Are Deliberative Democracies better than Representative Democracies?

Introduction

A deliberative democracy is a process that aims to have a large number of people involved in various discussions about any given issue in a country in a bid to come up with the opinion that is favored by the majority, and then recording it formally (Boniolo & Schiavone, 2015). A deliberative democracy, therefore, employs the elements of a majority rule and decision-making by consensus. In a deliberative democracy, it is vital for there to be authentic deliberation among citizens, and not just the aggregation of preferences which are brought together through the voting process (Lin, 2017). On the other hand, a representative democracy, which is the most prevalent form of democracy today, is based on the existence of officials who are elected by the people to represent them (Landemore, 2017). Countries that have representative democracies include the United States, France, India, and the United Kingdom, among others (Mancic, 2012).
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The study aims to answer the question; are deliberative democracies better than representative democracies? This is to help governments to implement the democracy that will be the fairest and equitable for different countries.

Significance and Background of the Study

The study is crucial since Petkova (2017) argue that the lack of inclusion of all citizens in the decision making process of many countries has been a major issue that has caused some citizens to become sidelined and marginalized. Therefore, for governments to include all citizens in the decision making process, they must adopt some form of deliberative democracy. It is crucial since it allows the exchange of arguments among equal and free citizens which ensures that no single group’s ideas are ignored and that the majority rules.

However, two difficulties are faced in the implementation of deliberative democracies. Firstly, a deliberative democracy requires the involvement of the majority of people in a given nation for legitimate decisions to be made. However, there is a very low chance that the people will live up to deliberative standards in a genuine way (Boniolo & Schiavone, 2015). The low probability is because people are unlikely to have the time to provide reasons for the decisions that they make. Boniolo & Schiavone (2015), made a rough calculation to determine how feasible a deliberative democracy is. They assumed that six thousand citizens participate in a study, and each provided their opinions for ten minutes. Consequently, for everyone to speak, they would take a total of sixty thousand minutes. These are equivalent to forty-two days. If the people had a break of twelve hours each day to sleep, then they would take eighty-four days. Therefore, they concluded that deliberative democracies were not well-suited for democratic societies due to the time constraint.

Secondly, people would likely be unwilling to participate in the deliberation process, even under the assumption that they have the required skills and time. According to Boniolo & Schiavone (2015), people are unlikely to have widespread participation. These two issues are referred to as the motivation and scale problems of deliberative democracies.

Hypotheses

The study will seek to test three hypotheses.

H1: deliberative democracies allow for more inclusion than representative democracies in the decision-making process.

H2: deliberative democracies are likely to bring higher levels of political stability when compared to representative democracies.

H3: technology can help in the enhancement of deliberative democracies.

The main argument of the paper is that deliberative democracies can work better for countries, as long as they are well implemented to overcome the two shortcomings listed in the previous section.

Various studies and theories will be analyzed in this study to gain a better perspective on the advantages and disadvantages of both deliberative and inclusive democracies. The two theories that will be analyzed are the Fishkin’s model of deliberation and the Gutmann and Thompson’s model. Additionally, there will be an analysis of Joshua Cohen’s requirements for the creation of deliberative democracies. The theoretical analysis will, therefore, aid in the process of determining the best strategies that will allow deliberative democracies to work in different countries.

The study will also consider different case studies to determine how various forms of democracies influenced the decision making processes of different countries over the years. It will hence look at how decision-making bodies such as the judiciary and legislature have affected decisions. It will also analyze the changes of various democracies such as America, France, Britain, and the Roman republic. The analysis will, therefore, help create a broad picture of how changes in the types of democracies have impacted the decision making process in these countries.