus, this section of the paper seeks to draw out five of the main insights from deliberation theory and elaborate them as largely discrete and useful on their own.<sup>5</sup> Rather than denoting rigid guidelines (as many theorists tend to do), such principles embody ideas that can be used to facilitate specific guidelines for a given deliberative context. They should help practitioners find opportunities for more effective deliberation as well as bring to light any existing processes that undermine public discussion, although they do not necessarily prescribe the specific tools that might be used to address such findings.<sup>6</sup> These ‘lenses’ include accessibility, public reasoning, validity testing, group polarization, and power dynamics. Hypothetically, each should be persuasive and understandable on its own and any one of them might be applied to public discussion – a beneficial arrangement for everyday political actors.

It would be dangerous, of course, to apply a single lens to a deliberative situation at the expense of all others, so let us first consider a framework to guide their utilization. A prerequisite to any practical use of deliberative democracy is a subscription to the general belief behind it, that generally thoughtful and discursive public participation in decision-making will produce more just and rational policy outcomes for society as a whole (recall Baber and Bartlett 2005, p. 3). This underlying belief ensures some consistency among the utilization of the different principles; any lens whose application leads to reforms that stifle participation, restricts open thought, or leads to unjust outcomes (e.g. disproportionately benefitting a single group) is likely being used inappropriately. More specifically, while the application of a single principle should still be beneficial on its own, there is a balance to be struck between the collective concerns of deliberative theory. As such, while a practitioner need only be well-versed in one of the lenses before they can analyze a situation of public discussion from a deliberative perspective, it is important for them to have, at minimum, a general awareness of other principles, so that they can ensure the over-application of one does not completely undermine another. Aside from these guidelines, in

---

<sup>5</sup> Note that there are certainly more than five main principles that could exist, but the discussion in this paper has been restricted to five for the purpose of simplicity. Similarly, there may be some overlap between the content of the principles, but the important point is that they can be used independently, even if they are not truly discrete.

<sup>6</sup> A plethora of such tools is available in the prevailing literature on conflict resolution and negotiation. See, for instance, Fisher et al. 1991 and Furlong 2005.

the interest of flexibility, this paper does not provide any concrete minimum standard for the application of each lens or the collective set of them. As long as a general deliberative belief is followed, and the application of one principle does not substantially undermine the interests of another, any utilization of deliberative theory in this manner should be more effective than none at all.

The principle of *accessibility* means guaranteeing the basic right of citizens to participate in deliberative processes and be privy to relevant information for the topic under discussion. Of the five, this principle is the least unique to deliberative democracy, meshing well with traditional understandings of effective government (indeed, public consultation processes have been around much longer than deliberative theory). While open invites to public forums and the simple disclosure of information are important prerequisites for effective deliberation (Baber and Bartlett 2005, p. 122), meaningfully respecting the principle of accessibility entails much more. First, physically including a diversity of stakeholders in discussion is not enough to ensure they all have effective access to deliberation – certain demographic groups (e.g. the rich and well-educated) are better-equipped to make the type of rational argument that public discussions tend to favour. This situation systematically disenfranchises minority groups, even as they are nominally included in the process (Young, in *Ibid*, pp. 158-159). Those facilitating public discussion must be vigilant in encouraging all modes of participation from all stakeholders. For example, deliberative processes should allow additional types of communication, such as storytelling, as long as they are not coercive and are able to connect the particular to the general (Dryzek 2000, p. 68). Second, simply providing information does not guarantee that it will be understood by participants in the discussion. Background information on a policy question is often generated by experts who communicate with their own specialized language, unfamiliar to laypeople. While the public trusts experts to make the right decisions on their own in many circumstances, the types of complex policy issues that benefit from deliberation require that experts return that trust by translating information into ordinary language so that members of the public can participate meaningfully (Baber and Bartlett 2005, p. 50). Consultation processes are indeed more effective when the public has access to impartial information provided by experts before and during the discussion (Sunstein 2003, p. 98). Overall, what deliberative democratic theory adds to the general idea of accessibility is that many potential problems with opportunity and information are hidden – they must be purposefully targeted and addressed as a prerequisite for effective public discussion.

The principle of *public reasoning* (labeled in such a way as to distinguish it from Rawls' 'public reason', although it embodies many of the same ideas) suggests that deliberation is more effective when participants are committed to making arguments framed under the collective interest of the community and do

not put forward arguments rooted in self-interest. This concept seems straightforward, but it has been presented in different ways by a number of authors. The ‘original position’ thought experiment of Rawls is one way to encourage public reason; people can be asked to temporarily suspend the knowledge of their own position in the community and argue for a society where any randomly assigned position into which they could be thrust would be acceptable to them. Sagoff (in Dryzek 1997) argues that “every individual has two kinds of preferences: as a consumer and as a citizen... citizen preferences are more concerned with collective, community-oriented values, as opposed to the selfish materialism of consumer values” (pp. 94-95) – public reason essentially asks that the participants put the former above the latter. Similarly, a situation where interests other than one’s own are called to mind, argues Dryzek, is an effective way to catch interests otherwise under-represented by the discussion process, such as those of future generations and non-human animals (or minorities who cannot effectively participate); this mode of thought is referred to as ‘enlarged thinking’ (2000, p. 152). Each of these ideas essentially suggests a shift away from the self-interested, individualistic rationality that is common in developed democracies. Although this philosophy would be beneficial for overall deliberative outcomes, why would individual participants buy into it? Gutmann and Thompson’s concept of reciprocity answers that, in a deliberative setting, citizens should offer public reasons simply because their potential adversaries will be doing the same (1996, p. 53); when all participants agree to the principle, selfish reasoning will be taken less seriously, and all participants benefit.<sup>7</sup>

The principle of *validity testing* acknowledges that participants do not enter the deliberative process with the same level of knowledge as one another and that it is impractical to require complete and flawless information as a background condition to discussion. As such, much of what is discussed during deliberation might be interpretation of factual data (e.g. the effect of a mining operation on the quality of the surrounding watershed), especially when more than one actor is producing such data. It is productive, then, for participants to question data that does not make sense and seek the advice of experts when conflicting factual information cannot be reconciled (or to simply have experts present during, but not dominating, the discussion). Our traditional dependence on experts has also been criticized; they may claim to know the most appropriate course of action for a particular problem even when said problem is too complex for any one discipline to have a complete understanding of it (Baber and Bartlett 2005, p.

---

<sup>7</sup> This principle could even be implemented by having facilitators, or any educated person participating in the discussion, help others rephrase or refine their arguments as collective. For example, “I refuse to let the government put forward this policy because it will cost me my job” could be said as “Many workers, including myself, stand to lose their jobs if this policy is implemented”.

148). However, the key difference here is that experts should be relied on for arbitrating factual information, not for deciding the entire issue. The policy discussion must involve lay stakeholders and citizens, but they should be educated by experts on factual matters when necessary. There is a difference between a question with an absolute correct answer, such as one addressed by traditional natural sciences, and a question of value couched in uncertainty, such as the complex policy questions deliberative democracy is supposed to help us deal with (see Hardin 2003, p. 165). Overall, the principle of validity testing means allowing participants to question one another's factual claims and relying on experts to reconcile competing information when necessary, but not letting experts decide the issue alone.

The principle of *group polarization* embodies the frequent observation that “members of a deliberating group predictably move toward a more extreme point in the direction indicated by the members’ predeliberation tendencies” (Sunstein 2003, p. 81). In other words, deliberation sometimes makes participants even more convinced of a particular position, even as the goal of deliberative democracy is to change minds through rational argument. Sunstein (Ibid) argues that there are two primary explanations for this phenomenon: participants may want to be viewed favorably by other group members and thus will adjust their opinion toward the dominant stance; as well, the number of arguments offered for each side of the issue will be disproportionately in favor of the majority position when everyone gets the opportunity to speak (p. 84). The concept of cognitive dissonance, the resulting state of mental discomfort when new information conflicts with an individual’s existing behaviour and belief, is also relevant here: people try to avoid cognitive dissonance by rejecting or avoiding arguments that are inconsistent with their initial opinions (Bradshaw and Borchers 2000, par. 8). It is difficult, then, to change a person’s mind, and trying to do so may only encourage them to hold onto their belief more tightly. However, deliberative polling experiments appear to have avoided the problem of group polarization; in these cases, participants often adjusted their opinions after deliberation, and not always in the direction of the majority (Fishkin 1997, see appendix D). Polarization was prevented in these cases, notes Sunstein (2003), because individuals were not required to vote publicly, the groups were made up of randomly-selected participants (controlled for diversity), moderators encouraged general participation and ensured that no one dominated the discussion, and external factual information was available through balanced written materials and expert panels (pp. 97-98). Random participation and the absence of voting address the problem of social pressure, while moderators and balanced information

mitigate the dominance of popular arguments. It is important to keep similar concerns in mind when setting up a deliberative process.<sup>8</sup>

The principle of *power dynamics* entails being aware of how the subtle effects of self-interest and power can negatively affect the deliberation process, even when it is operating under nominal assumptions of equal access and public reason. “Politics in capitalist democratic settings is rarely about disinterested and public-spirited problem solving in which a variety of perspectives are brought to bear with equal weight. Often there are powerful interests with large financial resources at their disposal which will try to skew the outcomes of policy debates and decision-making processes in their direction” (Dryzek 1997, p. 98). Deliberative democracy has been criticized for its inability to mitigate these deleterious interests – corporations can use their financial strength to skew the realm of public debate, giving the political positions they support more airtime than those of their opponents (Shapiro 1999, p. 34). It would not be surprising for such influence to creep into deliberative processes (e.g. the hiring of skilled lobbyists and rhetoricians to participate in deliberation on their behalf). In addition, it has been argued that factions without power are actually the least-equipped to engage in rational processes of deliberation, and need to rely on non-deliberative strategies of direct activism and protest. Humphrey (2007), for instance, demonstrates the unfairness in asking environmental groups to present their arguments in terms agreeable to their corporate opposition; the restriction of rational argument, which is always defined by the norms of the day, precludes them from demanding the radical (or revolutionary) change they may believe is necessary (p. 105). While deliberative democracy may not, indeed, be an appropriate process for resolving deep moral debates, those who practice it can at least try to be aware of, and expose, the undue influence of subtle power that may lie within.

Acknowledging that there is some overlap between these five general lenses of deliberative democracy, they are presented in this way to illustrate that they are useful on their own. The remainder of this paper will focus on demonstrating their individual applicability to deliberative situations by applying each of them to a case study of public discussion, explaining outcomes and making suggestions for improved deliberative design. Should these lenses prove effective and easy to understand, then the set of them might be applied similarly to other public discussions and perhaps, in many cases, the division of deliberative democratic theory into simple component principles is a better way to increase its accessibility to non-experts such as everyday political actors.

---

<sup>8</sup> This principle, in particular, overlaps with a number of the others. However, it has been treated separately here because it addresses a unique concern, as will be further illustrated by the case study following this section.

#### CASE DESCRIPTION AND METHODS:

The case under study deals with the issue of city-provided curbside recycling in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. This section will first provide some background on the case example and then describe the methods undertaken to apply the lenses identified above to the related public deliberation. Regarding background information, a thorough contextualization of Saskatoon's recycling debate was provided by the city's Environmental Services Branch in a presentation during the city council meeting of May 24, 2011 (a video recording is available at [http://download.isiglobal.ca/saskatoon/archive\\_2011-05-24.flv.html](http://download.isiglobal.ca/saskatoon/archive_2011-05-24.flv.html)); it will be paraphrased here.

In June of 2010, Saskatoon launched a campaign called "Let's Talk Recycling" which solicited public feedback through consultation meetings and surveys<sup>9</sup> on the question of whether Saskatoon should adopt a mandatory curbside recycling program for all single-unit dwellings (i.e. excluding apartment buildings and condominiums) – mandatory meaning that citizens would pay into the program through taxes, but could still choose not to make use of the recycling bins provided to them by the city. Note that, at the time of this study, Saskatoon has no such service, although citizens can recycle by taking material to depots or by paying private collectors to pick it up. In concert, city administration conducted background analysis on best practices across North America, cost and risk assessment, and estimating the potential for diversion from the landfill. The public feedback and administrative analysis were reported to council in late June, but there was little concrete action taken by council until January (of 2011) when a resolution was passed asking city administration to develop a request for proposals (RFP) targeted at potential collectors and processors that could implement city-wide curbside collection. At the same January meeting, council also passed a resolution declaring "No Harm to Cosmo"<sup>10</sup> as a result of the new program. As it turned out, developing the RFP was a fairly complex task, and more questions were raised after city administration started putting it together, which would require further input from city council.

The primary purpose of the May 24, 2011 council meeting was for council to provide this further guidance to the administration and, since the meetings are open to the public, it offered the opportunity for citizens and other stakeholders to

---

<sup>9</sup> Note that this paper might have used the deliberative processes taking place during these meetings for its analysis, but their recordings are not available to the public. Similarly, the survey results were not published in sufficient depth for any analysis of them to be instructive.

<sup>10</sup> Cosmopolitan industries is an organization that provides employment and other services for persons with intellectual disabilities – processing paper for recycling is one of their key functions in this regard, and much of this paper is provided to them from the existing depots; mandatory curbside recycling means that citizens will use the depots less and the paper could end up at a different processor (depending on the results of the RFP), which would reduce employment opportunities for those at Cosmo.

do so as well. Essentially, through four “Recycling Reports” (City of Saskatoon 2011a) presented, administration was seeking answers to the following primary questions about the RFP and the program:

- Should contractors have to bid on the city as a whole or should it be divided into four zones which could theoretically be awarded to different contractors?
- Are individual contractors expected to bid for both collection (i.e. curbside pick-up) and processing (i.e. actual recycling) services or is it permissible to bid for just one and have another contractor provide the other?
- Should the program adopt a single-stream approach, where all recyclable materials are put into the same single bin provided to each house, or a multiple-stream approach, where each house is given a number of smaller bins and is expected to separate paper, plastics, metal, and glass?
- How might the “No Harm to Cosmo” provision be met? Note that administration’s tentative proposal was that the city ensure that Cosmo be provided with the same tonnage of paper each year as it received from depots and city offices in 2010 (i.e. 7800 tonnes).

Prior to the meeting, any interested person was permitted to write a letter to city council requesting to speak on the issue. They would be given five minutes to address the council, after which the councillors could question them until the chair (i.e. the mayor) felt it was necessary to move the discussion along. 18 speakers were heard throughout the course of the meeting. It was this discussion to which the deliberative lenses identified in this paper was applied for the case study (note, though, that the meeting ran late – while all the speakers were heard, city council did not pass any resolutions on the recycling matter until the meeting of June 13). In October and November of 2011, the archived video for the May 24 council meeting was examined in depth to identify notable situations where heated controversy arose or where discussion did not seem to move the issue forward effectively, essentially areas where there was room for deliberative improvement. These moments were coded by the five principles, each one matched to the lens that might offer the best insight for improvement. The next section of this paper explains the most persuasive of these insights, demonstrating the independent applicability of the simple principles into which deliberative theory can be divided.<sup>11</sup> Also, a brief summary of the speakers in chronological

---

<sup>11</sup> Note that the case study could have been analyzed using any one principle alone, generating more in-depth suggestions than what will be offered here. The reason for applying all of the lenses to the example is not to demonstrate any necessary interdependency between them (in fact, the argument of this paper is quite the opposite), but rather to illustrate that each of them is useful.

order has been extracted from the meeting minutes (City of Saskatoon 2011b, pp. 26-27) and is available in the appendix.

#### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

The meeting demonstrated that the Saskatoon City Council's deliberation with the general public generally meets the deliberative principle of access. As mentioned above, any citizen can request to speak and will be granted five minutes of uninterrupted time to address the council at any meeting. In addition, alternative forms of communication in addition to rational argument were accepted; one speaker, Maxim Gertler-Jaffe, was permitted to play a DVD music video about waste generation and consumer culture that he had made for a school project, while the final two speakers, Karen Rooney and Taylor Yee, read a poem about recycling in tandem (in the style of Dr. Seuss). Both presentations were well-received, although they did not generate much additional discussion. Language was also fairly accessible, probably because city administrators (the 'experts') have to simplify their communication for council members (who are not 'experts') anyway, making things easier for the public to understand at the same time.

However, the principle of access also offers two insights for deliberative design in this case. Not all letters to council regarding this issue requested an opportunity to speak, but rather made an argument or communicated a concern in written form. While council was provided with copies of all such letters in the agenda given to them for the meeting, there was no reference to any of them during discussion, despite their important points about Saskatchewan's Multi-Material Recycling Program (a provincial subsidy for municipal recycling initiatives) and the demands of Cosmo. It seems that those without the confidence or oral communication skills required to address city council verbally and in-person may not have their concerns heard. It might be beneficial to set aside some time to run through the written letters. In addition, some important stakeholders seemed to be absent from the meeting. After one presentation, Councillor Lorje asked a question about SARCAN (an organization that employs disabled persons to collect deposit recyclables at depots throughout the province) and its stake in the discussion, but no one knew the answer to the question and no representative from SARCAN was present. Similarly, Sheri Praski mentioned a fairly organized "keep garbage free" opposition movement in her presentation, but it appears they were also absent. Some citizens may still be unaware of their right to speak at city council meetings or the fact that recycling was on the agenda for this meeting; perhaps the city could advertise such opportunities more broadly, or extend specific invitations to organizations which could contribute to the discussion.

On the principle of public reason, city council and city administration seemed very open to broadly weighing the different parts of the recycling issue, at least on the surface; environmental, economic, and social harms were all



discussed as important, and potentially vulnerable groups were certainly a concern. There was more diversity in types of reasoning used by citizen presenters. On the debate about “No Harm to Cosmo”, some speakers were prone to private reasoning, that which only seemed to consider their own side of the issue. Peter Gerard, the first speaker and executive director of Cosmo, argued that the city’s obligation to Cosmo was not only contractual but also moral, and that no set tonnage amount could ever be set on that relationship. His presentation concluded with the words “Do you care? Do you care enough?” as if the only reason council might decide against his position was if they did not care about disabled persons. Similarly, Shelly Bartram, who works with some of the Cosmo employees, stated that she did not appreciate the council “playing the numbers game” (i.e. some councillors had been asking for the number of people employed by Cosmo and SARCAN, so that they would know how many people might be benefited or harmed by their decision) and thought that even one person was important. She also reduced the choice to one between improving the quality of life for these people and taking it away. Such comments are intuitively narrow and unpersuasive.

This kind of reasoning appeared to have another effect during the meeting. Discussion after these presentations, if there was any at all, generally consisted of councillors trying to criticize or de-bunk the claims within, perhaps fairly so. The short discussion after Mr. Gerard’s comments, for instance, concluded with one councillor asking for some historical numbers to refute the idea that the number of people supported and employed by Cosmo would continue to grow in proportion to the city population. Most interestingly, council seemed to reserve most of their open-ended questions (which essentially extend a presenter’s opportunity to speak) for those who did not engage in such private reasoning. Even though the two executive directors mentioned above might be most capable of answering questions about Cosmo and its position, most of the discussion happened with one of Cosmo’s board members, Michael Stensrud, after his less combative and more reasonable presentation.<sup>12</sup> However, he was often unable to answer the questions asked of him, frequently looking to the executive director in the gallery for feedback and confirmation on the information he was providing. This type of situation is inefficient and unpersuasive comments do not meaningfully contribute much to the discussion besides. The deliberative principle of public reason offers two design suggestions here. Speakers could either be educated about a general expectation of public reasoning prior to their presentations or councillors could help them frame their concerns more reasonably in the following discussion.

---

<sup>12</sup> Acknowledging that this phenomenon may have been something of a coincidence, there is still room for improvement in the question procedure. If a previous speaker who is still in the gallery might be able to answer an important concern that comes up later, the councillors should be able to question them.

Indeed, these people do have legitimate points to make, which should not be ignored simply because of how they are phrased.

The deliberative principle that was most frequently relevant to the discussion during the meeting was that of validity testing. Much of the back-and-forth during the question periods focused on determining the actual values of different numbers or what information was true about different recycling processes. There was some debate over how quickly Cosmo had been growing and how many people were supported by its services, as mentioned above. In addition, some of the speakers from Cosmo were able to effectively challenge the city administration's estimate regarding paper tonnage provided to Cosmo. While administration proposed continuing to provide Cosmo with 7800 tonnes a year from city-run depots as well as city offices and partner organizations like schools, it was shown that Cosmo already has independent partnerships with the schools making up nearly half of their intake – the city would not be able to get much additional paper from schools to provide to Cosmo, not to mention that the depots would surely receive less material once everyone had access to curbside pickup. In the end, council did feel that the 7800 tonnes met the city's obligation to Cosmo, but they also passed a motion to establish a task force to work with Cosmo to identify further opportunities for employment, acknowledging that their strategy to meet such a requirement might be insufficient (p. 12, City of Saskatoon 2011c). This sequence of events is an example of effective validity testing leading to well-reasoned decisions.

However, the main point of contention saw a less successful resolution. As noted above, one of the questions put forward to council that evening was whether the RFPs should permit single-stream collection, multiple-stream collection, or both. The speakers from Cosmo had a strong opinion on this matter in favor of multiple-stream collection alone, because their employees are only trained to handle paper, and other material like glass are a safety concern. Consequently, they presented a compilation of research showing the dangers of single-stream collection; basically, the complicated sorting process leads to higher rates of contamination in the processed product (i.e. the recycled paper is dirty), which lowers the demand for it and means it often has to be shipped to other countries in order to be sold, counteracting much of the environmental good of recycling. Apparently, many paper mills will not accept paper that was collected through a single-stream mechanism, even if the most state-of-the-art processing technology was used to separate it. These allegations were challenged at the meeting, in particular by Aaron Loraas from Loraas Disposal Services Ltd., a waste collection company interested in submitting a bid to the recycling RFP (and hoping to collect through a single-stream process no less). He argued that the study cited by Cosmo was seven years old and mostly referred to problems in Southern Ontario; modern processing technology, which Loraas was planning on using, allegedly

results in very low contamination rates. The two opposing claims about single-stream collection were never reconciled; council did not divulge which one they thought was more persuasive. It was clear that some speakers found this frustrating, as additional letters were written to the city continuing to argue for a multiple-stream process, noting that the council's position was still unclear (pp. 129 and 134, City of Saskatoon 2011d). During the June meeting, council did end up passing a resolution that would allow bidders to propose either a single- or multiple-stream system (p. 14, City of Saskatoon 2011c); Cosmo's recommendation was not adopted. It would have been beneficial to employ a more rigorous validity testing process during the initial meeting.<sup>13</sup> Mr. Loraas' claim about the study being seven years old, for instance, was simply incorrect, as the article involved numbers from 2010; such a statement should have been refuted during the initial meeting.

As for the principles of group polarization and power, both seemed less frequently relevant than the other three, but each still facilitates at least one important observation. First, the prevalence of speakers addressing the recycling issue on behalf of Cosmo, and thus presenting similar arguments, is precisely the sort of situation that group polarization theory warns against; their position might seem more compelling simply due to the number of speakers they sent to the meeting. In this case, however, it would be difficult to say that such a harm occurred, given that council essentially decided against the recommendations of Cosmo, but it could certainly be argued that the repetitive nature of the speakers is what unnecessarily extended the meeting and postponed the decision-making process to a later date. Second, the deliberative principle of power points to an inequity in rules enforcement during the council meeting. The chair (i.e. the mayor) enforced the 5-minute time limit for citizen speakers quite rigidly, and was quick to point out when they broke other rules, such as the requirement to address their comments to the chair instead of specific councillors. However, the councillors themselves seemed somewhat immune to the rules; time set aside for questions was often used instead to make speeches, to which speakers were then disallowed to respond, and the chair did not intervene. This dynamic could make it very difficult for citizen speakers to be persuasive when a councillor has already made up their mind. Overall, then, each principle can offer some insight for the deliberative design of Saskatoon's city council meetings. Applying any one of them to any degree (as long as the general frame is followed) is likely more effective than applying none at all. While using all lenses together (or effectively using one of the comprehensive existing theories) would best illuminate

---

<sup>13</sup> Admittedly, council meetings (like all deliberative processes) operate under time constraints, which preclude opportunities for more extensive discussion. However, a number of the other suggestions facilitated by the deliberative lenses may save time, so the improvements might very well balance out.

opportunities for deliberative improvement, this analysis shows that partial application of deliberative democracy can still be helpful, which a practitioner unfamiliar with the broader theory would more easily be able to employ.

Not only does the city administration and council have the ability to implement the suggestions offered by the set of deliberative lenses, but they also have an interest in doing so. The examples listed in the above discussion of the principle of power illustrate that the council is already able to enforce rules of procedure, such as speaking time limits, and rules of content, such as restrictions on to whom arguments may be addressed.<sup>14</sup> In addition, speakers respected the time constraints and had clearly been informed about them in advance so that they could prepare their comments properly. Thus, it seems possible to educate speakers about the merits of public reason and to discourage large groups with a position on the issue from sending multiple speakers to continually make the same arguments – and obviously the council itself is interested in hearing well-reasoned arguments from a diverse set of stakeholders and having more efficient meetings. Similarly, the city could directly extend invitations to groups who might be underrepresented (e.g. SARCAN) to address some of the problems with access; hearing from all relevant stakeholders makes decision-making easier for the council as well. As for the actual meetings, there seems to be a number of process conventions in place that are already followed, so it should not be difficult to add an additional provision for validity testing. When a piece of quantitative information is important to the discussion, councillors might be allowed to ask if city administration (or anyone else at the meeting) can verify or contest the numbers before they are tacitly accepted and the discussion moves on. Certainly it would be easier to make decisions on this more complete and accurate information. Finally, while the councillors probably do not have any incentive to give up their subtle power over the rules of the meeting, the principle of power at least points to the problem. Perhaps if citizen speakers were made aware the inequity, they would put pressure on the councillors to adjust their behaviour.<sup>15</sup> Not only do the five lenses suggest improvements in deliberative design, then, but they also facilitate reasons for adopting such recommendations, much of the reasoning being based on the original theories of deliberative democracy that give rise to the principles.

---

<sup>14</sup> Certainly, implementing these suggestions is more challenging in organic deliberative processes where there is no administrative body that can set rules and norms.

<sup>15</sup> Note that the councillors will always have more actual decision-making power than the gallery, but, for efficiency's sake, this situation not usually considered a problem, and only process inequity is addressed here.

#### CONCLUSION:

Since each of the five lenses (i.e. accessibility, public reasoning, validity testing, group polarization, and power) was able to independently elicit at least one practical suggestion for the deliberative process surrounding the case study of recycling debates in Saskatoon, the conceptualization of deliberative theory as being comprised of independent principles appears viable. Under this model, deliberative democracy is simpler to understand and easier to apply, and thus is more likely to be utilized by those who can most benefit from its lessons, the everyday politicians at the core of the political decision-making process – indeed, even a person familiar with only the concept of public reason would still find many ways to apply it to the deliberative processes relevant to them. As well, much of strength the original theories enjoyed from their holistic and all-encompassing nature is not lost, as the principles can also be applied in tandem. For example, perhaps the problems with group polarization at the city council meeting (i.e. too many speakers from one group and position) could be addressed by the suggestion from the access principle that relevant stakeholder groups should be sent direct invitations to speak prior to the meeting. The recommendations of the principles of validity testing and public reason might reinforce one another, speakers being kept more accountable since they know their arguments are being evaluated for not only public reason, but also the use of correct factual information. By many metrics, then, the lenses approach seems more effective. Of course, it may be highly inadequate for application to some particularly large-scale or complicated deliberative problems, which may require the nuance and holism of the existing theories.

It is important to note that the application of such a conceptualization is not restricted simply to processes on the order of a city council meeting. Mansbridge (1999) defines the entire deliberative system as consisting of “talk among formal and information representatives in designated public forums, talk back and forth between constituents and elected representatives or other representatives in politically oriented organizations, talk in the media, talk among political activists, and everyday talk in formally private spaces about things the public ought to discuss” (p. 211). Deliberative theory, under the lenses model, should be generally applicable anywhere on this spectrum. For instance, the principle of validity testing might be relevant to everyday talk – two friends discussing a political issue who reach a stalemate because they have internalized contradictory factual information should compare their sources. On the other end of the spectrum, the power principle could certainly be applied to international government negotiations – hidden power dynamics might exist within such discussions that prevent smaller or less-developed countries from contributing, even though they are nominally permitted to do so. As such, there are many ways in which the five principles might be applied.

In conclusion, deliberative democracy useful for a gamut of political issues from those discussed in everyday talk to the topics of international negotiations. Recall, as well, that deliberation is touted as one of the only ways for society to really progress on complex modern issues, such as those concerning the environment. For these reasons especially, it is important for the tenets of deliberative theory to be distilled into a form that is accessible to the people who make decisions on such issues; the lens approach is an initial attempt to achieve this crystallization. Further research on this topic could include assessing whether practitioners themselves find the approach helpful, proposing and applying different or additional lenses, or more directly evaluating the efficacy of a deliberative forum designed or altered through these principles.

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:**

I thank Kara Shaw and Tara Ney of the University of Victoria for their valuable feedback on the paper. I also acknowledge the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for funding my doctoral studies, of which this paper was a part.

REFERENCES:

- Ackerman, B. and Fishkin, J. (2003). "Deliberation Day." Ch. 1 in *Debating Deliberative Democracy*. Eds. Fishkin, J. and Laslett, P. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Baber, W. and Bartlett, R. (2005). *Deliberative Environmental Politics: Democracy and Ecological Rationality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bradshaw, G. & Borchers, J. (2000). "Uncertainty as Information: Narrowing the Science-Policy Gap." *Ecology and Society*, vol. 4(1), <<[www.ecologyandsociety.org](http://www.ecologyandsociety.org)>>.
- City of Saskatoon. (2011a). "Recycling Reports (File No. WT 7832-19)." Reports to City Council Meeting of 24/05/11, <<[http://www.saskatoon.ca/DEPARTMENTS/Utility Services/Environmental Services/Waste Minimization/Documents/Recycling Reports May 24 Council.pdf](http://www.saskatoon.ca/DEPARTMENTS/Utility%20Services/Environmental%20Services/Waste%20Minimization/Documents/Recycling%20Reports%20May%2024%20Council.pdf)>>.
- (2011b). "Minutes of the Regular Meeting of City Council, Tuesday, May 24, 2011, at 6:00 p.m." Minutes for City Council Meeting of 24/05/11, <<[http://www.saskatoon.ca/CITY%20COUNCIL/Documents/m2011/m\\_council\\_240511.pdf](http://www.saskatoon.ca/CITY%20COUNCIL/Documents/m2011/m_council_240511.pdf)>>.
- (2011c). "Minutes of the Regular Meeting of City Council, Monday, June 13, 2011, at 6:00 p.m." Minutes for City Council Meeting of 13/06/11. <<[http://www.saskatoon.ca/CITY%20COUNCIL/Documents/m2011/m\\_council\\_130611.pdf](http://www.saskatoon.ca/CITY%20COUNCIL/Documents/m2011/m_council_130611.pdf)>>.
- (2011d). "Order of Business: Regular Meeting of City Council, Monday, June 13, 2011, at 6:00 p.m." Full Agenda for City Council Meeting of 13/06/11, <<[http://www.saskatoon.ca/CITY%20COUNCIL/Documents/m2011/fa\\_council\\_130611.pdf](http://www.saskatoon.ca/CITY%20COUNCIL/Documents/m2011/fa_council_130611.pdf)>>.
- Chambers, S. (2003). "Deliberative Democratic Theory." *Annual Review of Political Science*, vol. 6(1), pp. 307-326.
- Dryzek, J. (1997). *The Politics of the Earth: Environmental Discourses*. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- (2000). *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations*. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Fisher, R., Ury, W., and Patton, B. (1991). *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement without Giving in*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Fishkin, J. (1997). *The Voice of the People: Public Opinion and Democracy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Furlong, G. (2005). *The Conflict Resolution Toolbox*. Mississauga, ON: John Wiley & Sons.
- Goodin, R. (2003). "Democratic Deliberation Within." Ch. 3 in *Debating Deliberative Democracy*. Eds. Fishkin, J. and Laslett, P. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Gutmann, A. and Thompson, D. (1996). *Democracy and Disagreement*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hardin, R. (2003). "Street-Level Epistemology and Democratic Participation." Ch. 8 in *Debating Deliberative Democracy*. Eds. Fishkin, J. and Laslett, P. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hendriks, C., Dryzek, J., and Hunold, C. (2007). "Turning Up the Heat: Partisanship in Deliberative Innovation." *Political Studies*, vol. 55(2), pp. 362-383.
- Humphrey, M. (2007). *Ecological Politics and Democratic Theory: The Challenge to the Deliberative Ideal*. New York: Routledge.
- Mansbridge, J. (1999). "Everyday Talk in the Deliberative System." Ch. 15 in *Deliberative Politics: Essays on Democracy and Disagreement*. Ed. Macedo, S. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Neblo, M. (2005). "Thinking through Democracy: Between the Theory and Practice of Deliberative Politics." *Acta Politica*, vol. 40(2), pp. 169-181.
- Pilon, D. (2009). "Investigating Media as a Deliberative Space: Newspaper Opinions about Voting Systems in the 2007 Ontario Provincial Referendum." *Canadian Political Science Review*, vol. 3(3), pp. 1-23.
- Robert, H., Robert, S., Robert, M. III, Evans, W., Honemann, D., and Balch, T. (2011). *Robert's Rules of Order: Newly Revised*. 11<sup>th</sup> ed. Philadelphia: De Capo Press.
- Shapiro, I. (1999). "Enough of Deliberation: Politics is About Interests and Power." Ch. 2 in *Deliberative Politics: Essays on Democracy and Disagreement*. Ed. Macedo, S. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Simon, W. (1999). "Three Limitations of Deliberative Democracy." Ch. 4 in *Deliberative Politics: Essays on Democracy and Disagreement*. Ed. Macedo, S. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Steiner, J., Bachtiger, A., Spordli, M. and Steenbergen, M. (2004). *Deliberative Politics in Action: Analysing Parliamentary Discourse*. New York: Cambridge University Press.



Sunstein, C. (2003). "The Law of Group Polarization." Ch. 4 in *Debating Deliberative Democracy*. Eds. Fishkin, J. and Laslett, P. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Young, I. (2001). "Activist Challenges to Deliberative Democracy." *Political Theory*, vol. 29(5), pp. 670-690.

APPENDIX: EXCERPT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 24, 2011 SASKATOON CITY COUNCIL MEETING – SPEAKERS LIST

*Mr. Peter Gerrard, Executive Director, Cosmopolitan Industries Inc., provided a brief history on Cosmo's activities and outlined the contractual obligations with the City. He noted that there are safety concerns with employees regarding glass contamination in the paper.*

*Mr. James Gillis spoke on behalf of Family and Friends of Cosmo and Elmwood Inc. He addressed the no-harm policy to Cosmo and expressed concerns with a co-mingled system and job security of employees.*

*Mr. Michael Stensrud indicated that he is not satisfied with the City's no-harm policy and suggested the City focus on recycling services that are best for the environment. He referenced a magazine article entitled "Newsprint on the Orient Express". He also noted that Cosmo is a paper processor not a paper collector.*

*Mr. Jim McClements, parent of a child with disabilities, spoke regarding the quality of community and the impact that some of the decisions may have on the employees of Cosmo noting that other communities aspire to provide a similar program to Cosmo.*

*Mr. Howard Stensrud provided a brief history regarding recycling in the city and dispelled some of the myths surrounding Cosmo Industries.*

*Mr. Ken Gryschuk, Cosmopolitan Industries, indicated that Cosmo Industries is a paper processor and expressed concerns with a single-stream collection system. He asked that Council consider Cosmo employees when making its decisions.*

*Mr. Jerome Nicol, Executive Director, Community Living Association Saskatoon, expressed support for Cosmo Industries and the programs it offers for the community and recycling.*

*Ms. Shelley Bartram, Executive Director, Elmwood Residences, indicated that she does not support a single-stream recycling program and expressed support for the program that Cosmo Industries provides to the community.*

*Mr. Alan Hunter expressed concern with a co-mingled system indicating that it would have a negative impact to Cosmo Industries. He encouraged a dual-stream system.*

*Mr. Ernest Boyko, Executive Director, Cheshire Homes, expressed health and safety concerns of a co-mingled collection system with glass contamination.*

*Ms. Gillian Smith spoke regarding the programs that Cosmo Industries offers for people with disabilities and asked that Council remember the 40 years of community service Cosmo provided.*

*Mr. Aaron Loraas, Loraas Disposal, indicated that Loraas has approximately 4,000 subscribers for its blue bin service and the rate is increasing. He raised three key points: the principle of issuing a fair and reasonable Request For Proposal, agreement with the provision to support Cosmo as a non-profit organization as long as Cosmo does not become a competitor, and concern regarding the performance outcomes and whether they can be achieved with four different companies providing the same services.*

*Mr. Dwight Grayston, Curbside Recycling, expressed a need for the City to move forward with a curbside recycling program. He indicated that Curbside currently works with Cosmo, providing them with the fibre product.*

*Mr. Alexandre Akoulov expressed support for a mandatory recycling program in Saskatoon.*

*Mr. Maxim Gertler-Jaffe expressed support for a mandatory recycling program in Saskatoon. He provided a DVD presentation of a music video he produced with a classmate in high school entitled "Love to Love You Landfills".*

*Ms. Sheri Praski spoke regarding the cost of garbage and encouraged the City to move forward with a Request For Proposal for a curbside recycling program.*

*Ms. Karen Rooney and Ms. Taylor Yee expressed support for a curbside recycling program in the city.*