

Among the laws that rule human societies there is one which seems to be more precise and clear than all others. If man are to remain civilized or to become so, the art of associating together must grow and improve in the same ratio in which the equality of conditions is increased.

– Alexis de Tocqueville, 1835

Recent Books and Other Studies

Deliberation and Citizen Construction

By Gabriel Murillo & Lariza Pizano, [2003]

Spanish version published by Editorial Alfaomega with continental distribution in the Americas.

The English version will be out soon. The publication of this book would not have been possible without the Kettering Foundation's support.

In the Balance: Debating the State of Democracy in South Africa

By Paul Graham, Robert Mattes, Richard Calland, [2002]

Five leading political commentators record and measure the depth and degree of democracy in their area of specialization, grading South Africa's performance to date. This book produces a profile of South Africa's democracy seven years after the 1994 founding election. The five areas of inquiry are:

- Consensus on and participation in government – Steven Friedman
- Selection of decision-makers – Sipho Maseko
- Popular control over decision-makers – Ebrahim Harvey
- Protecting citizens' equality – Cathi Albertyn
- Economic and social inequality – Bongani Khumalo

Includes contributions by Michael Spicer of the Anglo American Corporation and Molefe Tsele of the South African Council of Churches. In the Balance incorporates IDASA's Democracy Index, a tool for assessing the state of South Africa's democracy, to be completed by readers.

The Right To Know, The Right To Live

By Allison Tilley, Richard Calland, [2002]

The right to access information is not only an important civil and political right. It is also a socio-economic right, enabling the full realization of other socio-economic rights such as the right to welfare, housing, or education. This book focuses on the South African Law – said to be the "strongest access to information law in the world".

Capital Social (Social Capital)

By Alfredo Carrasquillo & Ramon Daubon, [2002]

Edited by Tal Cual Press of the Center for Public Policy Research

*Alfredo had also sent to the University of Puerto Rico Press a book on contemporary political discourse analysis titled **Los enemigos del orden** (The enemies of order) expected to be out sometime in 2003.

Moderating Public Forums

Naming Issues in Public Terms

Translations from English into French

By Melanie Beauvy & Sany Nzima, [2003]

The authors' intention is to train more people on the practices involved in the deliberative processes throughout the French speaking countries. Melanie and Sany are also doing research on earlier traditions of Collective Decision Making Processes in the communities they are more acquainted with.

Recent Books and Other Studies (continued)

A Guide for NIF Convenors and Moderators

Translation from English into Portuguese

By Ina Ouang, [2003]

The original U.S. guide was adapted and simplified to meet the Brazilian training necessities.

Teaching about Deliberation

- In Brazil, Ina Ouang uses the deliberative forums to teach young people about non-violent communication. Together with the State Secretary of Education, Silvana Augusto (a new participant at the last year's DDW), Ina is at the beginning of a series of meetings with middle-school teachers. Their hope is to produce an issue guide on violence prevention in the classrooms.

- The teaching and practice of deliberative politics is an integral part of Alfredo Carrasquillo's activities. At the University of the Sacred Heart, San Juan, Puerto Rico, they began the Graduate Program in Nonprofit Management where deliberative politics is a paradigm that runs across the curriculum in an effort to show and teach the importance of democratizing community processes and organizational cultures for a healthy development of the third sector and a continuous strengthening of civil society. Together with his colleague, Maria Teresa Martinez, they have been continuing their work in the development of the local Public Policy Institute hosting several conversations on public education (funded by the Ford Foundation) and community economic development (funded by the Rafael Hernandez Colon Foundation). In February, they finished hosting a series of National Issues Forums sponsored by the U.S. Council for Public Policy Education and the Southern Growth Policies Board on the topic "Pathways to Prosperity: Choosing a Future for Your Community".

Alfredo also joined other colleagues at Montgomery College in Maryland and at the University of Missouri in Kansas City in two different public policy institutes workshops for the training of NIF moderators. In that very subject of moderators training, he has continued with another colleague of ours, Marisol Pages, in the Dominican Republic around the issue of crime prevention.

Sponsored by the Municipal Government of Caguas, he facilitated a series of community dialogues between different groups in the Barriada Morales – a very poor barrio of Caguas that has been suffering the effects of two drug trafficking groups harassing community leaders and impeding the development of several community efforts. According to Alfredo, the dialogues were a serious and tough challenge, having around the tables representatives from all those groups, including the drug lords. After several months of an ongoing dialogue, a new community association was developed and their board elected. As with other cases, only time will say if deliberation is possible in contexts such as this one, Alfredo Carrasquillo Ramirez concludes.

- From a series of messages that Gabriel Murillo of Colombia had sent, it is obvious that he has been very involved in the academic coordination of a hemispheric project on deliberation and democracy in Latin America. This is a joint project shared by the Council for Public Policy Education, the Inter American Foundation and the Inter American Network for Democracy. In March of 2003, they held their third research workshop in Mexico City. The collection of ten case studies were expected to be finalized in order to report their progress before the preparation of a book that will be published both in Spanish and English. This book will be presented in an international meeting in Dayton and in Washington in the fall of 2003.

Recent Books and Other Studies (continued)

Teaching about Deliberation (continued)

- The purpose of the **international meeting** held in Dayton in late-February was to learn with groups initiating or continuing with projects in deliberative democracy through a research exchange in the international network. The meeting also helped address the questions about the extent of deliberation in the network.

The main questions addressed during this meeting were the following:

- How do citizens best learn deliberation?
- What is the role of deliberation in community problem solving?
- Can deliberation develop where other forms of politics dominate?
- What is the role of public deliberation in representative government?

For each question, there were a number of cases from different countries discussed. The presenters were:
Russia: “Deliberative Politics as a Course for Higher Education,” by Denis Makarov;

Cameroon: “Public Deliberation and Participative Citizenry in Cameroon,” by Sany Nzima;

Brazil: “Public Deliberation and Civic Participation,” by Telma Gimenez;

New Zealand: “Deliberation and Community Functions,” by David Robinson;

South Africa: “Is Deliberation an Option When Power Is Unequally Distributed?” by Ivor Jenkins;

Guatemala: “Can Deliberative Politics Develop Where Other Forms of Politics Dominate? Deliberation and Governance in Guatemala,” by Jorge Dardon Rodas;

Puerto Rico: “Following the Consequences of Deliberative Dialogues in the Second National Congress on Public Policy for Community Issues in Puerto Rico: The Role of Media in Communicating Deliberation Outcomes to Office Holders,” by Maria Teresa Martinez;

Puerto Rico: “Five Years of Deliberative Practices and Participatory Governance: The Autonomous Municipal Government of Caguas, Puerto Rico and the Promotion of Social Development and Community Self Sufficiency through Citizen Participation and Public Deliberation”, by Alfredo Carrasquillo.

The Extent of Deliberation in the International Network

- a study conducted and written by Ileana Marin -

The following pages represent a study I have worked on over a period of a few months. The biggest challenge in writing this piece of research that I hope to be useful for many members of our international (net)work was that of collecting all the necessary data.

Throughout the years I have had quite a number of experiences in gathering pieces of information and details on the work of my colleagues and friends from all over the world whenever I have written and edited the International Newsletters (for those of you interested in finding the latest issues of this Newsletter, please check them on **www.icscpd.org**).

I have learned through my work that getting to know people is wonderful; meeting those who have a lot in common and share the same interests is a beautiful and enriching life-time experience; however, staying in touch and keeping close updates on both work- and other life-related matters represent a great challenge. That is probably one of the reasons why many ideas, contacts and relationships have gotten lost in this big world that we all seem to see as a rather small place when it comes to finding our own heaven on earth but far too large when we have to stay in touch from a distance.

In spite of all these, though, we do share a lot through our work, and, even if sometimes invisible, our connections from time to time bring a lot of joy, on one hand, and plenty of interesting and useful pieces of knowledge, on the other hand.

Therefore, this study is based upon a questionnaire I designed and sent out (via e-mail) to 50 people in the international network out of which most of them met through the conferences and workshops organized by the Kettering Foundation (KF).

The questionnaire was sent to those people who have been more actively involved within the international network created over the years.

Out of the 50, I received replies from 39 and real answers from 23 – which I consider to be a good turnout taking into account previous experiences.

There is a great range of answers (from quite laconic ones to others very elaborated and detailed), of course, but I was very pleasantly surprised by the nature of the experiences, activities described, and the thoughtfulness that emerged from the replies.

For a more appropriate perspective on the core of this study, I have deliberately selected what I considered the most representative samples based directly on our colleagues' answers. For the purpose of our work, I took the liberty to compile and edit them accordingly.

Here are a few comments and thoughts on what the deliberative democracy methodology means to some of us, for instance:

“I think it is an excellent tool and very necessary in a culture like ours (Dominican) where debates take place over the press with radical positions.”

“I am convinced this is a fundamental tool for the promotion of a participatory governance and active citizenship.”

“Deliberative methodology has given me confidence in promoting an understanding among those of different opinions as to the values of a project.”

“This methodology helped me to value the potential derived from individuals getting together. I got more convinced about the power of collective action.”

“My propensity to a high understanding of the social processes has been fundamentally influenced by the deliberative democracy methodology.”

“Deliberative democracy is not a superior stage of democratic development, but rather the site in which representation and participation merge in order to strengthen the public sphere and therefore democracy in general.”

“Deliberative democracy is certainly a very useful tool in the harnessing of people’s energy in a positive and constructive way.”

It continues to make it a little difficult for some of us (particularly our U.S. colleagues at KF) to deal with the rest of the people part of the international network as the latter ones mainly come from universities, NGOs or from institutions that are narrowly purposeful and have, for the most part, very practical concerns in communities where needs are clear and sometimes desperate. It seems that the 'message' that stands behind deliberative democracy goes extremely well in those environments where the civic or public problems exist in fundamentally settled, democratic, and even cultivated or middle-class communities. U.S.A. represents the most eloquent example, but in a paradoxical way, even some of the former Soviet and Eastern European countries fit the description of ordered societies where a central or underlying concern is always the greater engagement of citizens in the command of their own lives. This is what one of our Russian colleagues who is project coordinator within the Center for Citizenship Education in Saint Petersburg writes, for instance: “I think that this methodology [deliberative democracy] is very helpful and useful for the Russian NGOs in the discussion of hot issues, and for those who believe that there are no effective civil society and democracy without public involvement in the decision-making process. There is a lack of skills and habits of public participation and initiative. Due to the absence of a real experience under the authoritarian communist regime people are missing the skills for public dialogue and for reaching common ground on the public policy issues they are concerned about. Thus, in my opinion, deliberation is a rightful and successful thing in order to reach this goal.”

That, after all, is what the very deliberative methodology is directed at; and it must present a particular challenge in societies that have experienced extreme instability or where the problems that have to be addressed include primarily access to the immediate necessities of life and social organization itself.

In order to get a better overall view on the rest of the comments, I am attaching hereinafter the questions that were included in the questionnaire.

1. What is your current job? Please describe your work briefly.
2. How much of your work nowadays involves the knowledge and practice of democracy in deliberative forms? Please give us a few details in order to better understand your decision to use or not to use the deliberative democracy methodology in your work.
3. How has the exposure to deliberative methodology influenced your overall work over the years? Please be specific.
4. What parts of your knowledge have you shared with others in your community and country?
5. Do you use what you have learned about public politics in any voluntary activities?

6. Are you aware of other individuals, institutions, and/or organizations in your country that are interested in and/or performing any kind of activities involving the knowledge and practices of deliberative democracy? If so, please name them (whole name and address) and their specific area of expertise and activity, and let us know whether you are cooperating with them at all.
7. Are you aware of other individuals, institutions, and/or organizations in other countries that are interested in and/or performing any kind of activities along the lines of deliberative democracy? If so, please name them (whole name and address) and their specific area of expertise and activity, and let us know whether you are cooperating with them at all.

Here are a few interesting comments and remarks on the influence that the practice and knowledge behind deliberative democracy have in the *daily work* for quite a number of us.

“I have to make decisions with my colleagues, with the manager and with the director of CARE in El Salvador as well as with the leaders of political parties, private enterprises, central and local government, and it is difficult to guide the decisions when all of them show an interest for one or several issues.”

“One thing that I can link to the exposure to deliberative methodology is that I try to use it when I want to determine the issues we write about [at the KosovaLive News Agency, Kosovo]. I very often see the discussion in the regular budget meetings, in our newsroom move into a sort of a deliberation in trying to frame the issues we want to write about.”

“Percentage-wise in terms of my work [as manager of the Institute for Democracy in South Africa, IDASA] I would say [that I use deliberation] less than 20%, but quite a few of the staff under my management do work quite extensively in the area and practice of some form or another of deliberative forms.”

“I use my knowledge and practice of democracy in deliberative forms almost in all my work to defend the values of my projects by promoting debate and action. Before trying to convince anyone on the values of any project, deliberation is used to study and strengthen the values of the issue.”

“I believe that the knowledge of deliberative practices is helpful in many decision-making circumstances where a large group of people is involved. My current work does that to the extent that I participate in meetings where we have to deliberate on university matters.”

“I am involved in various programs that are related to deliberative forums, even if the overall process is pretty different. But many times I have used some of the knowledge and practices of the deliberative forums.”

“Definitely, my current job [with the United Nations Population Fund in Nicaragua] requires the deliberative methodology skills that I use as a personal methodology and transmit to my counterparts. The office I work for is part of the donor community in the country and provides the government and civil society with technical and financial assistance to help them accomplish international commitments on population matters. It implies a lot of political dialogue that we have to encourage among the social and political actors.”

“I have been involved in public life in my city and region for several years (before I was elected to the Polish national parliament I was a member of a regional one for three years) deliberative methodology helped me to create a better contact and understanding with people on public issues.”

“I devote 80% of my time to these practices. My writing, research and social practice are dedicated to the promotion of deliberation and citizen construction.”

“My fellowship project [at the International Fellowship Program at the Open Society Institute, Budapest, Hungary] is about the impact of media discussion of poverty on society and social policy. Words as acts, as always. In addition, in designing policy alternatives, policy analysis experience from the Kettering Foundation was useful. On the other hand, knowing that there is no policy without public discussion about it, I organize roundtables for professionals.”

“It has become a motivation for on-going research and it is one of the organizing and dialogue tools I have as resource for my work.”

“I’ve learned how important it is to see alternative points of view and understand the reasons behind people’s disagreement.”

“I think it has given me a new perspective on how to debate on issues, and it represents an effective tool to have citizens engaged in useful conversations about a public issue.”

“Exposure to deliberative methodology influenced my work in few ways: it has opened my mind in many ways; it improved my knowledge and skills from forum to forum, and it has made my work better.”

“I’m using it throughout all of the projects I’m helping (more or less). Usually, it is very helpful when establishing contacts between citizens and local authorities or mass media. It’s also necessary in the question of forming the public opinion (for instance, one of the projects we run now – at the Psychological Education Center in Saint Petersburg, Russia – includes changing the public opinion by different means, including that of deliberative methodology on the position of the mentally ill in the society).”

“My involvement with the Kettering Foundation and introduction to the deliberative approach has resulted in building a network of people in New Zealand who are integrating deliberation into their work and in mentoring and supporting this work.”

“For one and a half year I worked for the Presidency of the Republic of Nicaragua as main adviser in the Formulation and Implementation of Public Policies on Citizen Participation. I also worked (for the Presidency) as a National Coordinator of the National Youth Policy for the last two years. In both jobs I had to promote participatory processes and political dialogue applying the deliberative principles.”

“Being exposed to the methodology, I would say that has intensively influenced my overall work because it has given me a new way to approach those issues that have always been of concern for me, as well as it has been the way in which I have acquired most of my professional experience as political scientist [at the Department of Political Science, DECIPO, of the University of the Andes, Bogotá, Colombia].”

Regarding the methodology per se, many of the interviewed people believe that this can be used after making *appropriate adaptations*.

Here are a few examples:

“At the moment, I am organizing a forum on health issues and struggling with the steps to ensure that what we mean by forum is not what people in general believe it is (cultural practices).”

“I have adapted deliberation as pastoral tool when I counsel individuals [as priest in the Anglican Church in Cape Town, South Africa].”

“Since last April, I have been negotiating with the municipalities, Ministry of Health, central government, rotary clubs, both local and international, different ways to help 6,500 people [through CARE El Salvador]. Until now, I only have words and words but I hope for more. How to use deliberative democracy in this negotiation:

- First, I address the real problem with the people involved: we define it, we look for ways to solve it, and we meet with larger groups who consider two or three options for solving the problem.
- Second, once the problem is defined, we look at who can help.
- Third, everybody is involved in different ways in order to bring some sort of help.

I do not use the methodology as a forum like the NIF people do in the U.S. I have meetings with the actors (people affected and leaders of institutions or local and central government) meant to make decisions together and work together. These meetings take place in the communities (this is not achieved in one, two or three meetings, we have to sustain about ten or more), in our office or in the local municipality. People who are involved choose the place where they want to talk and where they feel more comfortable. We have many spaces to define what the options are to deal with the problems. The main things are that we establish with the actors how we should moderate the climate of the meetings and how to discuss the different points of view in order to reach an agreement.”

“I also introduced this method to an environmental-initiative NGO group that is solving nuclear problems in a zone near Saint Petersburg [Russia].”

“I have had to adapt it to the context of my country, South Africa, which is in a process of stagnating-transformation. Many in civil society are finally finding a voice, and this has involved a review of the way we responded to difficulties in the past and the deliberative method has been useful in responding to emerging needs and challenges.”

I have managed to gather an impressive number of *examples* to give you ideas of the type of the activities developed by our colleagues in the network.

In *Croatia*, since 1999 some of our colleagues have started to plan a project on fighting against corruption in their republic. The first design was based on public participation, and the cooperative planning processes they have practiced before. After the first then International Deliberative Democracy Workshop (IDDW) held in Washington D.C. that the director of Partnership for Social Development in Croatia attended, he has decided to make public deliberation a part of their project. So far they have had over 45 forums in five cities in Croatia and these forums are still going on about two a month in each city, according to our Croatian colleague. “The results are much bigger than we ever expected, and the real value of this process is to be determined by the evaluation and results we expect to see in following months,” he continues.

They have also shared all the knowledge within their organizations, as well as with other NGOs when they ask for support in designing the process for a series of debates regarding the impact of the integration in the European Union, for example.

They explained the approach and then provided them with all the materials received in IDDW, thus offering their help for initiating and facilitating debates with local governments.

In *Romania*, one of our colleagues with Partners Foundation for Local Development has been facilitating meetings between the Roma (Gypsy) community representatives, central and local representatives responsible for strategy implementation, under the national [Romanian] strategy for the improvement of the Roma situation.

Because of these forums/workshops, she and her organization were able to increase the participants' understanding of the critical problems regarding the Roma community, and to identify the problems/obstacles in the strategy implementation.

They also facilitate meetings between representatives of NGOs and local governments, under Building Bridges II, a project focused on helping the Romanian NGOs and local governments to work more effectively together. According to the same person, because of these forums/workshops, the participants increased their understanding of the citizen participation in the decision-making process, and they have developed ideas about various approaches for solving local critical issues.

“The reason for using this methodology in a different manner was because we initiated the discussions/debates without a pre-prepared written issue-book. The logic of the process and some practices were very similar, though,” she concludes.

Another Romanian colleague who is very active in the field of social policies thinks that deliberative democracy is essential in his work because he is focused on social development, “and the deliberative practice could be the most effective instrument,” according to him. He also set up a NGO ñ called Community Development Center ñ with a few U.S. University Alumni specialized in social development through increasing the stock of social capital. “The deliberation is our essential method to achieve it,” he says. For the moment, the focus of this NGO is on the Romanian rural area.

He also shares one of his deeper thoughts on his mission: “I have accepted to be involved in public life because I deeply believe that I will be able to apply a part of deliberative democracy approach in order to achieve a real social development in Romania.”

From one of our friends in *Argentina* we learn that the ideas and philosophy of deliberative democracy are being put to use in the serious political crisis in his city over the past year. There has been important participation of people of his organization, Woodville Foundation for Education, in the *Mesa de Concertation Social* where citizens have become directly involved in trying to solve the very serious social, economic problems, such as poverty, hunger, distribution of aid, etc. The practice they gained from the training they had was the start for a large group of facilitators and moderators who became involved in this, and the *Encuentro de Profesionales* who also began to get directly involved in the fate of the community. “I feel that the community has begun to understand that it cannot leave everything in the hands of the politicians and that change is possible if they get involved,” he writes.

The organization he directs continues to develop forums, and has had requests from other communities in other parts of Argentina to organize and conduct forums.

The forums they organized so far have been very effective in encouraging cross-generational dialogue (on the subject of drugs, for example) and they are investigating the possibility of using the forum-system to address the problem of trash and recycling in the community as well as the siting of a large Convention Center.

“Much of our work in the community takes experience and ideas that underlie deliberative democracy since we firmly believe that the only solution for Argentina is a grass-roots citizen democratic movement. The political system and the party system are totally discredited but it is still hanging onto power. Meanwhile, all over the country people are getting involved in their own fate,” he concludes.

Another friend who works at the Institute of Bioethics of the Catholic University of Argentina, after the experience of IDDW 2000, found the necessary stimulation to put into practice something she has been

interested in for many years but could never get around. She got in touch with *Asociación María de las Cereles*, an NGO that works to improve inmate's conditions in prisons.

Another good example comes from **Brazil** on promoting an educational project against destructive graffiti. Two major NGOs, Colmeia, the Institute for Youth Service, and the Institute for Citizenship, worked together bringing members of the community, prospective supporters and those that practiced destructive graffiti into a forum to find common grounds on how to convert a crime against private and public property into a politically correct 'art of the streets' with proper artistic and creative training, as one of our old-time member of the international network relates.

In **Colombia**, one of the Kettering Foundation's former international fellows has developed a number of forums with people in different communities using the issue that she framed while at KF – on the Internally Displaced People – “issue that has turned into such a big problem that it is almost dangerous to do it anymore,” according to her.

Another project that she and her colleagues at DECIPOL, the Department of Political Science of the University of the Andes, have recently presented is about using the deliberative methodology as an alternative way for solving conflicts in the community, and about creating stronger ties inside the civil society. “This issue involves strengthening the ties with the internally displaced persons that are living now in the communities where we are planning to focus our project,” she explains.

As part of the activities one of our colleagues does as finance director of Grupo Pages, a business group in the **Dominican Republic**, they have a public benefit campaign for crime prevention. The campaign uses deliberative forums on that topic to increase awareness and develop solutions to crime-related problems in neighborhoods, schools and university campuses.

One of our colleagues, director of the Social and Policy Institute as well as of the Program on Civil Society at the Victoria University's Institute of Policy Studies in **New Zealand** tells us about his work where deliberation sits alongside the work on social capital in providing a framework for an approach that emphasizes the importance of involving all those affected in developing policies and in carrying out their activities.

Around one third of his work time is allocated to managing an entire program focused on deliberation, according to him. This project aims to identify the potential for public policy design and implementation of evolving ideas about the concept of community, encompassing current interests in social capital, citizenship and civil society. It is essentially about improving the society through participation, and enhancing the role of government through legitimacy. It relates to both the design of policy, especially who designs policy, and to the delivery of services, especially the impact of delivery systems on community values and attitudes, as he tells us.

In **South Africa** this methodology also forms part of the “visioning exercise” one of our old-time colleagues who is a priest in the Anglican Church does to enable a community or an organization to deal within internal conflict and divisions and where they have a crisis of identity in relation to future activity and organization existence.

A large number of examples come from those who have decided to use the deliberative democratic methodology in the **classroom**:

From **Puerto Rico** (where a former KF fellow uses it specifically in the courses she holds at the University of the Sacred Heart on Research Methodology, Media and Democracy, and Ethics and Social Responsibility of NGOs) to **Russia** (where another prestigious member of our network has introduced the

deliberative forum methodology in the curriculum of the school she directs: she teaches students and teachers how to use the deliberative methodology in the classroom, as a crucial part of the “Public Forum in Classroom” project developed within the Russian Center for Citizenship Education).

In **Brazil**, they have integrated the practice of deliberation into some of their graduate programs. In **Colombia**, as part of her class, one of our colleagues with DECIPOL has included in the curriculum a special portion of the theory and practice of the deliberative democracy methodology as a tool to involve civil society in the fight against corruption. She has also been doing forums with her students regarding the issue of corruption and how to fight against it.

She writes that “this methodology has stimulated my students and some of their final research projects for the class have been based on the ways people get involved and get active in fighting this problem from the communitarian perspective”.

Regarding specific *parts of the deliberative methodology that are being used* throughout the sample of interviewed people, most of them have been actively using techniques associated with the process of naming and framing an issue. Forums are quite popular as well.

In the Dominican Republic, for instance, over 50 people participated in trainings on moderating forums. About 400 have participated in the forum process at some point or another, according to our colleague from the Grupo Pages.

An old-timer in our network tells us about his major role as director of the Social and Civic Policy Institute in organizing a deliberation-training course for 15 people in New Zealand. Through this network they produced a deliberation handbook – “Public Politics in Practice” – for which they continue to have a steady demand, he says. With other members of this group, he has also made presentations on deliberation at the annual conference of the Local Government in New Zealand, at an International Community Development Conference, and to the Department of Internal Affairs. He gave talks about deliberation to local community groups in London as well.

Quite a number of our colleagues all over the world have chosen to introduce their students to the theory related to deliberative democracy and civil society. They organized forums with them in the class. Others wrote guides for the teachers on how to use a public forum, how to use the issue framing process, and how to work on a social project.

One of our colleagues from Brazil has tried to share this knowledge by translating David Mathew’s book on public schools; published an issue book on public schools in Portuguese that is being distributed to teachers in seminars and conferences through paper presentations.

A few others have demonstrated that this methodology is good and useful to see things in different ways, and to observe how others see them from the different angles of their thoughts.

“I tried to communicate the importance of achieving common ground when arriving from different perspectives. The outcome of these deliberations not only enhances the involvement of the actors, but also helps to build a better democracy,” one of our colleagues concludes, for instance.

In terms of other individuals, institutions, or organizations in their country that are interested in or performing any kind of activities involving the knowledge and practices of deliberative democracy, many have mentioned quite a number of interested people.

Mostly those citizens who participate in forums are in favor of this process, and willing to continue and explore possibilities to use this process, and thousands of citizens have learnt this term and its basic meaning mainly through media presentations and articles written about this (in Brazil, for example, one of our colleagues mentions that more than 40 articles were written on this topic in national newspapers, and it got often on regional TV stations and radio).

Regarding other individuals, institutions, or organizations in other countries that they know to be interested in and performing any kind of activities along the lines of deliberative democracy, our international colleagues have mostly mentioned mainly those who are part of the International Civil Society Consortium for Public Deliberation (ICSCPD) network. However, they are not cooperating among themselves as they would like to because the necessities and the cultural universe of these countries seem very different as well as the distance that separates them. The only moment to exchange experiences is when there is a chance to meet through KF, many of them write. Others motivate themselves by saying that due to the size of the projects they are concentrated on nowadays they cannot accomplish such a big task. However, they are certain that there is a need for knowledge on these matters in the regions they come from.

Quite a number of people wrote about the issue of receiving funding for certain projects, and how fundraising is being dictated by the very circumstances of their own countries, on one hand, and by the priorities set by those who are giving out grants, on the other hand.

A few good examples of successful cooperation, though, come from places like South Africa, for instance, where the director of Idasa works on a weekly basis with more than 50 NGOs in Zimbabwe, Zambia, Angola and Mozambique. With most of them, they have an agreement on skills' transfer and capacity building, and within this process, they do some training using the deliberative methodology and choice work, according to our South African counterpart.

In Croatia and Romania, too, there is a network of trainers and training institutions from 28 Central and Southeast European countries. The network includes more than 60 training organizations interested in capacity building for local government.

One of our members from New Zealand is also an active member of another widely respected world organization, CIVICUS, and through their meetings and work on the Index of Civil Society he is in touch with a wide group of people who have an interest in deliberation. He also works with Oxfam New Zealand who has used the learning circle model in their work in Vanuatu, the Solomon Islands and Fiji. In addition, he and others collaborate on a regular basis with others who have a direct interest in deliberation.

A number of the South and Central American organizations that we have had fruitful contacts with focus on democracy and civil society, in general, and on democracy as a whole and/or the relationship of civil society to democracy, in particular.

A few of them concentrate specifically on what it will take to make civil society itself democratic as well as the larger question of how civil society can help build democracy itself. Four NGOs (Conciencia and Poder Ciudadano in Argentina; Participa in Chile; INIAP/Instituto Nacional de Investigacion y Autoformacion Politica in Guatemala, and the Department of Political Science of the University of the Andes in Colombia organized the Inter-American Democracy Network (IADN) in 1993, with financial support from AID through Partners of the Americas and with educational support from the Kettering Foundation. These five founding members have since reached out, through training and conferences to over 100 other associate member organizations, most of who have other programmatic interests. The real paradigm of this network is the role of the citizen in civil society, with public deliberation a key part of that, fact that represents a huge step in the Latin American political culture.

As a conclusion to this first rather comprehensive and extensive questionnaire, I would write that the results implied demonstrate that the international network thus created over a number of years is a very strong one, in spite of its obviously heterogeneous overall character. There is a special link created between its members, and the main thread is based upon the ideas that stand behind the larger concept of deliberative democracy. We all need to ponder on better ways to communicate and collaborate in the future; but before wrongly concluding that this network is too loose, we ought to look at the great encounters we have had during the last years. The Kettering Foundation has been the more or less 'invisible entity' that in many cases made possible and then perfected this special link. However, almost all these people representing an impressive number of institutions from a large range of areas have managed to mingle through their work before and after their connections via KF. Many of them have been using the techniques implied by a deliberative democratic methodology for a long time throughout their work, and probably one of the best parts in KF's role was that of helping them to give a name and frame these techniques in a more structured manner, on one hand, and better appreciate the contacts they have developed inside this network created in a quite ad-hoc manner at times, on the other hand.

This is the list with the names of all those who answered:

1. Stephen Cohen, Woodville Foundation, Argentina;
2. Marina Lopez Saubidet, Institute of Bioethics of the Catholic University, Argentina;
3. Telma Gimenez, Londrina University, Brazil;
4. Ina Oaung, COLMEIA-Institute for Youth Service, Brazil;
5. Sandra Martinez, University of the Andes, Colombia;
6. Gabriel Murillo, University of the Andes, Colombia;
7. Munir Podumljak, Partnership for Social Development, Croatia;
8. Marisol Pages, Pages Group, Dominican Republic;
9. Arely Reyes Reinaldo, CARE, El Salvador;
10. Ferenc Hammer, ELTE University, Hungary;
11. Kelmend Hapciu, KosovaLive, Kosovo;
12. David Robinson, Social and Civic Policy Institute, New Zealand;
13. Eduardo Mangas, United Nations Population Fund, Nicaragua;
14. Jacek Protasiewicz, Polish Parliament, Poland;
15. Alfredo Carassquillo, University of the Sacred Heart, Puerto Rico;
16. Maria Teresa Martinez, University of the Sacred Heart, Puerto Rico;
17. George Cretu, Community Development Center, Romania;
18. Nicoleta Rata, Partners Romania Foundation, Romania;
19. Alexandra Breslav, Russia;
20. Boris Demidov, Center Transparency International, Russia;
21. Alissa Fomina, Living Law Clinic, Center for Citizenship Education, Russia;
22. Ivor Jenkins, IDASA, South Africa;
23. Michael Weeder, Anglican Church, South Africa.

For more information and future updates contact Ileana Marin at imarin@icscpd.org