

DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY AND THE SO WHAT QUESTION: THE EFFECTS OF BELGIUM'S G1000

**2016 APSA Annual Meeting
Philadelphia, PA, September 1-4**

Didier Caluwaerts, Vrije Universiteit Brussel
Vincent Jacquet, Université Catholique de Louvain
Min Reuchamps, Université Catholique de Louvain

The impact of deliberative mini-publics


- Two categories of procedures (Papadopoulos 2013)
 1. Organized by public bodies
 2. **Organized by civic organizations and experts**
- Two kinds of impact
 1. Micro impact on participants: preferences changes and civic education
 2. **Macro political uptakes** (Goodin and Dryzek 2006)

The G1000 in Belgium

- Institutional crisis in Belgium
- Organizers (artists, leaders of foundation, businessmen and political scientists)
- The manifest
- The general call
- The 3 steps/phases of the G1000



The three phases of the G1000



The political uptake of the G1000

Two kinds of impact

1. On public policies: no impact (so far)
2. On the broader public sphere: agenda-setting
 - The media uptake: more on the process than on the content
 - The maxi-public uptake: survey
 - The conventional political uptake: political parties and parliaments
 - The social uptake: “children” of the G1000

Awareness of the G1000

Have you heard of G1000?	Not at all	A little	Quite a lot	A great deal
Total	47.7	39.8	10.1	2.4
Region (p=0.000)				
Flanders	38	45.9	12.6	3.5
Wallonia	65	30.9	31.4	0.6
Brussels	52.3	31.4	15.1	1.2
Gender (p=0.010)				
Male	42.2	43.1	11.7	3
Female	52.4	37.3	8.5	1.9
Education (p=0.005)				
Low	53.4	38.8	6.8	1.1
Middle	49.5	42.5	9.2	2.5
High	40	42.5	14	3.5
Age (p=0.909)				
>= 34	47.9	39.1	10.5	2.5
34-54	46.3	41.0	9.6	3.0
55+	48.8	39.5	10.1	1.6

Support for the process of the G1000

	Completely disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Completely agree
G1000 contributed to renewal of democracy in Belgium	7.2%	16.6%	60.1%	15.4%	0.7%
Recommendations formulated by citizens at G1000 should be turned into law.	3.3%	6.3%	59.7%	28.0%	2.7%
In future, citizens should be gathered again to discuss political issues, as at the G1000.	2.8%	4.9%	32.6%	44.0%	15.7%
I would agree to participate in a G1000 if I were randomly selected in the future.	11.4%	10.9%	36.2%	29.8	11.7

The conventional political uptake

- Party manifestos
 - Election of 2014
 - More parties refer to democratic innovations and random selection in their manifestos than – ever – before
 - The green party directly refers to the G1000

“Specifically, Ecolo calls for the development of citizens’ conferences or deliberative panels such as panels of citizen-users to evaluate some policy; roundtables with experts and citizens or the G1000. In other words, investigation of an issue by a group of people randomly selected, through an improved public debate (particularly with regard to environmental issues, societal debates or other long-term issues)”
- Several speeches in favor of democratic innovations
- Parliamentary questions
- Projects of deliberative mini-publics in parliaments

The social uptake

- G1000 as the most famous democratic innovations in Belgium
- Several initiatives inspired by the G1000
 - G100 and K35 at the local level
 - G1000 in the Netherlands and UK

Conclusion

- Low impact on policies but high impact on the democratic debate about democracy