

Ways to Generate an Inclusive, Legitimate, Informed, Coherent and Trustworthy Voice of "We the People"

| Type of Citizen Deliberative Council | | Picking an Issue | Framing the Issue | Selecting Deliberators | Information and Expertise | Deliberations | Decision-making | Dissemination and Impact | Organizational Support |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| Citizen Jury | | Picked by Convening Authority - <ul style="list-style-type: none">Government AgencyLarge NGOCorporationUniversityWisdom CouncilAutomatic part of government operations | Organizers usually create a "charge" naming options deliberators must choose among and describing pros, cons and tradeoffs | * Random selection, usually with stratified sampling to reflect demographic profile of the larger community <ul style="list-style-type: none">* 12-24 jurors | Oversight committee of diverse partisans and/or respected neutral experts choose briefing materials and expert witnesses | * Normal agenda-based meeting facilitation, often includes values analysis and voting <ul style="list-style-type: none">* 4-5 days | * Usually majority or supermajority vote <ul style="list-style-type: none">* Generate findings and recommendations | * Results sent to convening authority and media (with varying degrees of publicity) <ul style="list-style-type: none">* Wisdom council reports to community meeting + high expectation from participant selection* Sometimes -- other dialogues organized before, during and/or after-- officials take action or explain why not-- institutionalized outcomes, e.g., popular vote, legislative action, placement of findings in voters pamphlets... | * Professional (or other high quality) organizers <ul style="list-style-type: none">* \$20,000 and up |
| Consensus Conference | | | Citizen panel frames the issue within their mandate, in liaison with the organizers | * Random from whole country/community database and/or newspaper recruitment; select people who know little about the issue <ul style="list-style-type: none">* 12-24 panelists | Similar to citizen jury, but citizens have final say on expert witnesses | * Moderated public hearings followed by facilitated consensus process <ul style="list-style-type: none">* 2 briefing weekends, then 3-4 day conference | * Usually consensus, sometimes reporting the nature of any remaining differences <ul style="list-style-type: none">* Generate findings and recommendations | | * Professional (or other high quality) organizers <ul style="list-style-type: none">* \$30,000 and up |
| Wisdom Council | | Picks its own issue(s) | Citizen panel frames and reframes the issue as they proceed through dynamic facilitation | * As close to pure random selection as possible, chosen in public ceremony to generate public interest <ul style="list-style-type: none">* 12-24 members | Citizens are experts in their own experience, and can choose other experts if they wish. | * Dynamic facilitation of choice-creating process <ul style="list-style-type: none">* 2-5 days, culminating in public meeting | * Usually emergent consensus, but sometimes a more crafted agreement <ul style="list-style-type: none">* Generate statement | Grassroots advocacy for recommendations, using blogs and MoveOn-type organizing, etc. | * Can be done by grass-roots citizens from manuals <ul style="list-style-type: none">* \$2,000 and up |
| Tao of Extreme Democracy (ideas for) | | Some method of surfacing issues online on an ongoing basis through popular participation? | National Issues Forums-style issue framing, which provides 3-5 approaches w/ arguments for and against, trade-offs, values, etc., for each - and invites deliberators to move beyond them. | * Random selection (using demographics) from large pool of volunteers who have provided demographic information? <ul style="list-style-type: none">* Random selection of and from diverse groups (NGOs, churches, unions, etc.)?* 24-100 or more deliberators | * Info from issue framings and web searches <ul style="list-style-type: none">* Experts available from pools of diverse volunteer experts, accessible via all telecommunications media (online, teleconference, etc.) | * Volunteer facilitators following standard guidelines? <ul style="list-style-type: none">* Numerous groups of deliberators simultaneously considering the same issue ("parallel processing" a la German "planning cells")? | * Probably supermajority <ul style="list-style-type: none">* Mixing and matching members of diverse parallel groups may increase common sense agreements* Could have feedback between deliberators and public before decision made | | * Since not-for-profit and very experimental, needs major investment in experiments (high ROI of social change when successful!) <ul style="list-style-type: none">* Needs grassroots support, especially from techies |
| Resources and Comments | Purpose -- To facilitate the emergence of an inclusive, legitimate, informed, coherent and trustworthy voice of We the People | * Need to cover popular issues <u>and</u> emerging dangerous ones | * Universities; graduate students <ul style="list-style-type: none">* Existing "issue books"* Wikipedia of issue framings co-created through a citizen journalism movement* Must be demonstrably inclusive and/or unbiased | * Database and Selection software <ul style="list-style-type: none">* Needs to be as unbiased and inclusive (wide spectrum diversity) as feasible, to nurture both legitimacy and collective wisdom | * Wikipedia pattern map for solutions? <ul style="list-style-type: none">* Needs to be as unbiased and inclusive (wide spectrum diversity) as feasible, to nurture both legitimacy and collective wisdom | * Dialogue Circles <ul style="list-style-type: none">* NIF/Kettering* Needs facilitation to help diverse views evolve towards wise agreement | • Synanim.com <ul style="list-style-type: none">* The smaller the group, the more agreement they must demonstrate in order to be seen as representing the whole community | * Building expectations builds "buzz" afterwards <ul style="list-style-type: none">* Partisan advocacy tools can be used to advocate for inclusive solutions | * Needs to be easily replicable and inexpensive - and hopefully very appealing ("sticky meme") |
| | | | | | | | | | Tom Atlee (w/Kaliya Hamlin) cii@igc.org co-intelligence.org |

1. In democratic theory, a leader, institution, system or policy is **legitimate** to the extent people will voluntarily go along with it without being coerced. Force -- importing *extrinsic* energy into a system -- does not achieve stable outcomes. Intelligence (which collectively involves dialogue) is an alternative to force -- learning the *intrinsic* energies, tendencies and patterns that can be worked *with* (as in permaculture).
2. Things to consider: Imagineering. Wisdom Civilization. Civic Intelligence / CPSR. Anthony Judge. CWPR. URI. "How Not to Make a Decision." Pattern language. Noo. Edmonton Sean. *The future is here -- it's just not well distributed yet!*