

## **DEMOCRATIC REPRESENTATION OF THE PUBLICS: “A LINK BETWEEN ASSOCIATIONAL DEMOCRACY AND DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY”**

Yomna SOLIMAN

### Abstract

Democracy theory witnessed many and varied contributions along the history with different perspectives, each introduced that the ideal of democracy should be approached through. However, representation is considered principal target of democracy and it was emphasized through different paths and methods of public representation. Associational democracy and deliberative democracy theories are of those methods that focus on the representation objectives, however each proposes distinctive model of representation. While, the former focus on the role of associations or secondary associations such as civil society and interest groups, the latter's main focus is deliberation of the public on their preferences. Both perspectives provide powerful argument to their maintenance of democracy and representation ideal. Despite that, they received much critique in regard to their application of a comprehensive concept of democratic representation. Consequently, this clarifies a need to the development of a model that could combine the merits of both and solve their problems to reach more democratic model of representation.

**Keywords:** Representation, Associational democracy, deliberative democracy, public interest, and public sphere

## Argument and Questions

Accordingly, the paper argues that the core of democracy cannot be achieved depending only upon the procedural formal political representation of election systems and elected institutions of the political system. However, more substantive informal representation by Civil society activity is required to develop more quality of democracy which is introduced by “Associational Democracy theory” regarding its purpose of public interest advocacy. Besides, there is a need to guarantee a free reasonable deliberation of individuals’ preferences to better improvement of the democratic representation. Neither associational nor deliberative representation could independently ensure comprehensive public representation since each has its shortcomings. Rather a combination of both in a democratic model of representation should best provide inclusive and real representation of citizenry. In other words, this paper is not an advocate of associational democracy or deliberative democracy however, it tries to show the principles of each of them along with their shortcomings to be able to reach a model that enjoys their merits and overcomes or at least minimizes their demerits. It argues that associational democracy and deliberative democracy could work as complementary to each other for the purpose of better representation. It puts forward these questions to be answered as following:

What is the essence of associational Democracy and deliberative democracy?

What are the shortcomings of associational democracy and deliberative democracy?

How can informal political representation by secondary associations or civil society as developed by “associational democracy” come together with “deliberation” of individual to improve the quality of public representation to democracy? In other words, how both complement each other and push forward to better representation and public interest advocacy?

## Theory and Methodology

This study will rely on *Associational Democracy theory* to understand the role of civic engagement and civil society activism in protecting democracy from degeneration and for more

representation of the public interests by mobilizing people through associations to have a greater share of participation in the political process. (Kaufman, 1999; Elstub, 2008)

Besides, it will recall *Deliberative Democracy theory* to underline the need for deliberation of citizenry and the conditions of equality, freedom and reasonableness of those involved in the discourse to determine their preferences in terms of the common good not individualistic preferences. (Held, 2006; Elstub, 2008)

The paper will use the qualitative method of Content Analysis for the purpose of a theory discussion.

Research plan

Defining Associational Democracy and its Critique.

Defining Deliberative Democracy and its Critique.

A Link between Associational and Deliberative Democracy.

Introduction

Representation is perceived as one of the most essential principles of democracy especially in handling the dilemma of scale and the inclusion of citizenry in the political process. Besides, the issue of inequalities in participation of the public. Representation required a new path to go through so as to be able to represent the preferences of the people and have their views included without being directly participating. It needs to be out of the representatives' function in assemblies. Participation of citizens in the political process is viewed differently. (Elstub, 2008, pp.121-122) Some may view participation as an end to be

targeted in itself with more quantitative criteria while others may define it as a mean to more democratic system and anti-despotism with more qualitative standards to represent people's preferences. However, political engagement is generally rewarded by most democracy advocates for many reasons. It creates a sense of political efficacy and guarantee a sort of collectiveness in the society in terms of determination of preferences and choices and facing problems as well. Most importantly, it enhances the knowledge of the citizens and enables them to reach the common good. (Held, 2006, p.331)

Consequently, the introduction of the secondary associations to tackle this issue of representation by creating informal public sphere for people to participate or to carry deliberation within these associations provided the needed new path of representation. The idea of associations gives the opportunity to people to come together and formulate their interests to push them forward in the political process. These preferences are out of the focus of the political parties for some reasons. This kind of representation boosts the sense of autonomy of individuals. (Elstub, 2008, pp.121-122) Accordingly, associational democracy and deliberative democracy models are introduced to handle this issue of representation and to develop a public space for participation and deliberation of the people.

#### Part one: Associational Democracy and its Critique

It is argued that state cannot hold all the tasks of democracy and meet the participation and representation standards of democracy in current complex political systems. Due to power dynamics and relationships in the modern societies, formal democratic institutions will not be enough as representative of the public. Moreover, the state manipulation of representative entities caused a legitimation crisis for these structures of democracy. Associational democracy offers another option for participation and representation of the people. It facilitates decision-making opportunity to citizens and enhances self-governance which relieves the state's burden. It also maintains and widens democracy within the political system to an extent that cannot be reached by the sole efforts of the government. Associational democracy can also handle the problem of social complexity and provide more spaces of participation which will facilitate the

application of deliberation that faced many critiques of unattainable and unrealistic. As a result, it increases the sense of autonomy within the society. (Elstub, 2008, pp.107-108) It prevents or decreases the tendency of apathy or much dependence on the state within democracy and motivates political participation and civic engagement in the light of the role of interest groups. Associations may provide an alternative in the case of the absence of political parties in terms of pushing for certain policies or to influence elected officials to fulfill their interests and objectives. (Kaufman, 1999, pp. 1297-1298)

Kaufman examines theoretical classification of associational democracy and proposes three views of associational democracy. The first is “Neo-Tocquevillian perspective” of associational theory which emphasizes the role of associations as substitute to the government role or interventions. The second is “Social movement perspective” which perceives associations as interest groups that manipulate government policies in accordance with its interests. The third is “Social Capital perspective” which is not focusing on the relations or the scope of the government rather it considers associational activity as stimulator of citizens political participation. (Kaufman, 1999, p. 1296)

Neo-Tocquevillian theory of associational democracy argues that citizens through associations come together and work for the sake of certain interests and this creates a sense of responsibility towards their group and their community and provides services that otherwise would be the task of the government. Accordingly, associations from such perspective decreases the size of the government and refrains the expansion of government activities within the society since it provides a substitute for it. In addition, it encourages more participation and representation of the individuals in the decision-making process. By that it is claimed that it protects democracy from deterioration. Moreover, associationalism develops a sense of voluntarism and self-sufficiency. As examples of these associations are service organizations and non-profit groups that provide services like medical care or poor relief. In this sense, it should be observed that there is a negative relationship between the number of associations and government size and expenditures within a community. (Kaufman, 1999, pp. 1299-1300) As stated by Tocqueville, *“The more government takes the place of associations, the more will*

*individuals lose the idea of forming associations and need the government to come to their help. That is a vicious cycle of cause and effect.” (Tocqueville, 1988, p. 515)*

In addition, there were some other functions of associations \_proposed by Elstub\_ to act as ‘places of Governance’. It is claimed that if more powers and functions are transferred to the associations, they may share the burden with the government with its functions such as the execution of legislation and achievement of ‘quasi-public functions’. They could conduct many social activities without the need of a central power like the state. They also would decrease the pressure on the state in regard with the issue of legitimacy which enables the government to invest its time and resources in other functions and areas. It provides this sense of legitimacy since it gives people the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process and enjoy more control on the issues related to their interests. (Elstub, 2008, p.108)

On the contrary, social movement theory of associational democracy characterize associations as interest groups that assemble for the sake of specific individualistic interests of their member. Since that they will not be an alternative to state functions \_unlike to neo-Tocquevillian theory\_ rather they would pressure the government to response to the interests of its members. In associational democracy, associations will lobby the government to its interests not to the common good of the society while in the neo-Tocquevillian perspective they substitute the functions of the government for the community service. In the former, it may lead to the increase in the government or municipal expenditure by the pressure of the interest groups. However, in the latter it is reduced. Although, both may be similar in terms of outcomes such as the increase of the ‘rate of voter turnout, more public awareness and responsive government’, the neo-Tocquevillian perspective encourages “fellowship through cooperative engagement” while the social movement perspective push for “social tensions through segmented self-interest”. This social movement perspective is extensively used in the contemporary literature on social movement and protest. It is worthy to underline that both conceptions are not mutually exclusive. The same associations may be categorized under the two perspectives at the same time which means that it may, in general terms, decreases the

dependence on the state and promoting common interest while, in specific areas, they foster individualistic interests. (Kaufman, 1999, pp. 1301-1303)

The last variation suggested by Kaufman in this classification is the Social Capital perspective. It is distinct from the above-mentioned conceptions since it is not analyzing the mechanism of association or its activities. However, it focuses on the context or pre-context of associational democracy. It may coincide with the neo-Tocquevillian perspective in the proposition that associations provide social cohesion; and with social movement perspective, it follows-up with the inquiry of how individuals come together for the purpose of common objectives. They mainly give attention to the effect of associationalism on the collective action and the desire to cooperate. From this perspective, cooperation is enhanced by social capital such as trust, norms and network that boost collective action and cooperation. It is portrayed as a solution or a context that facilitates the coordinated action through its norms. It is considered as a solution to the “dilemma of collective action” in which people may refrain from any cooperation because of lack of trust and security or the passion to ‘free-ride’. In other words, they depict associational democracy as a context that minimizes the negative tendency against cooperation and collective action. Correspondingly, this means that social capital theory is somehow distinct from social movement theory since its principles are not matching with the idea that associations may lead to divisive or conflictual groups of interest and it may result in factionalism instead of social cohesion. In contrast to factionalism, they believe that it should enhance individual networks and relations to boost collective action for the purpose of common goals and objectives. Such a model, will boost civic engagement and societal communication as a result of the enhancement of trust. Consequently, it is supposed that there is a positive relationship between associational activity and voter participation. (Kaufman, 1999, pp. 1304-1305)

#### *The Critique of Associational Democracy*

Associational democracy received some critiques in regard to its application. Some theorists accused it as not putting into consideration the complexity of current modern societies

in the development of the theory and its arguments. Moreover, the ideal of “more democracy” is not always applicable however it may also be unrealistic or dangerous in other situations. It is debated that individuals are not too much attracted and do not enjoy participation in politics. The claim that they will directly take part in if they were given the opportunity to do so is not totally applicable. (Hauptmann, 2001, pp.400-401)

Stears provided some points of criticism against associationalism. First, it is claimed that it would increase inequality since the lack of a “uniform welfare provision” of services would probably differ from one association to another depending on the differences between them in terms of resources of money and staff and as a result, it led to their unequal provision of services. Second, Stears refuses the idea that ‘needs’ will be varied and different within the same society. In his view, needs may differ between different societies not the same society. He refuses the interpretation of needs and believes that it should be objectively approached. Since that, the best entity to define, decide on and provide them is the state not secondary association. Following on this, he does not accept the claim that people are capable of reaching the best methods to achieve their needs. People -in Stears’ understanding- are not qualified to tackle these issues as it is complex enough and it needs the intervention of experts. Moreover, people are more occupied by the short-term immediate needs not putting in their consideration the future needs or long-term ones. The final criticism of Stears is about differentiation between ‘needs’ and ‘preferences’ and he asserted that a mistake with the former is more serious and since people are left to determine on their needs subjectively, they might confuse between needs and preferences and take one for the other or they may ask for more than they really need. (Stears, 1999, pp.583-584)

Although, most of these criticism points are acceptable or have a sense of logic. I am more persuaded by the defends that refute them. First, inequality can be kept away by the application of the free market mechanisms. People would be more occupied and influenced by the better associations and by that they will boost the existence of best ones and worse ones will be forced to modify themselves or to be lost. Second, the belief that needs are similar within the society overlooks the diversity and complexity of contemporary societies. However, it is

argued that neither the state institutions nor associations can decide on people needs. Rather it need to be determined through deliberation and discourse between the citizens and this also could provide a more qualified approach to reach a better understanding and response to these needs as well as the focus of people on immediate needs can be modified under the conditions of the reasonable discourse. This will be tackled afterwards as a response to the main claim that deliberative and associational democracy could complement each other. Fourth, if as claimed by Stears, that people are not able to decide on their needs, would bureaucrats be capable of such a function more than people themselves. (Elstub, 2008, pp.116-120)

#### Part two: Deliberative Democracy and its critique

Deliberative Democracy as a term was first developed by Joseph Bessette that celebrated an 'informed debate' and 'public use of reason' and 'impartial pursuit of truth' as basics for deliberative democracy. Participation and reason are the main elements of deliberative democracy. It not only participation but also rational participation and the use of reason to deliberate on political choices. It is "Reasonable political judgement" rather than being "Empirical Will" of the people. This reasonable political judgement requires \_as mentioned by Claus Offe and Ulrich Preuss\_ three conditions to be satisfied which are 'fact-regarding' (to be based on truthful facts), 'future-regarding' (to focus not only on present issues, capabilities and choices but future ones) and 'other-regarding'(to be concerned by others for the sake of whole society not individual preferences). (Held, 2006, p.332)

To be clear, deliberative democracy is not similar to direct democracy. Deliberative democracy is concerned by the quality of participation not direct participation of citizens in democracy. In other words, deliberative democracy has qualitative criteria while direct democracy has quantitative criteria. In the view of deliberative theorists, even if the society increased its participation by widen the electorate or vote franchising without real improve in its participation quality through deliberation and argument, it may be risky and may endanger

the democratic system. It is claimed that there is no advantage in direct democracy institutions to the ideal of deliberative democracy. (Held, 2006, p.237)

Held suggested that the basic theoretical debate on deliberative democracy is that whether democratic understanding of the “common good” could be accomplished by just the ‘aggregation of individual preferences’ or it is better achieved by ‘public debate and deliberation. Accordingly, it is somehow agreed that it is more about the formulation of preferences by public deliberation and reflection on societal, economic, and political issues. Deliberative democracy theorists are going more further to consider that it is the source of legitimacy not the mere will of individuals represented in any model of representation, but it is more of deliberation and debate. It is viewed as an open-ended and continuous “learning process” for the people. In other words, they refuse to have a democratic system based on “fixed or given preferences”, however they insist on the use of reason and debate for preference learning. (Held, 2006, p.333) Moreover, Current competitive democracy results in “a manufactured public will” produced by advertising methods resembling those followed in the commercial sphere. Unfortunately, this negatively deteriorates the legitimacy of democracy. However, deliberative democracy provides through learning process a genuine ‘public will’. It bridges the gap between elites and the public which improves the quality of democracy. It develops an alternative path for the representation of the public will. (Fishkin & Mansbridge et al., 2017, pp.7)

“Principle of reciprocity” as indicated by Offe and Preuss is a “a multi-perspectival mode of forming, defending and thereby refining our preferences”. It is based on the idea that each is sharing in a debate with other to understand better and be able to choose the most adoptable by all not only by an individual or group of individuals. Everyone is motivated to elaborate on his own reasons and try to make it to be persuasive for others so he can get their acceptance. These refined preferences come through a process of some steps. First, confront between the one’s point of view with other views so as to put them in regard during the reflection process. Second,

to reflect upon preferences by the citizen according to the understanding in such a confrontation. Third, is to complement the democratic procedural theme of voting with dialogical forms to make its content more reasonable and worthy. That's why, this process need to be materialized by a constitutional design to include a deliberative stance in the democratic theme. However, these preferences emerge in contexts which take part in its formation and testing them as well to reinforce existing ones or create new. It leads to a shift from the concentration on the macro political institution to civil society for the sake of deliberative democracy as a better democracy. (Held, 2006, pp.333-334)

Deliberative democracy thinkers believe in the defects and inefficiencies of current mode of democracy. James Fishkin indicates that there are limits to democratic theory which need to be tackled. Firstly, the apathy and lack of interest in public life today is a significant limit to democracy including (elitism of political parties and governing groups, low voter turnout, “superficial, ill-informed and thoughtless” public debate, sense of alienation and disengagement of the public as a result of disconnected elite with them and the focus on politician personalities not on their proposed policies). Secondly, the ‘undermined Public Sphere’ as a space for deliberation and reasoning is weakened in democratic systems by the intensive use of opinion polls to aggregate the preferences of people instead of having reflection or debate on it. Thus, it \_as elaborated by John Elster\_ negatively affected the application of rational participation by people. Moreover, even if there are developed rational preferences, it would be rational according to ‘market-based’ rationality not suitable to political or societal context which is in real need to a rational political choice which is (other-regarding) rather than consumer choice which is only (self-regarding). This case if prevailed, will prevent a sense of socially-based approach to government and politics. According to Dryzek, decision making quality was deteriorated in democratic terms. Since this paved the way for private preferences which are not easily transformed. (Held, 2006, pp.334-335)

Deliberative democracy is not equal to direct democracy according to its scholars and thinkers. Even ideal direct Democracy is limited. It cannot be approached because of the complex societies and political systems. Besides, idealization target will be lost by personalization of politics and intolerance resulting from each person seeking to maintain his/her preference not the whole society or collective ones. Direct democracy broadens participation unfortunately not quality of it. So direct democracy does not introduce the best deliberative democracy and an independent theory for it is required. (Held, 2006, p.)

Held moves forward to show the aims of deliberative democracy. By definition, Deliberative democracy is ‘any one of a family of views according to which the public deliberation of free and equal citizens is the core of legitimate political decision-making and self-governance’. Correspondingly, the main objectives are as following; firstly, the enhancement of political legitimacy as preferences are not merely presented in terms of ballot boxes instead by reflected public decisions. Secondly, the capability to transform private preferences to collective ones leading to the improvement of the quality of the decision-making process through the broad share of information and knowledge, exposition of sectional interests and publicly adopted preferences and maintaining collective judgement. Finally, Preferences would be developed through reasons and justification. ‘Language of reason’ will replace the ‘language of interests’. As best described by Habermas “No force except for the better argument is exercised”. Anyway, citizens should be able to justify their interests in public with no obstacles and to have institutionalized path to enforce it. (Held, 2006, pp.337-338)

‘Impartialism’ is another concept provided by the deliberative democracy theory. Impartial means “being open to reasoning from and assessing all points of view before deciding what is right or just, it does not mean simply following the precepts of self-interest, whether based on class, gender, ethnicity or nationality.” Deliberative democracy does not pay attention

to given or fixed preferences, however it examines citizens opinion about common problems. This mode of reasoning makes a difference between two concepts of legitimacy; “legitimacy as acceptance” to status quo or existing political arrangements and “legitimacy as ‘rightness’ or ‘correctness’” of a political order to be legitimized as it was generated by people’s reflection in an impartialist context. Impartialism calls for a “Universally shared standpoints” which means that decisions or policies should come from a comprehensive agreement by deliberation on them. It is more adoptable by the whole society not by one individual or group of individuals. It represents somehow the common good of the society as first proposed by the ancient Greek philosophers. In other words, it refers to reasoning from the point of view of others to understand the whole societal circumstances and determine according to them not to limited individual needs and preferences, however these positions can be adopted by all. (Held, 2006, pp.339-341)

Held also provided some adopted or suggested institutions of deliberative Democracy which they are ‘Deliberative polls and deliberative days’, ‘Citizens’ juries’, ‘Expanding voter feedback mechanisms and citizen communication’ “top-down” and “bottom-up”, ‘Civic education’ and ‘public funding of deliberative bodies’. (Held, 2006, pp.346-355)

### The Critique of Deliberative Democracy

Deliberative democracy has some points of criticism. These critiques are about the assumptions and principles of the theory, its application and implications and its position in the democratic theory context. To begin with, Cohen laid some pre-conditions to the application of deliberative democracy including the discursive element, in a context conditioned by equality,

freedom and reasonableness, which lead to the achievement of the common good. (Rocha, 2008, p.6)

However, the question here; Are these conditions attainable? Can it be guaranteed to have an equal and free citizenry to deliberate in a reasonable manner? Deliberative advocates sought to have deliberation between equal people with no difference that can affect their representation of arguments which cannot be easily maintained. Within the public there are individuals who are more influential, wealthy, powerful, skillful or educated. Equality is even extended to other aspects by Habermas such as the capacity of time, cost of information and organization. Since that people will never be equal. This indicates that deliberation should be held in a community where there is no unequal distribution of resources between people. Publics are assumed to be totally free from any constraints that may affect their deliberation in a way or another. (Rocha, 2008, pp.6-7)

Besides, the inclusion of all citizens in the deliberation process is principal to deliberative democracy as no one should be excluded in a way or another. However, it is not always the case as a result of the power structure and dynamics. Citizens will not have the same opportunity to deliberate because of the power dynamics. Some will be privileged socially or politically so their arguments would enjoy more appeal due to different factors. These power factors may be in terms of influence, knowledge or wisdom, ability to represent preferences and manipulate other. All of that can control who deliberate and who will not. (Sanders, 1997, pp.352-354) Additionally, as Sanders added the governing principle of 'rational, moderate and mutual respect in deliberation' is not fair in terms of application since it does not take into consideration the paradigm of communications which is shaped by status and power of individuals. Consequently, this will distinguish some in comparison to others. (Kadlec and Friedman, 2007, p.4)

Iris Young critique of impartiality in deliberative democracy deserves to be mentioned at this point. He criticized it as being a fiction as people will not be able to leave away their particularities and it also prevents the existence of difference between people and try to decrease diversity for the sake a simple mode of deliberation. Accordingly, it cuts off the number of opinions or preferences from many to only one. This made him to introduce the “ideal of heterogeneous public” which is targeting more inclusion of the people without the anticipation of leaving their specialties and particularities behind. Rather, it aspires a better representation of different groups in the public sphere. (Young, 1990, pp. pp.100-119) He also suggests some instruments and methods to be followed to accomplish his ideal such as group analysis and group generation of policy proposals, public funds, veto rights in public policy-making to mast affected groups and changing public culture for more communicative characteristics. (Young, 1990, pp. 184-5; 2000, pp. 56ff)

Moreover, impartialism was criticized for many reasons. It is accused to be too abstract and too narrow in regard of the elements or the components of the better argument. It is also idealistic with unattainable mode, it is more logic to have deliberation that help to reach a good understanding of the situation under more realistic or non-ideal conditions. Another point of criticism, is the stance of no disagreement or conflict which is contradicting with the human nature and social life. These conflicts should be handled and people need to learn how to deal with it morally rather than work to prevent it. Besides, it cannot provide a method to handle these moral conflicts. No general reason could be easily reached and it would be disputed. (Held, 2006, pp.241-242)

The element of rationality in deliberation also may be debatable in the sense that rationality if maximized is not the best choice because it increases the power of experts and bureaucrats at the expense of the public. It concentrates the power in the circles of tech-skilled experts and as a result, may prevent the deliberation by the citizenry. (Held, 2006, p.235)

According to what mentioned above, both principles of ‘inclusion of all citizens’ along with the ‘impartialism or generally acceptable reasoning’ facilitate the rise of dominant groups that can monopolize deliberation, preference setting and decision-making processes. In this sense, deliberative democracy turns from rational reasoning of the whole citizenry to elitist reasoning. In which the deliberation process is manipulated by the elite and their represented arguments would be perceived as the better argument. It was criticized that such a model may lead to a ‘single model of deliberative reasoning’. (Held, 2006, pp.243) On the other hand, deliberative conception is described by Sanders as a satisfaction to both participatory democrats and elitist democrats. The first groups are admired by the idea of inclusion of whole citizenry in the common issues and problems and enabling them to have a say in the decision-making process. While, the latter are comfortable with the belief that the dynamics of power will maintain their positions at the expense of the participation of masses or less qualified citizens in the deliberation process. As a result, both pro-democratic and anti-democratic proponents will welcome deliberative democracy. (Sanders, 1997, p.356)

To sum up, deliberative democracy can be considered as a supplement to procedural democracy. Deliberation is not a substitute for the procedures and institutions of democracy such as parliamentary deliberation, voting system and other democratic institutions. However, it can overcome the deficiencies of liberal democracy by enabling citizens to have channels -at least- to influence the political system and guarantee minimal representation of the whole society preferences to balance the domination of private interests and preferences of liberal

democracy. However, it should be kept in mind that the dynamics of power may negatively affect the deliberation process and make it lose its advantages. In conclusion, at best situations deliberative democracy can play complementary role to democracy.

### Part three: A link between Associational and Deliberative Democracy

Through the examination of the shortcomings of both associational and deliberative democracy models, one can find that what is not existing in one of them, can be provided by the another. In the following section, this paper tries to verify the argument that each of them can act as a complementary to the other. Correspondingly, associational democracy facilitates the application of the deliberative democracy and vice versa. There is a challenge to the legitimacy of the decision-making process, if it is not linked with deliberation. In case that decisions are only made by elitist groups then democracy will be threatened. On the other hand, if deliberation is limited to the informal public sphere with no extension to decision making process, then these decisions created by deliberation are not guaranteed to be put in action. (Elstub, 2008, p.137) This is better described by the statement of Gould; “We may say that while decision without deliberation is blind, deliberation without decision is empty.” (Gould 1996: 176) This can be understood in the light of the “Weberian dilemma” which implies that either the decision-making efficiency could be guaranteed at the expense of deliberation and democratic civic engagement or maintain democracy at the expense of the decision effectiveness. Accordingly, a dualistic model is considered to be the available method to overcome these challenges. It is suggested to combine both aspects of democracy together. Associations will carry out their deliberation in the informal public sphere. This deliberation performs a kind of influence on the opinion of individuals and the formulation of their preferences and to prioritize which ones to come first. (Elstub, 2008, pp.138-139)

Associational democracy provides the public spaces for representation needed for deliberative democracy. Multiplicity of associations give the opportunity to individuals with similar beliefs and interests to come together in an association that enables them to deliberate on and represent their preferences and overcome being excluded in the context of power

dynamics and existing institutional mechanisms. Through the provision of association, it tackles the dilemma of scale and provide unlimited sphere for representation. It also increases the autonomy of individuals and by that enables them to get their voices heard. Another important aspect of associations is their provision of information through the efforts of specialized associations. Information is one of the challenges that counter deliberation and by this, deliberation would not be confined to experts for the decision-making process. Moreover, information can help people to hold government accountable. Associational democracy eliminates or at least decrease the challenge of inequality of people in terms of power, knowledge and information. Above that, association could provide information which cannot be provided by the state. All of what mentioned, foster the pre-conditions of deliberation such as equality and reasonableness. (Elstub, 2008, pp.121-125)

That's why, it is advocated that deliberation and aggregation work together in a democratic system rather than to be separated from each other. There is a distinction between discursive and participative democracy in their main principles and priorities. It is worthy to show the difference between the elitists and deliberative theorists. The first underlines the importance of decision-making and they view the issue from a decisional conception while the latter is of the contrary, they pay more attention to deliberation even at the expense of decision-making. In this sense, deliberative democracy theory is in real need to combine deliberation with other concepts such as bargaining and voting and to decide on the model of majority role that is most adaptable with deliberation. (Rocha, 2008, pp.18-19)

The dilemma of parliamentary deliberation is important in this context. Parliaments may tackle the task of deliberation more effectively since acting as assembly of representatives. It allows for odd opinion to be viewed together and considered and also it has its power of decision-making. Deliberation in contemporary societies should include both factors representation and deliberation. It needs to mingle participation and representation in a more comprehensive view in which they interact and work with each other. It guarantees the existence of an institution to pave the way for deliberation continuously. The mixture of formal and informal deliberation paths may enrich the process and make it more attainable. (Rocha,

2008, pp.16-17) In this sense, it would be more of aggregation and deliberation together. They will complement each other through the forums and associations. This may represent a solution to the multiple models of reasoning by providing a method to decide on which one to follow and which decision to be taken.

This is related in a way or another with the call for the institutionalization of deliberative ideal and its implementation. Deliberative democracy is criticized for not providing institutions for deliberation. It is also accused to be no more than a trial to influence the political system with no far-reaching targets. (Rocha, 2008, pp.5-6) Consequently, there is a need to combine both perspectives to reach a more applicable model of deliberative democracy. Following on, Habermas stressed the distinction between the public sphere and the formal institutions and procedures within the political system. He also emphasized the different structure and functions of both entities. While the public sphere is essential for each decision to be legitimate, he keeps the function of taking decision and applying them as core tasks for the formal institutions such as parliament and government institutions. What is more important to Habermas is not the institutionalization of the deliberation process rather the institutionalization of the relationship between the two entities and their communication. However, still the question here is it applicable to create an institutionalized relation between public sphere and institutions of the political system. (Rocha, 2008, pp.12-13)

Follesdal proposes three aspects provided by associations that enhance deliberative democracy flourishment in social complexity. Firstly, 'reduction of size' which indicates that smaller units can better perform in regard of deliberation of interests and their representation. This is more effective than larger units that hinder the possibility of deliberation and representation. Secondly, 'reduction of domination' which refers to the reduction of external interventions that influences or dominates individuals' deliberation by "providing institutional

space” for preferences to be freely formed and represented. Thirdly, ‘reduction of agenda’ which means that having less individuals will only have few issues and interests. Consequently, this indicates less need for information which covers these issues. While information is very essential for deliberation, reducing issues entails less need for information and enables the group to be capable of covering them. (Follesdal, 1999, p. 15)

There are three paths in which informal public spheres and political system interact with each other. They are the “inside access model”, “mobilization model” and the “outside access model”. The inside access model is mainly about pressuring those in power to consider an issue and put it on the agenda. It influences decision makers through discourse. The mobilization model accomplishes special forum to through which it can pressure legislative bodies. Both of inside access and mobilization models are to put pressures on the agenda settings. Only outside access model that allows for reflection of agenda setting in the informal public sphere. A dualist model of associational and deliberative model provides more opportunities for outside access model of agenda setting by its supply of multiple informal public spheres which are venues for participation, deliberation and representation. (Elstub, 2008, pp.141-142)

In summary, the dualistic model will combine both models in which associations would provide the “social infrastructure” for deliberation and communication that enables opinion and preferences formation which in this context would be reasonable due to the provision of information by the associations and it would be all inclusive of people as they could have equal opportunity to participate in deliberation. Moreover, it would maintain accountability of the government institutions. (Elstub, 2008, pp.141-142) On the other hand, associations will be setting people’s agenda according to deliberation and discourse which boost a reasonable understanding that really could reflect upon actual needs and preferences. This understanding would overcome the short-sighted views of the people. In other words, it would form associational democracy with more qualified approach that avoids the demerits or shortcomings mentioned before. It is worthy to declare that democracy as an ideal could not be perfectly approached. It is an ideal that should be approached as possible but in realistic terms there are always limits to democracy application.

## Conclusion

Democracy could not be achieved only through traditional formal institution of representation. Representation -due to the challenge of scale and social complexity- should not be confined on the role of parliamentary and representative bodies of democracy based on voting and electoral process. Associational democracy theorists provided a distinguished method to enhance democracy and engage people in the political process through civic engagement and participation through associations. On the other hand, deliberative democrats envisaged a model of deliberation based on conditions of equal participation and reasonable argument for the common good of the public. Discourse and deliberation are considered to increase the quality of the representation of the citizens and accordingly the quality and depth of democracy. Unfortunately, both associational and deliberative models faced some problems and shortcoming in regard of their application. However, these problems of mainly the quality, reasonableness and common good which were present in the context of associational model could be handled by the principles of deliberation. Besides, the idealistic image of deliberation and its problem of scale and social complexity of current societies can be best solved by the provision of associations that can create the required informal public sphere for deliberation which tackles the problem of scale and complexity. Correspondingly, dualist model of associational and deliberative democracy can better improve the application of democracy in the political system.

## References

Elstub, S. (2008). *"Towards a Deliberative and Associational Democracy"*, Edinburgh University Press.

Fishkin, J & Mansbridge, J, et al., (2017). *"The Prospects & Limits of Deliberative Democracy Daedalus Ending Civil Wars: Constraints & Possibilities"*, Dædalus (Journal of the American Academy of Arts & Sciences), Available at: [https://www.amacad.org/sites/default/files/daedalus/downloads/17\\_Summer\\_Daedalus.pdf](https://www.amacad.org/sites/default/files/daedalus/downloads/17_Summer_Daedalus.pdf)

Follesdal, A. (1999). 'Subsidiarity and Democratic Deliberation', *Arena Working Papers*, 21, Available at: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/30390445\\_Subsidiarity\\_and\\_Democratic\\_Deliberation](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/30390445_Subsidiarity_and_Democratic_Deliberation)

Gould, C. (1996). "Diversity and Democracy: Representing Differences", in S. Benhabib (ed.), *"Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political"*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 171–86.

Hauptmann, E. (2001). "Can Less Be More? Leftist Deliberative Democrats' Critique of Participatory Democracy", *Polity*, Vol. 33, No. 3, pp. 397-421, Palgrave Macmillan, Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3235441>

Held, D. (2006). "Deliberative Democracy and the Defence of the Public Realm". In idem, *Models of Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Kadlec, A. and Friedman, W. (2007). "Deliberative Democracy and the Problem of Power," *Journal of Public Deliberation*: Vol. 3, Issue. 1, Article 8. Available at: <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol3/iss1/art8>

Kaufman, Jason (1999). "Three Views of Associationalism in 19th-Century America: An Empirical Examination", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 104, No. 5, pp. 1296-1345, The University of Chicago Press, Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/210176>

Reid, S. (2018) "*Political Representation and Public Interest Advocacy*", University of Melbourne, Available at: [https://www.auspsa.org.au/sites/default/files/political\\_representation\\_sophie\\_reid.pdf](https://www.auspsa.org.au/sites/default/files/political_representation_sophie_reid.pdf)

Rocha, Marta Mendes da. (2008). "A critique of the discursive conception of democracy". *Teoria & Sociedade*, 4(se), 94-117. Available at: [http://socialsciences.scielo.org/scielo.php?script=sci\\_arttext&pid=S1518-44712008000100002&lng=en&tlng=en](http://socialsciences.scielo.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1518-44712008000100002&lng=en&tlng=en).

Sanders, L. (1997) "Against Deliberation". *Political Theory*, 25(3), 347-376. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/191984>

Stears, M. (1999), "Needs, Welfare and the Limits of Associationalism", *Economy and Society*, 28 (4), 570–89. Available at: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/232946840\\_Needs\\_welfare\\_and\\_the\\_limits\\_of\\_associationalism](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/232946840_Needs_welfare_and_the_limits_of_associationalism)

Tocqueville, A. (1945). "*Democracy in America*", New York: Vintage.

Young, I. (1990). "*Justice and Politics of Difference*". Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Young, I. (2000). "*Inclusion and Democracy*". New York: Oxford University Press.