DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY
AND TECHNOSCIENTIFIC INNOVATION.

NEW PROCEDURES OF PARTICIPATION IN A EUROPEAN NETWORK PROJECT.

Chloe Elizabeth Alexander.
alexander.chloe@gmail.com
Paper presented during undergraduate graduation discussion for degree course
in European Politics and Integration.
October, 2007.
The University of Padova.
Faculty of Political Science,
Via del Santo, 28.
Padova, Italy.
In collaboration with Observa-Science in Society**:** www.observa.it

I N D E X

ABSTRACT

The main aim of this study is to examine whether two of the European Commission's recent objectives are being reached by the funding of European network projects. The first of these aims is to improve European integration between member states by harmonizing economic, social and cultural practices. The second is to construct platforms for the exchange of information and experience regarding the field of deliberative participation methodologies in the area of science in society.

The empirical aspect of the thesis takes the example of a three year European project, CIPAST (Citizens' Participation in Science and Technology), which was funded by the Commission under the FP6. Nine interviews were carried out with representatives from each partner institution. The effectiveness of the CIPAST project, the network structure of the project and the developments of deliberative democracy in the different member states were discussed. The aim of the interviews was to discover whether, in the opinion of experts from the partner institutes, the European Commission is succeeding in "building platforms for exchange within the EU" for the dissemination of deliberative participation methodologies. The conclusion confirms that the two goals of the European Commission are being reached through the funding of the CIPAST project and network. The empirical work done for this study revealed that platforms for exchange are being built within the European Union. There are criticisms of the network which include the absence of Eastern European countries and dissatisfaction about the amount and quality of contact between partners. On a larger scale, European integration is being promoted as a result of organizations and individuals from different EU countries co-operating and communicating on a common project.

INTRODUCTION

Recently, the developments in the fields of scientific and technological innovation have been so many and so controversial, dealing with areas of research that so closely affect the lives of every European citizen, that the models which have been used until now to make political and policy decisions are proving inadequate. These models are in need of changes to help them become more able to deal with this changing reality. Science and technology present huge challenges to today's reality and these can only be met by rethinking the way deliberation on these issues is carried out. Processes which are more inclusive need to be experimented which can help us reform ourselves, and our institutions. There is hope that if citizens are more involved in deliberative methods and the decision process, this will lead to higher levels of empathy and tolerance for other people's views, greater trust in the government and more informed and considered public opinion. The scientific and technological sectors are, after all, as conditioned by the changes in European civil society as civil society is by the innovations of science and technology.

Techno-scientific innovation is progressing fast and is setting up many economic and social development opportunities. The European Commission in its aim to create the European Research Area is aware that, to do this, civil society needs to be represented by research and also that research must also be accepted by society. The Commission acknowledges that in order to respond quickly and effectively to the innovations which are affecting society and also offering great economic and development opportunities, civil society must be involved in the political process.

It is, however, is not an easy step to take for both politicians and scientists who have been used to working within a culture of expertise. Now the European Commission claims that this expertise has to be "democratized" (IFOK Interim Report, 2003). This is proving one of the biggest challenges to the ever growing developments of deliberative citizen processes, which are used as a tool to get the views of the public listened to, and taken into account during the political decision process. Participative methodologies have been widely studied and there is already a wide variety of methodologies which are being constantly adapted, analysed and experimented in many European member states. The European Commission's ambition to create "a pool of methodologies" (IFOK, 2003) which can be adapted to the context and national requirements of the specific problem, is being addressed by both the Sixth and Seventh Framework Programme and the Science and Society Action Plan. Within this context a network project is being funded**:** the CIPAST project. The aim of this three year project is to**:** "to contribute to the active participation of society at large in public policy development relating to science and technology" by linking together actors who are involved in public participation and pooling their capacities and experiences on a common platform. The project is based on international workshops, the circulation of a newsletter and the creation of a database and a toolkit which can be used for organizing public participation events.

Representatives from the partners in the CIPAST network have differing views about whether**:** the project itself is contributing to effective dissemination in their member states; the network structure is working and effective, and whether developments in deliberative democracy are being furthered by membership to the CIPAST network. These views help to evaluate if the aims and objectives of the European Commission to initiate and disseminate "successful models of participation in the process of policy making and new governance" and offer "assistance to member states by building platforms of exchange within the European union" (IFOK, 2003) are effectively being reached by funded European network projects like CIPAST. The larger question of whether the funding of European networks like CIPAST, for work on common projects, is helping to promote a more and better integrated Europe is also addressed. An answer to this question is formed on the basis of the analysis of the opinions of experts of the partner organizations of the project.

PART ONE
THEORIES ON DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY AND PARTICIPATION METHODOLOGIES.

CHAPTER 1
DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION. SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND SOCIETY.

What deliberative democracy is.

Deliberative democracy, also sometimes called discursive democracy, is a term used by political theorists, for example, Jon Elster or Jurgen Habermas, to refer to any system of political decisions based on some trade-off of consensus decision making and representative democracy. Deliberative democracy can be used in conjunction with the representative democracy model and can be considered a way to improve the latter. In representative democracy and traditional decision making, not necessarily all the points of view and interests of civil society are looked for and represented. This means that representation occurs only partially and some of the viewpoints and needs of civil society are not represented fully. The deliberative model of democracy is based on public discussion and deliberation. The deliberative processes which form the backbone of deliberative democracy are founded on rational and impartial discussion. These methods are democratic because the participants who take part in the discussions of deliberative processes are those who will, after the decision has been made, be subject to the consequences of that decision.

Instead of relying on the production and availability of information which citizens have to process, deliberative methods use a high level of interaction between actors of civil society, policy makers and experts in specific fields to help the public to get well informed about certain topics. The point of the deliberative model is that the opinions which are formed by the participants of deliberative processes are then taken into account by policy makers and decision makers. There is, however, no imperative for the decisions of the public to be reached on the bases of a consensus. The concept of consensus is used in some European member countries but not in others depending on the political traditions and culture. This has proved a problem when countries which do not have a tradition of consensus have tried to introduce the method into their political setting. The term consensus can mean 'compromise' in some languages and 'agreement' in others. (See Chapter 5). Coherence from policy makers is a fundamental point of the deliberative model. It is also one of the most difficult to accept because of worries on the part of policy makers that their representative position will be undermined by the greater involvement of citizens. The dialogue which is created by deliberative processes between different actors who represent different points of view, leads to an enrichment of both public life and also the work of experts and decision makers. Policy makers' work can be bettered by listening to what their public has to say and its opinions. Also, the innovations of experts will, eventually, be consumed and used by the public so, listening to this group will only benefit the innovation field. Civil society can offer a lot to policy makers and experts in the form of the questions it is able to ask through deliberative processes.

The theory that citizens can get well informed about issues, contribute to the making of decisions which directly affect them, be represented in a more complete way and that certain fields and decision processes benefit from the involvement of civil society is put into practise in the delibera-

tive method. This can be applied and examined, as is the case in this thesis, to the fields of scientific and technological innovation.

Democratic Models.

The liberal political theory, which dates back to the eighteenth century, is based on the fundamental principle that all citizens have universal rights which are guaranteed by the State. This model was founded in the Anglo-Saxon cultures. The liberal theory is based on three principles**:** economic realization which has no barriers or obstacles, a State politically limited by its representative role and by the separation of political powers, and thirdly, the creation of a state of law and rights. In this State of rights, the law is the pillar which separates the state from society. In the liberal State, citizens are considered individuals who act rationally to reach their own ends and the role of the State is to protect the rights of the citizens to be able to do this. The rights which are guaranteed by the liberal State are universal because every citizen of society has equal opportunities according to the State. These equal rights include that of being able to participate in democratic elections of a government.

Marshall theorizes that citizens have the right to fulfil their own economic and social needs and that the State should guarantee them the freedom to do this. The State, also according to Marshall, should protect the public from economic and social uncertainties with the help of subsidies, thus, reducing the number of groups of poor citizens (Marshall, 1950). This is done, as Rawls mentions in his theoretical point of view, by helping them lead a life in which every step is not necessarily the consequence of the social-economic situation in which they were born. Politics, therefore, must protect individual citizens and not try to prevent them, in any way, pursuing in their own projects and plans (Rawls, 1971).

Public participation, in this model, is seen as an action in which citizens exercise their equal rights. Importantly, the public has equal rights but no obligation to participate in the creation of the laws and norms which they are subject to. For Rawls, another aspect of the liberal model is that**:** "the politics of a democratic society can not ever be based on one uniform truth". Citizens must recognize the opinion of other rational citizens and must not insist that their own opinion is the only one to be accepted. In Rawls, the idea of political liberalism is to address cultural and ideological pluralism which is both honest and systematic (Rawls, 1994).

The communitarian theory was developed out of criticism for the liberal model and its main principles are respect for others and recognition of the importance of the common good. Civil virtue is central to the theory. The membership of a society of individuals with certain rights, which is at the base of the liberal theory, is too formal. According to the communitarian theory, liberalism does not take into account the principles of identity and participation which are fundamental for the unification of members of a community. The communitarian model goes against the moral individualism of the liberal theory and attempts to revive the concept of a collective citizenship with a political community founded on cultural community. Reunifying the community is an attempt to revive the principles of responsibility, identity and participation in a society which has an ever decreasing political sense. For some theorists, redeveloping the community has a moral

function considering that citizens, in other democratic models, are losing their political 'voice' and the politics is losing its sense.

The republican theory incorporates the liberal ideas of individuals serving their own ends and into those of the communitarian theory of equality and membership of a community. The funda-

mental elements in this republican theory are dedication, involvement and participation of citizens in public life. In this theory, civic sense is given central importance, over that of economy and State. The republican theory stresses the importance of public participation over the search for an individual's own ends and personal autonomy (as in the liberal theory). According to this way of thinking, individuals are justified as citizens and they have rights because they play an active role in public life. Theorists, among others, Arendt and Barber, argue that, to remedy the ever more depoliticized society which is described as weak and caused by the search for individual and private ends as in the liberal model**:** "Democracy has to be taken out of the hands of the elite and given back to the citizens" (Barber, 1984). This is called strong democracy. Instead of the negative idea of freedom of the liberal model or the 'non dominance' idea of the communitarian model, social order in the republican model is guaranteed by individual obligation to participate

in questions regarding the community. This model proposes deliberative forms of democracy with the right to participate based on having fundamental resources, instead of rights, as in the liberal model. Here the definition of 'deliberative' is that of the Anglo-Saxon traditions of careful consideration and discussion, rational arguing of the pros and cons of a decision. Deliberative democracy is described as**:** a democratic model which uses the exchange of dialogue as an essential element for making political decisions.

At the centre of the republican theory stands the idea that citizenship is an element of civic identity, supported by public culture. This civic identity helps develop the bond between citizens because their common identity is stronger than any identity with other, different sub-groups, for example**:** religious, ethnic groups.

The role of civil society in the republican theory is to promote values essential for the development of democracy**:** trust, dedication and solidarity. Social responsibility is no longer that of the state but of civil society itself and if this civil society proves strong, the state is strong and democratic.

Justifying the deliberative model.

There are several theories on how the deliberative ideal of democracy can be justified. M. Cooke writes about certain arguments which can be used in favour of participative democracy as a new form of governance, one of which is considered to be the strongest argument in the light of today's Western modernity.

Deliberative democracy is an ideal which is based on normative conceptions and, publicly, it needs to be well justified well because it puts heavy emphasis on public reasoning. Rational justification is also important to help us choose between the many deliberative models which exist. The educative strengths of deliberative democracy have been considered and evaluated by many including Mill and Arendt. Public participation is considered to be justified because it possesses particular strengths. Due to this, participation is thought to be positive in itself, not solely as a part of a bigger process which helps the creation of better decision making and norms. It is also considered that high levels of personal improvement are reached during the process of participation. This means that the moral, practical and intellectual values of a person are bettered when an individual takes part in a deliberative process. In this way, the educative strengths are hailed as a justification because the individual and also, importantly, the citizen is bettered in some way.

There is also an argument for the community-building strengths of the deliberative model of democracy. This theory is backed by those who believe that citizens participate in political life for

reasons of solidarity. In this case an individual is seen as a member of a group to which he or she belongs. In this way, an identity is found and the participant shares common values with others who find their identities in the same values and traditions. The community-building strengths do play a big part in the participatory procedures. These processes have a large element of discussion to them because citizens are forced to take on roles and make decisions with the opinions and positions of others in mind.

However, in evaluation, the arguments for the educative and community-building strengths of deliberative democracy cannot stand alone as the best justifications for deliberative democracy because**:**

a) They cannot guarantee that the pedagogic or community-building strengths are better in deliberative methods than in non-deliberative methods.

b) They cannot be the sole aim, but only one of the outcomes or positive side effects of public deliberation.

c) Independent measures are needed to gauge a person's moral, practical or intellectual development and also to gauge community.

Another, and also the strongest, argument for the justification of deliberative democracy, is the argument that this model of democracy is more in harmony with the idea which citizens of modern Western democratic systems, have of themselves**:** it fits with the idea of "Whom we are". (Cooke). This modern, Western idea of how we think of ourselves could come from post-modern values. These values include**:** society being interested in having more democratic institutions, more freedom in the workplace and society being generally more concerned with equality. However, to be able to deliberate on decisions which concern the way citizens live their lives, is an idea which fits well into the modern way of thinking of oneself. These normative concepts of the way society lives, of what it knows and of the self are at the centre of modern existence and beliefs.

Cooke argues that to reject these values would not be a simple matter of decision but would mean a radical reorientation in our way of thinking. To explain further, these conceptions are**:**

1) That in science, law and politics there is no final and conclusive knowledge, that any knowledge in these areas can be revised and challenged when new arguments and evidence come to the fore.

2) That autonomous reasoning is a valid part of our being. Autonomous reasoning is defined by the ability to both accept responsibility and give reasons for one's judgements, and take part in one's environment in a "flexible, critically detached, perceptive and informed" way. (Cooke).

3) That rational outcomes and, more importantly, justifications need to have the capacity to be made public thus respecting the principle that each citizen is capable of making judgements on moral matters.

4) That everyone, without exception or discrimination by any means, deserves equal respect on the grounds that they are able to make "informed and insightful judgements on moral matters" and that the input of all individuals is considered, helping them to feel that they are both making the law and subject to it (Cooke, 2000).

In light of this, it is discussed by the author that the concept which fits with the idea we have of ourselves, of "Whom we are" (Cooke) is the most supportive and strongest argument for deliberative democracy. It gives the citizen the opportunity to see herself as "author as well as subject of the law" and shows that all individuals' opinions and contributions are seen as valid in public debate and when dealing with common problems. The concept of empowerment is very important in deliberative democracy. This is produced by citizens being able to speak, make judgements, and be listened to by those with authority and power to make laws. Deliberative processes are capable of creating this precious and important feeling in today's society.

Some problems of deliberative democracy.

Obviously, every model of governance faces problems and deliberative democracy is no exception. The strong representative nature of liberal democracy, has leaves members of parliament and citizens in Europe unsure of which consequences a heavier input from civil society in the decision making process will have. Politicians are unwilling to renounce any of their representative power. They see deliberation with citizens and the obligation of having to take the public's opinions into account as a threat to their previous legitimacy as representatives of the public. This leads to a practical problem which will take some years to address**:** the involvement of policy makers in deliberation processes. A key element of public deliberation processes is that**:** after citizens have taken part in discussion, got informed, reached a consensus and/or written a conclusive report on the issue in focus, decision makers and politicians will take into account their opinions, points of view and recommendations. This is one of the most important stages of the deliberation process because it gives the participants feeling of empowerment. If individuals use their time, energy and enthusiasm for a deliberative process and, at the end, have their new and informed opinions listened to and considered by those who make policy choices, they feel empowered and valued. If, on the other hand, the participants are uncertain as to whether decision makers will consider the outcome of their efforts, and whether their work has been worthwhile, feelings of frustration and discontent could be produced. This is confirmed in a report by Einsiedel & Eastlick (2000) where a Consensus Conference (see Chapter 2) on the topic of food biotechnology is analysed. Post-process evaluations were made by participants who expressed**:** "uncertainty about whether their report would make a difference, whether their ideas were going to be heard" which created frustration. The participants also said they had imagined "a link to specific policy decisions" which was evidently lacking in this situation (Einsiedel&Eastlick, 2000). When analysing the shortcomings of the process, one of the three problems was "the absence of a link with specific policy decisions" which proved "a particular frustration for the lay panel" (Einsiedel&Eastlick, 2000). This proves that the feeling of empowerment which comes from taking part in deliberative processes depends on whether or not the views and work of the lay panel is listened to and taken into account by policy makers. We know, however, that these policy makers are reluctant to lose any of their representative power by having to take citizens' views into account.

Another effect of the strong model of representative democracy which European society has been used to until now, is that citizens**:** a) doubt whether they will be listened to, b) believe that experts and policy makers have the necessary knowledge and can go on representing without the need of public participation and c) only feel the need to get involved and start participating when a problem or issue directly affects their personal sphere. This last aspect combines the theories of NIMBY**:** Not in My Back Yard., the theory of The Monitoring Citizen and the idea that the mi-

nority of the public decides for the majority. It describes a common trait of modern, Western society**:** that while the situation is balanced and poses no threat, citizens are happy to let experts and politicians do their jobs and for a minority of participating citizens to act and participate on their behalf. When, as described by NIMBY, an issue comes into the physical or psychological sphere of an individual, and starts to threaten, the citizen starts to take action. Examples of these problems could be waste management and mobile telephone frequency pollution in a local area. This, in itself, is not a problem. It means though, that deliberative processes for issues on a local level, which enter the personal sphere, can be related to by the public because they see, hear or feel the affects directly, are well subscribed to. According to this; citizens show less interest in deliberative processes on a national or European level, which aim to discuss issues which do not enter their physical or psychological sphere directly or on a daily basis. This proves a problem when we consider that a lot of the issues which actually affect us very closely get discussed on international or global scale, for example**:** climate change and security.

Another problem which participation processes used to implement deliberative democracy face, is that a huge investment is needed. This investment is in the form of time, energy and finances. A lot of time and energy has to be spent by the organizers of the events to organize, plan, find the actors to take part, oversee the actual process and analyse results. Time and energy are also an issue for those taking part. Participants and experts use their free time to participate and use energy in the process which could be invested for personal activities. All deliberative processes require a lot of funding and this can prove hard to find and difficult to manage. It is also said that this high level of investment is sometimes not reflected in the reach of the affects of the processes. A lot is invested, and relatively few people benefit from the outcome of the process. This makes the investment of the processes difficult to justify and often a lot of media attention is needed to compensate for the relatively low number of citizens involved in the actual process. The aim is to make as big an impact as possible but with some deliberative processes involving groups of only fourteen citizens, this is challenging.

Science, Technology and Society.

In the last few decades, the scientific and technological innovation sectors have developed rapidly and have been the source of many controversial issues. These issues are divisive because the technological and scientific innovations affect the lives and reality of every citizen in civil society so closely and challenge us morally. It is enough to mention the issue of cloning, to bring to mind the moral and direct effects which these innovations have on the daily lives and future of civil society.

In the past, however, the relationship between science and society was different. There was a certain “society of expertise”, in which citizens accepted that experts had the scientific knowledge and experts were left to develop and research this field almost undisturbed. Within this frame, politicians were chosen and voted for by the public as representatives and decision makers for the public. This was also true for technological and scientific decisions. In light of this; policies and political decisions were made and planned between experts who were trusted to have the technical knowledge, and politicians who were trusted to make decisions with the public’s best interests in mind. Several important changes occurred to break up this equilibrium of trust between decision makers, experts and civil society. Civil society itself started to change in the 1970s with the revolutions and the introduction of the use of many and different ways of participating in political life. This was helped by the formation of interest groups and social movements. This era saw the shift from political participation which was encouraged by the leading classes to reinforce their

own power and gain advantages for themselves, to participation as an action coming from society, upwards. This involved organized groups putting political pressure on for a better quality of life and economic advantages for society itself. The most significant aspect to change was, therefore, the way in which civil society wanted to be and was represented politically.

Some major events and crisis also contributed to the change in the relationship between science and society. Among these, we could mention the Chernobyl nuclear disaster, the controversy over the use of asbestos in European countries and the BSE crisis in the UK. These are all examples of decisions and measures taken in a time when experts were trusted to have knowledge and politicians were trusted to decide. In the end, very dangerous and controversial results came light. These events can be characterised as having huge publicity coverage from the media, a high level of risk to the wellbeing of the public and, usually, international implications.

As a result of these factors, civil society began to question the representative role of politicians and, regarding scientific and technological innovation, seriously began to mistrust politicians' and experts' judgement and their authority to make decisions for the public. This has lead to the "gap" and element of strong mistrust which we know today between politicians and experts, and civil society regarding the field of techno-scientific innovation. Here, two fundamental principles come out**:** trust and knowledge. Trust and knowledge are very closely connected when talking about scientific knowledge, society and politics. J. Gregory argues that**:** "Where knowledge is lacking, trust is essential. Where trust is lacking, knowledge is essential" (Gregory, 2003).

This characterizes the two, former and latter, situations of science in society. Gregory also states that, when the public feels driven to know more about science, it is because the experts are not trusted.

This has lead to many studies and theories about the role of the public in science and movements such as the Public Understanding of Science (PUS) have been set up. In Britain, the PUS was started with a report written by the Royal Society in 1985. The general theme and argument of the report was that the whole of society had to have some understanding of science. In this way, the public, which did not know very much about science, would be able to appreciate and value it more. This lack of scientific knowledge was supported by a survey of the British public which confirmed a deficit in this area. The report stated that this should be remedied with a basic scientific understanding for all citizens, and that this understanding should, initially, be given at school. As well as citizens, it advised politicians and industry to get informed about the subject in order to keep Britain a competitive nation. The mistake which can be, and often is, made is to think that an individual who is ignorant of science has a negative view of it, and when she is better informed, her opinion will be more positive. This is called the deficit model and can be mistakenly applied by the media. It is easy to think that making a lot of information available about scientific topics will better the understanding and opinions of science, forgetting that a better informed citizen may understand more but also be more critical and not necessarily positive. In the same way, better knowledge and understanding does not mean that citizens will behave differently in certain situations. For example**:** people who know that smoking damages one's health, continue to smoke and, likewise, people who know that sun exposure can cause skin cancer, still do not protect themselves from the sun. So, knowledge and understanding does not necessarily mean a change in behaviour or attitude. In light of this, it is important to know the context in which scientific knowledge is used by the public, to understand if it will change people's lives.

Gregory also mentions one negative point of the PUS movement. The movement sees the role of the media in the communication of science as "dangerous scaremongering". Gregory argues that

media attention could easily be seen as a useful service for both civil society and science because it helps "air the issues" (Gregory, 2003). The movement also only considers the negative side of the public's lack of knowledge and does not value public points of view. These views do not necessarily have to be seen as 'wrong'. Indeed the modern sectors of bio-technology, for example, depend on citizens as chief consumers and users, and it will be them who decide the failure or success of their 'products' like in any other business. Also, people's ability to analyse the effects and consequences which innovations will have on their own society could be valued more highly (Gregory, 2003).

The European Commission's Aims and strategies for Science and Society.

The European Commission has many aims and objectives regarding the Science in Society issue and how it means to address it in order to be able to achieve its objectives and set the agenda for the future. The main reason and push behind the Commissions moves to remedy this situation is to set the European Union up as a leading world competitor and research area. The first of the European Commission's main aims is, as was cited at the Lisbon summit, to transform the EU into the world's most competitive and knowledge based economy by 2010. Another is to improve civil society participation to aid and further the creation of the European Research Area (ERA). With these main goals in mind, the Commission has set itself area of action and the task of transforming European governance accordingly. These areas of action can be put under three headings**:**

1) European Governance.

2) Science and Society.

3) Deliberative participation methodologies.

1) European Governance.

In the IFOK 2003 Interim report produced during the European Science Society Forum held in Brussels the Commission acknowledges the emergence of an increased "demand from citizens and interest groups for more information about decision making" and that this has led to a trend of "political and administrative decision making becoming more open and transparent on all levels" (IFOK, 2003). There is a need to move the arena of political decision making from lobbies to wider and more open spaces. The European Commission knows that there is a real danger in closed decision-making and this can only be avoided by civil society and policy makers being encouraged and helped to work more closely together. A shift from decisions being made in closed policy circles to more and diverse actors becoming involved has already made itself evident. The Commission recognises the need for more than just information and accountability on the part of the authorities and that this needs to be substituted by a process of deliberation, negotiation and decision making.

This has all been set out in the Commission's White Paper on European Governance (2001) which demands, as its five principles of good governance**:** openness, participation, accountability, effectiveness and coherence (IFOK, 2003). It advises that an online database should be set up for access to ongoing consultation processes and the Forward Studies Unit now named "Group of Political Advisors" has been discussing civil society participation as a consequence of the Paper. In its realignment of European governance, good use of expertise in Community policy-making

and good practise in the collection and use of expertise at all stages of commission policy making is emphasized (IFOK, 2003).

2) Science and Society.

The monopoly of scientific experts as the sole source of expertise is starting to be questioned and the importance of consumer knowledge is coming to the fore. In this way "expertise is becoming democratized" (IFOK, 2003). This trend is caused by the ever higher complexity of scientific and societal background for techno-scientific decision making. Science and society are more and more interlinked. Innovation and scientific progress are accelerating all the time and are the source of great social and economical developments. However, new scientific and technological innovations greatly affect the daily lives of every citizen and these innovations are often controversial and highly disputed. The Commission is also aware that the setting up of the ERA is an ambitious project and understands fully that research and civil society cannot stand apart. The concerns of civil society need to be represented by research. Research activities, in turn, need to be accepted by the actors of civil society (IFOK, 2003). The subject must be treated with care also due to the diversity of the cultural, political and institutional backgrounds which exist in the different European member states.

The issue of science in society is addressed in several European initiatives including a database for consultation, internet based interactive activities, conferences, the Science and Society Action Plan and the Sixth Framework Programme (FP6). The FP6 (which became FP7 in 2007) had a budget of 17.5 billion Euros and was aimed at financing collaboration in research, mobility, and partner projects. These partner projects have a network structures which also makes them good tools for European integration. The aim of the projects is to create a "pool" of participative methodologies which will help develop the dialogue between civil society and scientific innovation. (IFOK, 2003).

3) Deliberative participation methodologies.

This is the tool which the European Commission hopes to use to reach its goal of bringing research and society closer together to create the ERA. Many civil society participation methodologies have been invented and used within the European territory and the Commission's objective is to create a "pool of methodologies to align with the emerging new networks of various players in research policymaking" (IFOK, 2003). These methodologies are designed to create dialogue between actors from different groups like stakeholders, policy makers and civil society. They are structured processes which focus, either on citizens getting informed and reporting their new, informed opinions for decision makers to take into account, or on collecting the views of the public to shed light on issues and problems. Through this dialogue, civil society is more accepting of research and research understands better the needs of civil society.

The Commission advises that it is important to recognize in which situations participative deliberation methods will be useful and in which situations they will not. It also stresses that there cannot be one process which is right for a certain problem. In light of this, there needs to be a "pool of methodologies" to choose from, once the context and characteristics of the specific problem have been identified. The main role, which the Commission has taken on regarding these methods, is to "offer useful assistance to member states by building platforms for exchange within the European Union". To do this the Commission has set up bodies to organize confer-

ences, the FP6/7 and the Science and Society Action Plan. This plan is based on promoting science and education culture in Europe, bringing science policies closer to citizens and placing responsible science at the heart of policy making.

Aims and hopes for European Integration on a larger scale.

In 1957, the Rome Treaty was signed by the founding members of the European Community. The objective of this treaty was to set up a union between European states which would "establish a common market and an economic and monetary union" Article 2, The Rome Treaty. To reach this goal, the European Community, which has since become the European Union, predicted the "harmonization" of the functioning of many areas of its individual member states. This "harmonization" or integration is what permits the EU to go ahead with its plans for a monetary and economic union, the ERA and the creation of the "world's most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy". European integration was cited in the 1957 Treaty in many forms, both economic and cultural. Art. 4 mentions**:** "the adoption of an economic policy which is based on the close coordination of Member States' economic policies" and Art. 2**:** "implementing common policies or activities to promote a harmonious, balanced and sustainable development of economic activities…". Under social developments, it is predicted that the Commission will "implement measures which take account of the diverse forms of national practices, and the need to maintain the competitiveness of the Community economy. Measures to**:** "encourage cooperation between member states through initiatives aimed at improving knowledge, developing exchanges of information and best practices, promoting innovative approaches and evaluating experiences" (Art. 137, 2a) are foreseen in the chapter of Social Provisions.

This exchange of information and best practices is what the European Commission has highlighted in its aims to create the ERA in that it brings together and pools the knowledge of each member state. In doing this, however, the EU can fulfil another of its more general objectives**:** to make and encourage organizations, institutions and individuals from different European countries cooperate, communicate and work together on common projects to aid European integration and the highlighting of a "common cultural heritage". Art 151 states that the Community will**:** "contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States while respecting their national and regional diversity and bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore". This suggests that a common European feeling needs to be created between the member states and that the EU aims to address this as well as keeping national traditions alive.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGIES AND TECHNIQUES OF ACTIVE CITIZEN DELIBERATION.

In the recent search for new and more democratic models of governance and politics, many participation methods have been invented, adapted and formulated to address the challenge of involving citizens "in a process of public discussion and debate" (Bohman, 1997). Through these processes or participatory methodologies deliberative democracy is predicted to become more integrated and entrenched in society. The European Commission has been aware of this for a number of years and has introduced measures to further the dissemination of these processes throughout the EU as mentioned in Chapter 1.

Participatory methodologies.

There are many deliberative methods which are in use in the member states of the EU. Some of the most popular, common and diffused are described here**:**

Consensus Conference.

The Consensus Conference is a method for lay citizen assessment during which a panel of citizens meets an expert panel. Dialogue is established between these two panels on a socially controversial issue of science and technology. The aim is to shed light on controversial and complex topics, to promote dialogue and create knowledge. A randomly selected representative group of about 14 citizens is chosen. During the process, three or four meetings take place over consecutive weekends. The citizen panel is helped by a facilitator who is present at the first three meetings. During the meetings of the process, the following activities are undertaken**:**

1) The group meets and forms questions and queries which the participants have about the subject which is being deliberated.
2) The group meets a panel of experts and confronts them on the topic which is being discussed. This gives the group a chance to get well informed and make changes to ideas and views which they had about the issue before the debate.
3) The panel of citizens meets alone to write up a concluding document of the experience and what they found out from the panel of experts. This report is devoted to inform policy decisions on the topic. In this part a consensus is asked for or not depending on the national context of the conference.
4) The citizen panel gives a press conference and discusses the conclusive report. At this stage, politicians are invited to view the report.

Table 1- Plan of a Consensus Conference organized according to the model of The Danish Board of Technology.

Meetings.	Actions.	Actors involved.
Meeting 1	View the material, write questions and queries, select experts for panel.	Citizen panel and facilitator.
Meeting 2	Debate with expert panel.	Citizen panel, facilitator, expert panel, public.
Meeting 3.	Write up the conclusive report.	Citizen panel, facilitator.
Meeting 4.	Present the conclusive report, public discussion, press conference.	Citizen panel, journalists, decision makers.

The conclusive report is presented to the media in a press conference and members of parliament are invited to receive the report. This is an important stage in the process of the Consensus Conference. It is here that citizens have their opinions listened to and the feeling of empowerment is created in civil society.

The Consensus Conference is used and acclaimed widely because people's attitudes can be better informed and communicated and politicians may learn to see a problem area in a new light. Policy makers can benefit from listening to their public's views and they are able to understand the affect which certain issues have on civil society more fully. The Consensus Conference is suited to dealing with are controversial and complex issues. A lot of common knowledge usually exists about the topic but opinions do not necessarily have to be well formed.

In the past the method has been used for discussing**:** plant biotechnology (UK), GM food and traffic issues (Denmark) and information and communication technology (Norway). Weaknesses of the consensus conference are that it requires a very intensive investment of energy, time and finances and relatively few people are involved in the process compared to this high investment. Also, the process from start to finish is quite long so results take a long time to come out. There can be, as mentioned by Einseidel & Eastlick (2000), frustration among the citizen panel because it is unsure of whether the conclusion will be taken into account and noted by decision makers.

Some strengths of the Consensus Conference are**:** its ability to encourage a good dialogue between different actor groups, that it gives citizens a chance to get very well informed about a topic and that the media attention which it attracts is positive for the impact which the process and results make.

Citizens' Jury.

A Citizens' Jury questions expert witnesses who present information or advocate positions to the Jury on a topic of techno-scientific innovation in the same way a legal jury questions witnesses in a legal trial. The aim is to acquire informed recommendations about a specific policy or decision

problem. The Jury which is chosen is representative of the population and is made up of 12 to 24 randomly selected citizens. The Jury has access to experts who represent all aspects of the issue. The process during which the Jury questions expert 'witnesses' is carried out over four to six days of hearings. At the end of these hearings the Jury produces a citizens' report of recommendations. This report is delivered to relevant departments which can take it into consideration when making decisions.

This method can be used for issues with varying levels of complexity about which opinions are well or only slightly formed and knowledge can be well diffused or not. The method ideally deals with highly controversial issues. In the past, the Citizens' Jury has been employed to look into local rather than national or international issues. Regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the Citizens' Jury; strengths are that it is a good method when more than one alternative to a problem must be selected and that it gives rich results. Also dialogue and contact between experts and citizens is achieved. Weaknesses are that there is a danger of the process becoming only a place where things are discussed with no contact or relevance to policy making if a link is not established. Also, the process is lengthy and expensive.

Interactive Technology Assessment (ITA).

ITA aims at influencing the process of innovation by interacting early on in the process. It aims to direct development paths in a way that is desirable according to the participants involved. The European ITA method tries to include social, ethical and political aspects in the development of technology. The objective is not just the assessment of specific technologies but the discussion of alternatives. During the process participants are given a platform on which they can formulate their views and concerns and help to create wider acceptance in decision making. The group consists of about 15 people who explore all sides of the technological issue, discuss it and make recommendations. The workshop takes from six to ten days and the process lasts a total of six months from start to finish.

The ITA method is adapted to issues about which there is little common knowledge and where opinions can be formed or not. It suits highly complex technological issues which can or cannot be controversial.

The method has been used to assess the social, ethical and political aspects of the genetically modified vineyards in the Champagne region of France.

ITA is an expensive process which takes a long time to complete. Its strengths are that it favours dialogue between the producers and consumers of innovations and assists the implementation of recommendations.

Focus Group.

During Focus Group activities, lay citizens or representatives of stakeholder groups meet in face to face facilitated meetings to discuss techno-scientific issues. The groups can consist of up to 12 participants and the workshops last from one to two hours. The aim of the Focus Group is to get insight into the group's perspectives, interests visions and bring out the factors which may have shaped these views. The method can be applied on all levels, from local to international.

There does not necessarily have to be a lot of common

knowledge about the issues which are dealt with by the Focus group and usually the public is still forming its opinion about this issue. It is not suited to very complex issues but can deal with both controversial and noncontroversial topics. This method was used to find out the views of the public on GMOs in the European funded project PABE.

The Focus Group's strengths lie in its ability to bring out new angles on issues and shed light on unexpected topics and new research concepts. Also a group's opinions and reasoning can be documented. Its weaknesses are**:** the participants of the method are not necessarily representative of a larger group and documentation can be less effective than in other interview methods.

Future search.

In the Future Search method a group of participants jointly develop desirable or potential future scenarios for scientific or technological topics and discuss the necessary conditions for their implementation. The participants fall into three main categories**:** those with knowledge and information (experts), those with authority and ability to act (politicians) and those who will be affected by the results of the workshop (citizens and stakeholders). There are normally 60 to 80 participants which take part in the workshop. The workshop can last from 1 to 3 days and consists of 5 phases**:**

1) Focus on the past

2) Focus on the present

3) Future scenarios (visioning)

4) Common ground

5) Action planning.

This method is usually used for local communities to find common goals and plans of action in a deadlocked situation. It gives citizens who are concerned by future developments and active role in the development of future scenarios. Future scenarios are best suited to long term perspectives and initiatives. It is used for issues about which there is little common knowledge and about which opinions have already been formed. These issues can be highly complex but do not have to be highly controversial. In the past, the Future Search method has been used to create a new advisory body for traffic and transportation in Copenhagen.

Strengths are that the method helps to create dialogue between actors in a deadlocked situation who considered it impossible to communicate and that networking relationships are established between stakeholder groups and across expert fields. The method is best adapted to local issues, not national or international, and for long term, not short term planning.

Scenario Workshop.

This is a method of technology assessment where participants with different knowledge views and experience develop visions and proposals for future developments at a local level. The participants can be business persons, residents or concerned citizens, policy makers. The group is normally made up of between 24 and 32 participants. The workshop usually lasts for 2 or 3 days and involves 3 phases**:**

1) The Critical, analytical phase, where limits to vision realization are discussed.

2) The Visionary phase, to bring out the participants' views and ideas.

3) The Implementation phase, to develop local plans of action.

During the workshop, several scenarios describing alternative technological trends are presented to generate common vision making and dialogue and ultimately, local action plans.

The objectives of the scenario workshop are to bring out participants own knowledge, experiences, visions and views on the scenarios presented and to develop local plans of action.

This method is applicable for economic, technological and social developments. It is suitable for issues where there is little common knowledge and citizens are still forming their opinions of it. It suits issues which are highly technical but that are not necessarily very controversial.

This method was first employed to carry out the Barriers to Urban Ecology initiative by the Danish Board of Technology in 1991 and then was adapted for the Europeanwide Sustainable Urban Living Project. It has also been used for workshops on issues like urban ecology (Denmark), food and farming futures (India) and genetics and health (UK).

Strengths**:** the Scenario Workshop is not a long or expensive process. It brings a lot of different actor groups together. The method is usually used on a local scale to develop local plans of action but, when used in conjunction with other workshops in different areas, a wider picture is given.

The Consensus Conference as an example of a method for deliberation on techno-scientific innovation.

The Consensus Conference was first imported to Europe from the USA by the Danish. The Danish Board of Technology (DBT) took the idea from the North Americans. In the US, however, the model was used with a panel of only experts. The structure was kept the same by the DBT and the element of lay citizens was introduced to develop it into the Consensus conference we know today in Europe (See above). It is described as**:** "a process of public enquiry, discussion and recommendation on social issues with citizens at its centre" (Einseidel&Eastlick, 2000) and is characterized by an intense dialogue and interaction between experts and the public which is formed around queries set by the panel of citizens. The process of integration of this model into the political society and systems of the very different European member states has already had its ups and downs. One of the problems is based on the issue of consensus. In Denmark, where the method was first experimented, the aim when writing the final report is for the citizens involved arrive at a consensus of ideas and opinions. This has proved problematic for countries which do not historically have the tradition of consensus like, for example, France. When the method was first proposed in France, politicians were wary of the concept of consensus because it went against their tradition not having a consensus. This is because the term consensus in the French tradition means compromise and this goes against their discursive system. In France the Consensus Conference is, therefore, named Citizens' Conference and does not ask the public involved to arrive at a consensus in the final report. This name can also be given to the conference if the organizing body wants to place more emphasis on the citizens involved rather than the process.

The consensus conference has been used for controversial technological problems and innovation because, as explained above, it is suited to highly controversial and technically complex issues.

This is so because the citizen panel has access to experts who answer questions from the citizens. An intense dialogue is created here and a lot of information is given and assimilated. It is a useful method to clearly answer the public's queries about the issue in discussion. In Denmark issues like infertility and transgenic animals have been treated using this method and plant biotechnology was the subject of one of the first consensus conference in the UK.

One of the biggest challenges the consensus conference (and deliberative methodologies as a whole) faces is getting the final report and recommendations of the citizen's panel recognized and taken into consideration by decision makers and policy makers. This, as mentioned in Chapter 1, is one of the problems which deliberative processes face because some policy makers see taking the public's opinion into account as a threat to their representative legitimacy. The gauges or measurements of how much methods like this can make an impact on decision processes are very broad. Some of these measures look at the impact on policy change, some at the impact on the citizens involved, but the results have mainly been positive. As an example, The Danish parliament now uses the conferences as part of its policy making system implying that a large impact is made in this country by deliberative methodologies.

There is, however, the question of what deliberation actually is; its definition, and whether a structured deliberation process like that of the consensus conference actually encourages this.

Deliberation and structured participation processes.

Deliberation itself has also been the subject of analysis, although to a lesser degree than the deliberative democratic model. Theories have come to light about the dynamics of group deliberation, its different 'levels' and also whether structured processes aid its success. As definitions of deliberation we are given**:**

- "conversation, whereby individuals speak and listen consequentially" (Gambetta, 1998) before a decision is taken collectively.
- A process in which participants must be "open to the facts, arguments and proposals that come to their attention and must share a general willingness to learn from their colleagues" (Bessette, 1994).
- "to weigh carefully both the consequences of various opinions for action and the views of others" (Burkhalter, Gastil, & Kershaw, 2002).

In a study by J. Macoubrie, a four level measure of deliberative behaviour is designed. This measure helps analyse the differing levels of deliberation which can occur among a group of individuals and helps to evaluate whether deliberation processes such as the consensus conference enable a citizens panel to reach high and positive levels of deliberation. The measure takes into consideration the fact that deliberation is an interpersonal style of communication and that group interaction is central to public deliberation. It also adheres to the descriptions we have, above, which emphasize the ideas of**:** listening consequentially, learning from others, and weighing and making dialogic response. Here is a description of the four levels of deliberation**:**

1) Macoubrie describes a base level where a speaker talks in the hope that others will listen, but acknowledges that this does not constitute deliberation as such. A first level is characterized by listening. In this way a speaker is listened to, but response is given to what is heard ac-

cording to one's own opinion. Here the panel agrees, disagree and can raise a topic but in this level deliberation is not evident.

2) Weighing and evaluating take place in the second level, where, as well as hearing what the others say, engaged reasoning is applied. This is the "Thoughtful Argument" stage, where the citizens offer criteria for solution and contribute facts. Here deliberation is limited and insufficient.
3) In the third level explanation comes into play and citizens can give reasons for their own opinion, explain reasons for disagreement, request information about another's view and add new topics and issues. In this level deliberation starts to form moderately, but it is not until the criteria in level four are reached, that true deliberation takes place.
4) The highest level of democratic deliberation is reached here because the panel is able to take in an idea and integrate it into their own set of ideas and views, and consensual decisions are reached among the panel. This involves listening, weighing, agreeing on an integrated solution and changing or modifying an opinion of one's own on the basis of what has been communicated during the process. This level is based on integrative solutions and decisions because it asks citizens to reason collectively. (Macoubrie, 2003)

So, this highlights the fact that citizens' democratic deliberation as an interpersonal style of communication can be described using a four level measure which has, as its highest level**:** "citizens reasoning cognitively with each other and creating integrated solutions" (Macoubrie, 2003). Going back to the study carried out by Einsiedel and Eastlick (2003); during the evaluation of a consensus conference done in Canada on the subject of food biotechnology, participants are quoted to have said**:** "The process did reassure me somewhat (about the Canadian process of regulating food)", "it made me feel far more uncomfortable about than I had previously", "I understand the issue much more", "many of the concerns I had going into the conference, I no longer have. I now have different concerns". These short but telling comments confirm that the participants had entered the conference with a defined set of views and opinions, and had, during the process, modified and been able to change their own views in light of what they had learnt during the process. This fits exactly with the four level measure of deliberation which Jane Macoubrie mentions in her study. It also, very importantly, confirms that the consensus conference has the ability to enable participants to reach the fourth and highest level of democratic deliberation where "citizens reason cognitively with each other". The other condition of reaching the highest level of deliberation according to Macoubrie is that, as mentioned, integrated solutions need to be created. The writing of the final report at the end of the consensus conference fulfils these criteria, probably more so in the cases where consensus is asked for.

Another aspect for analysing the value and ability of the consensus conference to promote effective deliberation is the form of the structured process. Macoubrie looks at the "specific conditions that are external to the group and that can significantly affect the potential for a group deliberative process". The writer argues that there are certain conditions which are necessary for deliberation to take place and that the possibility which a group has of deliberating may lie in the introduction of supporting group systems. The key question which is asked here is "Under what circumstances can groups of citizens best engage in democratic deliberation?" (Macoubrie, 2003).

It is said that structured processes can, and do, affect the quality of both individual and group processes. Unstructured processes are thought to produce poor outcomes and it is known that behaviour of a group is, in some way, influenced by external factors. The outcome of a group proc-

ess can vary and this may be directly linked to the conditions under which the deliberation is carried out. This can be demonstrated if one takes the example of a group which has been given the task of identifying the points or subtasks which need to be discussed concerning a certain issue. This group consequently spends all its time deciding what the points are instead of actually discussing the issue. In contrast, a group which is given a list of points which have already been devised as part of a structured process can spend all its time discussing the points using what they have been given as a guide. This confirms that all groups have trouble structuring tasks in an improvised or ad hoc way. Confirming Hirokawa, (1983, 1985) and Jarboe, (1988)**:** "In complex decision making, structured processes lead to higher quality group outputs". The consensus conference is a process with a definite structure (see above) which lets citizens and experts get involved in dialogue about a pre-defined topic. The meetings have an aim and structure and this proves positive for all involved. There are, however, negative points which .affect the outcomes of the consensus conference. In an evaluation report of a conference held in Canada on the subject of food biotechnology, there was evidence of frustration on the part of the citizens involved. This frustration was caused by the uncertainty of their opinions and views being taken into account by policy makers (Einseidle&Eastlick, 2000). This reflects one of the down falls of the method. There is a danger that the conference becomes a sort of 'talking shop' where a lot is discussed but has no connection to policy decisions. The acceptance of the opinions of citizens by decision makers proves a big problem for the field of deliberation methodologies.

PART TWO

THE CIPAST PROJECT AS ACASE STUDY OF A EUROPEAN NETWORK PROJECT.

CHAPTER 3

THE CIPAST PROJECT.

Aims and objectives of the CIPAST project.

The CIPAST project (Citizens' Participation in Science and Technology) is an initiative funded by the European Commission, co-ordinated by the Cité de Sciènces et de l´industrie (CSI), Paris, France. The project is aimed at**:** "Bringing the actors together, pooling their various capacities, and integrating their various contextual perspectives through a common platform. This is done to provide an opportunity to disseminate useful practices more efficiently, to boost innovation, and to foster the emergence of a European culture of participatory democracy in scientific and technological issues" (CIPAST website). The actors and organizations which the project aims to bring together are those who already have significant experience in using and organizing participatory procedures to deal with techno-scientific issues. These, more experienced organizations, are to set up a training programme with a target-audience of**:** decision makers, both in the political sphere and research sector, non-profit organizations and industry. The training programme will be based on information collected from 40 international organizations which have all had experience in the field of participatory methodologies in recent years. Networking is very important for the CIPAST project and, by bringing together many and varied actors, the project hopes to support the structuring of an expanded network of European organizations which are involved in using deliberative methodologies.

The CIPAST initiatives and activities.

The CIPAST project started in April 2005 and is scheduled to last three years, until March 2008. This period will help establish a more solid and stronger network and ensure a degree of continuity in the meetings between the partners and members. Over this three year duration the project involves a series of activities and will aid the organization of different communication lines to encourage and facilitate networking. These activities and communication systems include**:** workshops, newsletters, setting up a database, creating a toolkit for future reference, and a final conference.

The CIPAST database.

This database is being set up in web form to facilitate access by all members of the project. The objective is to create a collection of information which can support the structure of a network of European organizations and institutions which are already involved, and have experience, in the use and planning of public participatory processes. The database will help the effective transfer of information and knowledge between the members of the CIPAST network. One of the partner institutions; The Bonn Science Shop, is in charge of the co-ordination and processing of the data for the database.

Newsletters.

A newsletter is being regularly compiled and sent to network and project members as part of the CIPAST activities. This is an important line of communication to facilitate networking. It helps to bring together news, experiences, and accounts of the current state of deliberative processes and their use and organization in Europe and within the CIPAST project. A summary and overview of the international CIPAST workshops and their outcomes are reported here. The newsletter also includes links to useful electronic resources aimed at civil society in Europe and information on different initiatives involving the public in debate.

Toolkit.

The CIPAST toolkit is being produced and made available in the form of a practitioner's manual. This volume is aimed at helping those who are involved in the organization of citizens' deliberation processes. It contains information on which methods are available and how they can best be applied. There are detailed instructions on issues including finances, budgeting, and staffing of public participation events. The idea of the toolkit is to provide a practical, hands-on, guide to organizing participatory events. Checklists are included to aid successful planning and there is also a part dedicated to the outcomes and the organizers' expectations of these outcomes. The toolkit is printed in three of the main European languages and is available through the CIPAST project's website for easy access to all members. This element of the project helps the diffusion of information and the dissemination of useful practices throughout the network and also to other non-members.

Workshops.

During the three year course of the CIPAST project, two international workshops are to be held in cities of two different partner institutions. These workshops are held in the summer months of 2006 and 2007 and last three or four days. The aim of these workshops is to bring together individuals who are involved at all levels in public participation. These individuals include**:** those who have a strong interest and have already been involved in organizing participatory processes, to those who would like to start organizing or simply want to know more aboutthe field.

Taking part in the workshops involves attending lectures and talks given by experts and members of the partner institutions. These are very useful opportunities to hear what people who have a lot of experience in the field think and what advice they give to others. These experts are from different European member states, thus, making the content of the lectures interesting and applicable to the international participants of the workshop. Having attended these introductory lectures, the participants have the chance to get informed about the different participatory methodologies which are in use in Europe and which the workshop focuses on (See Chapter 2). The main part of the workshop is spent discussing case studies in small groups. These case studies are presented by experts from the partner organizations or, by the participants themselves. During this part of the workshop, the participants are presented with a science in society issue which has actually occurred, and can discuss which methods to use to address it. After discussion, their ideas are presented to the other groups and the participants are told which method was used in the real situation, how, and why. This activity gives the participants an idea of how complex the organi-

zation of participation processes is and also how issues are being addressed and dealt with in reality by European institutions and organizations.

Partner institutions and organizations.

At the centre of the CIPAST project is its network of partner organizations which co-operate and work together as the steering committee. Twelve institutions from seven European member states are involved in structuring the network, disseminating good practises and producing and circulating relevant information.

The twelve partner organizations of the project are**:**

La Cité des Sciènces et de l´Industrie (CSI), Paris, France

The Danish Board of Technology (DBT), Copenhagen, Denmark

The Rathenau Institute (RI), Den Haag, The Netherlands

Città della Scienza (IDIS), Naples, Italy

Deutsches Hygienemuseum (DHMD), Dresden, Germany

Institut National pour la Santé et la Recherche Médicale (INSERM), Paris, France

Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique (INRA), Paris, France

Centre for the Study of Democracy (CSD), Westminster University, London, UK

Science-society interface, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

Association pour la recherche et le développement des méthodes et processus industriels (ARMINES) - Ecole des Mines de Paris / Centre de Sociologie de l'innovation, Paris, France

Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques (FNSP), Paris, France

Bonn Science Shop, Bonn, Germany

As mentioned, the Cité des Sciènces et de l´Industrie (CSI), Paris, France is in charge of the scientific coordination and the Bonn Science Shop, Bonn, Germany, heads the database and web activities of the project. Other institutions bring the experiences which they have had inusing the participatory methodologies. Some organizations have been part of the process of adapting or inventing the methods we know today in Europe.

CHAPTER 4

THE RESEARCH PLAN.

From the 18th to the 21st June, 2007, I attended the second workshop of the CIPAST project in Naples, Italy. As explained in Chapter 3, this workshop was organized to help the formation of individuals who organize public participation events to deal with issues of scientific and technological innovation in society and, to give the partner organizations and participants space to network and freely discuss the field of public participation in science and technology. Attending the project gave me the opportunity to interview the members of the steering committee. This was

made up of representatives of some of the most active and innovative organizations in the field of citizen's participation in Europe. These included institutions like The Danish Board of Technology, Denmark and The Rathenau Institute, Netherlands, INRA, France and also some leading universities like University of Westminster, UK.

An informal, conversational interview lasting 15 to 20 minutes was composed and the interviews were carried out during the course of the week of the workshop in Naples. The experts who were interviewed were all leading figures in the field of participation methodology invention, deliberative democratic theory and public participation organization. The general aim of the research project was to find out the experts' opinions of the project and find out whether, according to them, it is working. To achieve this goal, three areas of interest were identified to form the basis of the interview questions**:**

1) **The effectiveness of the CIPAST project.**
2) **The network structure of the project.**
3) **The theme of deliberative democracy and public participation in science and technology in Europe and in each of their member states.**
4) **The effectiveness of the CIPAST project**

When talking about the effectiveness of the project I aimed to engage the interviewees in talking about the project, its effectiveness and ability to encourage the dissemination of the ideas and methodologies of deliberative democracy which were discussed at the workshops. I was also interested in discovering which techno-scientific issue they thought would benefit from using the participation methods which were talked about at the workshop in the future.

I asked questions about which methods they had used, or seen used, in their country and what they thought of these methods. I asked about how much and how well the ideas were put into practise in their country. This was to discover how well the methodologies had already been disseminated. I was also interested in whether they would be able to pass on the ideas to other institutions, colleagues and organizations to se how much their involvement in the project was a catalyst for dissemination. Here, I also brought in the topic of whether they thought that the ideal methods for each issue would be best decided at national or at European level. This enquiry was to search for their opinion of the effectiveness of the project which had been organized on European level and ultimately to find out whether, in their opinion, the aim of building platforms for exchange at European level was being achieved.

In this section, I enquired about whether, in the opinion of the interviewees, the CIPAST project was the best way to develop and discuss ideas on how to promote public deliberation methodologies. In this way I could get the views of those who are partners of the project and instrumental for its success. A very open question was asked at the end of this part to find out which specific contribution the CIPAST project was making to the developments of deliberative democracy in the home countries of the experts. From this general and neutral question, I wanted to give the interviewees a chance to be as negative or as positive as they wanted to be about this topic.

2) The network structure of the project.

The CIPAST project is based on a network structure of twelve partners who make up the steering committee of the project and are instrumental in creating the toolkit and database (see Chap. 3).

The partners meet at the CIPAST workshops and form a network of information and exchange of experiences. I was interested to find out whether the members of the network felt that this aspect of the project was a success and if the network and exchange of information is helping the members and partners in organizing more and better public participation events. The aim was to see if the project's network structure is succeeding in helping and encouraging exchange of experiences and information between the partners of the network. The questions which were asked were quite direct. One was about whether the network structure of the project helped its success and another dealt with whether hearing the experiences of the other countries was helpful to see how a particular method would or would not be useful in their member state. The aim in this section was to find out if, by creating a European network, the aim of European integration was being furthered by making experts from different countries communicate and cooperate on a common project.

3) The theme of deliberative democracy and public participation in science and technology in Europe and in the individual member states.

The questions in this section dealt with deliberative democracy in general and how it is developing in the different European member states. When asking about this area I used a variety of questions which I hoped would bring out a lot of very interesting responses at all levels. On the subject of deliberative democracy I promoted discussion on how well their own country was responding to the developments of deliberative democracy. I was interested in which actors are involved at present in the processes which are being organized thanks to the project. I also asked if deliberative methodologies had had any attention from the media. The theory of deliberation becoming an activity which could be driven from the bottom-up was investigated. I was interested to know whether the countries with a long tradition of deliberation had begun to see a change from processes being initiated from the institutions downwards, to a bottom-up demand. The question of**:** to what level the demand from the citizens to be involved in techno-scientific debate in their member state was. With this they commented on whether this was a bottom-up process or not.

I was also interested to know which actions they considered useful in order to spread the developments of deliberative democracy throughout all the European countries. Here I expected support or criticisms of the CIPAST project to come out because having had experience of the project, the experts could tell me whether it was an ideal action for the dissemination of deliberative democracy in the future. The topic of the level of political participation in the EU member states was also very interesting and the interviewees talked about why they thought that public participation in the science and technology sectors had been so low until now. We discussed under which circumstances they thought citizens could be more willing to, and interested in, participating in techno-scientific innovation. I asked questions about whether they thought participation could ever be compulsory, and also about the present record of political participation and to what extent citizens could be expected to willingly participate.

Who was interviewed.

One representative from each of the partner institutes which had a role in the instructional part of the workshop was interviewed. This resulted in nine complete interviews. The western member states of the European Union were well represented with some countries having more than one spokesman.

Here is a list of the interviewees' initials, institutions and member states**:**

R. S., La Cité des Sciènces et de l´Industrie (CSI), Paris, France

I. A., The Danish Board of Technology (DBT), Copenhagen, Denmark

S. H., The Rathenau Institute (RI), Den Haag, The Netherlands

G. M., Città della Scienza (IDIS), Naples, Italy

J. N., Deutsches Hygienemuseum (DHMD), Dresden, Germany

P. B. J., Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique (INRA), Paris, France

S. J., Centre for the Study of Democracy (CSD), Westminster University, London, England

A. K., Science-society interface, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

D. B., Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques (FNSP), Paris, France

CHAPTER 5

DATA COLLECTION AND MAIN RESULTS.

The data for the research project was collected over the course of a week on the island of Procida, Naples, Italy. The interviews lasted between fifteen and twenty-five minutes each and the data was digitally recorded and then transcribed. The questionnaire and the interview transcripts can be found in the appendix. The main results of the research project have been summarized here under the headings of**:**

1) **The effectiveness of the CIPAST project.**
2) **The network structure of the project.**
3) **The theme of deliberative democracy and public participation in science and technology in Europe and in their member state.**

1) The effectiveness of the CIPAST project.

Experience of participation methods and how they are used.

The first point which was discussed regarded the participatory methods which the interviewees had used or seen used. The main and most common of the methodologies was the Consensus Conference (see Chapter 2) with all but one of the nine experts having had experience of using it. Other methods which had been tried, but to a lesser degree, were focus groups, technology analysis, citizen's juries and future workshops, future scenarios or future search. The representative from the Danish Board of Technology had had experience of almost all the different methodologies, having been with the institute for nearly twenty years and also having helped develop the consensus conference from the Northern American version to what we know it as today in Europe. The main advantages of the consensus conference were unanimously mentioned by all those who had used it or seen it used. These advantages were that it gave citizens the chance to get well informed about a topic and to have an exchange with experts about it. This aspect of "an

intensive dialogue between lay persons and experts" was important (J. N.). This intense dialogue and together with citizens getting well informed, was said to bring about "new insights into a problem or project" (J. N.). It was said that the process brought out intense information about a subject. These two points highlight a very important aspect of public debate. It is evident the citizens can contribute a lot to both the decision making process and the technoscientific innovation fields by what they are able to bring out about an issue. This suggests that deliberative processes are beneficial for all actors who are involved. This is because citizens feel empowered by having their opinions listened to and taken into account. The learning and community-building strengths mentioned by Macoubrie (Chap. 1) which are achieved through deliberative processes, are beneficial to citizens. Also, decision makers benefit by listening to and understanding the public more. Experts find out what the consumers and users of their innovations think of the 'products' produced.

Another advantage was noted to be the "great learning and empowering experience" (I. A.) for the citizens involved. D. B. of the Centre de Recherches Politiques de Sciences Po, France called the consensus conference**:** "a very interesting and good way to improve democracy" which, in general, is what the use of the participatory methodologies is aiming to do. S. H. of The Rathenau Institute, Netherlands stated that one of the advantages is that**:** "Most of the time, people are extreme at the beginning and then, by means of information, it all comes together". This fits in with the thoughts of Cooke, (see Chap. 1) that deliberation has an educative effect on those who participate (Cooke, 2000). Although this does not stand as the strongest argument for deliberative democracy, it is certainly a positive result. However, the consensus conference does have its disadvantages and weaknesses, which were also uniformly mentioned by the majority of the experts interviewed. The main disadvantage which was evident was that to carry out a consensus conference a lot of time, energy and money needs to be spent. As explained in Chapter 1, one of the known problems which these deliberative processes faces is that a lot of time is spent on their organization. Planning and organizing the event, contacting and finding participants, overseeing the process and processing the results all takes time and energy. These activities are done by the organizing body. The participants also invest their time in participating in the process, and this time could be spent in other ways. Due to the small number of people on the citizens' panel, this investment of time energy and finances is not reflected in the amount of people who benefit and are involved in the process. R. S. of the Cité des Sciences et de l'Industrie, France**:** "There is an enormous investment and few people involved. It's very difficult. This gap between heavy investment of time, energy and expertise and few people deeply involved".

R. S. then went on to explain that to try and make up for this, a lot of media involvement is needed and organized so that the small number of people which is involved, can be compensated for by having a large amount of coverage that reached as many people as possible through the media. The impact which a deliberative process makes is important for the strength of the feeling of empowerment the citizens get from the process and also for the cause of deliberative democracy as a whole. The general aim is to increase the impact so that these elements are as heightened as possible. One way to do this is to ensure a lot of media attention for the participative events. The difficulty of getting the experts and the lay people to engage in good, effective dialogue was also mentioned as one of the problems. In some experiences the lay panel noted the presence of an "us-them" mentality with regard to the expert panel (Einsiedel&Eastlick, 2000). Another problem was finding the experts and professors who could give the citizens their time and expertise during the event. The time which is invested by participants, as mentioned, is given for free and not many professionals have the time to spare in this way.

By far the greatest difficulty for the consensus conference method, which is also mentioned in Chapter 1 as one of the problems facing deliberative democracy in general, is getting decision makers, policy makers and politicians to listen to the results and reports of the conference and to get these taken into account when decisions are made. "Another is the difficulty to make decision makers and policy makers listen to advice and recommendations coming out" (I. A., The Danish Board of Technology). This was confirmed by a lot of the interviewees and appears to be a problem even in those countries where deliberation has found some institutional backing like Denmark.

The problems which were explained about the consensus conference were all quite uniform for the countries which had had experience of using it. There is, however, an interesting point to look at, surrounding the terminology and naming of the Consensus Conference. The word 'Consensus' and its implications is something which is always a point of discussion. The Scandinavian countries, which first imported the consensus conference to Europe, added the lay contribution to the process**:** "We have of course exported methods from other countries. Originally, the Consensus Conference was an American method but not with lay people. That was our contribution" (I. A., DBT)

In these countries, consensus is asked for in the third meeting when the group has to write a conclusive report of the meeting and dialogue with the panel of experts. In France, however, this was, from the very start, a delicate point. According to D. B. of the CRPS, France**:** "I remember the first Consensus Conference we organized years ago. When I used the word 'consensus' for the first time, the Politicians who were in charge of the debate asked**:** "What do you mean by consensus?", "We are not a society with consensus, we are a society where we discuss". So, in France we don't name it Consensus Conference, but Conference of Citizens". The term consensus can mean many different things in the different European member states. In France, as illustrated by D. B., it means the opposite of discuss and R. S. explained that**:** "in France Consensus means compromise" and that is why it isn't used. This illustrates well the way in which the different cultural, political and societal backgrounds of the different member states of the EU influence the way that these procedures for deliberation are put into practice and implicated in the respective country.

Moving on to the focus group, the advantages of this method are that it is a good way to encourage an informal dialogue and helped generate a "light result which is interesting to initiate a process" (A. K.). This shows that the focus group is a good method to use for getting a constructive result about certain issues. The method has been used a lot by Città della Scienza, Italy, and G.M. explained that**:** "it's a way of helping people to express themselves freely without any fears", and that once the situation has been set up, with help from the facilitator, discussion is free-flowing.

The disadvantages of the focus group method are that sometimes the group finds it hard to initiate the discussion process. This highlights the 'gap' which has formed between the actors of civil society groups and expert groups and also how dialogue is not an easy element to promote. Also, the participants come to the participation event with high expectations of what will be achieved from the results of the process. G. M. explained that the expectations of the citizens, who were involved, were sometimes too high, in comparison to the results which the organizers were able to achieve by using this type of methodology. One must keep in mind that the focus group method is not used for citizens to get informed or have direct dialogue with experts. Its main aim is to gather points of view from different actor groups to help the group which approaches a problem better informed. This group is often policy makers.

Going on to talk about the funding of the participation events which had already been used or seen used by the interviewees, in some member states like Denmark, the Netherlands, the UK, France and Germany, the funding for the deliberative processes came from government or ministerial sources. The initiatives of INRA, France were funded by the Ministry of Agriculture. The Ministry of Education funded events in more that one country. However, an Italian representative from Città della Scienza, Naples, G. M., explained to me that it was the state which was the obstacle when trying to organize participation events because of a lack of funding**:** "It's more a matter of support from the state so Citizens Jury is not something possible to do in Italy. Consensus Conferences needs a lot of money and there is no public funding".

However, one must keep in mind that the deliberative processes can be funded by sources alternative to those of the government or Ministries. Funding could come from the private or non profit sector or from regional or provincial bodies.

Diffusion of deliberative processes due to CIPAST.

By carrying out the research project with experts from different European countries, it was possible to get a very varied response to the question of how much the ideas from the CIPAST project are disseminated and put into practise in the experts' home countries. The idea which came out from the answers of the interviewees was that the CIPAST project is not helping very much in this area. Some representatives talked about national networks or commissions which were either making a better or widespread impact in disseminating the deliberative methodologies in their home state. D. B. of CNRS, France explained that**:** "The difficulty in France is that we have another commission, the CNBP (National Committee for Public Deliberation) which has nothing to do with CIPAST and is in charge of organizing local debate. It is very different from CIPAST and they are not interested in the Consensus Conference".

This illustrates that, obviously, the CIPAST project is not the only agency which can facilitate dissemination of the deliberative methodologies within Europe. Here, D. B. talks of a national commission which is helping dissemination of deliberative processes, albeit, not those discussed at the CIPAST workshops. It is negative for the evaluation of the CIPAST project if national networking is preferred and more effective than international relationships. This limits the impact of European integration and does not help to further the aims of the European Commission in this area.

The situation in the UK seemed similar, with S. J. of the University of Westminster explaining that he was part of other, national networks and was afraid that the CIPAST network would only play a limited role in the dissemination of deliberative methodologies in the UK. J. N. of The German Hygiene Museum told me that the toolkit (see Chap. 3) would be useful in the form of "case studies for a training kit or brain food for further use mainly for people who are interested in organizing participation projects". This is a positive point for the CIPAST project and implies that it is helping dissemination. The truthful response of a Danish representative was that the ideas discussed at the workshops were widespread in Denmark "but not because of CIPAST. It's maybe the other way around". This is true to a pattern which emerges throughout the research data. The Danish and some other members, who have been using participative methodologies for longer and have a lot of experience, have a strong influence in the project.

Techno-scientific issues to be dealt with using participatory methods.

When asked, the interviewees had many different ideas about which techno-scientific issues should be treated using the methodologies from the CIPAST workshop. Nearly all the most important current issues were mentioned including**:** climate change, bio-ethics, life sciences, nuclear energy, and electricity. The representative from the Netherlands specifically suggested that a debate about energy on European level should be organized. G. M. explained that, in Italy where the public is influenced very much by the Catholic Church, the methodologies would be useful to give citizens the confidence to form an opinion which was different from that of the Church on questions with strong moral controversy, like stem cell research and fertility treatment**:** "In my country, when people have to talk about hot topics sometimes they are afraid to take a position which is totally different from the general opinion. Even if they think differently from for example, the church, they don't feel comfortable saying something that goes against this". (G. M.) One can also note that in Italy, in recent years, the most important social questions have been dealt with and managed by parties. Due to this, the Italians do not have a strong tradition in using deliberative processes and deliberation.

Interestingly, and quite importantly for the aims of this research project, a lot of topics had already been dealt with, to some degree, using deliberative processes. In France there has been intense debate about the GMO vines in the champagne region which were being field tested, and then were the object of active protests by the public which included actually destroying the crops. This was treated with Interactive Technology Analysis.

R. S. explained**:** "We have already experimented with Climate Change and Nuclear Waste. We had a very intense national debate" and J. N. of GHMD**:** "if you look at areas already covered by participation methods, GMO, Brain research has been covered and the area of Nano Technology has been partly touched".

This fact, that some very important aspects and issues of science in society have already been treated using participation processes, means that, although the CIPAST project may be helping to further the dissemination to a limited degree (see above) it has not been the move which initiated it for these experts in the field. Having said this, D. B. admits that the contact with certain institutions has proved helpful**:** "The first one (consensus conference) we organized was ten years ago in 1998, there was no CIPAST then and we had some relationships with people from the Danish Board of Technology for instance but it was a personal network. Now, with CIPAST, we have more knowledge about how they are organized in Northern countries."

This shows that the project and its network structure do have positive results and implications. In the same way it also shows that deliberation was organized before the CIPAST project was started.

National or European level for deciding methods.

All representatives unanimously mentioned that the methodology best suited to each topic should be decided on, depending on the level the issue needed to be discussed at. For example; if an issue has local effects then it should be discussed at local level. All interviewees also uniformly agreed on the fact that the ideal methods for each issue had to be adapted to the cultural, political, and societal characteristics of each country. R. S. explained that this was due to politicians in some countries being afraid of public participation and others more welcoming of it. This is mentioned in Chapter 1 as one of the most challenging problems for deliberative democracy. In Europe, where there the political situation is not homogeneous the challenge is even more difficult to face. This is illustrated by**:** the Danish government using participation processes in its de-

cision processes as a matter of course, the fact that some governments have set up science in society committees which make little progress and the reality that some countries are really not ready at all for the introduction of participation methods. S. H. talked about the Eastern European member states and how they are not ready for some processes**: "**A girl from Romania has presented a case study here and I was responsible for helping her and ……I don't know if Romania is ready for that." This helps to back up the point of the challenges of the nonhomogeneity of the European situation and how challenging it is to create participation methodologies which can be adapted to and used in all European national settings. Linked to this, when asked about the CIPAST project as being the best way to discuss ideas on deliberation, I. A. and S. H. from Denmark and the Netherlands stated that "learning by doing" was a good way to develop the methodologies. These countries are some of the most advanced in Europe in the field of deliberation methods. They are leading countries who have helped bring the methods to the EU. The Danish especially, have gained their experience by "learning by doing" in that they were the first European country to use the methods. This is also evident in the way that other partners look at these countries as 'leaders' or 'teachers' in the field of deliberative methodologies.

In reply to this question, many replied negatively due to the lack of the presence of any policy or decision makers in the CIPAST project. This reiterates the problem of involving politicians in the deliberative democracy processes. Others explained that CIPAST is**:** a good tool to train organizers, good for more and less experienced members to meet, and positive because of the high level of imagination at the workshop. We could say that a better solution than CIPAST has not yet been found but, a lot depends on the aims of the deliberative processes and what they hope to achieve.

The impact of the project on national level.

When responding to the question of which specific contribution the CIPAST project has had to the developments of deliberative democracy in their country, the "leading" countries with the longest experience in the field answered**:** "we are more advanced than CIPAST is in this field. It's so difficult for me to answer." (I. A.), "I don't know. We're a bit ahead. I'm here because I want to help and to share my experiences." (S. H.), "In my country, Swiss democracy isn't exactly waiting for CIPAST project!" (A. K.). This, again, highlights the emerging pattern of the countries, with the most experience in the field of deliberative processes, expressing that the CIPAST project is learning from them, more than the other way around. This is also important for the dynamics of the network structure of the project as we will see in the next section of data analysis.

From France the answers were varied. P. B. J. mentioned a national network which had been founded thanks to the CIPAST contacts. This is a positive result for the scope of the project in furthering the dissemination of participation methodologies but does not contribute to the hopes that European network projects will encourage integration between the European member states. D. B. explained that the consensus conference was the greatest contribution that the project had made to the French national scene. The consensus conference, as mentioned, was imported from the USA and adapted to the model we know today in Europe by the Danish at the DBT. This shows how the experiences of the Danish and leading countries are important to the success of the project.

J. N. reiterated what had been said by others before; that the diffusion of the effects of the project was limited by the level of acceptance of politicians and decision makers at national level. Again,

this is evidence of how much the issue of getting results of participation processes listened to by decision makers, of fundamental importance to deliberative democracy.

2) The network structure of the project.

Regarding the network structure of the project, there were many varying and interesting points of view. The overall picture gained from the answers to the questions asked about the network structure of the project was that**:** the "leading" countries who have the most and longest experience of using and developing participation methods for public deliberation, felt that their presence in the network was of much more benefit to others than it was to themselves. The presence of these members is also very much appreciated by other member organizations because their expertise and knowledge brings lot to the network and instructional element of the project. This had already started to emerge from previous answers and responses. It shows that there is a difference in the countries which were able to start using deliberative processes some time ago because the historical, political, and cultural background of that state made it possible. Now, the result is that there is also a difference in the competence of the individuals who represent those countries and the representatives of other states. However, the interviewees from Denmark, The Netherlands and Switzerland admitted that**:** it was good to meet people and cooperate with them, and that the database (see Chap. 3) was a useful resource. This highlights one of the greatest challenges of setting up European networks. Due to the differing historical, cultural, political and societal backgrounds of the countries which are called together to take part in networks on a European scale, there are countries which are more advanced and knowledgeable and have more experience in a certain area.

This creates, as seen with the CIPAST project, a type of hierarchical or pyramidal network which has its "leading" or "teaching" states and its "following" or "learning" states. This can lead to dissatisfaction on the part of the countries that need to learn from the experiences of those who are more developed in that field, if they feel the dynamics of the network are not what they should be. Having said this, the aim of the EU is to put together networks of different member states to encourage European integration. This is happening with the CIPAST project but a certain sense of dissatisfaction has been created within the network because some members feel that others are not sharing experiences enough.

Representatives from other countries were less impressed with how the network was functioning and complained of a lack of referencing, little sharing of ideas and not enough reflection on how the network should interact. There was also doubt among members of the steering committee as to whether the network which had been established in the CIPAST project was truly a network**:** "It's sort of Network but I'm not convinced it's really Network. It's a set of people you know. So, I know if I have a problem when I'm organizing a participation process I can send an email to someone I know in the network to ask**:** "What would you do in that case? So, it's sort of Network. It helps" (D. B.).

When asked to define a real network, the frequency of the contact between the members of the steering committee of the project was of key importance**:** "A more frequent relationship. That's not the case with CIPAST." (D. B.) Other representatives said that the network structure was a positive thing, facilitating and encouraging the exchange of experiences and**:** "Enabling organizations to learn about and to explore new ways of addressing issues in public interest in technology and innovation" (S. J.). This goes to show that the aim of the European Commission (see Chap. 1) to "offer assistance to member states by building platforms for exchange" (IFOK, 2003) for

the dissemination of deliberative methodologies, is being addressed. It also suggests that the measures which are being taken are reaching levels of success. This is very important in our discussion about the success of the CIPAST project as a European network project funded under the FP6&7 to address the issue of Science and Society in the EU.

Very importantly for the question of European integration, the absence of new, Eastern European countries was mentioned by more than one expert. In fact, in the group of twelve partner organizations, there were no Eastern European countries. This could suggest a failing on the part of the network to expand to the newer arrivals in the EU. It also reflects the historical, political background of these countries which may not be, as mentioned by S. H., "ready" for the use of some participation methodologies. This is an important negative aspect for the CIPAST network and project, especially for the aim of European integration. It does, however, reflect that the Northern and Western states are more advanced and 'ready' for the use of deliberative processes in their current political settings.

3) The theme of deliberative democracy and public participation in science and technology in Europe and in member states.

Individual member states' response to deliberative democracy.

True to the pattern which has emerged and been analysed in the previous pages, the response to deliberative democracy is more advanced in northern European and Scandinavian countries than in the East and South of Europe.. However, even in the countries where politicians are often involved in deliberative processes which are funded by public institutions, it is still difficult to involve policy makers in participation processes and get them to listen to the outcomes of deliberation processes. This problem is echoed around the European territory**:** "Within the parliament and the Federal government is that there is a low interest to look over their own limited field of activities and bring in lay person's opinion to some relevant areas of society." (J. N. DHMD, Germany).

This implies that there is reluctance on the part of politicians to involve citizens' opinions because the policy makers do not want to look outside their area of expertise and of representation to what the public has to say. A French representative comments that, in France, this reluctance is more because politicians feel a threat to their position**:** "Nearly ninety-nine percent (99%) of politicians are opposed to these methods; the main reason being that they feel it as something that puts them in competition with society." (D. B. CNRS, France)

The non-acceptance on the part of decision makers is, as mentioned, one of the biggest problems which the progress of deliberative democracy faces in the European context and here we see that it is a problem in varying member states, albeit, for different reasons.

Another angle on this problem is that of credibility. As R. S. explained, politicians are becoming aware that the public is losing faith in them and they are starting to use participation methods as a way to reclaim the trust which has been lost in them**:** "Politicians are aware of the lack of credibility of lack of votes and they are trying to find credibility." (R. S.)

R. S. then goes on to explain that politicians are more aware of the positive affect of deliberation on their image**:** "This is very important because if participation is only used to influence political credibility then that's a mistake. Participation needs to be used to enrich democracy."

This is an example of the 'gap' which has formed between civil society and decision makers (see Chap. 1) due to a loss of trust on the part of the former. The danger is that**:** if the deliberative methodologies are only used to make politicians seem more trustworthy, deliberative democracy is being used for the wrong reasons.

results the methods themselves produce.

Bottom-up or top-down? The demand from the citizens.

The interviewees were asked whether, in their country, the demand from citizens to be involved in participation was strong. This was to find out if deliberation has started to become a bottom-up process in any EU countries. It is usual for deliberation to be initiated by institutions when the methodologies are first introduced onto a national scene. Similar opinions were recorded from most of the experts on this theme. "It's usually top-down. It's public policy or policy makers initiating the process or Universities." (A. K.)

This highlights that even in the states where participation has been in use for longer periods of time and has become institutionalized, like Switzerland and Denmark; the processes are still being initiated from institutions downwards. Another aspect, which was also discussed in Chapter 1 regarding the difficulties facing European deliberative democracy, was mentioned by one German and one French representative. This is that demand can be strong on local level. If an issue enters the personal sphere of the people, if citizens are closely connected, either physically of psychologically the public are very motivated to take part in deliberation. This, as explained in Chapter 1, is called the NIMBY theory and characterizes the involvement of citizens who feel an issue is encroaching on their personal sphere. Some topics are treated much more on local level because they are of local interest, for example, waste management. Other techno-scientific issues which are more general and physically far-reaching are dealt with on a wider scale. Examples of these issues are**:** GMOs, nuclear waste, climate change. Part of this NIMBY mentality is the theory that a minority is interested in taking part in debate and that a**:** "large majority only wants things to work correctly; that food is safe etc. They don't want to be involved in public debate" (D. B.). This, again, highlights how Europe's recent past of representative democracy has given citizens the chance to become citizens who do not want to participate but can monitor from a distance and let the qualified and elected do their jobs. The majority is happy for the minority to participate for them. The republican democratic model (see Chap.1) hopes to revive the principles of dedication, involvement and participation of society in public life and deliberation is an integral part of implementing this. It is theorized that, by taking part in deliberation processes, citizens are motivated to participate and consequentially feel empowered. This could bring changes to the trend described above of citizens being happy to let the minority decide for the majority.

Deficit of participation in science and technology in the past and how to encourage participation in the future.

Why has participation been at a low level in the past? How can we increase willingness to participate debate about techno-scientific issues?

There were many theories about these questions from the experts who were interviewed. These theories differed due to the national context about which the interviewees were talking. The Swiss representative spoke about the Eastern and new member states where**:** "the research system is poor you don't have the luxury to sensitize with research" (A. K.). Here there is evidence of the

great differences in political culture between the states in the West and East of the EU. It also suggests that the use of deliberative methodologies depends on a certain level of stability to develop an adequate research system.

From the three French experts, three different theories came out about this theme. R. S. explained how dominant the culture of expertise had been in France. This culture of expertise**:** the conviction of the public that the experts had the best knowledge, is what has lead the French population to be less willing to participate and to policy makers being unwilling to listen to the public's opinion.

D. B. talked about "the level of education of society" and that this differs a lot from the North to the South of Europe. In the opinion of D. B., the low level of involvement in public debate and deliberation processes is directly connected to the "level of education of society". A difference in this level of education between the North and South of the European territory is evident in the way the methodologies have been used and accepted until now according to D. B.

P. B. J. mentioned that scientists, as professionals, set up divides between themselves and civil society and are not willing to discuss their work. This supports the theory that a 'gap' has developed between the two groups of actors (see Chap. 1). P. B. J. also mentions that, with the use of deliberative methodologies which give the chance for lay citizens to get well informed on technoscientific issues, politicians who are not very well informed or up-to-date are reluctant to show this to clever, informed citizens. This will only help to increase the opposition many politicians in France already have towards the deliberative methods. The education system was mentioned in connection with the Italian case, due to the fact that it has always been a humanistic system, focusing much more on artistic subjects than scientific subjects. "It is a problem of school curricular and school information. Until now science has been seen like something different, so not as important as art, literature or music" (G. M.)

This has resulted in the population being much more aware of one reality than the other and having limited knowledge and ability to process scientific information. Similarly to the situation mentioned by R. S. in France, S. J., when talking about the UK, described the "elitist or rather technocratic way that science and technology were treated by government" as an explanation for this past situation. This is supporting the idea that citizens have participated less in the fields of scientific and technological innovation, due to trust in the experts and a dominance of them on the decision making processes in these areas. Similarly, different hypothesis were given for future situations which could encourage more involvement in scientific and technological innovation. Two of the representatives talked about the concept of NIMBY (Not in My Back Yard). This, as mentioned, means that citizens will be motivated to participate when, and only when, an issue enters their physical or psychological sphere. In the opinion of these experts, this is the situation which is most likely to bring about more public involvement in the field of technoscientific innovation. A sector where participation is often due to personal interest is the field of medicine**:** "one area where involvement takes place is medical problems with actors who are directly concerned" (P. B. J.). This proves that the NIMBY theory is, for some sectors, an important way to get citizens involved and participating. Other interviewees explained that the information which the public receives plays a large part in how much participation takes place. S. J. mentions**:** "I think that quality of information and transparency of information which is made available plays a part" and J. N. of the DHMD explains**:** "It's a matter of proper information from different sources and information in a way that the larger public can really consume that specific information. It means we have to train the scientific community to communicate their ideas better to the public information field". (J. N.)

Here we see that information is an important tool in the opinion of many experts to help the innovation field become more transparent and more easily accessible for citizens.

Diffusion of deliberative democracy throughout all the EU countries.

The experts were asked how they thought the methodologies of deliberative democracy could best be diffused throughout the EU. The answers to this question were varied and also quite indicative of the opinion about the CIPAST project. Some of the interviewees mentioned that a more efficient and professional network would help this**:** "I think that a more efficient Network, a more professional approach from more people" (I. A.). This shows dissatisfaction with the functioning of the present network, but also the belief that a network structure works and only needs to be better and more professional. A. K. also thought that the CIPAST project was worth funding further**:** "they should give more money to CIPAST and make institutions, people, and researchers, more sensitive to these issues" (A. K.). This implies that the project is functioning and fulfilling some of its objectives. The media was cited by two experts as one of the ways to bring the participation methods to a very wide public. The means which were mentioned were showing films and documentaries about participation processes on national television. D. B. explained that, according to him, the topic needs to be made attractive and 'sexy' to give it a good image and awake the public interest. This highlights the powerful and far-reaching the effects that media has on society nowadays. Using this method of dissemination of information could prove effective in disseminating information about deliberative processes.

P. B. J. of INRA, France thought that a law**:** "related to science and technology which creates obligations for the member states" would be the best way to spread the use of deliberative methodologies throughout the EU. S. J. explained that, in his opinion, the best way to spread the developments of deliberative democracy through Europe was to**:** "invite them (people and organizations from other countries) to come along to what you're doing and co-operate with them in joint projects". This reflects, in part the "learning by doing" mentality of the Northern European countries but, also, shows that it is widely understood the European states have to integrate and the beat way to do this is to share and carry out joint ventures for a common goal. Here, the interviewee is aware of the bigger goal of the EU**:** to create an integrated Europe which co-operates and shares its ideas, expertise and experiences.

CONCLUSION

In this study, two questions were addressed**:** 1) the question of whether the funding of European network projects under the Framework programmes of the European Commission is working to further European Integration and, in support of this first question; 2) whether the Commission is succeeding in dealing with the issue of science in society by setting up projects like CIPAST to**:** "offer assistance to member states by building platforms for exchange within the EU" (IFOK, 2003).

Regarding the first and larger question, the CIPAST network was studied and conclusions were drawn from interviews taken from representative experts from nine partner organizations.

Examining the responses of the interviewees it is clear that the twelve partners of the network meet regularly to organize and discuss the activities involved in the project. The network is being funded for a duration of three years which gives the member organizations time to get to know one another and build longer-lasting relationships. Within this particular project two, three to four day workshops are held. Participants from all the EU member states are invited to take part in these workshops and take advantage of advice given by experts in the field of deliberative participation methodologies. After talking to representatives from the partner organizations, evidence that the cause of European Integration is being bettered came to light. This is because there is regular exchange, discussion, contact and constructive criticism, for a considerable period of time, between a network of twelve member organizations from different countries of the EU. The attendance of the workshops of around 70 participants from over 20 different countries supports this statement and shows further that the funding of projects like that of CIPAST is helping the European civil society to integrate, co-operate and communicate. In other words, the CIPAST project is an example of how participation is being promoted by participation. The method used to encourage discussion and participation between science and society is coherent with the procedure which is being discussed.

At the same time, there is strong evidence that the members of that same network are not entirely satisfied with how it functions. Critical views on the amount of referencing and exchange between some of the partners were mentioned. There were also doubts about whether the CIPAST network could really be considered such, due to the fact that meetings were not frequent enough. Regarding the intellectual benefit which some partners got from the network, evidence of a more hierarchical network came out. Some members were seen and saw themselves as the 'leading' or 'teaching' members and others as the 'following' or 'learning' members. While this is not necessarily a negative point, it probably characterises the nature of most European networks, considering that there is such a huge diversity between member states when looking at historical, political and cultural traditions. There are always those who have less experience and those who have more in all fields. This must be seen as the advantage and strength of Europe rather than a problem or disadvantage. Another critical feature of the CIPAST network is the lack of representation from the newer European member states in the East of Europe. There is a definite over representation of the Western states with France making up just less than half of the twelve members. This is influenced by the nature of the project and its field of interest (techno-scientific innovation in society) because western European countries have had a longer experience of using the methodologies and their political and cultural traditions allow for easier initiation of these methodologies in the near future. However, the Eastern European member states would learn a lot from the exchange of information in the CIPAST network and the lack of their presence is a negative aspect of the network.

Regarding the second question, which supports and compliments the first, a positive response can be given. The European Commission within its wider ambitions of creating an integrated, harmonized Europe, creating the ERA and becoming "the world's most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy" has targeted the dissemination of deliberative participation methodologies. The funding of the CIPAST project is the direct result of the aim to "build platforms for exchange in the EU" and to have a "pool of methodologies" which member states can work with.

From analysis of the interviews which were carried out, it is clear that this "platform for exchange" has been constructed based on the network and its members. During the workshops organized, members, partners and participants can talk, exchange experiences and ideas, get and give advice about the organization of participatory processes. The website of the project is a good space in which to exchange experiences and news. This shows, as is the increasing trend, that platforms are not necessarily physical but virtual. The toolkit and database, which are part of the project, are also a helpful way to use the past experiences of others in future participatory events.

Having said this, the impact which membership of the CIPAST network has on the members' national scene is limited. Experts admitted that more impact was made by membership to and creation of national networks sometime as a result of the CIPAST network. Some said that their presence in the network was more beneficial to the project than the project was to their organization or national reality. This limited impact is also due to the willingness of decision makers to accept the methodologies in a national context.

For future ways of spreading the use of deliberative procedures to all European member states, I believe that the funding of network projects like CIPAST has its advantages because the aims of European integration are furthered due to participation in a network, and deliberative methodologies are discussed and advice is given on how to adapt the methods to specific issues in different national, political settings.

With its network projects, the European Commission is helping to further the cause of European integration and build platforms for exchange for the dissemination of deliberative participation methodologies. This kind of network functions in a way which reflects the wider European reality. This means that there are a lot of differences between all the member states but integration and co-operation are possible. Deliberative methods which encourage participation and dialogue on all levels are being discussed and, both the methods and the discussion about them could, potentially, improve the quality of European democracy and the integration between member states.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1
Interview Questionnaire.

The effectiveness of the CIPAST project.

1) Which methods for public participation discussed at the CIPAST workshops have you seen used or used yourself?
- What weaknesses have you found in them?
- What advantages have you found in them?
- Did you encounter any trouble regarding organization or financing?
- Were the expected or predicted outcomes achieved?
- Who were the sponsors of the initiatives?

2) How much and how well are the ideas from the CIPAST workshops put into practice in your country?
- Is the training from the Workshop directly useful?
- Is the support from the Network structure helpful?
- Were the ideas better discussed because of the guidelines given by the project Workshops?

3) Which specific techno-scientific problem in your country could benefit from using the ideas outlined at the CIPAST workshops?

4) Do you think that the ideal methods to use for each techno-scientific-societal issue are best decided at European or national level?
- Will these suggestions have to be modified to account for specific local or national needs?

5) Are projects like CIPAST the best way to develop, learn more about and discuss ideas on how to promote public deliberation?
- If yes, Why?
- If no, Why?
- Have there been any similar projects to CIPAST?

6) Which specific contribution has the CIPAST project made to the developments of deliberative democracy in your country?
- Have any politicians been involved in participation processes?

The network structure of the CIPAST project.

1) Does the Network structure of the CIPAST project help its success?
- If yes, How? In what ways?
- If no, why not?

2) Does hearing the experiences of other countries help you

to see how a particular method could/couldn't work in your country?
- Can you give me an example of this?
- Do you have any personal experience of this?

The theme of deliberative democracy and public participation in science and technology in Europe and in individual member states.

1) How well is your country responding to the developments of deliberative democracy?
- Which actors are usually involved?
- Which actions have been taken?
- Has there been any public debate in the media?
- Have there been any controversial issues?

2) Could there be one unique/ultimate form of involving citizens in the decision process?
- Does this always depend on the specific issue being discussed?

3) What, in your country, is the techno-scientific demand from the citizens to be involved?
- So, is this a bottom-up process?

4) Why do you think that citizens' participation in the areas of science and technology has been so poor until now in some European countries?
- What has the situation been in your country?

5) How do you think that people's view of science and technology could be improved to make them more willing to and interested in participating in these areas?
- Could this be through education?
- Could information help the situation?

6) Looking at the present record of political participation in your country; how much can we really expect citizens to willingly participate in deliberative democracy?

7) Should participation ever be compulsory?

8) Which actions do you think will be useful to spread thedevelopments of deliberative democracy through all the EU-countries?
- Do you think that this needs to be institutional or citizen initiative?

Attachment 2

Interview I. A., Danish Board of Technology.

CIPAST

1) Which methods for public participation discussed at the Cipast Workshops have you seen used or used yourself?
I E A: *Well, I have been in the Danish board of Technology for nearly 20 years so I have used, myself, many of the methods which are discussed at Cipast. Consensus Conference, Scenario Workshops, meetings. Different kinds of Workshops for Citizens Participation, also work on Citizens Summits and Citizens Juries. I think on the Citizens website there are more examples.*

- What weaknesses /advantages have you found in them?
I E A: *That's a very general question.*
- Ok, so what are the weaknesses and advantages of the Consensus Conference?
I E A: *The main advantage is that it is a real learning and empowering experience.*
- Does it have any weaknesses?
I E A: *Of course, all the methods have weaknesses. One is that it costs a lot of money, it takes a lot of time, if that's a weakness. Another is the difficulty to make decision makers and policy makers listen to advice and recommendations coming out.*
- Were the expected/predicted outcomes achieved?
I E A: *Yeah.*
- Who were the sponsors of the initiatives?
I E A: *When we do this, the sponsor is The Danish State. I have also been involved in an international project; The Meeting of Minds where they used Consensus Conferences in all 9 partner countries. It was sponsored both by the European Commission in Brussels and the national organizations.*

2) How much and how well are the ideas from the Cipast Workshops put into practice in your country? Is it very widespread?
I E A: *Yes it is, but not because of Cipast. It's maybe the other way around.*

3) Which specific techno-scientific problem in your country could benefit from using the ideas outlined at the Cipast workshops?
I E A: *Many. Lately we have been working with brain science, privacy, energy, health care systems, transplantation and open democracy…..…*

4) Do you think that the ideal methods to use for each techno-scientific-societal issue are best decided at European or national level?
I E A: *It's an impossible question to answer.*
- For example, if it is advised that a certain issue is best treated with a certain method, Will every nation have to modify this method….?
I E A: *It always has to be modified to the national context because all cultures are different.*

5) Are projects like Cipast the best way to develop/learn more about/discuss ideas on how to promote public deliberation?

I E A: *Only in collaboration with other ways because the best way is to learn by doing. To try to do it with some people and learning that way.*

6) Which specific contribution has the Cipast project made to the developments of deliberative democracy in your country?
I E A: *Again I must say……I'm sorry to say that we are more advanced than Cipast is in this field. It's so difficult for me to answer. Of course we can learn a lot from co-operating with people in other countries, that's very important.*

NETWORKS

1) Does the Network structure of the Cipast project help its success?
I E A: *Yes, yes.*

- How? In what ways?
I E A: *We can learn to know new people, and co-operate with them. Well that's networking.*

2) Does hearing the experiences of other countries help you to see how a particular method could/couldn't work in your country?
I E A: *Yes.*

- Can you give me an example of this?
I E A: *…..We have of course exported methods from other countries. Originally, the Consensus Conference was an American method but not with lay people. That was our contribution.*

DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY (General questions)

1) How well is your country responding to the developments of deliberative democracy?
I E A: *It's a very big and difficult question.*

- Well, from what you've said already, it sounds like it is responding well.
I E A: *Yes, but talking about context, we also have difficulties in making policy makers listen to lay people and citizens.*

3) I think I already know the answer to this question**:**
Could there be one unique form of involving citizens in the decision process?
I E A: *No.*

- Does this always depend on the specific issue and the country?
I E A: *Yes, it always depends on the issues and why you want to involve citizens.*

4) What, in your country, is the techno-scientific demand from the citizens to be involved?
I E A: *What do you mean?*

- Is this coming from the bottom-up or is it going from the institutions-down?
I E A: *We decide about the issues and we go out and ask but we don't go out in the streets and ask everybody. We ask people who are supposed to have ideas. You can say that when we involve citizens, in an issue or discussion they are there and we set the issue. They can influence how we discuss the issue.*

5) Why do you think that citizens' participation in the areas of science and technology has been so poor until now in some European countries?

I E A: *It's difficult to say. It's again a big, big question. As some people say, it's not so easy to make these discussions cool and sexy and easy to approach. In popular media, they do it one way and we do it another way but the fact is that there's not such a big interest in science and technology.*

6) How do you think that people's view of science and technology could be improved to make them more willing to and interested in participating in these areas?
I E A: *I think that some of it…yeah…I think through the education system. It would be possible to raise the interest, much more fundamental. We have a discussion at the moment in Denmark*
about the interest of young people to study science. Some people think it would be more interesting for them to go there if science and technology was put in context. If you also discussed the worries and concerns about it and not only presented it like one big progress because there are these concerns and people are interested in discussing them. It could be part of the education system……I think it's starting to be.

7) Looking at the present record of political participation in your country; how much can we really expect citizens to willingly participate in deliberative democracy?
I E A: *I think that the more there is of it, the more we can expect people to take part.*

8) Could/Should participation ever be compulsory?
I E A: *No.*

9) Which actions do you think will be useful to spread the developments of deliberative democracy through all the EU countries?
I E A: *Well, I think that a more efficient Network, a more professional approach from more people…*
- More institutions?
I E A: *I don't know about the institutions, they aren't always*

……

<u>Interview P. B. J., INRA, France.</u>

CIPAST

1) Which methods for public participation discussed at the Cipast Workshops have you seen used or used yourself?
P B J: *Consensus Conferences, Interactive Process, Focus Groups. I haven't used the Scenario Workshop or the Citizens Juries.*
- What weaknesses /advantages have you found in them?
P B J: *The issue is to find a good method adapted to a specific situation.*
- Who were the sponsors of the initiatives? Examples?
P B J: *The government, the Prime Minister, the Ministry of Agriculture and the Region.*

2) How much and how well are the ideas from the Cipast Workshops put into practice in your country?

P B J: *It isn't really in the culture but we have quite a few experiences of Consensus Conferences, mainly Consensus Conferences.*

- Will you be able to pass on the ideas discussed here to other organizations, institutions, and colleagues?
  P B J: *Yes, sure.*

3) Which specific techno-scientific problem in your country will benefit from using the ideas outlined at the Cipast workshops?
P B J: *Mainly life sciences**:** Nano Technology, Gm we've had a lot. Surely human and animal cloning. Any type of discussion**:** public transport, information technology.*

4) Do you think that the ideal methods to use for each techno-scientific-societal issue are best decided at European or national level?
P B J: *National.*

- Why is that?
  P B J: *Because the adaptation of the method to the society, because of the political culture.*

5) Are projects like Cipast the best way to develop/learn more about/discuss ideas on how to promote public deliberation?
P B J: *I don't know. Surely not.*

- It isn't the best way?
  P B J: *I think now the key point is the implication of policy makers and they aren't here.*

6) Which specific contribution has/does the Cipast project made/make to the developments of deliberative democracy in your country/the EU?
P B J: *In my country it is not the Cipast project as such but more the fact that we have quite a good Network of Cipast members in our country. For example, the Cipast members have been involved in a discussion, an experimental debate on Nano Technology in France. They have organized some debates on participation so there are a lot of activities related to the Network of Cipast.*

NETWORKS

1) Does the Network structure of the Cipast project help its success?
P B J: *No.*

- Why not?
  P B J: *Because it doesn't work!*

2) Does hearing the experiences of other countries help you to see how a particular method could/couldn't work in your country?
P B J: *No.*

- Can you give me an example of why not?
  P B J: *Because basically we know the methodologies now, it's clear. The issue is the interaction between this microcosm. To discuss that there is lack of reflection on that on the part of many of our members and contacts. This is why, in the first step it was very important to learn from others….. Then people, they are not referencing enough. That's why they share very few ideas.*

DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY (General questions)

2) How well is your country responding to the developments of deliberative democracy?

P B J: *Very well.*

- Which actors are usually involved?

P B J: *Mainly researchers.*

- Which actions have been taken?

P B J: *I am a member of Politics of Talk. I see it characterizes very well the situation in France. As far as science and technology is concerned, there are very few genuine experiences of public participation which have affected or changed the decisions are made. It's very different in the areas of local decisions with environmental projects, as I said yesterday, it is an institutional setting, they have compulsory provisions, so well established. That's not the case for consulting for science and technology.*

- Has there been any public debate in the media?

P B J: *Yes, with the election campaign of Segalin Royale, a lot! She was trying to push for deliberative democracy. Actually it was very badly understood which was a shame.*

3) Could there be one unique form of involving citizens in the decision process?

P B J: *No.*

- Does it always have to be adapted to the issue being discussed?

P B J: *Yes.*

4) What, in your country, is the techno-scientific demand from the citizens to be involved?

P B J: *I think from the citizens, it's very difficult for me to answer, in that there is a demand…certain social movements from citizens…..I don't know. Every time we organize a participation event we are asked for more information and more involvement and so on. Out of this specific frame, I'm not sure that there is a high demand to be more involved.*

5) Why do you think that citizens' participation in the areas of science and technology has been so poor until now in some European countries?

P B J: *Well, there are many answers. It is a specific situation for science and technology. Scientists as professionals set boundaries, erect boundaries in their professional landscape. This is one part of the scene. ainly scientists are positivists and they are not ready to discuss the knowledge they produce in an open setting with non-professionals. It is one part of the problem. Policy makers who perform very badly in science and technology issues don't want to be out-passed by clever citizens so they are very reluctant to open some biologic spaces for citizens, which is bad because they could really benefit from these. Stakeholders, who are very engaged debate, public controversy on technological issues, don't trust public participation. They have the feeling it may weaken their position. So this is the French situation. It is very influenced be the French national landscape which is quite opposed on these problems. Even NGOs which use participation methods within their own organizations, they are not quite democratic inside.*

6) How do you think that people's view of science and technology could be improved to make them more willing to and interested in participating in these areas? Is it down to education, information, institutions making the first step?

P B J: *They have to be concerned so one area where involvement takes place is medical problems with actors who are directly concerned. So I see that the concernment process*

counts more than education. People may have quite a passive attitude although they are well educated.

7) Looking at the present record of political participation in your country; how much can we really expect citizens to willingly participate in deliberative democracy?
P B J: *I guess it is my feeling that participatory democracy may really be a renewal of citizenship and general democracy. I say that because, in every single initiative I have participated in various positions, the key point is that feeling that there is strong involvement and the fact that people take charge of responsibilities. Each time it's impressive to see that if you give the people the possibility to have their say, reflect on behalf of the other citizens…even if they are not involved al all in policy or social movements, they very much like to take this position.*

- To be empowered.
P B J: *Yes.*

8) Could/Should participation ever be compulsory/obligatory?
P B J: *No. I think it has to be more institutionalized but not on the side of individual participation. It's not necessary either. It's not difficult to have the people to participate in participation processes. The shortcomings and limitations are not there.*

9) Which actions do you think will be useful to spread the developments of deliberative democracy through all the EU countries?
P B J: *Another convention related to science and technology which creates obligations for the member states.*

- Like this project?
P B J: *No, like a law.*

Interview G. M., Città della Scienza, Italy.

CIPAST

1) Which methods for public participation discussed at the Cipast Workshops have you seen used or used yourself
G M: *Most of all in Focus Groups in our centre. We work with Focus Groups a lot.*

- What weaknesses /advantages have you found in them?
G M: *Because it's a way of helping people to express themselves freely without any fears of… It's quite useful for our people.*

- And what disadvantages did you find in them?
G M: *They are just to gather them and convince them to start to talk. But once it's on they go directly. It's too formal so sometimes it's to talk together. One disadvantage is sometimes their expectations are too high compared to the results we achieve.*

2) How much and how well are the ideas from the Cipast Workshops put into practice in your country?
G M: *It's not a matter of country because I think that all the activities we have seen could be done in Italy. It's more a matter of support from the state so Citizens Jury is not something*

possible to do in Italy. Consensus Conferences need a lot of money and there is no public funding.

- Will you be able to pass on the ideas discussed here and our toolkit to others?
  G M: *Yes, yes.*

3) Which specific techno-scientific problem in your country will benefit from using the ideas outlined at the Cipast workshops?
G M: *Do you mean specifically Italy?*

- Yes.
  G M: *I don't know if there are specific scientific and technological problems but what could be useful, because sometimes in my country, when people have to talk about hot topics sometimes they are afraid to take a position which is totally different from the general opinion. Even if they think differently from example the church, they don't feel comfortable saying something that goes against this.*
- Problems of religion and issues of religion?
  G M: *No, for example stem cell research, fertility treatment.*

4) Do you think that the ideal methods to use for each techno-scientific issue are best decided at European or national level?
G M: *I think they should do it at national level but there should be a kind of co-ordination between nations. So trying to decide the topics together and trying to present them in a slightly different way.*

5) Are projects like Cipast the best way to develop and discuss ideas on how to promote public deliberation?
G M: *Yes I think so but any project putting together people form different countries from different experiences but with the same background of information and the same passion about the topics, will work. Not only the Cipast.*

6) Which specific contribution has the Cipast project made to the developments of deliberative democracy in your country/the EU?
G M: *Oh.*

- Will it have a large impact?
  G M: *Of course I hope so. I think it won't be an easy process and not a fast process. We're starting to leave the seeds in the ground and now it's our responsibility to have them grow into plants. I think it will have an impact, I don't know when and how.*

NETWORKS

1) Does the Network structure of the Cipast project help its success?
G M: *I think so. I must say that we have missed some Eastern countries from the project. That would have been useful because they're new EU countries; they have some problems that probably we would have helped to solve.*

- Useful for them more than for us?
  G M: *And for us too. There is probably too much Western European orientation but of course it has a lot of representatives form a lot of different countries.*

2) Does hearing the experiences of other countries help you to see how a particular method could/couldn't work in your country?
G M: *Yes, yes. I think so. Especially when we're talking about experiences in large towns because I think that large towns in Europe are facing the same problem. If we talk about countries in general of course, it changes. But if we talk about the large towns probably they are useful.*

DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY (General questions)

3) How well is your country responding to the developments of deliberative democracy?
G M: *Not so well I should say.*

- Which initiatives have been taken?
G M: *For example, I only recently knew that we have an institution in the Italian parliament which should take care of this process but they're not doing that.*
- So, there is an institution?!
G M: *Yes there is but it's made only of politicians. Something that Italy should do is to have an*
institution doing TA or something like that. Helping to deliberate but actually they're not doing that.

2) Could there be one ultimate form of involving citizens in the decision process? Could there be one method which is ultimately better than another?
G M: *At this moment no. I think that some methodologies could converge to go in the same direction ers we have talked a lot about Nano Technology and people were surprised that there are already some products, applications on the market and nobody has talked to them about that.*

7) Looking at the present record of political participation in your country; how much can we really expect citizens to willingly participate in deliberative democracy?
G M: *Um….Well we can expect a lot of people to participate but we have to show them that participation is useful in something. Italian people are a little bit sceptical. If you call them to do something they ask "What is your second purpose?" "What is behind this thing?". So of you're good at talking to them, at explaining that they can have a role, they can vote, they can do something concrete, they want to talk and have discussion.*

8) Could/Should participation ever be compulsory?
G M: *No. Participation should never be obligatory.*

9) Which actions do you think will be useful to spread the developments of deliberative democracy through all the EU countries? Maybe projects like this?
G M: *Yes, but probably we should leave this role to a means of communication that can reach a huge majority of people. TV for instance should do much more about that, national TV should do that. Showing a movie like the one we saw yesterday on the main channel of TV; that could have far-reaching impact.but I don't think there will be one unique best method.*

- So, they all have to be adapted to the circumstances?
G M: *Yes.*

4) What, in your country, is the techno-scientific demand from the citizens to be involved?

G M: *Well, if you say that in general, they don't care, but once they realize that there are some issues that they should know before accepting new technologies, then it changes. So if people are well informed, there is a lot of demand for information*

5) Why do you think that citizens' participation in the areas of science and technology has been so poor until now in some European countries?
G M: *Because especially in Italy, if you talk about culture, you talk about humanistic culture. So if you talk about if you know Leonardo or Raffaello all the people say yes because they did masterpieces in art or literature. Because that's our way of educating. If you talk about Galileo who was scientist, probably, 50% of Italians don't know who he is. It is a problem of school curricular and school information. Until now science has been seen like something different, so not as important as art, literature or music. But now, of course, things are changing because people are seeing that science and technology can improve the quality of life, but they can also create new problems that we didn't know before.*

6) How do you think that people's view of science and technology could be improved to make them more willing to and interested in participating in these areas? Does this depend on education, information….?
G M: *Yes education of course, but I think both education and information. Especially, I think that they should be informed every time a new technology comes into the market. Because what happens is that we inform people when the technology is already being used. So in our cent*

<u>Interview D. B., Centre de Recherches Politiques de Sciences Po, France.</u>

CIPAST

1) Which methods for public participation discussed at the Cipast Workshops have you seen used or used yourself?
D B: *Consensus Conferences mostly.*

- What weaknesses /advantages have you found in them?
D B: *The disadvantages are that it costs a lot, it's difficult to organize and find the people to teach the lay people.*
- Do you mean the professors?
D B: *Yes. It's difficult to find the balance inside the steering committee so there are many difficulties but it's a very interesting and good way to improve democracy.*
- Who were the sponsors of the initiatives?
D B: *The first Consensus Conference we organized it was the French Government in a Consensus Conference about the GMO problem. The second was the region - so it was public funding.*

2) How much and how well are the ideas from the Cipast Workshops put into practice in your country?
D B: *The difficulty in France is that we have another commission, the CNBP**:** National Committee for Public Deliberation which has nothing to do with Cipast and is in charge of organizing local debate on, for example, a new factory or a new electricity line so they are in*

charge of organizing debate locally. It is very different t from Cipast and they are not interested in the Consensus Conference for instance.

3) Which specific techno-scientific problem in your country could/will benefit from using the ideas outlined at the Cipast workshops?
D B: *A lot. Nuclear energy, electricity lines, many. GMOs; this is a great problems in France. They make experiments in open fields with new GMO crops. There is a big conflict about that in France. People, activists destroyed the experiment and there needs to be debate about it and it's very difficult to organize debate about it.*

4) Do you think that the ideal methods to use for each techno-scientific-societal issue are best decided at European or national level?
D B: *Both of course because one important aim of Cipast is to co-ordinate research and action in participation processes so it's important at European level and at national level – both.*

5) Are projects like Cipast the best way to develop/learn more about/discuss ideas on how to promote public deliberation?
D B: *Yes. There seems to be a lot of imagination in Cipast . Meeting people who have invented other methods and tested different experiments is a good way of working because of the variety of methods used by the different people in Cipast.*

6) Which specific contribution has/does the Cipast project made/make to the developments of deliberative democracy in your country/the EU?
D B: *I would say the Consensus Conference because we have learnt a lot about that. The first one we organized was ten years ago in 1998, there was no Cipast then and we had some relationships with people from the Danish Board of Technology for instance but it was a personal network. Now, with Cipast, we have more knowledge about how they are organized in Northern countries.*

NETWORKS

1) Does the Network structure of the Cipast project help its success?
D B: *It depends on what you mean by Network. We have meetings where we exchange ideas and so on but it isn't really network. I have a list of people, of emails so I can ask someone I didn't know 6 months ago. It's sort of Network but I'm not convinced it's really Network. It's a set of people you know. So, I know if I have a problem when I'm organizing a participation process I can send an email to someone I know in the network to ask**:** "What would you do in that case?". So, it's sort of Network. It helps.*

- So what is your definition of a real Network?
  D B: *Probably that we can chat more in a Network, I don't know.*
- More like everybody on en equal level?
  D B: *Yes, a more frequent relationship. That's not the case with Cipast.*
- How often do you have contact with the other members?
  D B: *Normally two or three times a year. During the last three years, we've had these two big meetings in Dresden and Naples and steering committee meetings. The steering committee isn't about methods but about the organization of the meetings.*

2) Does hearing the experiences of other countries help you to see how a particular method could/couldn't work in your country?

D B: *Yes, it helps of course because you can distinguish between cultural problems and general problems. Some methods fit more with a certain cultural background. For example**:** the idea of consensus fits well with Northern countries but doesn't fit well in southern countries.*

- Do you mean consensus form CC?

D B: *The idea of consensus. I remember the first Consensus Conference we organized years ago. When I used the word consensus for the first time. The Politicians who were on charge of the debate asked**:** "What do you mean by consensus?", "We are not a society with consensus, we are a society where we discuss". So in France we don't name it Consensus Conference, but conference of Citizens. There is a cultural difference between Northern and Southern countries.*

DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY (General questions)

4) How well is your country responding to the developments of deliberative democracy?

D B: *It's difficult because mainly politicians in France are not convinced of the legitimacy of these methods. Nearly 99% of politicians are opposed to these methods. The main reason being that they feel it as something that puts them in competition with society. They feel they are legitimate representatives and these kinds of methods are supposed to have a competition in legitimacy of representation.*

2) Could there be one unique form of involving citizens in the decision process?

D B: *No, absolutely not! We need different methods for different issues. We need a set of methods so you can choose this one or that one and new methods which haven't been invented yet.*

4) What, in your country, is the techno-scientific demand from the citizens to be involved?

D B: *It's difficult because we live in a society where the minority of society is interested in debating in science and technology and a large majority only wants things to work correctly; that food is safe etc. They don't want to be involved in public debate. Recently and enormous debate was organized in France about Nuclear Waste Management. At the end of it we evaluated only at 3,000 people who got in touch by web or other ways. So, only 3,000 people in a country where we have 44m adults. So, there's a big difference. You have to keep in mind that you are working for a minority of society and the large majority of society is not interested. They want to "Keep it safe. Let the experts do their job".*

5) Why do you think that citizens' participation in the areas of science and technology has been so poor until now in some European countries?

D B: *It's a question in the level of education! The use of these methods is directly correlated to the level of education of society and there is a big difference between North and South countries in this criteria*

7) Looking at the present record of political participation in your country; how much can we really expect citizens to willingly participate in deliberative democracy?

D B: *Difficult to say. It depends what you mean by participate. Is it actively participate or just click on the web to see what's going on about this issue? It's difficult to say.*

8) Could/Should participation ever be compulsory?

D B: *No certainly not. This is voluntary.*

9) Which actions do you think will be useful to spread the developments of deliberative democracy through all the EU countries?
D B: *Information, diffusion of movies like the one we did on the French conference on Nanos. Movies that are a bit more attractive, a bit more…*
- Something more……
D B: *A bit more pleasant and so on.*

<u>Interview S. J., University of Westminster, UK.</u>

CIPAST

1) Which methods for public participation discussed at the Cipast Workshops have you seen used or used yourself?
S J: *(I need to give you my answer in two parts. The impact that the Cipast members have had into the building up of the Network itself and that was reflected in the Workshop we hosted in Dresden which was very much led by the Cipast consortium. However the methods presented today and this week are a diversification of what was discussed initially at Dresden last year. That's partly because the network has grown and because we have invited people not previously involved in the Network to join and bring their own specific experience.) It's difficult to put a percentage on it but I would say I'm familiar with around 60-70% of the methods being discussed.*
- Can you give me some examples of the methods you've used?
S J: *I can give you several examples including Consensus Conferences, Citizens' Conferences, Citizens' Juries, Scenario Workshops, Future Workshops, and what is referred to in Dutch as Interactive Technology Analysis which was previously known as Constructive TA. Deliberative Polling-which hasn't been discussed at this workshop.*
- What are the advantages and disadvantages of these methods?
S J: *It's a difficult question-but a good one. I'm going to be evasive. I'm afraid, as so often, it all depends on context and on the topic to be assessed. So it depends on the context, the institutional context, it depends on the issue to be discussed. Certain methods have advantages over others and vice versa.*
- Who were the sponsors of the initiatives?
S J: *The majority of them, especially in the 1980s and 1990s, the first I analyzed and was involved in, were sponsored by parliamentary offices of TA, by ministries of research or ministries of education. In the latter part of the 1990s and in the early 2000s some of the initiatives I had some involvement in or knowledge of were run by more unconventional Networks or conglomerates of NGOs and Governmental Organizations.*

2) How much and how well are the ideas from the Cipast Workshops put into practice in your country? Will you be able to give the ideas to other people?
S J: *Well, I'm not sure about my own contribution of information within the UK. I'm already part of an established network within the UK so to be absolutely honest I don't know whether the Cipast project or my participation in it will have an impact in the UK. As I said I'm already part of other UK based Networks. I think my contribution will have had a greater im-*

pact in relation to newcomer countries; that is organizations, people, countries, who previously were not experienced in using participation processes.

3) Which specific techno-scientific problem in your country could/will benefit from using the ideas outlined at the Cipast workshops?
S J: *Looking back to the 1990s**:** GM crops, organic biotechnology which was a big question given the level of controversy at the time in the UK. Now I think it's Nano Technology which has been "benefiting" ("") from participation processes. I expect the attention is going to move to climate change issues.*

4) Do you think that the ideal methods to use for each techno-scientific-societal issue are best decided at European or national level?
S J: *It depends!! Yes and No! I think in the majority if cases, I would opt for the national or sub national levels. When it comes to health technology, the majority of decisions are taken at national or sub-national level. Also from a political theory or democratic perspective, it's imperative for the EU to succeed to have a strengthening of the local, regional and national in order to have a due delegation put to the EU. That's giving my personal view.*

5) Are projects like Cipast the best way to develop/learn more about/discuss ideas on how to promote public deliberation?
S J: *Whether or not it's the best way forward, the jury is out. Looking at what's happening today and looking at the thinking of the last 3 days, it's a pretty near perfect way of facilitating a process of getting more experienced people to meet with less meet with less experienced people to have an exchange of experience and a sharing of information and knowledge across institutions, language barriers and countries. The fact that the EU Commission funded this project in the first place is quite important in building up this Network. The only critical point I would add is that I would feel sorry if the Network were to disintegrate because of there not being funding available to carry it forward.*

6) Which specific contribution has/does the Cipast project made/make to the developments of deliberative democracy in your country/the EU?
S J: *I don't think it has made a specific contribution to what's been happening in the UK apart from building learning capacity within individuals, institutions and people. As far as the EU level is concerned, I think that there has been quite a successful dissemination and communication effect of this project that otherwise wouldn't have happened.*

NETWORKS

1) Does the Network structure of the Cipast project help its success?
S J: *I think it does. The fact that we have got a combination of academic organizations and academics, museum organizations, museum people, scientific organizations and scientists involved, has contributed to the success of the project because it has enabled us to look at the issue of citizen's participation in science and technology from different angles and different perspectives, thus overall enriching debate about citizen's participation.*

2) Does hearing the experiences of other countries help you to see how a particular method could/couldn't work in your country?
S J: *Oh, absolutely. This is not just limited to the Cipast project because I was part of previous European and other Networks. The effect is crucially important in enabling organizations*

to learn about and to explore new ways of addressing issues in public interest in technology and innovation.

DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY (General questions)

1) How well is your country responding to the developments of deliberative democracy?
S J: *It is responding. Whether it's responding well I'm less sure and confident about. There certainly has been something of a sea change in British attitudes to deliberative forms of policy assessment, policy deliberation and decision making. There's been a huge amount of investment and innovation within existing as well as new UK based institutions; both governmental and non governmental level institutions. How this fits in with the way decisions are made and how it's responding to public or social concerns about political issues and not just technology, I'm not sure. I'm not sure of the extent to which this drive towards deliberative democracy is window dressing and how much it actually represents, in mid to long term, a real change in the way governance works in Britain.*

2) Could there be one unique form of involving citizens in the decision process?
S J: *No. I'm a firm believer in the plurality of approach, plurality of methods, and representing diversity of interests, people and organizations. Definitely not.*

- Does this always depend on the specific issue being discussed?
S J: *It does partly depend on the specific issue being assessed and on the context meaning the organizational context of the decision making process. So, if something is at an exploratory stage or at the diffusion or dissemination stage of policy making, depending on the stage it's at, you would opt for different kinds of participation or deliberation procedures.*

4) What, in your country, is the techno-scientific demand from the citizens to be involved?
S J: *There's been considerable demand in relation to specific issues. If you survey the literature on science and technology this will be confirmed many times…..It was fuelled by Mad Cow Disease in the 1990s, followed by GM crops and "Franken-Foods", more recently the public has been sensitized by issues of stem cell technology and the use of personal information in bio medicine. These kinds of issues have reached public awareness by fuelling demands for greater involvement. There is a wider phenomenon of a certain divide between public perception and perceived elitist approaches to decision making on the other hand which has fuelled demand for more public involvement in a broader sense.*

5) Why do you think that citizens' participation in the areas of science and technology has been so poor until now in some European countries?
S J: *That's a big question. There are many different reasons for that. Historically speaking, because of the elitist or rather techno-pathic way that science and technology were treated by government and by administrative bodies, for a while that was ok as far as public legitimacy was concerned as long as they were conceived as drivers of the economy or as uncontroversial. In the 60s and 70s when the public became aware of the ambivalence of science and technology started to increase. You saw demands for greater public accountability of science and technology to arise.*

6) How do you think that people's view of science and technology could be improved to make them more willing to and interested in participating in these areas?
S J: *I think that quality of information and transparency of information which is made available plays a part. It is driven by whether or not citizens or members of the public can see that*

technology has the potential to affect them directly. I wouldn't like to have an abstract discussion about technological innovation trying to involve people. You have to have where they can see that technological innovation can and is going to affect them as individuals or as a society.

7) Looking at the present record of political participation in your country; how much can we really expect citizens to willingly participate in deliberative democracy?
S J: *There is a school of thought in political and democratic theory which houses the "monitoring citizen". This is where citizens may not tale an active part in the daily life of politics and decision making because they are concerned about their own well being, families and leisure activities and so on. Nonetheless, given the appropriate institutions of the media and transparency of the information provided they exercise a role of monitoring what's going on in politics. Should anything ever go wrong, should controversies arise, they would spring into action and start to form allegiances and coalitions to try to query what's happening and, if necessary, to try to oppose it. This theory doesn't require citizens to be active all the time and in relation to all topics. It depends on the salience of an issue and if it reaches certain levels, the mobility of a certain number of people then we'll actually see people springing into action. So, even if the participation of the general public in political processes like general elections may seem disappointingly low, that doesn't necessarily mean they are disinterested. It may simply mean they are doing pretty well, they are satisfied with their lot and the economy's doing well. Should something go wrong, the capacity for people to mobilize and get interested is pretty amazing.*

8) Could/Should participation ever be compulsory?
S J: *I'm just going to give a purely personal opinion and that is**:** "Certainly not". Why should they have to participate and who decides what participation is or isn't? Is it joining an art club in your local village and getting engaged indirectly in matters to do with society? Who says it isn't? So my answer is no.*

9) Which actions do you think will be useful to spread the developments of deliberative democracy through all the EU countries? Projects like this one?
S J: *Projects like this one have a part to play. What's happening here is a kind of meta level, a kind of forum where people meet to have space to reflect on participation processes. If you really want to involve organizations and people from other regions and countries in Europe, the best thing is to invite them to come along to what you're doing and co-operate with them in joint projects. For example, you could develop and Italian/ French or Italian/British project, trying to address a salient issue*

Interview S. H., The Rathenau Institute, Netherlands.

CIPAST

1) Which methods for public participation discussed at the Cipast Workshops have you seen used or used yourself?
S H: *The Consensus Conference (do you mean of the 6 displayed?)*

- Yes

S H: Because I haven't read them all. Consensus Conference more than once, Meeting of minds, that was about organ transplantation, cloning,

- I saw scenario workshop.
  S H: *I used that once.*
- Future scenario?
  S H: *I have used it but it's usually part of a bigger thing.*
- What weaknesses /advantages have you found in them?
  S H: *The Consensus Conference is the most important for me so let's stick to that one. The weaknesses are that it's expensive, takes a long tome, politics gets (as I just told you)*
- Gets in the way?
  S H: *Yes. You don't know if all the energy that is put in is worth it. The advantages are that it's good for people to get really informed; to know a lot about it, to be like experts. People are not lay any more, they really aren't. It's good to hear their opinion about a subject. Most of the time, people are extreme at the beginning and then, by means of information, it all comes together.*
- Were the expected/predicted outcomes achieved?
  S H: *Yep. I think when you look at the principle of what you're supposed to do during a Consensus Conference, about the contents; it's hard because a group you selected meets, you don't know what people you'll have there. Sometimes people are not as critical as you'd like them to be.*
- Who were the sponsors of the initiatives?
  S H: *The Ministry for Education in the Netherlands because we get our funding from the Ministry.*

2) How much and how well are the ideas from the Cipast Workshops put into practice in your country?
S H: *For example, the ECC projects are being done by the IPP. It's gaining acceptance, yes.*

3) Which specific techno-scientific problem in your country could/will benefit from using the ideas outlined at the Cipast workshops?
S H: *I think in our country……We'd like to have a European debate on energy. It would be good to start with looking at what to do about the shortage in fuel.*

4) Do you think that the ideal methods to use for each techno-scientific-societal issue are best decided at European or national level?
S H: *(Pause)……..It depends on the subject. You have to keep it on a level where it needs to be discussed*

- Does it always depend on the issue being discussed?
  S H: *Yep, Yep. Sometimes people say**:** "I want to do something about …that subject…" and you think**:** "You mustn't do that!"*
  For example; a girl from Romania has presented a case study here and I was responsible for helping her and ……I don't know if Romania is ready for that. You have to take into account the whole context, everything. You must have objectives, it's impossible to start without them or no one will fund you.

5) Are projects like Cipast the best way to develop/learn more about/discuss ideas on how to promote public deliberation?

S H: *Well, ……I don't know. Learning by doing is also very nice. We try to do it as well here but you learn most by your own mistakes. Maybe when we get to do the case studies.*

- Have there been similar projects?

S H: *To exchange views? Yes, I think so but they have been done with the TA institute and we then share experiences. Then there are a lot of facilities for science museums.*

6) Which specific contribution has/does the Cipast project made/make to the developments of deliberative democracy in your country/the EU?

S H: *In my country? I don't know. We're a bit ahead. I'm here because I want to help and to share my experiences. There's another woman here from the space agency, but she's the only one. Maybe she will get something out of it and we'll do some projects together in future.*

NETWORKS

1) Does the Network structure of the Cipast project help its success?

S H: *I hope so. If it won't work, I don't know how else to do it. I would have liked to have more people here from the new EU countries. That's why I helped the case study from Romania. At the "Meeting of Minds" we had a Citizen's Panel from Hungary, as you know all Citizens Panels are different, and they were very good!*

2) Does hearing the experiences of other countries help you to see how a particular method could/couldn't work in your country?

S H: *Yes, of course. Yes. Yes. I learn a lot from everything that is told here. From the Danish who are very innovative. We're used to doing it but we're not always innovative so new ideas can help.*

DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY (General questions)

1) How well is your country responding to the developments of deliberative democracy?

S H: *Very well! It's very hot.*

- Which actors are usually involved?

S H: *A lot of the time it's public funding. We aren't the only players. Universities are getting involved too.*

- Are politicians involved?

S H: *Always because we work for them at the Rathenau institute.*

- Has there been any public debate in the media?

S H: *No not so much about debate itself but I know it has been debated!*

2) Could there be one unique/ultimate form of involving citizens in the decision process?

S H: *No. No. We are adjusting the Consensus Conference all the time. The Danish look for consensus, but we don't. In Holland that's impossible. It isn't our aim to say "This is our manifesto". Some people think different.*

3) Does this always depend on the specific issue being discussed?

S H: *Yes, you have to decide for every subject. It's something different every time. For example it could be 5 meetings, 2 meetings then internet, or just internet panels.*

4) What, in your country, is the techno-scientific demand from the citizens to be involved? Is this really is a bottom-up process?!

S H: *No, it isn't bottom up. We think that this is an important issue to be discussed. That's the way it works. I know that in Denmark and the Flemish, you can post a subject on the web and they put a lot of time in dealing with issues, choosing, making some people very happy and some sad. We discussed this during a meeting 5 years ago and it has some pros and cons.*

5) Why do you think that citizens' participation in the areas of science and technology has been so poor until now in some European countries? Do you agree with this?
S H: *I think so. Only a few people get involved. Everybody has his own thing. If you ask 5,000 people, you get 200 reactions that really want to take part and that's a lot*

6) How do you think that people's view of science and technology could be altered to make them more willing to and interested in participating in these areas?
- Education?
S H: *Maybe NIMBY. Dealing with something that's in the neighbourhood Also if you have an illness*
- So personal involvement, not education or information?
S H: *No, it has to be something personal…….most importantly because other things add up as well but that's the most important thing.*

7) Looking at the present record of political participation in your country; how much can we really expect citizens to willingly participate in deliberative democracy? You said out 0of 5,000 there will be 200.
S H: *I don't know. If they show up they're always very very enthusiastic. As long as it takes, the more the group develops, it's very nice to see. That's the reason I think it's important to do it on the European subject because the European feeling is non-existent.*

8) Could/Should participation ever be compulsory/obligatory?
S H: *No. No. No. You have to know why you're engaged, to know why you do it*
- So we couldn't say "You have to participate"?
S H: *No. I wouldn't prefer that. Why would you? There will always be enough people who want to participate. It may be biased because you have people who already have interest……then you select. We had a debate about Organ Transplant and there was only one woman who was directly linked. All the others with certain interests were put out of the selection. It's important because it's her view…..*

9) Which actions do you think will be useful to spread the developments of deliberative democracy through all the EU countries?
S H: *I really don't know.*

Interview R. S.,Cite des Sciences et de l'Industrie, France.

CIPAST

1) Which methods for public participation discussed at the Cipast Workshops have you seen used or used yourself?
R S: *Only the Consensus Conference, what we call in France Citizens Conference because we don't like the term Consensus.*

- Because it doesn't have a consensus at the end of it?
  R S: *No because in France Consensus means Compromise.*
- So there's a language difference'
  R S: *Yes, so we say Citizens Conference. We organized one and we were involved in two others, Citizen's Conferences. One on European level**:** The Meeting of Minds, one on national level and we organized one about climate change in 2003.*
- What weaknesses have you found in the Citizens Conference? Does it have any disadvantages?
  R S: *Yes. You know there is an enormous investment and few people involved. I think this is a difficult problem and we usually try to solve/compensate this problem with trying to have media, coverage, press. It's very difficult. This gap between heavy investment of time, energy and expertise and few people deeply involved. This is principle of the methodology. The difficulty of Citizens Conferences is to have an impact on the decision making process. This is not specific to the method but to have a good level of decision. In France, I personally participated in a debate about Nano Technology on regional level , organized by regional council, regional body but the recommendations, what was difficult was to explain to the citizens what are the responsibilities of the region; to give precise recommendations depending on the differences of differences of the political partners. Usually recommendations are very general and not focused on who can do what, who can take what, who is responsible for what.*
- Were the expected outcomes achieved?
  R S: *The main achievement is to demonstrate that it's possible for lay citizens to handle the conference. This is always achieved and is important for themselves and the people involved.*

2) How much and how well are the ideas from the Cipast Workshops put into practice in your country? Are you the only people to have used it or are others using them too?
R S: *France is late in participation. That is the reason why we thought it was interesting to have partnership with countries where the methods were already on use, to make a sort of dissemination, contamination. I think it's changing now. The idea of a deficit of participation in Europe is going ahead.*

3) Which specific techno-scientific problem in your country could/will benefit from using the ideas outlined at the Cipast workshops? For example**:** waste management, Gm Foods, Climate Change?
R S: *We have already experimented with Climate Change and Nuclear Waste. We had a national debate, very intense. I think that in this coming period Bio-Ethics is crucial. In 2009 the parliament will revise/review the laws. We have awareness that the current legislation is not relevant to the question. Like organ donation, fertility treatment, whether they are free, unanimous.*

4) Do you think that the ideal methods to use for each techno-scientific-societal issue are best decided at European or national level? E.g.**:** If we decided here that a certain method was best for a certain issue, could that be applied in all the EU countries without modification?
R S: *The main thing is that in some European countries, people who make political decisions ask for participation and in others they are afraid of participation. In France they are afraid; they can't see how participation could make it better. Methods should be different for that reason.*

5) Are projects like Cipast the best way to develop/learn more about/discuss ideas on how to promote public deliberation? It's obviously a good way because we're here doing it.
R S: *We are convinced! What Cipast has learnt (taught) us is that, as a matter of fact, there is a growing European Network depending on what are the best practices. Cipast will be finished in 8 months (in March 2008) and that's a pity because now a Network is just starting and it should be reinforced with new tools. For instance, you mentioned different cultures, there is not time enough to have deep analysis on that, to compare the approach of different participation partners. We need deeper enquiries to feed the Network.*

6) Which specific contribution has/does the Cipast project made/make to the developments of deliberative democracy in your country?
R S: *I can give an answer about the Citè des Sciences et de l'Industrie.*

- Yes, please do.

R S: *Our efforts in this institute, as a science museum with exhibitions, pictures and organizing Round table debate is to…….the position of the institute as a professional operator of public debate to be a legitimate operator of public debate inserted in the decision process. For me Cipast has been helpful because we can have examples coming from other countries. We've learnt how to engineer these things and to become legitimate from institutes, the Rathenau institute, which are national government agencies. This is a very important thing for security.*

NETWORKS

1) Does the Network structure of the Cipast project help its success?
R S: *Another aspect thanks to the Network of actors of public debate in France has come out. We organized a seminar about public debate with some Cipast members (there are 5 French partners). We organized seminars which were then enlarged to universities. Recently others came for instance**:** an agency for nuclear security and private companies and they say "We are interested in doing public debate, can you help us?"*

2) Does hearing the experiences of other countries help you to see how a particular method could/couldn't work in your country?
R S: *We have experience of different methods. For example, the Scenario Workshop has not been tried yet in France.*

DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY (General questions)

1) How well is your country responding to the developments of deliberative democracy?
R S: *Well, I must say that things are changing. During the last 3 years the Government has said that it will prepare laws about nuclear waste in July 2003 and 2005. It also decided to prepare a law about school. In these three cases they said, this was right and left government, it made no difference, they were preparing public debate**:** "We have to organize public debate". The risk of the critical situation having now in France. Politicians are aware of the lack of credibility of lack of votes and they are trying to find credibility. This is very important because if participation is only used to influence political credibility then that's a mistake. Participation needs to be used to enrich democracy.*

2) Could there be one unique/ultimate form of involving citizens in the decision process?
R S: *No definitely not, it depends on the level. We have good tools for local level, good tools for national level but we haven't yet found good tools for European level.*

3) What, in your country, is the techno-scientific demand from the citizens to be involved?
R S: *I don't know how the citizens…It depends. For instance, when we had a local implementation debate about nuclear waste, from the local population which was directly concerned, there was a real demand**:** "We want to be part of the decision" because they were directly concerned by environment. In France there was a big debate on the installation for nuclear waste disposal. The people who lived around asked for public debate. The demand is strong on local level for people who live around. For general topics, the demand is not so strong. This is evident for 'new' topics like Nano Technology. For this there is not a real demand, it's "We can boost this".*

4) Why do you think that citizens' participation in the areas of science and technology has been so poor until now in some European countries?
R S: *Because there is, in some European countries including France, the culture of expertise. They are convinced that the experts have good knowledge; they were convinced before the recent crisis of expertise. The thing that changed it was Asbestos. For 50 years the experts said it was "No problem" and then……that was the turning point. Before this, the culture of expertise was very common in politics, technology and science.*

5) How do you think that people's view of science and technology could be improved to make them more willing to and interested in participating in these areas?
R S: *It depends on the crisis!*

6) Looking at the present record of political participation in your country; how much can we really expect citizens to willingly participate in deliberative democracy?
R S: *It varies very much. It's difficult.*

7) Could/Should participation ever be compulsory/obligatory?
R S: *I think it's impossible. It could be compulsory ……it depends for who…….. I think it sometimes could be compulsory for SOME decision makers.*

Interview A. K., Science and Society Interface, Switzerland.

CIPAST

1) Which methods for public participation discussed at the Cipast Workshops have you seen used or used yourself?
A K: *Well, since I am a member of the Swiss Institute for TA, I have used Citizens Conference and Focus Groups.*

- Do you call them Citizens Conferences rather than Consensus Conferences?
  A K: *By us it's Public Forum for Consensus Conference and Public Focus for Focus Groups. I have also used another which is Stakeholder Dialogue at my university.*
- What weaknesses /advantages have you found in them?
  A K: *Well, Consensus Conference costs quite a lot, it's difficult to organize but it gives you intense information about the subject. Focus Group gives you a light result which is interesting to initiate a process. In Stake Holder Dialogue it's difficult to manage, help people involved. If there are experts and participants, it's difficult to make them integrate.*

- Were the expected/predicted outcomes achieved?
  A K: *Yes, I would say they were. You have to be reasonable on expectations and always be aware that you are a piece of the landscape.*
- Who were the sponsors of the initiatives?
  A K: *In Switzerland it's the parliament.*

2) How much and how well are the ideas from the Cipast Workshops put into practice in your country?
A K: *In Switzerland we have TA Swiss. TA is already institutionalized.*
Cipast is more a plus for my university to involve close colleagues.

3) Which specific techno-scientific problem in your country could/will benefit from using the ideas outlined at the Cipast workshops?
A K: *In our country we have TA Swiss so that treats 3 different domains. We have information technology, mobility and bio medicine. So it's quite broad. Themes are treated by all parliamentary institutions.*
- Which problem would you like to see treated which is different from these?
  A K: *I would like to see, disseminate the methodologies. Everybody is doing something on national level and the impact/output is on national level so there is a necessity for impact, efforts and methods on local level*

4) Do you think that the ideal methods to use for each techno-scientific-societal issue are best decided at European or national level?
A K: *Well I think that some methods are very generic and can be used everywhere, they have a rigid frame but they also must be adapted to each specific context*
- If we decided that a certain method is best fro a certain issue, could that be applied in all the different countries or would these suggestions have to be modified to account for specific local needs?
  A K: *They have to be adapted but provided that they remain professional and they use skills and the right technology.*

5) Are projects like Cipast the best way to develop/learn more about/discuss ideas on how to promote public deliberation?
A K: *Cipast is a good way to train people especially from the new countries but the Network is a good way to test training methods.*
- Can you compare it to any similar projects?
  A K: *There are some brother projects financed by the EC like the PATH project. Sometimes we are exchanging some information but there is nothing the same as the Cipast project.*

6) Which specific contribution has the Cipast project made/make to the developments of deliberative democracy in your country?
A K: *In my country? I would say more in Europe. In my country, Swiss democracy isn't exactly waiting for Cipast project!! It's a good way of creating a common European culture of deliberating what is democracy. Democracy is an experimental system, not something fixed.*

NETWORK

1) Does the Network structure of the Cipast project help its success?
A K: *Yes, of course. It helps the Cipast partners.*

- I mean the structure of a lot of people from different places all meeting like this.
  A K: *There is diversity in the Cipast members which is interesting. The fact that there is the database allows us to touch a lot of different institutions and different kinds of actors.*

2) Does hearing the experiences of other countries help you to see how a particular method could/couldn't work in your country?
A K: *Yes. I would say that in my country we use two participation methods at national level and also a third called Classic Technology Assessment. I'd like to use more methods. You do what you know, you don't take risks and that is the danger.*

DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY (General questions)

1) How well is your country responding to the developments of deliberative democracy?
A K: *Well, participation is already very much entrenched in Switzerland. It's very typical. We have direct democracy, referenda and systematic confrontation when putting up a new law. It's a Federal system structure.*

- Which actors are usually involved?
  A K: *Every sector of civil society. Every sector of civil society can answer to consultation or initiate referendum.*

2) Could there be one unique/ultimate form of involving citizens in the decision process? Could we say the Consensus Conference is THE method to use and use it for everything?
A K: *No, I don't think so. I think there is……needs to be adapted to the context. We have to continue to invent new ones.*

3) What, in your country, is the techno-scientific demand from the citizens to be involved?
A K: *Well, it's difficult to say. It isn't a very well structured demand so……we have insight about this……by looking at the surveys. The issue for the environment is becoming very important and the issue of safety which has not only to do with technology.*

- So, this really is a bottom-up process?!
  A K: *It's usually top-down. It's public policy or policy makers initiating the process or universities like us. It's a long work to shift from top-down to bottom-up.*

4) Why do you think that citizens' participation in the areas of science and technology has been so poor until now in some European countries?
A K: *When you don't have a real democracy, and the research system is poor you don't have the luxury to sensitize with research. It's a question of global economy and political context. It's not a priority, of course, for a country with……..*

6) Looking at the present record of political participation in your country; is it low or is it quite high?
A K: *It's quite low.*

- How much can we really expect citizens to willingly participate in deliberative democracy?
  A K: *This is a real challenge because participatory democracy is part of what we call "Revival of Citizenship". It's a very complex theoretical problem. The idea of participation is to have participation everywhere. Also, participation has a cost. Researchers and promoters are often downplaying the cost of citizens to be involved. It's more and more difficult to have interviews and surveys.*

- Do you mean costs as in time?
  A K: *Yes, time and input.*

7) Could/Should participation ever be compulsory?
A K: *No, I don't think so. It would be in a low context. I don't think that would be a good thing.*

8) Which actions do you think will be useful to spread the developments of deliberative democracy through all the EU countries?
A K: *I think this is Cipast. They should give more money to Cipast and make institutions, people, researchers, more sensitive to these issues, to work with NGOs. Cipast is useful and interesting but it's difficult to involve decision makers in the Workshop. They don't have time for a project that is out of the country and to legitimize, to ask policy makers to come.*
- Do you think that this needs to be institutional or citizen initiative?
  A K: *I don't see atomized citizens being able to do….Each change in the relationship between science and society was activated by collectives, for example NGOs.*

Interview J. N., The German Hygiene Museum, Germany.

CIPAST

1) Which methods for public participation discussed at the Cipast Workshops have you seen used or used yourself?
J N: *Consensus Conferences, Scenario workshops partly and Open space partly.*
- What weaknesses /advantages have you found in the methods you've used
  J N: *For me it's not hard to tell you the differences between these different methods. An advantage of the Consensus Conference is that you have an intensive dialogue between lay persons and experts but it's really well prepared if you've organized well for lay persons. It brings really new insights of a problem or project. An advantage of the Scenario workshop is the way you can identify relevant points of activity for a community or society. It's more action orientated.*
- Who were the sponsors of the initiatives?
  J N: *For the methods we have used, mainly the state, no, the Federal Government, ministries of research and education and for the MOM project, the European Commission.*

2) How much and how well are the ideas from the Cipast Workshops put into practice in your country? Is there going to be a large diffusion of the ideas discussed here?
J N: *No there isn't. The idea of the Cipast workshop is not going to have a large resonance on national level. It will, more in the way that we collect material like case studies and prepare it for a training kit or brain food for further use mainly for people who are interested in organizing participation projects.*

3) Which specific techno-scientific problem in your country could/will benefit from using the ideas outlined at the Cipast workshops? For example; GMO or Nano Technology?
J N: *I think if you look at areas already covered by participation methods, GMO, Brain research have been covered and the area of Nano Technology has been partly touched. I think we need to go further more up-stream to something on the horizon of the scientific community*

and to think if we have some methods which could be prepared for setting the agenda for the research area.

4) Do you think that the ideal methods to use for each techno-scientific-societal issue are best decided at European or national level?

J N: *More and more the European dimension is relevant for the development of scientific research, therefore we need methods which could be used on European level more that on national level. Although, the methods will be very expensive and the major tasks of Cipast 2 or 3 will be to scale down these methods a bit, to a model that can be used with less money.*

5) Are projects like Cipast the best way to discuss and develop ways on how to promote public deliberation?

J N: *I hesitate to say yes because Cipast was not decided a as way to promote these ideas. It was more an idea to collect experiences that were gained on national level and to provide a European level with this collection of experiences.*

6) Which specific contribution has/does the Cipast project made/make to the developments of deliberative democracy in your country/the EU?

J N: *The contribution of the Cipast project in my country is very limited because it is very limited to the readiness of Stakeholders to take part in this participation process. The acceptance of these methods is very low, especially in Germany. It is not part of our political culture. It will take more time to convince policy makers and stakeholders to accept and recognize these methods as a very important tool to enlarge democracy.*

NETWORKS

1) Does the Network structure of the Cipast project help its success?

J N: *The Network of the participants is the core element to developing the training methods or conducting the Workshops we've had. Although, the composition of the Network doesn't reflect the European dimension at all**:** there are the main key players but there are no newcomer countries. That would have been very useful to know better what the real need is for some societies where you don't have any experience of these participation elements.*

2) Does hearing the experiences of other countries help you to see how a particular method could/couldn't work in your country?

J N: *Yes, of course. It's very relevant to organize these ways of exchanging experience in a manner that you can use them for your own country or for other participants of workshops.*

DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY (General questions)

1) How well is your country responding to the developments of deliberative democracy?

J N: *As I said, not so much. The main problem within the parliament and the Federal government is that there is now a low interest to look over their own limited field of activities and bring in lay person's opinion to some relevant areas of society.*

2) Could there be one unique form of involving citizens in the decision process?

J N: *Do you mean at national or European level?*

- Both really. European.

J N: *I would say no both at European level and at national level because you need specific, well adapted methods for specific questions.*

- So it needs to be adapted to the issue being discussed?
  J N: *Yes, I think so.*

3) What, in your country, is the techno-scientific demand from the citizens to be involved?
J N: *The demand is there if you talk about local problems or development. It's not so relevant for the public to be involved in development or irrelevant questions in the science or technology field. I think this is also a problem or task for raising public awareness in that field and also to make clear how relevant the development is for the daily life of the public.*

4) Why do you think that citizens' participation in the areas of science and technology has been so poor until now in some European countries?
J N: *It depends on the different cultures in the different countries. You have the Scandinavian countries with well developed parts of participation elements in their democracy and other countries where it hasn't been represented until now. It's probably a task on European level to have a flow of experience exchange towards countries where there is a low level of these elements.*

5) How do you think that people's view of science and technology could be improved to make them more willing to and interested in participating in these areas? Is it to do with education or information?
J N: *At first I think it's a matter of proper information from different sources and information in a way that the larger public can really consume that specific information. It means we have to train the scientific community to communicate their ideas better to the public information field. Of course you need better education; a lifelong learning process for the wider public to bring in their vision and experience to the scientific community.*

6) Looking at the present record of political participation in your country; how much can we really expect citizens to willingly participate in deliberative democracy?
J N: *That's a good question. Not so much, I'd say, because we've had activities in that area on national and local level and also at European level. We haven't had so much response from policy makers and decision makers to get results from the processes. Probably citizens feel a bit abused because they have done a lot of work to bring in their opinion without any response from the other side.*

7) Could/Should participation ever be compulsory?
J N: *No, I don't think so. We really need the willingness of the public to be in there. If you have any duty in that way you'll miss you own activity to convince the public to be in.*

8) Which actions do you think will be useful to spread the developments of deliberative democracy through all the EU countries?
J N: *It could be a European activity; it could be linked to a process we have within the European Union to reflect what the view in the European Union is like. It's also linked to finding some kind of constitution for the people. So I think that if the actors now realize that the participation of the public in each country of the European Union is very relevant for a European spirit, for building up a European idea then I think that we should gain a lot.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY, REFERENCES & WEBSITES.

Arndt H. (1970) On Violence. Allen Lane, Penguin Press. London.

Arendt H. (1958) The Human Condition. The University of Chicago Press, USA.

Barber B.R. (1984) Strong Democracy**:** Participatiory politics for a New Age. University of California Press, Berkley.

Benhabib S. (1996) "Toward a Deliberative Model of Democratic Legitimacy", in S. Benhabib (ed.), Democracy and Difference. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ..

Bessette J. (1994) The Mild Voice of Reason**:** Deliberative democracy and American National Government. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Bohman J. (1996) Public Deliberation**:** Pluralism, complexity, and democracy. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Bohman J. & Rehg W. (1997) Deliberative Democracy**:** Essays on Reason and Politics. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Burkhalter S., Gastil J. & Kershaw T. (2002) A Conceptual Definition and Theoricical Model of Public Deliberation in Small Face-to-Face Groups. Communication Thoery, 12 (in press).

Bucchi M. & Neresini F. (2006) Cellule e Cittadini. Biotecnologie nello spazio pubblico. Sironi Editore, Milan.

Cohen J. (1997) "Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy" in J. Bohman and W. Rehg (eds), Delibertive Democracy. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.

Cooke M. (2000) Five Arguments for Deliberative Democracy. Political Studies Association. Vol. 48. Blackwell Publishers, Oxfrod, UK.

Einseidel E. & Eastlick D. (2000) Consensus Conferences as Deliberative Democracy. Science Communication, Vol. 21 No. 4, Sage Publications, Inc.

Gambetta D. (1998) "Claro!"**:** An Essay on Discursive Machismo. In Deliberative Democracy, edited by J. Elster, 19-43. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Gregory J. (2003) Understanding 'science and the public'. Journal of Commercial Biotechnology. Vol. 10, No.2. Henry Stewart Publications.

Habermas J. (1987) The Theory of Comunicative Action, vol. 2, trans. T. McCarthy. Beacon Press, Boston, MA.

Habermas J. (1996) Between Facts and Norms, trans. W. Rehg. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA

Habermas J. (1998) L'inclusione dell'altro. Feltrinelli, Milan.

Hirokawa R. (1983) Group Communication and Problem-Solving Effectiveness II**:** An Investigation of Procedural Functions. Western Journal of Speech Communcation.Vol. 47, Page 59-74.

Hirokawa R. Y. (1985) Discussion Procedures and Decision-making Performance**:** A Test of a Functional Perspective. Human Communiction Research. Vol.12, Page 203-224.

IFOK Interim Report (2003) Governance of the European Research Area**:** "The Role of Civil Society". http**:** //europa.eu.int/comm/research/science-soctiety/

Jarboe S. (1988) A Comparison of Input-Output, Process-Output, and Input-Process-Output Modals of Small Group Problem-Solving Effectiveness. Communication Monographs. Vol. 55, Page 121-142.

Macoubrie J. (2003) Deliberative Democracy. Presented at the International Communication Association annual conference, San Diego, 2003.

Marshall T.H. (1950) Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays. Cambridge University Press, London.

Mill J.S. (1972) Utilitarianism, on Liberty, and Considerations on Representative Government. Dent,. London.

Miller D. (1988) "The Ethical Significance of Nationality". Ethics Vol. 98, Page 647-642.

Pellegrini G. (2005) Biotechnologia e Cittadininza.Fondazione Lanza, Padova.

Putnam R. (1993) Making Democracy Work, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Rawls J. (1971) A Theory of Justice. Belknap Press, Cambridge, MA.

Rawls J. (1980) "Kantian Constructivism in Moral Theory", Journal of Philosophy, Vol. 77, Page517-72.

Rawls J. (1993) Political Liberalism. Columbia University Press, New York.

Rawls J. (1994) Il Liberismo politico. Edizioni di Comunità, Milan.

Sandel M. (1998) Liberalism and the Limits of Social Jusice. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Taylor C. (1985) Philosophical Papers, Vol. 2. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Taylor C. (1989) "Cross Purposes**:** The Liberal- Communitarian Debate", in N. Rosenblum (ed.), Liberalism and the Moral Life. Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA.

Websites.

http**:** //www.tekno.dk

http**:** //www.cordis.europa.eu

http**:** //www.rathenau.nl

http**:** //www.inra.fr

http**:** //www.cipast.org

http**:** //europa.eu.int/comm/research/science-society/

http**:** //www.citizensjury.org

http**:** //www.futuresearch.net