

# Decision-making through the G1000 model

Deliberative democracy applied in the Netherlands



Dissertation - MA Governance, Leadership and Democracy Studies

Laura Kroet

Supervisor: professor André Azevedo Alves

Decision-making through the G1000 model

Deliberative democracy applied in the Netherlands

Dissertation

Lisbon, January 28, 2019

Laura Kroet

104517003

MA Governance, Leadership and Democracy Studies

Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Instituto do Estudos Políticos

Supervisor: professor André Azevedo Alves

Number of words, excluding bibliography and annexes: 18.439

## Abstract

Current representative democracies face a decline in support and confidence while experiencing assertive opponents. Therefore, a solution could be found in making democracies more inclusive. In the Netherlands, this is done by applying a type of deliberative democracy on a local level, via a project called G1000. This type of citizen participation (which is not legally binding) exists next to the local decision-making procedures and existing forms of citizens participation such as online surveys or referendums. A G1000 procedure leads to a citizens' decision, which incorporates the opinion of an entire community about a certain topic. This dissertation project shows that – for a citizens' decision to be implemented by the city council – the G1000 organisation needs to collaborate with a municipality. It can be stated that a bureaucratic system needs to recognise procedural rules within the G1000 method for it to accept it as part of 'the system'. Ideally, a G1000 procedure should be organised every half year to give guidance to a city's policy and to make sure that eventually, all inhabitants of a municipality will take part in a G1000. The direct democratic system would then exist next to the representative system, each handling the issues it suits best.

# Index

Abstract.....	3
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	6
The current state of democracy .....	6
New initiatives .....	9
The G1000 project .....	9
Historical background .....	11
Research questions.....	12
Dissertation structure .....	13
Acknowledgements.....	14
Chapter 2. Methodology .....	15
Characteristics of qualitative research.....	15
Qualitative research applied.....	15
Research question and purpose of the study .....	16
Research design and data collecting .....	17
Data analysis.....	19
Validity and reliability.....	20
Chapter 3. Theoretical framework.....	22
Democracy .....	22
Democratic practices .....	23
Deliberative democracy in theory.....	25
Deliberative democracy in practice .....	28
The point of citizen participation.....	32
The G1000 model .....	34
Decision-making at local level in the Netherlands .....	38
The G1000 model in the Netherlands.....	41
The Dutch G1000 model in earlier studies .....	43
Sceptical views on citizens' participation .....	45
Chapter 4. Results.....	49
Government has 'carte blanche'.....	49
A partnership with a city creates maximum impact.....	51
Cities and citizens experience a G1000 procedure differently .....	54
Chapter 5. Conclusion.....	58
Government for the people.....	58
Fitting into the bureaucratic system is essential.....	60

More inclusiveness because of G1000.....	61
Contribution of this research to this field of study .....	63
Limitations of this research .....	64
Recommendations for further research.....	65
Bibliography .....	67
Annex 1: topic list per interviewee .....	70
Annex 2: G1000 Manifesto.....	73
Annex 3: quotations from the interviews.....	80
Annex 4: coding process .....	95

## Chapter 1. Introduction

“We have to admit that democracy is experiencing a crisis of confidence. Not only does it face increasingly assertive opponents, but growing numbers of its beneficiaries either take it for granted, or else doubt its merits. (...) We need to make our democracies more inclusive. This requires bold and innovative reforms to bring in the young, the poor and minorities into the political system” (Annan, 2018).

In a speech delivered at the 2017 Athens Democracy Forum, Kofi Annan, the late Secretary-General of the United Nations, reflected on the current state of the democratic political system worldwide. As Annan indicated, and as research of several renowned institutions shows, democracies face challenges.

While expressing concern about the state of democracy is a relevant thing to do, finding ways to revive or strengthen the democratic project might be even more necessary. Therefore, an interview aired during the Dutch radio broadcast ‘Nooit Meer Slapen’ with Belgian writer David Van Reybrouck stood out amid all reports and numbers indicating democracy being in decline.

When hearing him explain about how deliberative democracy can change the current representative democratic system for the better, the inspiration for this dissertation was found. His idea to set up an initiative called ‘G1000’ to involve citizens in a more constructive way to decision-making, became the focus of this thesis.

### The current state of democracy

More about the G1000 project follows later in this introduction, first some relevant research and facts about the current state of democracy are presented. Freedom House, an American non-governmental

organization that conducts research on democracy and political freedom, states that democracy faced its most serious crisis in decades in 2017: “Seventy-one countries suffered net declines in political rights and civil liberties, with only 35 registering gains. This marked the 12th consecutive year of decline in global freedom” (Freedom House, 2018).

After years of optimism, summarized by Francis Fukuyama stating that the world has reached ‘the end of history’ by universalizing the ideology of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government after the Cold War has ended, democracy is no longer about success stories only.

“The world’s most powerful democracies are mired in seemingly intractable problems at home, including social and economic disparities, partisan fragmentation, terrorist attacks, and an influx of refugees that has strained alliances and increased fears of the ‘other’” (Freedom House, 2018, p. 1). According to Freedom House, the increasing support for populist politicians is a threat, but the institute refers to younger generations losing faith and interest in the democratic project as “the most worrisome for the future” and “a dangerous apathy” (Freedom House, 2018, p. 1).

Freedom House states that an antidemocratic view or practice is “a setback for fundamental freedoms” and has a potential economic and security risk: “when more countries are autocratic and repressive, treaties and alliances crumble, nations and entire regions become unstable, and violent extremists have greater room to operate” (Freedom House, 2018, p. 2).

The decline is also seen by the Economist Intelligence Unit. Its Democracy Index includes sixty indicators in five categories, namely: electoral process and pluralism, functioning of government, political participation, democratic political culture and civil liberties. Based on the scores of 2017, the researchers state that 89 of the 167 countries assessed in 2017 received lower scores than they had the year before and less than five percent of the world’s population lives in a “full democracy”

("Democracy continues its disturbing retreat", 2018). The Economist Intelligence Unit mentions the work of Larry Diamond who introduced the idea of a worldwide "democratic recession" and states that this trend remains "firmly in place" ("Democracy continues its disturbing retreat", 2018).

Diamond argues that the world has been in "a mild but protracted democratic recession since about 2006" (Diamond, 2015, p. 144). He argues, as data from Freedom House and The Economist Intelligence Unit show as well, that democracy globally experiences erosion. In the last decade, i.e. after 2005, several countries such as Russia, Venezuela and Turkey experienced a level of erosion in key democratic features as electoral fairness, political pluralism and space for opposition (Diamond, 2015, p. 144).

While democratic politics are under assault, the levels of democratic commitment appear to be fragile too (Diamond, 2018). Although research conducted among Americans shows that a clear majority (i.e. 86 percent) is in favour of the representative democratic system and six out of ten were "at least somewhat satisfied" with how democracy works in the United States, there are trends below the surface that could potentially be disturbing, Diamond argues (Diamond, 2018).

He refers to the support for democracy as not as robust as one should hope for. In research conducted by Diamond and his colleagues, five different measures of democratic commitment were studied, namely; support for democracy, a strong leader, army rule, the importance attached to democracy on a 10-point scale and whether citizens agreed that democracy is always preferable. "Only a slim majority of Americans (54 percent) consistently express a pro-democratic position across all of our measures. In fact, 28 percent of Americans give a nondemocratic response on at least two of our five items" (Diamond, 2018).

## New initiatives

In these times of low democratic commitment and democratic politics being under assault, some attempts occurred to make the political system more inclusive and deliberative than casting a vote during elections or voting in a referendum only.

Several initiatives explore the possibilities of adopting ancient Greek practices in modern, Western democracies. Athenians took part in the most important councils, assemblies and courts of the city, such as the *ecclesia*, *boule* and *heliaea*, and were appointed for these positions by lot (Van Reybrouck, 2017, p. 63).

A recent example is the Citizens' Assembly held in Ireland, which consisted of 99 randomly selected 'ordinary' Irish men and women. These participants joined twelve meetings between October 2016 and April 2018 to be informed about the Eighth Amendment of the Irish Constitution, which is about abortion. The outcome of this citizens' assembly led to a referendum on the abortion law in 2018 (Chalmers, 2018).

Some years earlier, in Iceland, a group of twenty-five elected citizens formed a government-organised constitutional assembly to review the Icelandic Constitution of the Republic over a period of two years. The members of the assembly were elected by a direct personal election. The previous constitution was seen as provisional, and critics considered it to be weak during the financial crisis of 2008-2011. In 2012, a non-binding constitutional referendum was held, in which 67 percent of the Icelandic voters approved the text (Van Reybrouck, 2017, p. 111).

## The G1000 project

As mentioned before, this dissertation focusses on one of those recent initiatives: the project G1000 which started in 2011. A group of Belgian writers, journalists and renowned thinkers believed that

involving citizens is essential for renewing democracy. They considered this to be necessary after the 2010 Belgian federal elections and the laborious attempts of forming a government (which took a world record of 541 days).<sup>1</sup>

In 2011, seven-hundred ordinary citizens, chosen by lot, came together in Brussels and discussed topics that they considered important. The underlying idea of this 'citizen summit' was that people are – according to David Van Reybrouck, one of the G1000 founders – able to find solutions for problems that politicians cannot solve: "If citizens get the chance to talk to each other, they can find rational compromises, as long as they have time and information" (Van Reybrouck, 2011).

Since 2014, this type of deliberative democracy is put into practice in the Netherlands on local decision-making level and in a slightly different form. The principles of members being chosen by lot and letting those people discuss several topics remained, but the concept was changed to increase the power of the attendees ("Over G1000", n.d.).

A G1000 procedure in the Netherlands consists of three steps: citizens' summit, citizens' forum and citizens' council. In brief, up to one thousand citizens draft proposals about a chosen topic at the summit. These proposals are presented to the entire community during the forum. Their opinions are collected, processed and reviewed in the council phase. The final proposals will form the citizens' decision.

To give an example of one of those Dutch G1000 meetings; citizens of the city of Enschede shared and discussed ideas regarding the use of fireworks on New Year's Eve in 2017. The city experienced a huge explosion at a fireworks depository in May 2000, killing twenty-three people, injuring almost one

---

<sup>1</sup> "Belgium will wake up today with a new prime minister after a world record of 19 months without government, but the incoming administration will not settle longer term questions over the future of the divided country" (Waterfield, 2011).

thousand people and destroying four-hundred houses, making the use of fireworks in the city a complex topic for inhabitants ("Informatie", n.d.).

The G1000 meeting in Enschede has led to a 'citizens' fireworks policy' in 2017 in which three proposals from the people are implemented by the city council now. This policy contains 'firework free zones' in the city, instructions for the safe use of fireworks for the general public and education about this theme at schools ("Stadsdialoog Vuurwerk", 2017).

## Historical background

Deliberative democracy gained increasing scientific attention in the 1980's, but criteria<sup>2</sup> related to it already appeared in earlier publications. John Stuart Mill argued for instance for a more inclusive democracy (a system in which women were allowed to vote too), but also for plural voting by which more voting power would be given to those who were better qualified than others (Fishkin, 2018, p. 21).

In 'Considerations on Representative Government', published in 1861, Mill pleads for a representative assembly that should control those who are in power, including a 'Congress of Opinions': "an arena in which not only the general opinion of the nation, but that of every section of it, and as far as possible of every eminent individual whom it contains, can produce itself in full light and challenge discussion; where every person in the country may count upon finding somebody who speaks his mind, as well or better than he could speak it himself – not to friends and partisans exclusively, but in the face of opponents, to be tested by adverse controversy, where those whose opinion is overruled, feel

---

<sup>2</sup> James Fishkin distinguished four criteria for popular control, i.e. for members of the mass public to have a significant role in ruling themselves. These are: inclusion (i.e. all adult citizens should be provided with an equal opportunity to participate), choice (i.e. the alternatives for public decision need to be significantly different and realistically available), deliberation (i.e. the people need to be effectively motivated to think about the reasons for and against competing alternatives in a context where they can get good information about them) and impact (i.e. the people's choices need to have an effect on decisions, such as who governs or what policies get enacted) (Fishkin, 2018, p. 21).

satisfied that it is heard, and set aside not by a mere act of will, but for what are thought superior reasons” (Mill, 1861).

James Fishkin first published about ‘deliberative polling’ as a method of public consultation in 1988 ("James S. Fishkin", 2018). As he stated, the process of consultation made citizens more competent, they had become more sophisticated in their political judgements, they had learned to change their opinions and become more aware of the complexity of political decision-making (Van Reybrouck, 2017, p. 105).

In June 2018, Fishkin published the book ‘Democracy When the People Are Thinking’, arguing that deliberative democracy is not utopian a practical solution to the challenges democracies currently face (Fishkin, 2018, p. 13). This is what Van Reybrouck pleads for in his book ‘Tegen verkiezingen’ as well (published in English as ‘Against Elections, The Case for Democracy’). He explains that a more inclusive democracy can be reached through a citizens’ assembly (Van Reybrouck, 2017, p. 152).

The G1000 initiative was studied in the Netherlands before this dissertation was written. Peer Smets and Marloes Vlind specifically studied the process of the G1000 model in the city of Amersfoort. Smets and Vlind examined deliberative techniques and underlying mechanisms by focusing on group dynamics, the communication between participants, the creating of a common ground and the process in which dreams and ideas are put into action (Smets & Vlind, 2017).

## Research questions

The existing research on citizens’ assembly’s and G1000 projects, does deliver an overview of how a deliberative democracy system works, but this thesis hopes to provide a clear study of the effects the G1000 project for citizens and local governments. By looking into these implications, the effects on the current decision-making procedures are shown, too.

This research also indicates whether a type of deliberative democracy could be beneficial for the declining support for democracy. This study might lead to ideas for follow-up research or useful insights on how the G1000 model can be scaled up and used elsewhere, i.e. outside of the Netherlands and Belgium.

The main question that will be answered in this dissertation, is the following:

*-What are the implications of the use of the G1000 model for citizen participation at local-decision making level?*

In relation to this, two sub-questions are formulated:

*-What are the effects of existing decision-making procedures on citizen participation at a local level?*

*-How could different procedural rules be adopted and what are the likely effects on citizen participation at a local decision-making level?*

Via these questions, the topic is narrowed down to give this study a clear focus. However, related topics such as the 'fairness' of such a deliberative system and citizens' assemblies in other countries will be briefly addressed as well (the latter to give this thesis a comparative dimension) although these topics are not the main focus of this research.

## Dissertation structure

The research methodology used to answer the research questions will be explained in Chapter 2. It provides information on the choice of two qualitative research methods as well as information about the research population. Chapter 3 lays out the theoretical framework. Here, relevant existing theories and research conducted prior to this dissertation are presented. The results of the study follow in chapter 4 and the research questions will be answered in Chapter 5. Chapter 5 also presents

information about how this study contributes to existing literature and theories. Limitations of this research and its validity are also discussed, as well as recommendations for further research.

## Acknowledgements

To conclude this introduction chapter, I would like to express my gratitude to everyone contributing to the completion of this dissertation, but mostly to professor André Azevedo Alves for his valuable feedback throughout the entire process, to the interviewees Harm van Dijk, Job Kantelberg and Loes Schippers for sharing their insightful thoughts and experiences about the G1000 model, and to my sister Cynthia Kroet for proofreading this document.

## Chapter 2. Methodology

In this chapter, the research methodology, which consists of a literature review and semi-structured interviews, is explained in more detail. Given these two research methods, the research can be identified as qualitative.

### Characteristics of qualitative research

Qualitative research can be characterized by five features: the type of research question and purpose of the study; the research design; the method of data collecting; the data analysis and the reporting of the research outcomes (Mortelmans, 2007, p. 21). In qualitative research, the questions are usually covering complex topics or social processes to understand the reality of the studied material or object. Here, the focus is not on how often a specific situation occurs, but rather on why that situation happens.

Since one tries to grasp a certain phenomenon, the research design can differ according to what is studied. This means that more than one data collecting method (interviews or a case-study i.a.) can be used throughout the same study. The purpose of the data analysis is to retrieve a meaning behind the studied object. Here, the focus is more on processes and texts instead of numbers (numbers can be used in qualitative research too, but it is usually a characteristic of quantitative research). The reporting of the outcomes can be done in cooperation with the people involved. Also, the influence the researcher might have had on the process, is taken into account (Mortelmans, 2007, p. 21).

### Qualitative research applied

The five characteristics Dimitri Mortelmans referred to will be discussed to explain the research methodology used for this thesis.

Research question and purpose of the study

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the main question of this dissertation project is as follows:

*What are the implications of the use of the G1000 model for citizen participation at local-decision making level?*

Characteristics of a qualitative research question, such as trying to understand a certain reality and having a focus on 'what' and 'why', can be identified in this main question. Research questions starting with 'what' can usually be identified as exploratory and can provide a base for further, explorative research (Mortelmans, 2007, p. 92).

Deliberative democracy has been studied before. Those research papers offer an overview of how it works in practice, such as James Fishkin's experiments on deliberative democracy in the United States and David Van Reybrouck's plead for the comeback of the Athenian way of decision-making (both examples will be explained in Chapter 3).

Dutch case studies of the G1000 model can also be found. Peer Smets and Marloes Vlind observed the group dynamics and communication between the G1000 participants in Amersfoort for instance (Smets & Vlind, 2017). Franziska Eckardt and Paul Benneworth looked into the G1000 procedure in the city of Enschede, in 2017. They specifically focused on the extent to which the G1000 model, as a new citizen participation process, can be designed as a 'social learning system' for citizens (Eckardt & Benneworth, 2018). These two studies are referred to in more detail in Chapter 3.

The purpose of this research project is to add new and relevant insights to the existing research on deliberative democracy and the G1000 model by looking into which implications for citizen participation arise when the G1000 model is used at local level. Two sub-questions help to narrow the topic down and provide an insight in the existing decision-making procedures.

The sub-questions are formulated as follows:

*What are the effects of existing decision-making procedures on citizen participation at a local level?*

*How could different procedural rules be adopted and what are the likely effects on citizen participation at a local decision-making level?*

By providing an answer to these three research questions, this thesis hopes to not only contribute to the research done on deliberative democracy, but to also add insights to the current and pressing discussion on democracy being in decline and to the initiatives that are organized to make democracies more inclusive.

#### Research design and data collecting

Initial desk research took place in May and June 2018, while more in-depth research was conducted over the course of four months (September 2018 till December 2018). Two different and complementary research methods are used, namely a literature study and semi-structured interviews with people involved in the Dutch G1000 procedure. By combining these two methods, this thesis has both a theoretical and an empirical component.

The theoretical framework can be found in Chapter 3 of this dissertation. It was established by searching for the most relevant literature related to the key concepts mentioned in the research questions, using both online sources (i.e. journals, news articles and websites) and books.

As mentioned in the introduction chapter, the initial inspiration for this thesis topic came from a Dutch radio broadcast called 'Nooit Meer Slapen' in which G1000 initiator David Van Reybrouck was interviewed. His book 'Tegen Verkiezingen' was mentioned and therefore used as a starting point for further research.

Also, sources provided on the 'literature list' section on the Dutch G1000 website as well as references used during some courses of the MA program Governance, Leadership and Democracy Studies, were used in the initial and secondary research phases. These books and articles helped finding other relevant sources related to the thesis topic.

For the empirical component, three people have been interviewed via Skype or phone calls. The two founders of the Dutch G1000 platform were contacted by email at the same time, to which one of them, Harm van Dijk, replied. During the interview with Van Dijk, information was provided on the G1000 held in the city of Enschede. These interviews add relevant and new information to the existing theories which is essential for understanding recent developments of the G1000 model in practice.

Enschede was the first G1000 case initiated by a city (by the mayor of Enschede) instead of by citizens. This suggests that the municipal executive board of a city is actively looking for the opinions of citizens, making it more likely that the citizens' decision will be accepted by the city council, something that does not necessarily needs to happen in citizen driven G1000 processes.

Since the research questions aim at finding out the effects on local decision-making level, two other interviews took place with people involved in the G1000 procedure in Enschede. Their contact details were provided by Van Dijk on request.

The second interview took place with Loes Schippers, one of the citizens of Enschede who took part in the entire G1000 process. She is actively involved in a 'monitoring group' and is in contact with the city of Enschede to see if another G1000 or other forms of citizen participation can be organized in the future. Therefore, she provided the 'participant view'.

The third interview was held with Job Kantelberg, advisor to the 'administration' of the municipality (the municipal executive board and mayor) of Enschede. He was closely involved in organizing the G1000 procedure and provided an insight on future G1000s, the effects on local decision-making procedures and citizen participation in Enschede, all from the city's perspective.

The interviews were semi-structured and held according to a topic list, which was sent to all interviewees prior to the conversation. The questions were divided in three topics related to the research questions, namely: citizen participation, local decision-making level and effects of the G1000 model (see Annex 1).

In accordance with the characteristics of a qualitative interview, the questions were not fixed and left room for the interviewee to share his or her own thoughts and ideas (Mortelmans, 2007, p. 213). Immediately after each interview, the notes were transcribed to give an accurate reproduction of the conversation.

### Data analysis

The data analysis method identified by Mortelmans was followed. Mortelmans' method is inspired by the Grounded Theory of Anselm Strauss and Barney Glaser, which is the most used method to analyse qualitative data (Mortelmans, 2007, p. 350). Mortelmans refers to the process as "breaking the data down and building it back up again" (Mortelmans, 2007, p. 349). The researcher starts with organizing his or her data and reading the interview transcripts, followed by dividing the relevant data in sub sections and connecting the information found.

Since the interviews were held along three main themes related to the key concepts of the research questions, it is possible to find these links in the data. Also, these same key concepts are mentioned in

the theoretical framework, which makes sure that a common ground can be found in both the theoretical and empirical part of the research.

Connecting the empirical information and eventually providing an answer to the research question, is done by the process of coding (Mortelmans, 2007, p. 355). The first step is 'open coding': "the analytic process through which concepts are identified and their properties and dimensions are discovered" (Mortelmans, 2007, p. 355). Labels will be attached to the concepts that the researcher thinks are relevant for answering the research questions.

The second phase is called 'axial coding'. Here, the big number of labels from the open coding phase is narrowed down by making sub categories. These sub categories then consist of similar statements or extracts from the data.

The last coding phase is 'selective coding'; "the process of integration and refining the theory" (Mortelmans, 2007, p. 356). In this phase, the sub categories – or concepts – are connected. By doing so, a theory will be formed since causes and effects of certain phenomenon become clear. This can be seen as the most crucial step, since this phase will lead to answering the research questions (Mortelmans, 2007, p. 356). The outcomes will be reported in Chapter 4.

## Validity and reliability

The quality of qualitative research is defined in terms of objectivity and generalization. Objectivity is about the researcher not having any (or as little as possible) subjective contribution, whereas generalization is about the results being universally applicable (Mortelmans, 2007, p. 428).

Objectivity is divided into two sub-characteristics; validity and reliability. As Mortelmans states; qualitative research by definition, cannot be objective since this type of research requires the

researcher to make choices when collecting and analysing the data (Mortelmans, 2007, p. 431). The same goes for reliability, which in this case means reproducibility, since each qualitative study is seen as unique.

He refers to work of Lincoln and Guba who set up four features to measure the quality of qualitative research differently, namely via checking the credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability.

Credibility is about being able to trust the results, transferability means transferring the results to a different context and them still being correct, dependability covers the ability to find similar results within the same research population or in a similar setting when the study would be reproduced, and confirmability is about the extent to which the role of the researcher may have changed the data collecting process (Mortelmans, 2007, p. 431).

This research aims at establishing a high level of credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability, by being transparent about the data collecting and analysing process, by choosing interviewees from one G1000 city – making it more of a ‘case study’ – and by executing the research according to the method described earlier in this chapter.

More details about limitations to this study, will be discussed in chapter 5. The following chapter, Chapter 3, incorporates the theoretical framework.

## Chapter 3. Theoretical framework

This chapter will clarify the main concepts used throughout this dissertation project. The concepts explained are those mentioned in the research questions, but also those related to the research in general since it is important to establish the context before answering the research questions.

### Democracy

Abraham Lincoln's "government of the people, by the people, for the people", or the slightly different, and earlier version (from 1830, instead of Lincoln's 1863) of Daniel Webster "people's government, made for the people, made by the people and answerable to the people", might be one of the most well-known definitions of democracy (May, 1987).

A similar notion can be found in Alexis De Tocqueville's observations of American democracy, published in 'De La Démocratie en Amérique' (translated as 'Democracy in America') in 1835 and 1840. De Tocqueville noticed a "general equality of conditions" in all aspects of American society; everyone's judgement is equally valuable, making the rule of the majority the only possible way to determine public issues. This was applied, not only on national but also at regional level.

"The Anglo-Americans are the first nations who, having been exposed to this formidable alternative, have been happy enough to escape the dominion of absolute power. They have been allowed by their circumstances, their origin, their intelligence, and especially by their moral feeling, to establish and maintain the sovereignty of the people" (Tocqueville, 1835, p.72).

The rule of the people is derived from the Greek, or rather Athenian, idea of democracy which started centuries earlier. Around the middle of the fifth century B.C., the word 'demokratia' ('demos' meaning people and 'kratia' meaning rule or authority) was used to classify the political practices

within city-states (Dahl, 1989, p. 3). This ancient idea of democracy looks unmistakably different compared to today's standards of a democratic society.

The demos, which consisted of a small minority of the adult male population of Athens, took part in political life on a small scale only (i.e. city-states), whereas current democratic systems are more inclusive and scaled up to nation-wide or even European level, making it a more indirect form of government (Dahl, 1989, p. 5).

A broadly accepted 'twenty-first century definition' of democracy was formulated by Robert A. Dahl. He set up eight criteria which determine whether a country qualifies as a democracy or not. These eight criteria are: the right to vote; the right to be elected; the right of political leaders to compete for support and votes; elections that are free and fair; freedom of association; freedom of expression; alternative sources of information and institutions for making public policies depend on votes and other expressions of preference (Lijphart, 1999, p. 48-49).

## Democratic practices

Based on a study of PEW Research Center, which used the Center for Systemic Peace's Polity IV dataset<sup>3</sup> to see how political authority is gained and used in independent states with a population of 500,000 people or more (currently 167 sovereign states meet this criterium), 'democracy in practice' can be identified in the most states worldwide (DeSilver, 2017). Although democracy might be in decline (as pointed out in the first chapter of this dissertation), the number of democratic nations around the world is still higher compared to the 1970's. PEW Research Center used data of 2016 and found that, by the end of that year, 97 out of 167 countries were democracies, 21 could be identified

---

<sup>3</sup> "Polity assesses six key factors, from openness of political participation to constraints on the chief executive, to place each country on a 21-point scale ranging from +10 ("consolidated democracy") to -10 ("hereditary monarchy"). Polity does not rate countries whose central government has completely collapsed, those that are subject to foreign intervention or occupation, or those in the midst of a regime transition" (Desilver, 2017).

as autocracies and the rest (49) showed elements of both democracy and autocracy or could not be rated. In 1977, 35 of the 143 countries that were rated, were considered a democracy while 89 were autocracies (DeSilver, 2017).

In his book 'Democracy and its Critics', Dahl points out the difference between democracy as an ideal and democracy as a practice. In order to judge if an actual regime is close enough to the ideal – and can therefore be properly regarded as a democracy – indicators are needed (Dahl, 1989, p. 6). These vary between philosophical arguments (assertions to values, human nature i.a.) and empirical findings (institutions, conditions that facilitate the democratic process i.a.), as shown in the table (table 1 Dahl – indicators) below (Dahl, 1989, p. 7).

*Table 1. Some Aspects of a Theory about the Democratic Process (Domain: Associations that satisfy the requirements of (2) below)*

	The argument is more explicitly philosophical: assertions as to values, epistemology, "human nature," etc.			The argument is more explicitly empirical	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Less critical	Philosophical grounds (justifications) for the assumptions of (2)	Characteristics of an association sufficient to require the democratic process (3)	Criteria specifying a fully democratic process	Institutions required in order to satisfy (3) at the levels historically achieved by certain concrete associations 4.1. Very small demos 4.2. Small demos 4.3. Large demos 4.31. . . . 4.321. . . .  4.32. Variations in the institutions of polyarchy	Conditions that facilitate <sup>a</sup> the development and persistence of (4) 5.1. . . . 5.2. . . . 5.3. Conditions that facilitate the institutions of polyarchy 5.31. Effects of variations in conditions
More critical	(6) Other valid grounds and criteria, not (1) and (2)	(7) Critique and evaluation 7.1. The extent to which the institutions of (4) fail to meet the ideal criteria of (3)—e.g., incomplete democratization 7.2. Defects by other criteria (6)		(8) Institutions that would be required to meet deficiencies specified under (7): e.g., for further democratization of polyarchy	(9) Conditions that would facilitate (8)

<sup>a</sup>Deliberately ambiguous: may mean necessary to, sufficient for, or increase (significantly) probability of . . .

Table 1 Dahl - indicators

Democracy in practice, one of the two types Dahl wrote about, has been studied by Arend Lijphart as well. He argues that there are many ways in which democracies can be organized and run. Modern democracies show varieties in legislatures, courts, political party and interest groups, but, as Lijphart

states, “clear patterns and regularities appear when these institutions are examined from the perspective of how majoritarian<sup>4</sup> or how consensual<sup>5</sup> their rules and practices are” (Lijphart, 1999, p. 1).

Lijpharts argues that ‘pure’ or ‘almost pure’ majoritarian democracies are rare and; “limited to the United Kingdom, New Zealand (until 1996), and the former British colonies in the Caribbean (but only with regard to the executives-parties dimension). Most democracies have significant or even predominantly consensual traits” (Lijphart, 1999, p. 7). He even argues that a consensual democracy may be considered more democratic than a majoritarian democratic system.

This is because a consensual system offers room for citizens to participate, which is something - based on findings of PEW Research Center - ‘the people’ want. As stated in PEW’s 2017 report ‘Globally, Broad Support for Representative and Direct Democracy’, majorities in nearly all nations<sup>6</sup> are in favour of a form of democracy with less emphasis on elected representatives (Wike, Simmons, Stokes, & Fetterolf, 2017). “A global median of 66 percent says direct democracy – in which citizens, rather than elected officials, vote on major issues – would be a good way to govern. This idea is especially popular among Western European populists” (Wike et al., 2017).

## Deliberative democracy in theory

As mentioned briefly in the first chapter of this report, deliberative democracy is about letting citizens participate in the decision-making process more actively, rather than just voting during parliamentary

---

<sup>4</sup> In the majoritarian model of democracy, the people will do the governing and the government should be responsive in the interests of the majority whenever the people disagree; “which comes close to the democratic ideal of ‘government by and for the people’” (Lijphart, 1999, p. 2). Here, power is in the hands of a bare majority, making this model of democracy more “exclusive, competitive and adversarial” (Lijphart, 1999, p. 2).

<sup>5</sup> The consensus model of democracy focusses on the opinion of as many people as possible and aims at “broad participation in government and broad agreement on the policies that the government should pursue” (Lijphart, 1999, p. 2). This model is also in favor of majority rule, but “it accepts majority rule only as a minimum requirement: instead of being satisfied with narrow decision-making majorities, it seeks to maximize the size of these majorities. (...) It [the model] is characterized by inclusiveness, bargaining, and compromise” (Lijphart, 1999, p. 2).

<sup>6</sup> The research was carried out in 38 countries, with 41,953 respondents, from February to May 2017 (Wike et al., 2017).

elections. James Fishkin describes it as follows: “Deliberative democracy is a practical answer to a philosophical question: What would the people think should be done if they could consider key issues under good conditions for thinking about them?” (Fishkin, 2018, p. 4).

This definition is similar to Dahls idea of citizen participation, or ‘minipopulus’ as he calls it: “an assembly of citizens, demographically representative of the larger population, brought together to learn and deliberate on a topic in order to inform public opinion and decision-making” (Escobar & Elstub, 2017).

As Fishkin states, the most common system of democracy [which can be found in most Western states nowadays] takes many central values such as freedom of expression and association, rule of law and accountability into account. He argues that this is a “major human achievement in the long history of democracy spanning 2400 years”, but an “entry point for any meaningful version of the public will” is missing (Fishkin, 2018, p. 5).

Deliberative democracy might offer a solution for this, but it also raises other issues such as the conditions under which the will of the people develops, and the mechanisms by which that will is expressed. Fishkin refers to “the dilemma” that governance all over the world faces; “listen to the people and get the angry voices of populism or rely on widely distrusted elites and get policies that seem out of touch with the public concerns? Populism or technocracy? (...) Deliberative democracy can fill the gap with a voice of the people that is representative and thoughtful – ‘a mild voice of reason’ from the people and not just from their leaders. It can provide the missing link between public judgement and public policy” (Fishkin, 2018, p. 11).

Casting a vote during elections is now often the people’s main (or only) way of expressing power. In many cases, elections are even seen as the equivalent of a democratic system. According to Van

Reybrouck, this idea came into existence as soon as the representative elective system got accepted as the general form of governance. He refers to De Tocqueville who, as stated in the beginning of this chapter, called the American electoral representative system a democracy (Van Reybrouck, 2017, p. 89).

But, as Van Reybrouck argues, elections were never meant to be a democratic instrument, but should be seen as “a procedure to bring a new, non-inheritable elite to power. (...) Different to what Abraham Lincoln hoped for, an electoral democracy became a government for the people instead of a government by the people. Inevitably, a vertical system was created with a top and a bottom layer. The voting process brought the lucky few to the top” (Van Reybrouck, 2017, p. 99).

De Tocqueville was in favour of the equality this American system brought into society but remained critical of the electoral way of selecting a candidate: “A presidential election in the United States may be looked upon as a time of national crisis. As the election draws near, intrigues intensify, and agitation increases and spreads. The citizens divide into several camps, each behind its candidate. A fever grips the entire nation. The election becomes the daily grist of the public papers, the subject of private conversations, the aim of all activity, the object of all thought, the sole interest of the moment” (Goldhammer, 2016).

De Tocqueville was favourable about citizens participation in juries, he saw it as a process in which people (or: men, at that time) learn to judge their neighbours in a way they would like to be judged themselves as well: “The jury teaches each man not to retreat from responsibility for his own actions; a manly disposition, without which there is no political virtue. It vests each citizen with a sort of magistracy; it makes all feel they have duties to fulfil toward society and that they enter into its government. By forcing men to get involved in something other than their own affairs, it combats individual egoism, which is like the rust of societies (that ruins nations more than armies do)”

(Tocqueville, 1835, p. 448). De Tocqueville even calls it a way to “augment the natural enlightenment of the people”; something he considered to be “its greatest advantage” (Tocqueville, 1835, p. 448).

### Deliberative democracy in practice

Fishkin describes that deliberative democracy should not be “just a matter of armchair theorizing or thought experiments”, but rather the subject of empirical work and something that can offer a contribution to practical reforms and can improve governance at different levels (Fishkin, 2018, p. 10).

He was (one of) the first to experiment with deliberative democracy in modern day decision-making. In 1988 he published an article in which he proposed to bring 1,500 American citizens together for the duration of two weeks to let them discuss ideas with Republican and Democrat presidential candidates. This should stop the system in which the first debate broadcasted on television is the most important and therefore has a tremendous effect on how candidates are seen throughout the rest of the campaign. The debates and talks with ordinary citizens should also be broadcasted on television to enable other citizens to make a motivated choice, too (Van Reybrouck, 2017, p. 103).

In Fishkin’s proposal, two aspects of Athenian democracy could be found: members are elected by lot and they receive a financial compensation, to guarantee diversity. In short, his idea was to regain equal political chances for each citizen (Van Reybrouck, 2017, p. 103). After some adjustments to this proposal, Fishkin’s experiment was put into practice in 1996 under the name ‘National Issues Convention’ (NIC).

The NIC included surveys before and after the entire process, question and answer periods with experts, dialogues and workshops in small groups and a plenary discussion. Through the NIC, Fishkin wanted to show the value of the method itself and he regarded this poll as “a picture of public

opinion as it is, it's a window on American public opinion as it might be, if people become more engaged in the issues" (Ogle & Fletcher, 2016).

As research points out, the participants did not 'dramatically change' their opinions about the survey items discussed at NIC. In just seven out of 81 items, the opinion of the majority of respondents changed, and twenty out of 81 items had a significant change after the event took place. But, it did have a rather big influence on the way the participants viewed the government. "The idea that 'public officials care a lot about what people like me think' jumped up to 60 percent after the NIC, compared with 41 percent before. In a wider survey, those who had watched the NIC at home even felt more empowered to act in the political sphere" (Ogle & Fletcher, 2016).

Based on this NIC study, it can be argued that deliberative democracy may help to raise the level of political trust. Research shows<sup>7</sup> that confidence in public institutions (which includes parliaments, the civil service, the judiciary and the legal system) has been in decline for many years. According to Robert Putnam, to whom fellow political scientist Pippa Norris refers to in her book 'Critical Citizens, Global Support for Democratic Governments', this is a consequence of a changing pattern in political and social activities.

In short, since the 1950s, people (i.e. in the United States) tend to be less involved in local political activities such as attending political meetings, helping candidates or working with their neighbours on local issues, which affects their trust in governance (Norris, 1999, p. 19). Van Reybrouck also refers to

---

<sup>7</sup> As research conducted by Pippa Norris et al. shows, published in 'Critical Citizens, Global Support for Democratic Governments', most countries of which data are collected, experience a declining support for public institutions. As argued in that book, this shift might be related to a broader pattern of declining respect for authoritarian and hierarchical institutions (Norris, 1999, p. 19).

More recent numbers of research performed in the US show that the level of trust in political leaders dropped from 63 percent in 2004 to 42 percent in 2016 (Jones, 2016).

the declining numbers of political trust, but states it is not fair to say citizens are apathetic when it comes to politics<sup>8</sup>.

Citizens are interested in politics, but the level of political trust is low which creates, according to Van Reybrouck, a gap between what people want and what the politicians do. This ultimately leads to frustration of the people (Van Reybrouck, 2017, p. 12). Again, adopting a form of deliberative democracy in which citizens are involved and have a more direct say, may offer a cure for this situation (this is in line with the earlier mentioned number of the PEW Research Center, which states that 66 percent of the people asked, say that direct democracy in which citizens instead of elected officials have a say, would be a good way to govern).

However, political interest and actual participation are two different issues. Based on low voter turnouts and “the competing uses for personal time in modern society and the ‘unattractiveness’ of politics”, it can be argued that this would be a challenge (Bouricius, 2013, p. 6). Terrill Bouricius thinks that one can assume though that “most citizens would readily participate for a set period of time, with appropriate compensation, in a process in which they believed their input really mattered (unlike mass elections). This democratic process would bear almost no relations to ‘politics’ as we know it today” (Bouricius, 2013, p. 6).

He states that being one of the selected citizens to take part in a deliberative democracy process has the potential power to stop the ‘rational ignorance’<sup>9</sup> problem of mass elections. These people take their tasks seriously and they – just like people asked to be member of a jury in the American legal system – “go away with a heightened sense of citizenship” (Bouricius, 2013, p. 6).

---

<sup>8</sup> Van Reybrouck refers to research done by Koen Abts, Marc Swyngedouw and Dirk Jacobs published in ‘Nieuwe tijden, nieuwe mensen: Belgen over arbeid, gezin, ethiek, religie en politiek’, 2011, stating that people discuss politics with friends, family and their colleagues more than ever before.

<sup>9</sup> Rational ignorance is defined as follows: “since either acquiring information or processing publicly available information is costly for voters, and the impact of any voter on the outcome of a large election is presumably negligible, individual voters will generally choose to remain un-informed” (Martinelli, 2006, p. 1).

Based on a short documentary video about the Citizens' Assembly on the Eighth Amendment of the Irish Constitution, on abortion, a similar sense among the participants could be noticed. Ninety-nine randomly selected ordinary Irish citizens came together on twelve occasions between October 2016 and April 2018 to discuss and get informed about this topic<sup>10</sup>.

As John Long, one of the participants, states in the video: "I would say we probably put a couple of hundred hours of total time into it, which is probably more than any parliamentary committee would have put into it. So, we are probably the best-informed amateurs on the country on this topic at the moment" (Chalmers, 2017).

The Irish Citizens' Assembly published a final report with recommendations on the Eighth Amendment. A committee of members of parliament recommended a referendum, to remove the Eighth Amendment from the Irish Constitution. The referendum took place in May 2018 and passed with a majority of 66.4 percent voting in favour, overturning the ban on abortion in the country ("The Citizens' Assembly Fact Sheet", 2018).

A more recent example of citizens' participation is the Dutch initiative 'Code Oranje' ('Code Orange' in English). This political movement was launched on October 25, 2018 and wants to participate in elections for the States-Provincial (a provincial parliament and legislative assembly in each of the twelve Dutch provinces) on March 20, 2019. Code Oranje first focuses on three provinces but the initiator Bert Blase hopes that the movement will spread across national Dutch politics as well as European politics (Mebius, 2018).

---

<sup>10</sup> Over this period of time, the Citizens' Assembly also discussed four other topics, namely: "how we best respond to the challenges and opportunities of an ageing population; how the State can make Ireland a leader in tackling climate change; the manner in which referenda are held; and fixed term parliaments" ("The Citizens' Assembly Fact Sheet", 2018).

The agenda of this political movement is formed 'top-down', which means it will be entirely formed by citizens and gathered through online surveys, citizens' assemblies and interviews with voters (Mebius, 2018). Blase, who is a mayor and member of the Dutch PvdA ('Partij voor de Arbeid', social-democratic workers' party), believes that this is a method to address voters' distrust into politics and to fight populism at the same time (Mebius, 2018).

Blase argues that citizens will also need to be consulted after the elections, not just in the process of setting up the agenda. Coalition talks should be held in complete transparency and openness for the public. Besides that, he believes that referendums should be used to redirect decisions that have been made by politicians in order not to let political disagreements escalate (Mebius, 2018).

### The point of citizen participation

The examples of deliberative democracy projects mentioned are all inspired by democratic ideals; letting the people deal with public issues. Citizens' assemblies or juries generally consist of five different stages: planning and recruitment (in which the legitimacy and quality of the council is ensured), learning phase (in which participants get information about the subject from different perspectives), deliberative phase (in which participants discuss ideas in the light of all information collected), decision-making phase (in which informed decision-making is done which may lead to recommendations or a decision based on reasoned arguments) and a follow up (in which the outcomes of this assembly or jury are shared) (Escobar & Elstub, 2017).

Oliver Escobar and Stephen Elstub refer to Fishkin's statement, mentioned earlier in this chapter, as the main point of organizing a form of deliberative democracy: "How would the public deal with an issue if they had the time and resources to learn and deliberate about it in order to reach an informed decision?" (Escobar & Elstub, 2017).

Other than survey research or different forms of public engagement processes, deliberative democracy offers more than “snapshots of uninformed opinion by members of the public who may know little about an issue, or may not have even thought about it” (Escobar & Elstub, 2017). Escobar and Elstub identify three aspects that can be found in surveys, meetings and other forms of public engagement processes, which deliberative democracy projects avoid.

Firstly, citizen participation through deliberative democracy is not based on self-selection, guaranteeing representativeness and diversity in contrast to the other forms of public engagement. “Mainstream public participation processes tend to attract self-selected participants of certain socio-demographic characteristics and struggle to reach a cross-section of the population” (Escobar & Elstub, 2017).

Secondly, through these ‘mini-publics’ as Escobar and Elstub call these forms of citizens’ participation, poor quality of interaction and communication is avoided. The mini-publics are designed to: “avoid the usual problems of many public meetings and forums: dominant voices, silenced views, confrontational dynamics, lack of thinking time (reflex responses), shallow exchanges, rehearsed monologues, pre-packaged arguments, lack of opportunities to learn about diverse views, and so on” (Escobar & Elstub, 2017).

Thirdly, they see forms of deliberative democracy as a way to divide labour, and ‘proxies for the broader public’. People who did not participate in a certain council or jury, should be able to rely on their fellow citizens.

Besides this, the British scholars state that deliberative democracy may also contribute to civic engagement and the people’s capacity to deal with and argue about complex issues. Based on their research, they state that: “when citizens are given the time, resources and support to learn and

deliberate about public issues, they can engage with complex debates and collectively make considered judgements” (Escobar & Elstub, 2017).

The effects of this way of decision-making on institutions and on local governance in a representative democracy will be addressed later in this dissertation.

## The G1000 model

This thesis focusses on one deliberative democracy project, namely: G1000. This initiative started in 2011 by a group of Belgian writers, journalists and renowned thinkers after they experienced the long process of forming a government (which took 541 days) following the 2010 Belgian federal elections. Their main idea was to get citizens more involved into the democratic process and to revive democracy in Belgium, as put forward in the ‘G1000 manifesto’.

“If the politicians do not manage to find a solution, let the citizens deliberate. The latter may not have the same expertise as the former, but they have more freedom. And in this context that is a huge advantage. Ordinary citizens, unlike politicians, do not have to find a balance between national interests and electoral strategies. Ordinary citizens do not constantly need to ask: will I be rewarded or punished? Will my opponent be able to score on this issue, or not? Ordinary citizens do not need to be elected or re-elected. That is an invaluable asset. Expertise is something you can gain, but freedom is something you either have or you don’t. Citizens are therefore in a better position to make impartial choices” (Derenne, Van Reybrouck, Sinardet, & Vanthielen, 2011).

The manifesto consists of an analysis of the current state of democracy in Belgium (i.e. in 2011). The authors state that Belgium needs “a radically democratic alternative to the current situation” (i.e. a representative democratic system) in order to solve the country’s crisis (Derenne et al., 2011). They

refer to it as a crisis of democracy which can be seen in other European countries as well; not only in Belgium has government formation become a difficult process. The authors of the G1000 manifesto claim that representative democracy has reached its limits.

“Elections no longer enable governments to work; instead they seem to have become an obstacle to good governance. Political parties, created to streamline the diverse interests in society, now have each other in a permanent stranglehold. (...) Representative democracy, the system that was once so fresh, has become a low-oxygen environment. No wonder that the country can't breathe” (Derenne et al., 2011).

According to the G1000 manifesto writers, several symptoms can be identified which indicate that democracy has reached its limits. First of all, the role of parliamentarians gradually changed from being elected and focusing on his or her tasks for the duration of a governing period to being permanently present in the public sphere in which he or she can be criticized and questioned constantly. A certain restlessness occurred, as stated in the manifesto, because of elections happen more frequently and voters are more assertive and critical.

Secondly, traditional civil society organisations such as unions have less power or are disappearing. This means knowledge of how citizens' voices can be best translated into policy suggestions, is lost too (Derenne et al., 2011). Also, technological developments changed society unmistakably. Whereas citizens could only voice their dislike with a letter, demonstration or strike in the past, they can show their aversion to policies or (political) events in an unlimited and unfiltered way nowadays. “The occasional aggressiveness doesn't necessarily reveal a coarsening of public morality, but often the desire of the citizens to be heard” (Derenne et al., 2011).

The manifesto continues by arguing that democracy does not need to be applied in a fixed way but needs “to grow according to the needs of the age. (...) Innovation is everywhere, except in democracy. (...) Why should we be obliged to stick to a formula that is almost two centuries old? If democracy is no longer facilitated by elections, or even hindered by it, then citizens should help find democratic alternatives” (Derenne et al., 2011).

The authors refer to forms of deliberative democracy that have been tested in other countries, such as the reform of electoral laws in two Canadian provinces – British Columbia, in 2004, and Ontario in 2006, 2007. In both cases, the recruitment of the citizens’ assembly over three different phases<sup>11</sup>, brought together some hundred citizens who gathered expertise about alternative electoral systems through meetings over the course of nine to twelve months (Derenne et al., 2011). These groups of selected citizens in British Columbia and Ontario both came up with a proposal for electoral reforms, after which referendums were held.

The G1000 initiatives refer to other examples of citizens participation in the decision-making process stating that these initiatives lead to “a debate between people of diverging views. Often, they have led to deeper insights and calmer decisions” (Derenne et al., 2011). Belgium does not have a tradition of deliberative democracy, but as the authors argue, it can complement to the representative democratic system and may help to overcome the system’s limits (Derenne et al., 2011).

“Just as in a system of direct democracy, it aims at the large involvement of ordinary citizens, but through its careful sampling of diverse groups it also respects the spirit of representative democracy. The formula differs fundamentally from a referendum or plebiscite, because

---

<sup>11</sup> The selection process for the citizens’ assemblies consisted of three phases which each took three to four months:  
1. A random sample from electoral registers was done to select citizens who received an invitation by mail;  
2. Those who were interested joined a meeting and could indicate if they were interested to take part in the assembly;  
3. A quota sampling was done (in which the representativeness of society) from the interested candidates to select the final assembly participants (Van Reybrouck, 2011, p. 113).

these systems require everyone to vote on a subject that few people really know well. In a deliberative democracy, a few people are asked to discuss something they are thoroughly informed about. The results are usually more sensible and mature” (Derenne et al., 2011).

Their proposal was to bring one thousand Belgians together in Brussels to discuss major challenges that Belgian democracy faces. They called it ‘G1000, the citizens’ summit’. This group of citizens, which should represent the entire population of the country, was supposed to discuss, get informed and being heard on several topics in smaller groups. By doing so, the initiators believed that they could advise officials with the outcomes of the summit on what the people of Belgium want.

“Obviously, the decisions and recommendations of the G1000 cannot be binding, and that’s a good thing – as a citizens initiative we do not want a formal mandate; we want to retain maximum freedom. But they will provide a meaningful framework for further negotiations” (Derenne et al., 2011).

In the manifesto, three different stages of the G1000 summit are mentioned. In the first phase, which began in July 2011 and ended in November 2011, an online survey is conducted to find out which topics concern citizens. The second phase is the actual summit itself, which took place on November 11, 2011. Finally, in the third phase (which lasted from November 2011 until April 2012) a smaller group of citizens came together to elaborate on the summit’s results to develop them into solutions (Derenne et al., 2011).

In order to make this a successful process, the initiators of the G1000 summit set up basic principles, namely: independence, openness, dignity, optimism, complementarity, participation, transparency, opportunity and dynamics (for the full manifesto, please see Annex 2).

In a news article about the G1000 meeting, David Farrell was not so optimistic about the results on the short term but more focused on those in the long run. “Of course, the summit will not succeed in terms of suggesting breakthroughs for solutions, it is about the atmosphere and the feelings” (Zonderop, 2011). Farrell states that such forms of citizens participation are valuable for strengthening democracy: “politicians should take advantage of it” (Zonderop, 2011).

The participants discussed topics such as immigration on which they stated that minorities should be obliged to integrate (which politicians tend to formulate more carefully) and that the procedure regarding asylum should be organized more efficiently. Most of the 1,000 participants were willing to join the third step of the G1000 project, and discuss the outcomes of the summit in smaller groups.

According to the article, the participants were enthusiastic about this way of getting involved in democracy, as one of them states: “Even if this summit only changes one thing, we have shown that we can make a difference. Than we started a revolution that, I believe, could spread all over Europe” (Zonderop, 2011). The journalist states that it is important that politicians recognize this trend as well and understand this call for involvement (Zonderop, 2011).

## Decision-making at local level in the Netherlands

Before getting into more detail on how the G1000 model is applied in the Netherlands, it will be helpful to present more information on how regular local decision-making works in the Netherlands. An overview can also be found in ‘Table 2 local government structure’, on page 41.

Each Dutch municipality (i.e. the local decision-making level that this dissertation focuses on) has a city council, a mayor and a municipal executive board (its members are referred to as aldermen in English).

The members of the city council (which can be up to forty-five) are elected through direct elections which take place every four years, and all represent a political party. The council meetings take place once a month in smaller towns, but more often (i.e. biweekly or weekly) in bigger cities and the agenda is published beforehand. The council's three main tasks are: to set up a framework for the municipality's policy, to check if the mayor and the municipal executive board are executing their tasks properly and to represent the inhabitants of the town or city. Members join several committees (on healthcare, transport and education for instance) and prepare the process of decision-making on specific topics and consult with the municipal executive board ("De organisatie - ProDemos", n.d.).

Together, the mayor and the municipal executive board form the 'administration' of the municipality. After the elections, the political parties that form a majority coalition in the city council, discuss the appointment of members of the municipal executive board. Each member of that board has his or her own topics to focus on (i.e. finance, housing, education or culture). The meetings of the mayor and the municipal executive board are not open to the public.

Dutch municipalities offer several ways to get citizens involved at local decision-making level. They can join meetings of the city council and its committees for instance. Besides that, municipalities also tend to employ civil servants who inform the public about policies by publishing articles on assigned pages in local newspapers, creating brochures, updating websites or creating a city or town newspaper.

Also, other ways of citizen participation are put into practice, such as online surveys, referendums, public participation meetings (which are in many cases, a legal obligation) and citizens' initiatives ("De invloed van burgers - ProDemos", n.d.). Citizens are informed when decisions are taken but also in the process prior to it, to allow them to have their say ("De invloed van burgers - ProDemos", n.d.).

Some towns or cities have ‘neighbourhood councils’ whom advise the municipality officials regarding plans for their own area of the town or city. Participants of these councils are not elected but are voluntarily involved. The municipal executive board and the mayor take their opinions into account before presenting their plans to the city council ("De invloed van burgers - ProDemos", n.d.).

<p><b>Mayor</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-appointed after approval of the city council, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the national governmental administration;</li> <li>-appointed for a period of six years and can be re-elected for another term.</li> </ul> <p><b>Main tasks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-maintaining public order and safety;</li> <li>-executing national laws;</li> <li>-chairperson of the city council (without the right to vote);</li> <li>-chairperson of the municipal executive board (with the right to vote);</li> <li>-forms the ‘administration’ of a municipality together with the municipal executive board.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Municipal executive board</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-between two and nine members;</li> <li>-each member has specific policy areas to focus on such as finance or education;</li> <li>-appointed by a majority coalition of the city council after the elections;</li> <li>-elections take place every four years.</li> </ul> <p><b>Main tasks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-implementing the decisions made by the city council;</li> <li>-executing national laws.</li> </ul>
<p><b>City council</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-up to forty-five members;</li> <li>-directly elected;</li> <li>-elections take place every four years;</li> <li>-each member represents a political party;</li> <li>-meetings take place at least once a month;</li> <li>-members join committees on specific topics such as transport or healthcare.</li> </ul> <p><b>Main tasks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-setting up a policy framework;</li> <li>-checking the duties of the mayor and municipal executive board;</li> <li>-represent the inhabitants.</li> </ul>

*Table 2 local government structure*

## The G1000 model in the Netherlands

In the Netherlands, the G1000 model was introduced in the city of Amersfoort in 2014, by citizens' initiative Platform G1000.nu. Ever since, twenty-two citizens' summits on local decision-making level have been organized. The Dutch G1000 project was inspired by the Belgian citizens' summit of 2011. Harm van Dijk, one of the initiators, states that they wanted to create a space in which citizens, civil servants, politicians and employers could talk to each other about several topics they believe are important. Together they could come up with solutions, translate those into policies and decrease the space between 'the government' and 'the people' (Van Dijk, 2018).

Therefore, a G1000 procedure in the Netherlands is always led by citizens, but the (local) government, employers and other parties take part in the process too. Besides seven-hundred citizens (chosen by lot), one-hundred local government representatives, as well as one-hundred professionals and one-hundred independent thinkers (i.e. these can be local entrepreneurs) join the process. To ensure political independence, these 'third parties' cannot initiate a G1000 process themselves.

A G1000 procedure in the Netherlands consists of the following three steps: citizens' summit, citizens' forum and citizens' council (also see 'Table 3 G1000 procedure explained', on page 43). A G1000 starts with a citizens' summit (in Dutch it is called 'burgertop'), a one-day-event in which up to one thousand people get together to talk about a specific topic regarding their own town or city ("Over G1000", n.d.). The central strategy here is to let the participants have a dialogue, to allow them to find the topics they consider to be important as well solutions for problems related to those topics.

On its website, Platform G1000.nu states that the citizens' summit is based on the following rules: there is no agenda (there is no preference for certain proposals, but a procedure to talk about new proposals), there is a dialogue (no discussion, but acknowledging that everyone has his or her own view), participation is based on draw (this means that everyone has an equally big chance to

participate), all actors of the political system are welcome to participate in the dialogue (there are no ‘anti-politics sentiments’, parties as the government, employers and citizens join to make sure that everyone feels responsible for the outcome), the process is transparent (the participants are responsible themselves for the outcomes of the G1000 citizens’ summit) and there is a safe atmosphere (supervisors allow the dialogue, according to guidelines, to take place ) ("Over G1000", n.d.).

The second step is the citizens’ forum (in Dutch is it called ‘burgerforum’). In this phase, the proposals of the summit are made public. Each inhabitant can respond to the proposals online or in small organized meetings. In the citizens’ forum phase, workshops are organized in which further reactions are collected and processed in the initial proposals ("Over G1000", n.d.).

The third and final step is the citizens’ council (in Dutch called ‘burgerraad’). At this meeting, the participants of the citizens’ summit (i.e. the first phase) come together and judge the proposals made in the workshops in the second phase. Finally, the proposals that are voted by a majority of the participants form the citizens’ decision (‘burgerbesluit’). This document is signed by all participants and the mayor is asked to present the outcome to the city council with the request to implement that decision ("Over G1000", n.d.).

Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
<b>Citizens’ summit</b>	<b>Citizens’ forum</b>	<b>Citizens’ council</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Up to 1000 participants;</li> <li>-Dialogue about a specific topic</li> <li>-No agenda;</li> <li>-Participation is based on draw;</li> <li>-Political actors are welcome as well, to make it inclusive;</li> <li>-Transparent process;</li> <li>-Safe atmosphere in which citizens can share ideas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Proposals (outcomes) of the summit are made public;</li> <li>-All citizens can respond to proposals online or in meetings;</li> <li>-All ideas are collected and processed in workshops.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Participants of step 1 come together to judge the proposals made in step 2;</li> <li>-Proposals that are supported by the majority form the citizens’ decision;</li> <li>-The citizens’ decision document is signed by all participants and presented to the city council to be implemented.</li> </ul>

*Table 3 G1000 procedure explained*

## The Dutch G1000 model in earlier studies

The Dutch G1000 model has been studied before. To provide some context on earlier studies, an example of one of the earliest G1000's organised in the Netherlands, as well as a more recent one (i.e. 2017), are briefly analysed in this section.

Peer Smets and Marloes Vlind examined the G1000 organised in a specific neighbourhood (an area called 'Kruiskamp') of the city of Amersfoort. This smaller G1000 derived from a meeting organised for the entire city on citizens' initiative. The researchers mostly looked at the interaction between the participants to see how they come up with solutions for the entire community. Smets and Vlind state that the group of people did not seem to represent the entire community; the participants were mainly middle-aged, middle-class and white – whereas the population of Kruiskamp is multi-ethnic (Smets & Vlind, 2017, p. 24).

Smets and Vlind argue that having a dialogue is important for establishing a common ground, and to avoid a debate with 'pro's and con's'. Since the participants discuss their ideas in smaller groups, the persons leading these smaller dialogues have a rather big influence on the process. The same goes for the composition of the group; whenever people leave, or join later, the group dynamics change which can affect that common ground. Moreover, Smets and Vlind conclude that the relatively high number of meetings could negatively affect the willingness of people to participate in a G1000 process (Smets & Vlind, 2017, p. 26).

The meetings in Kruiskamp have led to several initiatives. The citizens are responsible for the continuation with the results themselves (i.e. the G1000 organisation does not help with executing the final ideas, it is there to facilitate the process of forming ideas). Smets and Vlind conclude that a G1000 can stimulate people in feeling a common responsibility for certain issues, instead of being dependent of the government or professional organisations (Smets & Vlind, 2017, p. 27).

An example of a more recent study of the G1000 model, is the research of Franziska Eckardt and Paul Benneworth. They studied the G1000 procedure in the city of Enschede, just like this dissertation is referring to. Eckardt and Benneworth investigated the extent to which the G1000 model can be seen as a 'social learning system' for citizens (Eckardt & Benneworth, 2018, p. 1). They refer to Woodhills definition of social learning systems as being "processes and structures necessary to involve a heterogeneous set of [societal actors (individuals, or groups)] in analysing and making decisions about complex, multifaceted and value-laden problem situations" (Eckardt & Benneworth, 2018, p. 2).

To judge if the G1000 contributed to effective social learning among participants, the two researchers examined if the procedure "developed a sense of joint enterprise, made mutual engagement emerge, and if it developed shared repertoires" (Eckardt & Benneworth, 2018, p. 8). When it comes to the first point, Eckardt and Benneworth state the participants referred to the atmosphere during the dialogues as "positive, relaxing and energising", which "helped to turn a sensitive subject [i.e. the firework policy] into a subject that can be discussed openly" (Eckardt & Benneworth, 2018, p. 8).

They also recognised a form of mutual engagement within the G1000 process, but; "participants established their own formal as well as informal ways of communication and interaction between working group members" (Eckardt & Benneworth, 2018, p. 10). Those informal ways of communication and interactions led to situations in which information about the process was not equally shared between all group members.

When it comes to developing shared repertoires, the researchers state that this can be seen throughout the G1000 procedure in several ways. Participants for instance talk about 'we' in their dialogues, as well as a similar way of expressing their point of view. Moreover, the people used an online platform to facilitate communication and to share knowledge (Eckardt & Benneworth, 2018, p. 12).

The researchers conclude that the G1000 model can support and facilitate social learning, given the fact that the 'safe' environment in which the talks took place, gave participants the opportunity to better understand the central topic through dialogue and interaction (Eckardt & Benneworth, 2018, p. 15). The G1000 procedure can therefore be considered sufficient to let a group of people decide about complex issues and situations.

### Sceptical views on citizens' participation

There are some less enthusiastic views on citizens' participation in democratic systems as well. Jason Brennan, for instance, sees political participation as something which is not valuable for most people:

“On the contrary, it does most of us little good, and instead tends to stultify and corrupt us. It turns us unto civic enemies who have ground to hate one another. Citizens don't have any basic right to vote or run for office. Political power, even the small amount of power contained in the right to vote, has to be justified. The right to vote is not like other civil liberties, such as freedom of speech, religion, or association. While there might be some intrinsically unjust forms of government, democracy is not a uniquely or intrinsically just form of government. Unrestricted, equal, universal suffrage – in which each citizen automatically is entitled to one vote – is in many ways on its face morally objectionable” (Brennan, 2016, p. 7).

Brennan states that universal suffrage leads to most voters taking political decisions in an ignorant and irrational way, and that “even though democracy turns out to be the best feasible system, we might be able to improve it with less participation” (Brennan, 2016, p. 8). He is in favour of a form of 'epistocracy', which means 'the rule of the knowledgeable': “a political regime is epistocratic to the extent that political power is formally distributed according to competence, skill, and the good faith to act on that skill” (Brennan, 2016, p. 14).

Brennan argues that an epistocracy can occur in different forms, such as ‘restricted suffrage’ in which only ‘competent and/or sufficiently well informed’ citizens acquire the right to vote, and ‘enfranchisement lottery’. In the latter, thousands of citizens are selected by lot prior to the elections and become so-called prevoters. “These prevoters may then earn the right to vote, but only if they participate in certain competence-building exercises, such as deliberative forms with their fellow citizens” (Brennan, 2016, p. 15).

This last form of epistocracy shows resemblance with the G1000 model and other forms of deliberative democracy presented throughout this chapter. However, a big difference between these procedures and Brennan’s idea is that according to his thinking, one should earn the right to vote and to participate whereas the other forms of citizens participation are open to everyone, promote equality and try to represent an entire community.

In his book, Brennan refers to John Stuart Mill and Joseph Schumpeter who held opposite views on political participation. Mill argued that “getting people involved in politics would make them smarter, more concerned about the common good, better educated, and nobler. (...) Mill hoped political involvement would harden our minds yet soften our hearts. He hoped that political engagement would cause us to look beyond our immediate interests and instead to adopt a long-term, broad perspective” (Brennan, 2016, p. 2).

This line of thought goes back to Schumpeter, who can be seen as one of the most influential twentieth century political economists, and who believed that political participation would not be beneficial. “The typical citizen drops down to a lower level of mental performance as soon as he enters the political field. He argues and analyses in a way which he would readily recognize as infantile within the sphere of his real interests. He becomes a primitive again. His thinking becomes associative and affective” (Schumpeter, 1943, p. 262).

According to Schumpeter, 'the typical citizen' is likely to be guided by prejudices and impulses and not see things as they are. Moreover, when logic and rational criticism are missing in a citizens' arguments, opportunities for other interest groups are increasing. "These groups may consist of professional politicians or of exponent of an economic interest or of idealists of one kind of another or of people simply interested in staging and managing political shows. (...) The will of the people is the product and not the motive power of the political process" (Schumpeter, 1943, p. 263).

Opposed to this, one could argue that the procedure of public deliberation improves the fairness of democratic outcomes. A commonly accepted view is that "democratic decisions are fair (and, on this view, also legitimate) insofar as they are produced by the fair procedure of majority rule" (Cooke, 2000, p. 950). In addition to that, Meave Cooke refers to the work of Seyla Benhabib and Joshua Cohen who state that: "democratic decisions are fair or legitimate insofar as they are produced by a fair deliberative procedure", or more precisely: "fair procedures produce fair outcomes because the procedure is in some normative sense fairer than other procedures" (Cooke, 2000, p. 950).

Cooke argues that this argument in favour of deliberative democracy as being fair, is strengthened if one would also accept the view that "deliberative democracy elucidates an ideal of democracy that is most congruent with 'whom we are'. (...) It posits the ideal of democracy as a fundamental principle that is in a sense uncircumventable for inhabitants of modern Western modernity" (Cooke, 2000, p. 950).

Cooke identifies two main elements in this statement, namely: "there are certain key normative conceptions of knowledge, of the self and of the good life that are so central to modern Western history and traditions that rejecting them is not a matter of simple decision but would require a fundamental reorientation in our thinking, and that a deliberative model of democracy makes best sense of these normative conceptions" (Cooke, 2000, p. 954).

David Van Reybrouck also addressed the principle of fairness, which he believes is important to be taken into account in the G1000 model. Van Reybrouck presents examples of ancient Athens, and Italian and Spanish cities in the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries, who used a system in which citizens' participation was common and in which people were selected by lot. He states that history has learned the following: "draw has been a political instrument since antiquity, it has always been used at local level in which only a particular part of society could take part, the use of draw was done at times a society was wealthy, draw was used in several ways, but it caused less conflicts and greater participation, draw was always used in combination with elections to guarantee competence, states that used draw have known political stability, despite having rivalry groups" (Van Reybrouck, 2017, p. 74).

The different aspects links to the research questions which were presented throughout this chapter, offer context for the following chapters. Also, this theoretical framework will help answering the main and sub research questions. The next chapter, Chapter 4, will focus on the results of this study.

## Chapter 4. Results

In this chapter, the results of the research will be presented per research question, starting with the two sub-questions. A conclusion will not yet be given; this follows in Chapter 5. For an overview of the coding process which has led to the following results, please see Annex 4.

### Government has 'carte blanche'

Van Dijk, founder of the Dutch G1000 platform, described the government in the current Dutch political system as 'powerful' (Annex 2, quotation 1). The government, which relies on existing decision-making procedures, does not experience much 'pushback'. According to Van Dijk, several civil society organisations were professionalised over the past years and are dependent on governmental grants. This, he claims results in "citizens being basically 'left on their own' and the government having 'carte blanche' to arrange society in the way it wishes" (Annex 2, quotation 1).

Van Dijk states that bureaucracy has two main characteristics. "It is incredibly unfair to bottom-up impulses, but it is – at the same time – extremely sensitive to top-down impulses", meaning that governments do not involve citizens in how decisions are taken, but do welcome views of lobby groups (Annex 2, quotation 2).

However, at the local level, there are numerous examples of governments asking people to get involved in decision-making procedures. As found through literature research (see Chapter 3), this can range from attending a meeting of the city council, to sending out online surveys and organising a referendum – in which participation takes place in a relative short time frame – or taking part in a 'neighbourhood council', where members tend to be involved over a longer period of time ("De invloed van burgers - ProDemos", n.d.). This differs, as Van Dijk argues, from the G1000 approach. "G1000 is about direct democracy. Government-lead citizen participation is about a government

being so kind to let the citizens have a say too”, which incorporates a sense of inequality (Annex 2, quotation 3).

He states that in the current set-up, both the government and political parties miss the connection with the people, whereas citizens want to express themselves and want to be part of a bigger, social sphere. “G1000 aims at having direct influence in the centre of the political system and secondly, and more importantly, to create a place where citizens can meet again and where they experience that sense of being part of a community” (Annex 2, quotation 4).

Loes Schippers, a participant of the G1000 held in Enschede, adds that people need to be more aware of living in a democratic society. “The city’s policy is what we [the people] decide. Casting a vote every four years is too easy; people do not feel responsible for democracy. A process like G1000 works well against the distrust and incomprehension between citizens and the government” (Annex 2, quotation 5). She noticed that some participants of the G1000 in Enschede were sceptical about the outcomes of this citizens’ participation process. “A lot of people had distrust against the city; [and thought] we are doing the work for them. Or they said; the final decision has been made already” (Annex 2, quotation 6).

This feeling might not entirely justified, as it was the mayor who brought up the idea of consulting the inhabitants of Enschede. The city council had been looking for ways to involve the citizens in decision-making and decided to ask their opinion about the town’s firework policy.

Job Kantelberg, advisor to the ‘administration’ of the municipality (the municipal executive board and mayor), was part of the project group who decided to implement the G1000 procedure. Enschede became the first city in which the G1000 platform created a partnership with a city (Annex 2, quotation 7). This will be explained in more detail in the next paragraph (Sub-question 2).

To answer the first sub-question, *What are the effects of existing decision-making procedures on citizen participation at a local level?*, it can be stated that existing decision-making procedures in the Netherlands do leave room for several types of citizen participation, although these are different from G1000 procedures. The government-led ways of involving the people in decision-making procedures could be regarded as a favour rather than a type of direct democracy.

Van Dijk claims that the government does not experience much 'pushback' in the current Dutch political system, but is sensitive for top-down impulses, which creates opportunities for lobby groups instead of citizens. Citizens, as Van Dijk argues, do want to have a say and want to be part of a bigger community. Involving the people through G1000 would fight the feelings of distrust and incomprehension between citizens and government, as stated by Schippers.

#### A partnership with a city creates maximum impact

Here, it is important to make a distinction between the first few G1000 procedures (based on citizens' initiative) and the G1000 model that exists since 2017, which is a collaboration between a city and the G1000 platform itself.

As Van Dijk explained, two main characteristics of the initial G1000 format complicated the process of influencing on the local political system. The first is having a too general topic. "The question: 'What do you consider to be important for the future of our community?', turned out to be too abstract and only attracted participants with a college or university degree" (Annex, quotation 8).

The second point is being too much of a citizens' initiative. This was initially meant to make sure that G1000 is not a government-led instrument, but as Van Dijk states: "This resulted in a sceptic government, saying: well, interesting that the citizens want this, but let's see how it turns out" (Annex, quotation 8).

Because the G1000 platform was not organised in the same way as the government is going about decision-making, the G1000 procedure experienced difficulties with realizing the outcomes. “There were lots of ideas and enthusiasm [among the participants], but this was smothered in the realisation process. Therefore, we needed a different approach because those enthusiastic citizens would think twice about organising another G1000” (Annex, quotation 8).

The G1000 platform reconsidered its course in 2017 by accepting a request of a city to establish a partnership. “This turned out to be a breakthrough for realising the outcomes of a G1000 procedure” (Annex 2, quotation 8). Within this partnership, the independence of the G1000 organisation is guaranteed and the city agrees to seriously consider the outcomes. Prior to the start of the G1000 procedure, civil servants are trained to co-organise it. Van Dijk: “Within each city, we found civil servants who really enjoyed this process. This is of great help because now we immediately have people at the forefront” (Annex 2, quotation 8).

The most important realisation, as Van Dijk argues, is that the outcome of a G1000 needs to be similar to the outcome of the bureaucratic system for it to be implemented (‘the system’ can only work with ideas and outcomes it recognises as something it could have come up with by itself as well). The gap between the usually ‘linguistic’ proposals of a city and the less ‘bureaucratic’ ideas citizens come up with, was closed by adding the citizens’ forum to the G1000 procedure (Annex 2, quotation 8).

A G1000 procedure now takes three months and consists of three steps; citizens’ summit, forum and council, as explained in Chapter 2. In Enschede some 10,000 invitations were sent out. Around 350 people joined in the first round, from whom 100 participated in the second session, too. According to participant Loes Schippers, this group represented the city well (Annex 2, quotation 9).

After collecting the general ideas, participants were divided in smaller groups based on sub-topics such as safety. Each group got a civil servant assigned to it who facilitated the process but did not intervene in the dialogues itself. “They for instance asked us if we needed any office space to get together [for future meetings]”, Schippers explains (Annex 2, quotation 9).

At the citizens’ council (the final stage of a G1000 procedure), the ideas of those smaller groups were presented to three different panels, namely; citizens who did not take part in the G1000 process, professionals and politicians. These people could ask questions about the ideas, after which the participants voted on all matters. The proposals that received enough support are included in the citizens’ decision. By doing so, a collectively supported citizens’ decision – ready to be implemented – can be handed over to the city council.

This new procedural rule has an important effect on citizens’ participation, as Van Dijk explains: “Since we introduced this model, the city council does not dare to vote against the citizens’ decision. (...) Where we did not have any impact at first, we have maximum impact with the citizens’ decision now” (Annex 2, quotation 8). This is because the G1000 procedure is now based on a city’s initiative and therefore, lives up to the demands of a city, Van Dijk states. “This means that the path to policy is evened. This is very important. We are connecting to the bureaucratic system. (...) The ritual, namely the meeting with its electoral procedures, is something the bureaucracy recognizes, it sees reflections of its own system [in the G1000 procedure]” (Annex 2, quotation 8).

As stated in the answer of the first sub-question, the G1000 procedure in Enschede was based on both the initiative of the mayor and the wish of the city council to explore different ways of involving citizens in decision-making. Kantelberg stated that the city as a whole is satisfied with the procedure: “However, there are some improvements thinkable, it is quite expensive. Also, some people did not

agree with making the firework policy such a priority, but the fact that it is about having a dialogue everyone supported.” (Annex 2, quotation 10).

The city wants to add more forms of citizens’ participation in the decision-making procedures, as Kantelberg explains. “It still needs to be agreed on how we will do this exactly. Involving citizens into decision-making is something we already thought about [i.e. it is not something the G1000 procedure is responsible for]. A city dialogue, ‘Enschede Dialog’, for example is even written down as a kind of second coalition agreement” (Annex 2, quotation 10).

Based on the information presented above, the second sub-question, *How could different procedural rules be adopted and what are the likely effects on citizen participation at a local decision-making level?*, can be answered by stating that the outcome of a G1000 procedure is more effective when the G1000 is organised in cooperation with a city. It then meets the wish of the city to get the citizens involved in decision-making. The G1000 platform also changed the procedures and has more resemblances with the bureaucratic system. The outcomes of the ‘new’ [i.e. the system implemented after 2017] G1000, are implemented by the city councils, whereas before, the G1000 platform experienced difficulties in getting the ideas of citizens accepted.

### Cities and citizens experience a G1000 procedure differently

The G1000 model has a ‘no agenda’ policy. As Van Dijk argues, a shortcoming of the current Dutch political system is that citizens seem to have influence on local decision-making level through the politicians they elect, but not on the agenda.

“The agenda is set up behind closed doors, and no one knows how that is done. That is why we [the G1000 platform] let citizens decide the agenda. This is probably one of the most revolutionary changes of the G1000 process, it is a very fundamental one. This ensures that citizens are in control.

The topic of the G1000 itself is chosen, but the rest is entirely up to the participants” (Annex 2, quotation 11).

In order to make sure that ‘the rules are not changed during the game’, as Van Dijk states, it turned out to be crucial to get a signed document of agreement of both the city council and the municipal executive board prior to the start of a G1000 procedure. He noticed that putting pressure on the local political and governance system, is not always appreciated (Annex 2, quotation 11).

In the case of Enschede, Schippers notes that participants did not have ‘extreme’ wishes but tend to come up with reasonable ideas and are prepared to follow up on the process after the citizens’ decision was taken. Some of the participants like herself, kept in touch with the city council and mayor about the adaptation of the citizens’ decision into policy for instance (Annex 2, quotation 12).

Van Dijk also noticed the aspect of reasonability and finding a common ground. “In no time, participants are prepared to put their own interests last. (...) This phenomenon, which arises when you play the game by the rules [i.e. the G1000 procedure], is every politicians dream. This is the real secret of G1000” (Annex 2, quotation 11).

A G1000 procedure requires commitment from participants, the city and the G1000 platform itself. All three parties admit that organizing a G1000 procedure takes a lot of time. Also, it is a quite expensive project; it costs around 300,000 euros. Therefore, the city of Enschede will choose an alternative method in the future (Annex 2, quotation 13).

The G1000 platform developed a ‘G1000 light’, which consists of just a citizens’ council with a maximum of 150 participants. This is also how Van Dijk sees future, sustainable G1000 procedures; ideally each municipality would organise one every half year. “Here, relevant issues are discussed with

citizens who are selected by lot. Each time, a new group of citizens would join so, eventually, everyone gets to join and gets to experience the beneficial effect of participation (Annex 2, quotation 11).

In case the G1000 becomes an established form of citizen participation, some adaptations to the method are required. Van Dijk believes that civil servants should be working on the outcomes independently, for instance. “Then, after a few months, those policy documents need to be presented to the participants of the citizens’ council for them to see if this is what they wanted and vote on it” (Annex 2, quotation 11).

By doing so, the administration of a city would need to professionalise handling a G1000 procedure. “Also, it should be able to resist a powerful lobby of a member of the municipal board” (Annex 2, quotation 11). Van Dijk also argues that the possible problems to motivate citizens to participate will be resolved by making attendance obligatory, similar to the jury duty in the United States.

“Then, the representative system is accompanied by a direct democratic system, a system based on participation. Some issues should be dealt with there, others somewhere else”, as Van Dijk explains, the G1000 procedure would in fact be a way of giving guidance to a city’s policy (Annex 2, quotation 11). The outcomes of the direct democratic system do not have any legal bindings, but it needs the formal approval of the city council. “We can, however, make an agreement beforehand, such as; whatever the people decide, we will approve it,” as Kantelberg explains. “That is what we did in Enschede; if it will be less than 15,000 euros, we can go ahead” (Annex 2, quotation 13).

The G1000 platform believes that the system could be applied on national level as well. “At every location where people need to discuss something [i.e. and find a solution], this is a fantastic replacement of the top-down system by a bottom-up system” (Annex 2, quotation 11).

Based on the interviews, the main question of this report, *What are the implications of the use of the G1000 model for citizen participation at local-decision making level?*, can be answered by stating that the implications of the G1000 model for citizen participation vary between those for participants and those for the city. Participants tend to come up with reasonable ideas and are willing to put their own interest aside. Also, they have direct influence on the agenda, which is not possible (or to a lesser extent) in the current representative system.

For the city, agreeing on organizing a G1000 method means a change in approach. City council members and members of the municipal organizational board cannot lobby for their own ideas and are dependent on the outcomes of the citizens' discussions. It is a quite expensive project, which may lead to cities exploring other possibilities like the 'G1000 light'. Future possibilities for the G1000 model include expanding the project to national level, where it could operate in a similar way.

## Chapter 5. Conclusion

In this chapter, the research questions will be answered by combining the results of the interviews in the light of the literature of the theoretical framework.

### Government for the people

As the theory presented in Chapter 3 shows, each Dutch municipality has a city council with elected members, a mayor and a municipal executive board that govern a city or town. On a local level, the power of citizens is not only limited to casting a vote for the city council every four years; several other instruments or procedures exist to involve them.

They can for instance join city council meetings or come up with a citizens' initiative, whereas municipalities can (or are legally obliged to) actively ask the people's opinion by sending out an online survey or organising a referendum. However, results coming from these political instruments do not necessarily represent the opinion of an entire community since involvement is voluntary.

Van Dijk describes the government-lead ways of citizens participation as 'a favor' granted by the government, rather than a type of direct democracy where there is a more specific wish to get the people involved in decision-making. He sees the current political system as 'powerful' and argues that the government has 'carte blanche' to operate in the way it wants.

Through this 'top-down' management-like governing style, losing the connection with the people is at risk, though the people want to experience a sense of community. This is what G1000 participant Schippers claims as well; she therefore describes a G1000 – or a similar direct democracy procedure – as a means to minimize feelings of distrust and incomprehension between citizens and government.

This matches the findings of PEW Research Center, which in a 2017 report about the support for representative and direct democracy suggests that a majority (66 percent) of the respondents to a survey among people in 38 countries, is in favor of a democracy in which citizens vote on major policy issues instead of elected officials.

Governing together is also James S. Fishkin's solution for, as he calls it, "the missing meaningful version of the public will" in current representative democracies. In most of these political systems, policies tend to be out of touch with the public concerns. As David Van Reybrouck argues, electoral democracies have created a top and bottom layer, and are "a government for the people" instead of "a government by the people".

The division of a top and bottom layer in society and a lack of confidence in the current democratic system make populist parties gain support. This, and an apathy regarding the 'democratic project', are – as Freedom House states – worrisome for the future because an antidemocratic view or practice equals a setback for fundamental freedoms and brings about potential economic and security risks.

Fishkin describes that most societies face a dilemma: "[should they either] listen to the people and get the angry voices of populism or rely on widely distrusted elites and get policies that seem out of touch with the public concerns? Populism or technocracy? (...) Deliberative democracy can fill the gap with a voice of the people that is representative and thoughtful – 'a mild voice of reason' from the people and not just from their leaders. It can provide the missing link between public judgement and public policy" (Fishkin, 2018, p. 11).

Based on the analysis of the interview data and the literature study combined, the first research question, *What are the effects of existing decision-making procedures on citizen participation at a local level?*, can be answered by stating that the existing decision-making procedures do offer space

for citizens to have their say, but it is also true that representative democracies created a division between a top and a bottom layer, in which a powerful government operates through a management-like style. This leads to distrust by the public and to a government that loses touch with the people's concerns.

### Fitting into the bureaucratic system is essential

As the theory and the results from the interviews show, deliberative democracy can have a positive effect on citizens' participation. It is generally a more inclusive type of decision-making in which those in power receive views of the people in a more constructive way than casting a vote or filling in a survey would: the representative group of citizens had more time and information to form their opinion.

Fishkin describes this type of public consultation as follows: "Deliberative democracy is a practical answer to a philosophical question: What would the people think should be done if they could consider key issues under good conditions for thinking about them?" (Fishkin, 2018, p. 4). This view is supported by Robert Dahl and David Van Reybrouck who see a citizens' assembly as a valuable addition to a representative democracy.

By using a deliberative democracy method, citizens become more aware of the complexity of political decision-making and more sophisticated in their political judgements, as research of Fishkin shows. Escobar and Elstub noticed a similar development. "When citizens are given the time, resources and support to learn and deliberate about public issues, they can engage with complex debates and collectively make considered judgements" (Escobar & Elstub, 2017).

However, as the results of the interview shows, the second research question, *How could different procedural rules be adopted and what are the likely effects on citizen participation at a local decision-*

*making level?*, can be answered by stating that different procedural rules should be adopted to let deliberative democracy have an actual effect on citizen participation at local level. The G1000 procedure is proven to be more effective when the G1000 platform collaborates with a city, compared to when it is just a citizens' initiative.

The establishment of a partnership with a city, solves two initial problems: the G1000 will not be about a too general topic and therefore stops attracting higher educated people only; and it will not be too much of a citizens' initiative that lacks the support and interest of the local government. By using this new G1000 method, Van Dijk states that city councils do not dare to vote against the citizens' decision anymore.

These new procedural rules ensure that the G1000 procedure lives up to the demands of a city and fits into the local bureaucratic system, which is, according to Van Dijk, essential for making citizens' initiatives like these work.

Moreover, it could speed up the process of local governments establishing similar, and less expensive, citizens' participation projects themselves. The city of Enschede was considering a way to involve citizens into local decision-making and came up with a 'city dialogue' after organizing a G1000 procedure. This city dialogue is a kind of second coalition agreement of the city council which focusses on citizens' participation only.

### More inclusiveness because of G1000

As Fishkin and Van Reybrouck argue, deliberative democracy can be a practical solution to the challenges that representative democracies currently face, because it leads to a more inclusive political system.

According to Escobar and Elstub, a citizens' assembly such as G1000 offers more than "snapshots of uninformed opinion by members of the public who may know little about an issue, or may not have even thought about it" (Escobar & Elstub, 2017). As stated by the interviewees, participants will – generally speaking – come up with reasonable ideas, find a common ground and act in the general interest; this relates to the benefits of political participation which John Stuart Mill already put forward in the nineteenth century.

Citizens are, by participating in a G1000 procedure, able to directly influence the political agenda, which is not (or not to the same extent) possible in the current representative system. This ensures that citizens can control those who are in power. which Mill also pleads for with his 'Congress of Opinions': an arena in which every individual can put forward its opinion without being overruled by superiors.

When it comes to political participation in general, rational ignorance is considered to be a problem. As research of Terrill Bouricius points out, a deliberative democratic procedure as G1000, does not have to fear this problem because: "most citizens would readily participate for a set period of time, with appropriate compensation, in a process in which they believed their input really mattered (unlike mass elections). This democratic process would bear almost no relations to 'politics' as we know it today" (Bouricius, 2013, p. 6).

To answer the main question of this research report, which is: *What are the implications of the use of the G1000 model for citizen participation at local-decision making level?*, it can be stated that a G1000 procedure can fight feelings of distrust between by the people and towards the government and can diminish the top and bottom layer of representative democracies.

The implications of the G1000 procedure for the city are different. The local government is dependent on the outcomes of the citizens' discussions and cannot interfere by lobbying for its own ideas or interests. A document of agreement is signed prior to a G1000 to ensure this does not happen.

By organising a G1000, the local government becomes more aware of the public will. In many democracies, there is a tendency for the administration to be out of touch with what the people want, despite the existence of the other options of citizen participation (i.e. elections). This could lead to the rise of populist parties and failing support for the 'democratic project' in general. A G1000 procedure can provide the missing link between public judgement and public policy, as Fishkin argues.

Furthermore, the G1000 procedure is an expensive and lengthy project for a city. To keep such a citizens' participation procedure attractive for cities, a cheaper and less extensive (i.e. maximum 150 participants) 'G1000 light' has been established.

Van Dijk states that in the future, a G1000 procedure would ideally be organised every half year to give guidance to the city's policy and to make sure that eventually, all inhabitants will take part in a G1000. The direct democratic system would then exist next to the representative system, each handling the issues it suits best.

### Contribution of this research to this field of study

This dissertation project aims at contributing to the existing studies of the Dutch G1000 model by adding new and relevant insights on the implications of this type of deliberative democracy for citizen participation at local level. It shows how an attempt to make current representative democracies more inclusive affects local decision-making level, and more importantly, which conditions are necessary to make it successful (i.e. a collaboration between the G1000 platform and a municipality).

Since the collaboration between the G1000 platform and a municipality is a relatively new approach, previous studies might not have included that aspect. Therefore, their conclusion of how to make citizen participation through the G1000 model work, might be different from this dissertation project.

Also, this study incorporates the opinions and experiences from three different point of view; the organiser, a participant and the municipality. By doing so, a more complete picture of the G1000 method in practice is given. However, this thesis also has its limitations, as described in the next paragraph.

### Limitations of this research

As described in Chapter 2, qualitative research cannot be fully objective and cannot be completely reproducible by nature. Therefore, this study aims at obtaining a high level of the four criteria of Lincoln and Guba, namely; credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability (Mortelmans, 2007, p. 431).

This is done through transparency about the data collecting and analysing process, by focussing mainly on one G1000 city (which means that this research report presents a type of case study) and by using the qualitative research method as described in Chapter 2.

Ideally, more people would have been interviewed. More participants and civil servants of the G1000 Enschede could have given a broader, and maybe different, perspective to this research. However, due to the scope of this research, three interviewees – each representing a different part of the G1000 procedure – still give a clear indication of how the G1000 works in practice. Since the interviewees were all involved in the G1000 Enschede, their statements have been confirmed and can therefore be seen as trustworthy.

Also, attending a G1000 meeting in person would have given an extra dimension to this research project. This was initiated by Harm van Dijk, but due to practical issues such as the thesis deadline, the location (this thesis was written in Portugal and the meetings take place in Dutch cities) and the date of the next G1000 (i.e. February 2019), this could not be realised on time. Reports and videos of G1000 procedures do give a good indication of how such a procedure works.

## Recommendations for further research

The recommendations focus on doing further research in three different aspects of the G1000 procedure. The first one is the partnership between the G1000 platform and a city. It is recommended to elaborate on this because it is a relatively new phenomenon which exists since 2017. As Van Dijk stated in the interview, this means a breakthrough: city councils always accept the outcome if a G1000 procedure is a collaboration with the city, and therefore meeting a demand from the city itself.

It would be interesting to notice if this is a lasting effect in future G1000 procedures. Here it is also important to see if the G1000 platform can remain its independence. If so, it could be concluded that a partnership between a city and the G1000 platform is the way to optimize citizens' participation.

Secondly, the 'G1000 light' might provide more research. This cheaper and less extensive procedure was mentioned briefly as a more realistic option in case cities want to organise G1000 procedures on a larger scale. Here, it would be good to know if this smaller G1000 has the same effect, is executed in the same way and is in fact more prone to be the future G1000 procedure.

Furthermore, the abilities to organise a G1000 procedure on national level would be interesting to watch closely. As literature shows, a G1000 – or deliberative democracy in general – can bring about a

change for a local community – both for citizens and for the city. It would be interesting to find out if this effect is limited to local level or if it would be similar on national level.

A relevant step will be the first G1000 organised on provincial level in the Netherlands. This is scheduled to take place in March 2019, in one southern province. Because it is the first time that the G1000 procedure will be scaled up, it will give a clearer indication if the system is ready for the next step; i.e. becoming part of decision-making procedures at provincial or even national level.

## Bibliography

- Annan, K. (2018, September 17). The Crisis of Democracy - Speech by Kofi Annan - Kofi Annan Foundation. Retrieved October 4, 2018, from <https://www.kofiannanfoundation.org/supporting-democracy-and-elections-with-integrity/athens-democracy-forum/>
- Bouricius, T. (2013). Democracy Through Multi-Body Sortition: Athenian Lessons for the Modern Day. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 9(1). Retrieved from <https://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol9/iss1/art11/>
- Brennan, J. (2016). *Against Democracy* (Rev. ed.). Princeton, United States: Princeton University Press.
- Chalmers, P. (2018, May 24). In Ierland wordt de democratie opnieuw uitgevonden. Met dank aan 99 studenten, truckers en andere gewone burgers. Retrieved October 4, 2018, from <https://decorrespondent.nl/8295/in-ierland-wordt-de-democratie-opnieuw-uitgevonden-met-dank-aan-99-studenten-truckers-en-andere-gewone-burgers/3636409978740-7f45cf2b>
- Chalmers, P. (2017, December 11). When Citizens Assemble [YouTube]. Retrieved from [https://www.youtube.com/watch?time\\_continue=367&v=MjpuDk9\\_BWI](https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=367&v=MjpuDk9_BWI)
- Cooke, M. (2000). Five Arguments for Deliberative Democracy. *Political Studies*, 48(5), 947–969. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.00289>
- Dahl, R. (1989). *Democracy and its Critics*. New Haven, United States: Yale University Press.
- De invloed van burgers - ProDemos. (n.d.). Retrieved November 5, 2018, from <https://prodemos.nl/kennis-en-debat/publicaties/informatie-over-politiek/de-gemeente/de-invloed-van-burgers/>
- De organisatie - ProDemos. (n.d.). Retrieved on 4 November 2018, from <https://prodemos.nl/kennis-en-debat/publicaties/informatie-over-politiek/de-gemeente/de-organisatie/>
- Democracy continues its disturbing retreat. (2018, January 31). Retrieved from <https://www.economist.com/graphic-detail/2018/01/31/democracy-continues-its-disturbing-retreat>
- Derenne, B., Van Reybrouck, D., Sinardet, D., & Vanthielen, F. (2011, November 2). G1000 Manifesto. Retrieved from <https://www.eurozine.com/g1000-manifesto/?pdf>
- DeSilver, D. (2017, December 6). Despite concerns about global democracy, nearly six-in-ten countries are now democratic. Retrieved November 10, 2018, from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/12/06/despite-concerns-about-global-democracy-nearly-six-in-ten-countries-are-now-democratic/>
- De Tocqueville, A. (1835). *Democracy in America*. London, United Kingdom: Saunders and Otley.
- Diamond, L. (2018, March 16). Are People Losing Faith in Democracy? Retrieved from <https://www.the-american-interest.com/2018/03/16/people-losing-faith-democracy/>
- Diamond, L. (2015). Facing Up to the Democratic Recession. *Journal of Democracy*, 26(1), 141–155. Retrieved from <https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/article/facing-democratic-recession>

- Eckardt, F., & Benneworth, P. (2018). The G1000 Firework Dialogue as a Social Learning System: A Community of Practice Approach. *Social Sciences*, 7(8), 129. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci7080129>
- Escobar, O., & Elstub, S. (2017). Forms of Mini-publics. Retrieved from [https://newdemocracy.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/docs\\_researchnotes\\_2017\\_May\\_nDF\\_RN\\_20170508\\_FormsOfMiniPublics.pdf](https://newdemocracy.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/docs_researchnotes_2017_May_nDF_RN_20170508_FormsOfMiniPublics.pdf)
- Fishkin, J. (2018). *Democracy When the People Are Thinking* (Rev. ed.). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Freedom House. (2018). *Freedom in the World 2018 (Democracy in Crisis)*. Geraadpleegd van <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/freedom-world-2018>
- Goldhammer, A. (2016, 28 September). What Would Alexis de Tocqueville Have Made of the 2016 US Presidential Election? Geraadpleegd van <https://www.thenation.com/article/what-would-have-alexis-de-tocqueville-have-made-of-the-2016-us-presidential-election/>
- Informatie. (n.d.). Retrieved October 4, 2018, from <https://g1000.nu/project/g1000enschede/>
- James S. Fishkin. (2018, March 13). Retrieved October 4, 2018, from <http://comm.stanford.edu/faculty-fishkin/>
- Jones, J. (2016, September 21). Americans' Trust in Political Leaders, Public at New Lows. Retrieved from <https://news.gallup.com/poll/195716/americans-trust-political-leaders-public-new-lows.aspx>
- Lijphart, A. (1999). *Patterns of Democracy*. New Haven, United States: Yale University Press.
- Martinelli, C. (2006). Rational ignorance and voting behavior. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 35(3), 315–335. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00182-006-0051-4>
- May, C. (1987, September 21). WASHINGTON TALK: POLITICAL SPEECHMAKING; Biden and the Annals of Raised Eyebrow. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/1987/09/21/us/washington-talk-political-speechmaking-biden-and-the-annals-of-raised-eyebrow7.2.html>
- Mebius, D. (2018, 25 oktober). Nieuwe beweging Code Oranje wil Nederland een nieuw democratisch tijdperk inloodsen. *De Volkskrant*, p. 1.
- Mill, J. S. (1861). *Representative Government*, by John Stuart Mill. Retrieved October 5, 2018, from [https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/m/mill/john\\_stuart/m645r/chapter5.html](https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/m/mill/john_stuart/m645r/chapter5.html)
- Mortelmans, D. (2007). *Handboek Kwalitatieve Onderzoeksmethoden* (2nd ed.). Leuven, Belgium: Acco.
- Norris, P. (1999). *Critical Citizens, Global Support for Democratic Governments*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Ogle, C., & Fletcher, S. (2016, May 25b). 1996 National Issues Convention Deliberative Poll. Retrieved from <https://participedia.net/en/cases/1996-national-issues-convention-deliberative-poll>
- Over G1000. (n.d.). Retrieved October 4, 2018, from <https://g1000.nu/over-g1000-2/>

Schumpeter, J. (1943). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.

Smets, P., & Vlind, M. (2017). Een G1000 gun je iedereen. (Participatiebevordering in Kruiskamp, Amersfoort). Retrieved from <https://kennisopenbaarbestuur.nl/media/200063/Smets-en-Vlind-Een-G1000-gun-je-iedereen-Participatiebevordering-in-Kruiskamp-Amersfoort-FINAL.pdf>

Stadsdialoog Vuurwerk. (2017, December 13). Retrieved October 4, 2018, from <https://www.enschede.nl/enschede-viert-oud-en-nieuw/stadsdialoog-vuurwerk>

The Citizens' Assembly Fact Sheet [Press release]. (2018, June). Retrieved October 19, 2018, from <https://www.citizensassembly.ie/en/About-the-Citizens-Assembly/CA-Fact-Sheet-June-2018.pdf>

Van Dijk, H. (2018). *Het Burgerbesluit, de praktijk* (G1000 University 2018). Retrieved from <https://g1000.nu/g1000university/>

Van Reybrouck, D. (2017). *Tegen Verkiezingen* (16th ed.). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: De Bezige Bij.

Van Reybrouck, D. (2011, June 11). Weg uit de impasse, hier is een plan. Retrieved October 4, 2018, from <http://www.davidvanreybrouck.be/sites/default/files/pdf/Weg%20uit%20de%20impasse%2C%20hier%20is%20een%20plan%20-%20De%20Morgen%20-%202011%20Jun.%202011.pdf>

Waterfield, B. (2011, 6 december). Belgium to have new government after world record 541 days. *The Telegraph*, p. 1. Geraadpleegd van <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/belgium/8936857/Belgium-to-have-new-government-after-world-record-541-days.html>

Wike, R., Simmons, K., Stokes, B., & Fetterolf, J. (2017). Globally, Broad Support for Representative and Direct Democracy. Geraadpleegd van <http://www.pewglobal.org/2017/10/16/globally-broad-support-for-representative-and-direct-democracy/>

Zonderop, Y. (2011, November 16). Belgische democratie, op de G1000 in Brussel praat iedereen mee. *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 135(46). Retrieved from <https://www.groene.nl/artikel/belgische-democratie>

## Annex 1: topic list per interviewee

### Interviewee 1

- Harm van Dijk;
- Founder G1000.nu platform;
- Contacted through email, contact details were found on: <https://g1000.nu/>;
- Interview through Skype, on November 12, 2018.

### Questions:

Topic 1:

#### ***-Citizen participation***

- Do you believe citizen participation is an asset to current representative democracies, i.e. on local and national (or even European) level? Can you explain why?
- What are the benefits and what are the downsides of citizen participation?
- How can the G1000 model help to strengthen citizen participation?
- Is organizing one G1000 summit in a city enough? I.e. at which scale/how often should the population be asked to join a G1000 summit to have an impact on local decision-making level?
- Political scientist James Fishkin described deliberative democracy as follows: "What would the people think should be done if they could consider key issues under good conditions for thinking about them?". Can you react to this statement in the light of the G1000 model?

Topic 2:

#### ***-Local decision-making level***

- What are the implications of the use of the G1000 model?
- Could you indicate the general implications of the use of the G1000 model or does it differ from city to city?
- How do local decisionmakers (i.e. city councils etc.) react to the G1000 model?
- Are local decisionmakers involved in the G1000 procedure? If so, at which point?
- Would the G1000 model be applicable at a larger scale; on national or European level? Why?

Topic 3:

#### ***-Effects***

- How 'flexible' is the local-decision making system regarding the G1000 model?
- Is deliberative democracy accepted as an asset to the current decision-making system?
- What are the effects of the use of the G1000 model on citizen participation?
- What are the effects of the use of the G1000 model on existing decision-making procedures?
- What needs to change in order to make deliberative democracy part of local decision-making procedures?
- Do you believe the G1000 model will be applied on a more frequent level in the future?

## Interviewee 2

- Loes Schippers;
- Participant G1000 Enschede;
- Contact details provided on request by Harm van Dijk;
- Interview by phone, on November 20, 2018.

### Questions:

Topic 1:

#### ***-Citizen participation***

- Do you believe citizen participation is an asset to current representative democracies, i.e. on local and national (or even European) level? Can you explain why?
- What are the benefits and what are the downsides of citizen participation?
- How can the G1000 model help to strengthen citizen participation?
- Is organizing one G1000 summit in a city enough? I.e. at which scale/how often should the population be asked to join a G1000 summit to have an impact on local decision-making level?
- Can you explain more about your experiences joining a G1000 process? (ask about being politically active/interested before the event, did it change through participation in G1000, do you view the process of local-decision making differently now, ask about three different steps of the G1000 model?)
- Political scientist James Fishkin described deliberative democracy as follows: "What would the people think should be done if they could consider key issues under good conditions for thinking about them?". Can you react to this statement in the light of the G1000 model?

Topic 2:

#### ***-Local decision-making level***

- What were the implications of the use of the G1000 model regarding the topic discussed?
- How did local decisionmakers (i.e. city councils etc.) react to the G1000 process and the outcome?
- Are local decisionmakers involved in the G1000 procedure? If so, at which point?
- Would the G1000 model be applicable at a larger scale; on national or European level? Why?

Topic 3:

#### ***-Effects***

- How 'flexible' is the local-decision making system regarding the G1000 model?
- Would you accept this model as an asset to the current decision-making system?
- What are the effects of the use of the G1000 model on citizen participation? Are you more politically active now for instance? Did your attention for certain political issues grow?
- What do you believe to be the effects of the use of the G1000 model on existing decision-making procedures?
- What needs to change in order to make deliberative democracy more of a standard asset to local decision-making procedures?
- Do you believe the G1000 model will be applied on a more frequent level in the future?
- Would you take part in another G1000 procedure if you have the chance to do so?

### Interviewee 3

- Job Kantelberg;
- Advisor to the 'administration' of the municipality (i.e. the municipal executive board and mayor) of Enschede;
- Contact details provided on request by Harm van Dijk;
- Interview by phone, on November 21, 2018.

#### **Questions:**

Topic 1:

##### ***-Citizen participation***

- Do you believe citizen participation is an asset to current representative democracies, i.e. on local and national (or even European) level? Can you explain why?
- Or should it be seen as 'a threat'; letting citizens do the work of elected politicians?
- What are the benefits and what are the downsides of citizen participation?
- How can the G1000 model help to strengthen citizen participation?
- Is organizing one G1000 summit in a city enough? I.e. at which scale/how often should the population be asked to join a G1000 summit to have an impact on local decision-making level?
- Can you explain more about your experiences regarding the G1000 process? (ask about their role in the process.)
- Political scientist James Fishkin described deliberative democracy as follows: "What would the people think should be done if they could consider key issues under good conditions for thinking about them?". Can you react to this statement in the light of the G1000 model?

Topic 2:

##### ***-Local decision-making level***

- What were the implications of the use of the G1000 model regarding the topic discussed?
- How did you and other local decisionmakers react to the G1000 model?
- Were you and other local decisionmakers involved in the G1000 procedure in any way? If so, at which point?
- Would the G1000 model be applicable at a larger scale; on national or European level? Why?

Topic 3:

##### ***-Effects***

- How 'flexible' is the local-decision making system regarding the G1000 model?
- Would you accept this model as an asset to the current decision-making system?
- What are the effects of the use of the G1000 model on citizen participation? Do you believe citizens become more politically active for instance? Did the attention for certain political issues or the work done by you and your colleagues in general, grow?
- What do you believe to be the effects of the use of the G1000 model on existing decision-making procedures?
- What needs to change in order to make this way of deliberative democracy more of a standard way of consulting citizens?
- Do you believe the G1000 model will be applied on a more frequent level in the future?

## Annex 2: G1000 Manifesto

Benoît Derenne, Dave Sinardet, David Van Reybrouck, Francesca Vanthielen

### **G1000 Manifesto**

Published 2 November 2011

Original in English

First published in G1000

Downloaded from eurozine.com: <https://www.eurozine.com/g1000-manifesto/>

If the politicians can't find a solution, let the citizens. That's the call of a group of Belgian intellectuals and activists. They have a detailed proposal: the G1000, a meeting in Brussels on 11 November 2011. One thousand randomly selected Belgian citizens will be given an opportunity to discuss, in all freedom, the future of their country. "Because democracy is so much more than citizens who vote and politicians who negotiate."

More than a year ago the citizens of Belgium elected the people they wanted to be governed by. They waited a year – in hope, in despair, with shame, with humour, and above all with great patience. There was no government. Clearly the challenges that Belgium currently faces are too big to be dealt with by the normal procedures of party politics. That's okay; fortunately democracy is more than merely a matter of political parties.

If the politicians do not manage to find a solution, let the citizens deliberate. The latter may not have the same expertise as the former, but they have more freedom. And in this context that is a huge advantage. Ordinary citizens, unlike politicians, do not have to find a balance between national interests and electoral strategies. Ordinary citizens do not constantly need to ask: will I be rewarded or punished? Will my opponent be able to score on this issue, or not? Ordinary citizens do not need to be elected or re-elected. That is an invaluable asset. Expertise is something you can gain, but freedom is something you either have or you don't. Citizens are therefore in a better position to make impartial choices.

After months of thinking, the signatories of this manifesto have figured out a concrete model for giving new impetus to the process of overcoming the stalemate that has plagued Belgium for many years: the G1000, a summit of one thousand randomly selected citizens. It relies on recent scientific research, relevant examples from abroad and new technologies.

The G1000 wants to revive democracy in Belgium.

### **Our analysis**

A radically democratic alternative to the current situation requires first and foremost a new perspective on the current conflict.

1. The Belgian crisis is not just a crisis for Belgium; the current standstill is by no means simply a matter of tensions between linguistic communities. There's more to it than that. The Belgian crisis is also a crisis of democracy. With its interminable period of government formation, Belgium is not lagging behind other western countries; on the contrary, it is one of the first countries where the general crisis of democracy is clearly manifest. In the Netherlands and Britain, too, government formation has recently been more difficult than ever before.

2. In a democracy, citizens choose to govern themselves. They either do this directly (as in ancient Athens) or indirectly. In a pure, direct democracy, everyone is closely involved in the political process

at all times. The system allows for a great deal of participation and works well for smaller units, providing the matters at hand are relatively simple. However modern states are far larger and more complex than the Greek city-states. Since not everyone can or wants to deal with governing, the public chooses, once every few years, a handful of individuals to do so on their behalf. This ritual is called elections and those who are elected serve as representatives of the people. They form the parliament, which in turn appoints an executive that respects the balance of power: the government. The direct democracy of yesteryear has given way to indirect, representative democracy: democracy as delegation.

3. Ever since the inception of the nation in 1830, with the exception of the war years, Belgium has been a representative democracy. The first elections were held in 1831. Since then, there have been nearly seventy elections. Representative democracy has worked well for nearly two centuries. It was a method aiming at the right balance between giving the people a voice and making government work effectively.

4. Today, however, we are encountering the limits of representative democracy. Elections no longer enable governments to work; instead they seem to have become an obstacle to good governance. Political parties, created to streamline the diverse interests in society, now have each other in a permanent stranglehold. Politicians are like what's called a rat king, a nest of young rats whose tails are so intertwined that any attempt to pull free tightens the knot still further. A rat king doesn't live long: the animals, which cannot coordinate their actions (each one pulls in its own direction), die of hunger. Representative democracy, the system that was once so fresh, has become a low-oxygen environment. No wonder the country can't breathe.

5. How could this be? Something has fundamentally changed in the world we live in. It was much easier being an elected representative in 1911 than in 2011. Whoever was elected in 1911 could, for four years or so, make themselves comfortable in the parliamentary environment. Between elections, he (it would not have been a she) was occasionally reminded of his electoral promises through newspaper articles or letters from citizens, but otherwise could go about undisturbed doing exactly what it was he was elected to do: discuss policies, make laws and supervise the running of society. And when elections approached, he could count on a high level of party loyalty among his voters.

6. What a difference today! Nowadays, the elected (female) politician can no longer hide from sight in an area reserved for power-holders; instead she has to expose herself to as much media attention as possible. She must remain permanently in the public sphere, where she can be questioned, attacked and criticized, after which she'll be faced with online forums where she'll be reviled, mocked, spat at, praised, worshipped and shot down. Gone are the noble ambitions. Politics has become a higher form of restlessness and politicians have to work like dogs. The reason is simple: elections occur more frequently than before. What's more, the voter is much more assertive and critical. Bye-bye to party loyalty. The restlessness is partly the politician's own fault: in order to win a seat in federal parliament she had to win votes in the regional elections. She knows she has made promises that sounded good during the campaign but that are difficult to keep afterwards. No wonder there are tensions. She knows that her constituents have been the dogs who pulled her sledge to where she is now, and that they won't hesitate to tear her to pieces if they don't get fed.

7. To sum it up: in 1911 politicians were in power, in 2011 they're afraid. The former enjoyed a permanent state of post-election equanimity, the latter experience permanent pre-election neurosis.

8. What also hasn't helped is the disappearance of traditional civil society. Unions, mutual insurance funds and cooperatives once mediated between the masses and those in power. They organizations knew how to package the multitude of citizens' voices and translate them into policy suggestions.

Conversely, they could persuade their members of the benefits of the hardwon compromises they made with the holders of power. This system had many drawbacks, but it did structure the tumult. Many of these civil society organizations still exist, but they hardly have an impact on linguistic community issues. Their members are now increasingly seen merely as clients.

9. And then there are the many technological developments. The arrival of a much more interactive Internet – Web 2.0 – at the beginning of the twentyfirst century changed things hugely. In the past, attentive citizens could only voice their opinions on a political initiative through isolated actions (a reader’s letter, a demonstration, a strike); now they can show their dislike permanently and in an unlimited and unfiltered way. At the end of 2006, Time Magazine nominated “you” the person of the year. What we did on the Internet was no longer merely to freely consult texts created by other people; we started contributing to the creation of entirely new texts. Millions of people helped to develop Wikipedia, YouTube, MySpace, Linux and Firefox. In late 2006 Time honoured us for this achievement, in mid-2007 the Belgian crisis began. That was no accident. The Belgian public has never been more rapidly informed about political developments than today. Every second we can follow and comment on the complications, but only once every four years can we vote. Is it a surprise, then, that online forums are full of opinionated and frustrated comments? The occasional aggressiveness doesn’t necessarily reveal a coarsening of public morality, but often the desire of the citizen to be heard.

10. Never before have citizens been so articulate, yet so powerless. Never before have politicians been so visible, yet so desperate. Should we find it unremarkable that we live in an information age with an electoral system that has remained essentially unaltered since the early nineteenth century?

11. Representative democracy – our system of elections, parties and parliaments – has reached its limits. In the heyday of pillarization [the organization of society into separate political and confessional “pillars” or interest groups – ed.], negotiators retreated to spacious private properties (Val Duchesse, Egmont, Bouillon) to conduct their discussions. During the “purple coalition” between 1999 and 2007, politicians experimented with the new political culture of public deliberation, which increasingly led to public fights. But in the current era of exaggerated focus on media they go one step further: politicians talk constantly to reporters, either off or on the record, or with their Facebook friends, their Twitter followers, with their faithful voters, their future constituents, with swing voters (almost everyone), but, strangely enough, not with each other. How many months now have they not sat together around the negotiation table?

12. Ecce homo: political power-holders in the year 2011 look alarmingly like a team of cardiac surgeons performing an extremely delicate operation in the very middle of a chock-full football stadium. Crowds cheer, fans run onto the field and, with every movement of one of the cardiologists, they shout their opinions about what the doctors should or should not do, and sometimes ridicule them entirely. The surgeons are afraid to move. They fear they will be shot down, they fear the people, fear each other. Everyone waits. The clock is ticking; the health of the patient doesn’t count.

13. Democracy has become the tyranny of elections.

### **An alternative**

But things can be different. Democracy is a living organism. Its forms aren’t fixed, but grow according to the needs of the age. Direct democracy perfect suited the era of oratory. Representative democracy was a good solution at the time of the printed word, the newspaper, and later other “one-way media” such as radio, television and the first phase of the Internet. But in the era of Web 2.0, the era of permanent interactivity, we still haven’t found a new and more appropriate form of democracy. All we know is that it is in urgent need of renovation.

1. Innovation is everywhere, except in democracy. Companies must innovate, scientists must cross boundaries, athletes must break records and artists must reinvent themselves. But when it comes to the organization of society, we are clearly still happy with the procedures of 1830. (Granted, voting rights have been extended to workers, women, and non-Belgian residents, but representative democracy itself has remained unchanged.) But why should we be obliged to stick to a formula that is almost two centuries old? If democracy is no longer facilitated by elections, or even hindered by it, then citizens should help find democratic alternatives.

2. Look at the music industry. Its death has been proclaimed repeatedly over the last century. Radio would mean the end of music. Then it was the phonograph. Or maybe not. Then the tape recorder! The CD! The mp3! All fatal stabs, as it were. But if we are still listening to recorded music today, it's because the industry has reinvented itself time and again. This holds a lesson for democracy: what was once the score for the music industry is the ballot for democracy. It is useful, but not enough.

3. A democracy that doesn't renew itself will be doomed. A democracy that takes itself seriously should invest in much-needed research and development. It can be done outside, as well through, existing parties.

4. This is far from simply a Belgian problem. The British political scientist John Keane has studied democracies worldwide and announced "the birth of a new kind of democracy, a form of 'post-representative' democracy that is radically different from the parliamentary and representative democracies in earlier times." Around the world he sees forms of citizen participation and ownership that "pause and silence the monologues of parties, politicians and parliaments."

5. In recent years, various western countries have experimented with different forms of deliberative democracy. In a deliberative democracy, citizens are invited to participate actively in discussions about the future of their society. In Canada, the states of British Columbia and Ontario wanted to reform their electoral laws. This couldn't be done through traditional politics: the system as it functioned gave a great deal of power to one of the two major parties (a system comparable to the first-past-the-post system in the UK), and it was clear that neither party would vote for a reform that could potentially run against their own interests. So the citizens were called in. In Ontario, a random sample brought together 104 people from all walks of life (and 158 in British Columbia). The group was balanced in terms of gender, age, education, income and origin. The participants were thoroughly briefed on the electoral law. Over the course of several meetings they built up their own expertise, asked questions, explored various models and deliberated over alternative electoral systems. Not bound by party interests, they could make more rational choices than professional politicians.

6. Public forums, citizens' assemblies and citizens' panels have been organized in other countries, always with the intention of launching a debate between people of diverging views. Often they have led to deeper insights and calmer decisions. Since 1986, Denmark has a Council for Technology that allows people to have a say on all developments in the field of genetics, brain research, climate change and biodiversity. Since 1995, an initiative in the US called the Peaks Inn has given over 160 000 people an opportunity to speak on public matters. When the City of New York wanted to redevelop the site at Ground Zero, it first gathered one thousand New Yorkers to talk about it. Since 2002, France has the Commission Nationale du D bat Public, the main consulting body for dealing with matters of infrastructure and sustainable development. In recent years, the European Union has regularly encouraged the organization of civic participation events to explore complex issues, amongst them the Meeting of Minds (2006), Tomorrow's Europe (2007) and EuroPolis (2009). Last year, Power2010, a deliberative meeting on the functioning of democracy, took place in the UK. And in 2011 Iceland entrusted a group of citizens with the task of writing a new constitution.

7. The American researchers James Fishkin and Robert Luskin have convincingly demonstrated that people who are given a chance to talk to each other and who can rely on sufficient information are capable of finding a rational compromise in a relatively short time. This has even worked in deeply divided societies like Northern Ireland! Catholics and Protestants who talked more about than to each other have now managed to find solutions in very sensitive fields such as education.

8. As yet, the Belgian government has no tradition of deliberative democracy. For the last fifty years, politicians have been so preoccupied with state reform that they have forgotten all about the reform of democracy. However deliberative democracy offers useful methods for overcoming the limits of representative democracy. It doesn't ignore the work of parliaments and parties; rather it seeks to complement it. Just as in a system of direct democracy, it aims at the large involvement of ordinary citizens, but through its careful sampling of diverse groups it also respects the spirit of representative democracy. The formula differs fundamentally from a referendum or plebiscite, because these systems require everyone to vote on a subject that few people really know well. In a deliberative democracy, a few people are asked to discuss something they are thoroughly informed about. The results are usually more sensible and mature.

9. Deliberative democracy could well be the democracy of the future. It is a perfect match for the era of user-generated content and Web 2.0. It harnesses the wisdom of the crowd. It's the Wikipedia of politics. It realizes that not all knowledge about the future of a society must come from the top. The reason for that is simple: there is no top anymore. There are different branches of knowledge. A society is a network. The masses today may know more than the elites. Debate is the heart of democracy. When people talk, they can more easily align their own private interests with the public interest. The voice of the many can thus help to enrich the decisions of the few.

### **G1000, the citizens' summit**

So, if we bring together 1000 Belgian citizens for a full day in Brussels in order to discuss the major challenges of our democracy;

- And if we find a way to ensure that the composition of this group mirrors the composition of the national population;
- And if we put one hundred tables of ten people in a conference hall in front of a centrally placed stage;
- And if, on that stage, the big issues of our time are comprehensively explained and the various policy options analysed as objectively as possible;
- And if, around those tables, various options are discussed, under the guidance of expert facilitators who give everyone a chance to speak, whatever their educational background, rhetorical talent or level of expertise;
- And if we listen to what all these ordinary, free citizens have to say about their country;
- And if, after these consultations, we vote on the various policy options and brainstorm how to improve things;
- And if we can map the preparedness of ordinary citizens to reach a compromise – before, during and after the deliberation;
- And if, as citizens of a country in crisis, were able to realize this large-scale experiment in democratic renewal...

Would we not then be able to inspire and advise official negotiators on what the people of this country want and what they think is an acceptable compromise?

And would it not be easier for the political representatives to explain a compromise to the people if it was the people who had first suggested that same compromise?

Obviously, the decisions and recommendations of the G1000 cannot be binding, and that's a good thing – as a citizens initiative we do not want a formal mandate; we want to retain maximum freedom. But they will provide a meaningful framework for further negotiations. The G1000 is an interface between the masses and the power-holders; it wants to show how democracy in this country can be improved – just as informally as the G20, the group of the twenty richest industrial countries, and just as committed as the G20 to the future, but much more democratic. Where it is not those in power who speak, but those who are free.

The G1000 is designed as a three-stage plan. Prior to the citizens' summit, we conducted a large-scale online survey to find out what it is that citizens are really concerned about. What problems do we find the most pressing? What worries us? This first phase began in July and ends in November 2011. The second phase is the citizens' summit itself, on November 11, when participants from across the country will gather at Tour & Taxis in Brussels. It is there and then that we'll establish an outline of possible solutions. How do we want to deal with each other? What principles do we consider fair? What priorities do we share with each other? After the citizens' summit follows the third phase: as was the case in Iceland, a small group of citizens will elaborate on the results. Over the course of several weekends, they will meet and discuss the results of the citizens' summit in order to translate them into specific solutions. The third phase starts in late November 2011 and ends in April 2012.

Can citizens do this? Without doubt. Recent small-scale experiments at the VUB and the University of Liege indicate that ordinary people with diverse opinions are prepared to discuss those opinions in a constructive manner and find solutions to complex problems. A citizens' summit like the G1000 is comparable to a civilian jury in a court case. If average citizens, once they have become acquainted with extensive evidence, can reach a substantiated verdict on the guilt of a person, then they are certainly capable of assessing the political system of a country.

### **Basic principles**

- Independence. The G1000 is a citizens' initiative that wants to provide new oxygen to the democratic functioning of the state. It is independent and relies on objective scientific research.
- Openness. The outcome is not predetermined. There are no set preferences for any specific proposals. The G1000 only offers a procedure to talk about new proposals.
- Dignity. Participants of the G1000 recognize the fundamental legitimacy of everyone's point of view. You don't need to agree with someone in order to have an open conversation with them.
- Optimism. A citizens' summit such as the G1000 recognizes the seriousness of the Belgian crisis, but rejects any cynicism or defeatism. The initiative wants to foster positive and constructive thinking about solutions.
- Complementarity. The G1000 is not a form of anti-politics; rather, it believes that politics is too serious to be left to politicians and political parties alone. Some politicians will perhaps worry that we want to make them redundant, but that fear is unjustified. The G1000 is a gesture of generosity from the civilian population towards those engaged in party politics.
- Participation. Besides one thousand people will participate in the actual discussions, there will be a multitude of volunteers collaborating in this project. They will do their share in welcoming and guiding the participants; they will translate and provide food and entertainment. We invite everyone to help think about this initiative. You can join us through our website.
- Transparency. In terms of funding, the G1000 is owned by citizens. Every donation of 1 euro is welcome, and nobody is allowed to offer more than 5 per cent of the total budget. The organizers have decided not to partner with any privileged sponsors or media; we believe in crowdfunding: individuals, companies, associations and governments are all invited to contribute.
- Opportunity. The current crisis is also an opportunity: a chance for democracy to gain new impetus, for citizens to renew democracy and make politicians aware of their involvement and priorities.

– Dynamics. As the largest deliberative process ever conducted in Europe, the G1000 will kindle the interest and admiration of the international community and provide people with a new sense of historical momentum. A democracy that reinvents itself through the involvement of its own citizens – that is an exceptional process.

## Annex 3: quotations from the interviews

Please note that some of these quotations consist of a lot of Dutch expressions which are difficult to translate in English. Therefore, some quotations are paraphrased instead of translated literally.

### Quotations Harm van Dijk

#### Sub-question 1:

##### *Quotation 1*

##### *Dutch*

“Als je dan zien dat alle traditionele mogelijkheden om tegenmacht te bieden, aan de overheid, dat die steeds verder eroderen en dat de overheid erin geslaagd is in snel tempo – dankzij de verwijding van de ideologische zuilen – dat ze daarmee het maatschappelijk middenveld heeft geannexeerd door onder de noemer, het professionaliseren van alle maatschappelijke instellingen, en zich daarmee aan haar lijnband heeft gekregen door ze afhankelijk te maken van subsidies die door de overheid verstrekt zijn, dan zie je dat de burger eigenlijk in zijn eentje verweesd achterblijft en dat de overheid de handen vrij krijgt om de maatschappij in te richten naar waar het haar goed is.”

##### *English*

“When you see that all traditional ways of offering the government ‘pushback’ are eroding step by step, and that the government succeeds in annexing civil society by professionalising all civil organisations, because the traditional ‘ideologic pillars’ are changing [Dutch society was divided according to religions and ideologies, all having their own social institutions, political parties, associations and newspapers]. She made these organisations dependent of governmental grants. This results in citizens being basically ‘left on their own’ and the government having ‘carte blanche’ to arrange society in the way it wishes”.

##### *Quotation 2*

##### *Dutch*

“Nu bestaat al sinds het begin van de bureaucratie – naast alle geschriften over de geweldigheden van de bureaucratie – zijn er ook studies te vinden die je wijzen op de gevaren. Bureaucratie die het in zich heeft om zichzelf te vermenigvuldigen. Als een soort overlevingsmechanisme, wat je niet toe kunt wijzen aan individuele personen binnen die bureaucratie – het zijn altijd heel aardige en heel redelijke mensen. Maar als systeem is het dodelijk met een belangrijk probleempunt, of eigenlijk twee, maar die vallen samen. Een: dat het bureaucratische systeem ongelofelijk inecht is tegenover impulsen van onderaf. En twee: dat het extreem gevoelig is voor impulsen van bovenaf.

En dat verklaart het wetenschappelijk onderzoek dat nu mondjesmaat begint te verschijnen, waarbij vastgesteld wordt, dat regeringen geneigd zijn om na de verkiezingen de burger extreem weinig aan het woord te laten – dus invloed te geven op de beslissingen die genomen worden – en dat daarentegen lobbygroepen die de weg naar de top weten, extreem invloed hebben. Er zijn analyses bekend van beslissingen van regeringen, waarin die vergeleken worden met de beslissingen vooraf. Er is natuurlijk een voorval in Nederland aan de hand – dat is de afschaffing van de dividendbeslating wat uiteindelijk niet doorgaat – maar waarbij 1.9 miljard dan toch naar het bedrijfsleven teruggaat. Dat is een duidelijk voorbeeld van hoe het fout kan lopen met de bureaucratie”.

##### *English*

“Since the beginning of bureaucracy, studies can be found – next to all writings saying it is a good thing – saying that there is a dangerous side to it as well. Bureaucracy can multiply. It is a kind of surviving mechanism, which is not the results of individuals working within that bureaucracy – those are always very kind and reasonable individuals. But the system itself is deadly with one, or actually two similar, mayor issues. One: it is incredibly unfair to bottom-up impulses, but it is – at the same

time – extremely sensitive to top-down impulses”, meaning that governments do not involve citizens in how decisions are taken, but do welcome views of lobby groups.

And this explains the scientific research that appears slowly, where it is confirmed that governments tend to not let the people speak much – so not letting them influence the decisions being taken – after elections took place. On the other hand, lobby groups who know their way to the top, do have a lot of influence. Analysis have been done the governmental decisions before and after [the elections]. Right now [November 2018], there is something going on in the Netherlands of course with the special tax rate for companies. That is not going to happen, but the plan was to get 1.9 billion back to the private sector. This is a clear example of how things could go wrong with bureaucracy”.

#### *Quotation 3*

##### *Dutch*

“Het is begonnen in Amersfoort, als burgerinitiatief, belangrijk om dat goed in je achterhoofd te houden, dat verklaart, dat verteld vanuit welk perspectief we ons vanaf dat moment hebben ontwikkeld. En dat verklaart ook veel van de logica van onze keuzes. We zijn daarin principieel iets anders dan wat de overheid doet aan pogingen om de burger te laten participeren. In de wandelgangen burgerparticipatie genoemd. We vinden die term niet helemaal passend, of helemaal niet bij G1000. Bij G1000 gaat het om directe democratie. En om het verschil te begrijpen, wat het bij ons oproept, burgerparticipatie is een overheid die zichzelf met de hand over het hart strijkt en wat ruimte te maken voor die burger. De burger mag ook aan tafel. Je hoort de boven- en onderpositie, nog steeds uitgebreid gecultiveerd. Veel van wat we de overheid zien doen, de goede initiatieven niet ten nadele, maar ervaren we vanuit het perspectief vanuit het veranderen of verbeteren van de democratie zien we als een veredelde vorm van spiegeltjes en kralen. Je weet wel: ontdekkingsreizigers die vroeger daarmee de nodige rurale gebieden koloniseerde. Wij zijn niet meer zo’n ruraal gebied, we zijn hoogontwikkelde burgers, we zijn eerder het tegenovergestelde, dat vat ik iedereen over, niet alleen WO-HBO-deel van de maatschappij. We zijn gewoon dankzij allerlei inspanningen de afgelopen eeuwen, we zijn geëmancipeerd, we zijn bevrijd van onze zuilen, van onze ideologische beperkingen, we zijn individualistischer dan ooit maar dat wil niet zeggen dat de behoefte aan samenhang en gemeenschap minder is geworden”.

##### *English*

“It started in Amersfoort as a citizens’ initiative, which is important to keep in mind. This explains how we developed from there. And it also explains the logic behind our choices. We are fundamentally different than the government with its attempts to the people participate. This is called ‘citizen participation’. We don’t think that word is fitting for G1000. G1000 is all about direct democracy. To understand the difference, citizen participation recalls the idea that the government is so kind to also let the citizens have a say. The citizen can also take place at the table. You already sense the ‘top’ and ‘bottom’ position. A lot of what the government does, not to talk badly about the good initiatives, but it is about ‘mirrors and beads’. You know, those things ancient explorers took to rural areas to colonise that. We are no rural areas, we are well educated citizens. We are rather the opposite, not only that part of society that has a college or university degree. We are, thanks to all sorts of efforts of the last century, emancipated, we are freed of those ideologic pillars and of our ideological constraints. We might be more individualistic than ever, but this doesn’t mean that the need for cohesion and a sense of community got any less”.

#### *Quotation 4*

##### *Dutch*

“Ik beschouw de politiek en bureaucratie op een lijn als een bestuurlijk technisch complex. Je ziet dat het samenhangt, mede omdat de huidige partijpolitiek – het representatieve systeem – in sterke mate ook weer geprofessionaliseerd is en ook weer verder van de burger af is komen te staan.

In mijn beeld is de mens aan de ene kant natuurlijk op zoek naar individuele expressie, dus het een van de twee basisbehoeften van elk mens is autonomie, en daarin dat kunnen beleven en je uit kunnen drukken. Maar dat is waardeloos als dat niet gebeurt in een sociaal verband waarin die persoon verbonden is. En die tweede behoefte is verbinding en deel uitmaken van een gemeenschap.

Of ie dat nou hardop uitspreekt of niet, als je beslissingen gaat analyseren kom je daarop uit. Het is tijd om nieuwe vormen te ontwikkelen om die behoefte aan gemeenschapszin en om de grenzen van je eigen bubbel heen, dat de ontwikkelen. En dan zie je de twee drijvers achter die G1000: het is echt gericht op directe invloed in het hart van het politiek stelsel en het tweede -eigenlijk belangrijker – om binnen gemeenschappen een plek te creëren waar burgers elkaar weer kunnen ontmoeten en de gemeenschap kunnen ervaren als een samenhangend geheel.

En, ik denk dat die laatste op de lange termijn belangrijker is dan de eerste. Je zou kunnen zeggen dat het een voortvloeit uit het ander. Dit is de fundamentele waarde van de G1000, de eerste konden we meteen incasseren, vanaf de eerste G1000 omdat we een vorm hadden geïntroduceerd die vanaf de eerste dag dat gevoel opriep: een uitspraak van een van de deelnemers: dit is voor het eerst dat ik me een echte Amersfoorter voel, ja, dat is wat het doet met mensen”.

#### *English*

“I see politics and bureaucracy as the same governmental technical complex. You can see it is similar, also because of the fact that current politics – the representative system – is strongly professionalised and further removed from the sphere of the people.

In my view, people are of course searching for individual expression. One of the two basic needs of humans is autonomy; to live up to that and to express like that. But that is useful if that does not happen in a social setting in which people are connected. The second basic need is connection and to be part of a community.

Whether you say it out loud or not, if you are going to analyse decisions, this is where you end up. It is time to create new ways in which people can develop their sense for community, past their own bubble. You notice the two main points of G1000: it is aiming at direct influence in the heart of the political system and secondly, and more importantly, it wants to create a place within societies in which people can meet each other again and where they feel society as a common place.

And, I believe that the latter will be more important than the first. You could say that the first makes the second happen. That is the fundamental value of the G1000; the first we could collect immediately because we created a system that instantly got that feeling. A quotation of the one of the citizens: this is the first time I feel like a real ‘Amersfoorter’ [inhabitant of Amersfoort]. Yes, that is what it does to people”.

#### **Quotations Loes Schippers**

##### **Sub-question 1:**

###### *Quotation 5*

###### *Dutch*

“G1000 zou vaker kunnen worden georganiseerd, maar het hoeft niet per se volgens deze methode te gaan. Het belangrijkste is dat burgers bewuster worden gemaakt van democratie, dat we als bevolking de baas zijn. Wat wordt uitgevoerd door een gemeente, dat is wat wij beslissen. Eén keer in de vier jaar gaan stemmen is te gemakkelijk, mensen voelen geen verantwoordelijkheid voor de democratie.

Een proces als G1000 is goed tegen het wantrouwen en onbegrip wat heerst over en weer tussen burgers en overheid”.

*English*

“A G1000 could be organized more often, but it does not necessarily need to happen according to this method. The most important thing is that people are more aware of democracy; of the fact that the people are ‘the boss’. The city’s policy is what we [the people] decide. Casting a vote every four years is too easy; people do not feel responsible for democracy. A process like G1000 works well against the distrust and incomprehension between citizens and the government”.

*Quotation 6*

*Dutch*

“Veel mensen waren wantrouwend naar de gemeente toe: wij doen hier het werk voor jullie. Of: wij zitten hier voor de sier, het is allemaal allang beslist. Maar ik vind het altijd belangrijk om je in een ander te verplaatsen. Het thema zelf vond ik zoals gezegd niet zo heel interessant, maar meer: hoe loopt dit nieuwe democratische proces?”

*English*

“A lot of people had distrust against the city; [and thought] we are doing the work for them. Or they said; the final decision has been made already. But I think it is always important to realise the intentions of the other people. Like I said, I did not think the theme itself was that interesting, but for me it was more about seeing how this new democratic process would work”.

## **Quotations Job Kantelberg**

### **Sub-question 1:**

*Quotation 7*

*Dutch*

“De G1000 is in Enschede een initiatief van de burgermeester geweest. Hij wilde een traject rond vuurwerk houden, het is een thema wat veel mensen bezighoudt, ook qua overlast e.d. Het is in zo’n geval duidelijk dat je niet op elke straathoek kan controleren. Over dit thema wilde hij een stadsdialoog houden. De raad was tegelijkertijd bezig met een ‘experimenteeragenda’ en wilde een stadsdialoog faciliteren. Die ideeën zijn bij elkaar gebracht en zo is het ontstaan.

Ik zat in de projectgroep van de gemeente. Het is in de eerste fase dus vooral wel een gemeentelijk proces geweest en er is gekeken naar voorbeelden van inspraak en participatie. G1000 kwam eruit naar voren. Daar zijn een paar duidelijke pijlers, zoals geen agenda, initiatief moet van de burger afkomen. We hebben toch contact met G1000 opgenomen en besproken hoe we als opdrachtgever erbij betrokken konden zijn. G1000 was erbij betrokken om het proces te bewaken.”

*English*

“The G1000 in Enschede was an initiative of the mayor. He wanted to a [citizens’ participation] procedure regarding fireworks, that is a topic that a lot of people care about, also regarding inconvenience et cetera. It is clear that you can not check [as a city] on each street corner. About this topic, he wanted to organise a ‘city dialogue’. At the same time, the city council was working on a ‘experimental agenda’ and wanted to organise a city dialogue too. Those ideas were brought together and that how it evolved.

I was part of the project group of the city. In the first phase, it has mainly been a process of the city itself and we reviewed other types of citizens having a say and citizens’ participation. G1000 was chosen. There are some clear rules, like no agenda, the initiative has to come from the people.

However, we did contact G1000 and discussed how we could be involved as the one proposing this process. G1000 was involved to guard the process.”

## Quotations Harm van Dijk

### Sub-question 2:

#### *Quotation 8*

#### *Dutch*

“Het tweede: invloed op het politieke bestel, daar hebben we veel meer moeite mee gehad. Onder andere door onze eigen principiële keuzes in het begin, namelijk: geen agenda vooraf. Dat is nog steeds zo, maar de meest open agenda die je kon bedenken, kozen we als onderwerp. Namelijk: wat vindt je belangrijk voor de toekomst van onze eigen gemeenschap? Dat blijkt een vraag te zijn met een abstractie die een oververtegenwoordiging van HBO-WO aantrekt.

Twee: omdat we zeiden van: de burgers moeten hiermee akkoord zijn maar het ook zelf organiseren om het wantrouwen tegenover de overheid te faciliteren, om het voort te zijn, dat we als overheidsinitiatief gezien zouden worden en een onafhankelijke naam te vestigen. Maar dat maakte wel dat de overheid met zijn armen over elkaar aan de zijkant ging staan en zei: nou wat interessant burgers dat jullie dit willen. Laten we maar eens kijken wat ervan terechtkomt.

Nou, aangezien burgers en G1000 niet uitgerust zijn met een uitvoeringsapparaat a la de overheid, kan je voorspellen wat er gebeurt: veel ideeën, enthousiasme en vervolgens wordt het gesmoord in de praktische problemen van de realisatie. Het was niet een goede weg om te gaan omdat daarmee de aanvankelijk zeer enthousiaste burgers dat die zichzelf een tweede keer gingen bedenken of ze wel een G1000 moeten organiseren, want het resultaat was gewoon te mager ten opzichte van de enorme inspanning die het kostte om met vrijwilligers zo'n G1000 te organiseren.

Op basis van die evaluaties werd duidelijk dat we op dit punt zwak scoren: wetenschappelijk onderzoek en onze eigen ervaringen wezen daarop, dus op een gegeven moment, hebben we in januari gezegd, we gaan in op het verzoek van een gemeente om voor het eerst met een gemeente een G1000 te organiseren. Dat heeft een doorbraak veroorzaakt, wat betreft het realiseren van de uitkomsten van de G1000. Die samenwerking met de gemeente die verplichtte ons tot een aantal zaken.

Allereerst om onze onafhankelijkheid te waarborgen. We hebben tegen die gemeente gezegd: we willen het wel doen maar alleen als een gelijkwaardige partner. En dat betekent dat we het fenomeen partnerovereenkomst realiseren waarin we de gemeente vragen om onze onafhankelijkheid te garanderen. En dat we de gemeente vragen om onze waarden en principes te waarborgen en daarnaast een aantal praktische dingen; bijv. de afspraak dat ze zich verplicht om de uitkomst van de G1000, om die in haar midden te behandelen en gemotiveerd daarover te besluiten.

-Ja, dan heb je een heel andere opzet inderdaad als ze er al zo instaan.

Precies. En het tweede is dat we zeiden: oké, als je dit wilt, dan gaan we dat niet zelf organiseren, jullie gaan de G1000 organiseren, onder onze vlag. Eigenlijk de omgekeerde wereld, maar de vlag is G1000 maar wij gaan een team van ambtenaren coachen en begeleiden om die G1000 te organiseren. Dat is een prikkelend figuur. Het leuke is dat er binnen elke gemeenteambtenaren te vinden zijn die dit ontzettend leuk vinden en je hebt meteen de voorhoede in huis. We trainen en begeleiden de mensen om op een andere manier met hun burgers om te gaan. Het is ook een soort training 'on the job' geworden, een veranderprogramma binnen die G1000 wat ontzettend leuk werkt.

Het allerbelangrijkste was de veranderingen die we moeten doen, dat we ons realiseerden dat binnen de bureaucratie, dat had ik al eerder gemerkt, dat het draait om talige uitkomsten: uitkomsten die dat niet zijn, daar kan de bureaucratie helemaal niets mee. Waarom niet? Omdat besluitvorming over zoveel schijven loopt. De manier om dat overdrachtelijk te doen is gevaarlijk. Dat is iets heel anders dan de burger, de burgeruitkomsten van de G1000 zijn ideeën, actie, energie, dus wat we ons realiseerden was: oké dan moeten we de G1000 zo vormgeven – met name het vervolgtraject – dat het ook daadwerkelijk ook goed uitgewerkte, talige uitkomsten zijn. En daarom hebben we het burgerforum geïntroduceerd, na de burgertop, de tweede fase. G1000 is nu dus een traject van drie maanden.

(...)

En dan komt er na drie maanden de resultaten. Toen realiseerden we ons, als je zoveel resultaten hebt, dan kan je die niet ineens bij de gemeenteraad dumpen, dan zul je eerst – want die groepen gaan elk autonoom aan de gang – dan zul je eerst als gehele groep nog met elkaar nog iets van uitkomsten moeten vinden, zodat die voorstellen ook namens de hele groep van de G1000 gedaan kunnen worden.

Dus er is een slotbijeenkomst bedacht, die noemen we nu het burgerberaad. Tijdens dat burgerberaad worden de voorstellen gepresenteerd aan drie verschillende panels in publieke, openbaar toegankelijke bijeenkomsten. En die panelpresentaties zijn eigenlijk bedoeld om toehoorders te prepareren aan hun deelname aan de burgerraad 's middags waar verwacht wordt dat ze stemmen zonder dat er een verdere presentatie van de voorstellen plaatsvindt.

Wij sluiten de G1000 tegenwoordig dus af met een stemming van de deelnemers over hun eigen resultaten, zodat er een gedragen besluit – dat heet burgerbesluit – overhandigd kan worden aan de gemeente.

Nou, die drie panels – 1: burgers die niet betrokken zijn bij de uitwerken van de voorstellen, 1: met professionals die vanuit hun vaktechnische kant de voorstellen bevragen en 1: politici die zonder zelf stelling te hoeven nemen gewoon een verduidelijkingsvraag kunnen stellen tijdens de presentatie. Elk vanuit hun eigen gezichtshoek. Ze geven daarmee de toehoorders het idee het eigen standpunt, de waardering van het voorstel wat ze horen, te verdiepen.

(...)

En vervolgens wordt er hoofdelijk gestemd. Alle voorstellen die de steun van de burgerraad krijgen, worden opgenomen in het burgerbesluit en die dat niet krijgen, komen er niet in. En dan sluiten we de burgerraad af met een ondertekening van het burgerbesluit door alle aanwezige burgers. (...) Wat eigenlijk gebeurt- tot mijn stomme verbazing, dat sinds we dat model hebben geïntroduceerd – dat de gemeenteraad het lef niet heeft om nog tegen zo'n burgerbesluit te stemmen.

Dat burgerbesluit dat wordt in alle twee keer dat dat nu heeft plaatsgevonden, klakkeloos omarmd door de zittende raad. Waar we voorheen totaal geen impact hadden, hebben we nu ineens met dat burgerbesluit maximale impact. Dat doet de vraag rijzen: hoe komt dat?

Een aantal aspecten hebben we al benoemd en kan je zelf ook bedenken, we zitten gewoon in dat systeem, en o, ja, belangrijk: we sluiten nu aan op een vraag van de gemeente. Dus de vraag, is een vraag die binnen de gemeente leeft. Dat betekent dat er al een beleidspad geëffend is naar de raad toe. Dat is een heel belangrijke. Je sluit aan op de bureaucratie.

-En dat is inderdaad heel belangrijk neem ik aan, want anders krijg je een situatie: leuk dat jullie dit doen, maar we doen er verder niets mee.

Bureaucratie kan alleen iets met wat ze zelf gecreëerd heeft. Dat is echt ook eigenlijk, als je het filosofisch bekijkt, het heeft allerlei boeiende effecten. Naar al die dingen, is er een wat politici enorm beïnvloedt. En dat is: het geritualiseerd is op een manier die zij herkennen. Het ritueel van een vergadering waar mensen hoofdelijk gevraagd wordt, en een in een keer zien ze zichzelf gespiegeld. En volgens mij – maar dat is een hypothese – is dat een van de dingen, naast dat het een geweldige inspanning is maar er zijn zoveel participatieprocessen waar dat gedaan wordt door burgers die nog steeds doodlopen, maar ik vermoed dat gaat blijken dat het onderdeel ritualisering een belangrijk aspect is in het verwerven van legitimiteit van het burgerbesluit.”

### *English*

“The second thing; having influence on the political framework was much harder to achieve. One of the reasons was the choice we made in the beginning, saying that there would be no agenda. That is still the case nowadays, but before we choose the most ‘open agenda’ there is. Namely: what do you consider to be important for the future of our community? That turns out to be a question which is too abstract and only attract participants with a college or university degree.

Secondly, because we were saying that the people have to agree with this, but also need to come up with this themselves. This was done in order to stop the distrust in the government, to make sure that we were seen as being independent. But this resulted in a government saying: well, interesting that the people want this, but let’s see how it turns out.

Well, since the people and the G1000 do not have a government-like apparatus, you can predict what is going to happen: a lot of ideas, enthusiasm which was stopped in the process of realization. This was not the way to go, since the initially enthusiastic citizens would think twice about organizing a G1000 procedure, since the results was too less considering the enormous effort it took to organise a G1000 on a voluntary basis.

Based on evaluations, it became clear that it we didn’t performed well on this point; scientific research pointed this out, as well as our own experiences. So at some point in January, we said: we go ahead with the request of a city to organise a G1000 together. This caused a breakthrough regarding realizing the outcomes of a G1000. This cooperation with a municipality does obliges us to some things.

Firstly, to ensure our independence. We said to that municipality: we want to do this, but only if we consider ourselves equal partners. This has led to the phenomenon ‘partner agreement’ in which we ask the municipality to guarantee our independence. We also ask the municipality to respect our values and principles, and it includes some practical things such as, the agreement that the outcome of a G1000 procedure should be treated fairly and decided upon.

-Yes, this is an entirely different starting point if a city agrees on this.

Exactly. And the second thing we said was; okay, if you agree on this, we will not organise the G1000 procedure, you will do it, we will provide the support. So the tables turned. As a G1000, we will coach and accompany the civil servants in organizing a G1000 procedure. The nice thing about this is that there are – within each municipality – a lot of civil servants who like this and are at the forefront of the procedure. We train and accompany them in having a different approach when it comes to citizen

participation. It became a kind of 'on the job' training, a program full of changes within the G1000 which works really well.

Within these changes, the most important thing to realise that bureaucracy is about language. The bureaucracy does not work well with outcomes that are not related to language. Why? Because decision-making goes through so many phases or levels. To do that just metaphorical, is rather dangerous. But this is really different than the citizens work; outcomes of citizens are about ideas, action, energy. We realized: okay, we have to shape the G1000 procedure – especially the next steps – in such a way that it actually ends up in outcomes that are related to language. That is why we introduced the citizens' forum, after the citizens' summit, the second phase. G1000 is now a trajectory of three months.

(...)

And then, after three months, there are some results. We realized, whenever you have so many results, you can not just give them to the city council, you first need to – because all groups worked autonomously – agree on the outcomes with the entire group. By doing so, the proposals can be done on behalf of the entire group.

We came up with a conclusion meeting, we call it citizens' council. There, the proposals are presented to three different panels in public meetings. These presentations are actually for the attendants to prepare themselves for the meetings that follow later. Because, in the afternoon that follows, the people are request to vote without seeing another presentation of the proposals.

So, we close the G1000 nowadays with letting the participants vote on their own results, so this results in a decision – which is citizens' decision – that is supported by all and can be handed over to the municipality.

So, these three panels – 1. Citizens that were not involved in working on these proposals, 1. Professionals who are involved because of the type of knowledge they have, 1. Politicians that do not have to vote but can attend to clarify questions. Each [group of people is there because] has its own point of view. They can help the participants to clarify viewpoints.

(...)

And, after that, there is an election. All proposals that get support from the citizens' council, are included in the citizens' decision. Those who do not get enough support, are not included. And then, we close the citizens' council by signing the agreement by all people that attended it. (...) And what we see happening – and I am amazed by that – is that, ever since we introduced that model – the city council does not dare to vote against the citizens' decision.

The citizens' decision is, in all two times it has been organised now, immediately accepted by the citizens' council. In the areas we did not have any impact before, we do have maximum impact now. This raises the question; why it is like this.

Some aspect we talked about and you can think of yourself; we take part in the system, and most importantly; we are replying to a wish of a municipality. That wish is something of the municipality itself. This means that there is already a willingness to make policy in that area. That is really important. We are connecting to the bureaucracy.

-That seems important, otherwise, that same situation arises: really interesting that you are organizing this, but we are not doing anything with it.

A bureaucracy can only handle something it created itself. If you look at it in a philosophical way, it has all sorts of interesting effects. There is one which really effects politicians, namely: when it is ritualized in a way politicians recognize. So, the meeting in which people are asked to vote, is a situation in which they recognize themselves. And that is – it is just a hypothesis – one of the things, besides it being an enormous effort, but there are many more forms of citizens' participation that do not succeed, that makes it important to become a success. If it is ritualized, it is important for getting legitimacy for the citizens' decision.

## Quotations Loes Schippers

### Sub-question 2:

*Quotation 9*

*Dutch*

“Voor een G1000-procedure heb je een lange adem nodig. Mijn indruk was dat de mensen die meededen blij waren met de kans om erbij te zijn. Ze gaan met elkaar in gesprek, er ontstaat een dialoog in plaats van debat. In juni tijdens de grote bijeenkomst werden de deelnemers verdeeld in groepjes van vier. Het was een dialoog waarbij de gemeente op de achtergrond bleef. Ambtenaren kwamen pas in de werkgroepen na de zomervakantie in beeld. Ze hadden voornamelijk een faciliterende rol.

Van de 10.000 uitnodigingen kwamen er 350 mensen. En in de sessie twee maanden later waren er nog 100 deelnemers over. Voor verschillende thema's werden groepjes geformeerd. Zo was er een groepje 'handhaving' en daar kwam dan een ambtenaar bij. De rol van de ambtenaar was daarbij meer faciliterend, als in: hebben jullie een ruimte nodig om bij elkaar te komen?

(...)

Het was een goede afspiegeling van de stad. Het hield elkaar in balans, er waren wat minder jongeren bij aanwezig, maar ze waren er wel. Naar mijn idee waren mensen bij de G1000 om drie redenen: 1. Ze wilden van het vuurwerk in de stad af. 2. Ze wilden reden 1 voorkomen. 3. Geïnteresseerden in het proces of in deze vorm van democratische vernieuwing. Het thema speelt hierbij ook een rol, denk ik. Als je een thema als onderwijs kiest, komt er wellicht een selecte groep op af, het vuurwerkbeleid was iets wat iedereen aanging.

*English*

“You need a lot of patience for a G1000 procedure. My impression was that the people who joined were happy to be part of it. They talked to each other, there was a dialogue instead of a debate. In June, during a big meeting, the participants were divided in groups of four. During this dialogue, the city did not interfere. Civil servants only joined after the summer break in those. They basically only had a facilitating role.

Of the 10,000 invitations sent, 350 people showed up. In the sessions held after two months, some 100 of those people were left. Groups were formed about several topics. There was a group called 'order' [or 'security'] for instance, which got a civil servant assigned. The role of the civil servant was to facilitate the process, like: would you need an office space for a next meeting?

It was a good representation of the city. It was a balanced group, maybe with less young people, but they did join. I believe that people participated at G1000 for three reasons: 1. They wanted to get rid of the fireworks in the city. 2. They wanted to prevent reasons 1 from happening. 3. They were interested in this process of democratic renewal. The theme itself plays a role also. If you would pick a topic like education, a specific group may join, but the firework policy was something that concerned everyone.”

### Quotations Job Kantelberg

#### Sub-question 2:

##### *Quotation 10*

##### *Dutch*

“De gemeenteraad heeft nu ook een akkoord gesloten om meer in te zetten op de burger. Hierbij wordt gekeken naar andere methodieken. Hoe dat precies uit wordt gevoerd, daar wordt nog naar gekeken. Het leefde dus al wel [dit is niet iets wat de G1000 tot stand heeft gebracht]; de burger bij besluitvorming betrekken. De stadsdialoog [Enschede Dialoog] bijvoorbeeld, dat is vastgelegd in een soort tweede coalitieakkoord zelfs.”

(...)

“Erop terugkijkend, zijn we als stad tevreden hoe het is gegaan. Er zijn wel verbeterpunten en het is erg duur. Ook waren er wat reacties als: moeten we hier nou de prioriteit bij leggen, bij vuurwerk. Maar de dialoog, dat is het aspect waar iedereen achterstond en achterstaat. Dat was ook de kracht, om een onderwerp bespreekbaar te maken. Vuurwerk is een lastig thema, dus dat maak je op zo’n manier bespreekbaar.”

“Er waren wel wat reacties vanuit de politiek ook; wat doen wij dan nog? Maar dat verschilde per politicus.”

##### *English*

“The city council made an agreement to involve citizens more. Therefore, other methods are reviewed as well. How this will be executed, is something that is still unclear. Getting citizens involved is something [the city] wanted to do for a longer time [it is not something the G1000 is responsible for]. The city dialogue ‘Enschede Dialoog’ for instance, that is even agreed upon in a second coalition agreement.”

(...)

Looking back at it, we [the city] are happy with the procedure. There are some recommendations thinkable and it was quite expensive. There were some reactions as: should we prioritize firework policy? But the dialogue itself, was something everyone supported. That was the most powerful thing, to make a topic like this discussable. Firework is a delicate topic, which can be debated in this way.”

“Some politicians replied: why are we here then? But that differed from person to person.”

### Quotations Harm van Dijk

#### Sub-question 3:

##### *Quotation 11*

##### *Dutch*

“Dan krijg je een dialoog. Het uitgangspunt is: geen agenda. De deelnemers leiden zichzelf. Het is een ‘open space-principe’; de wet van de twee voeten, de deelnemers leiden zichzelf; geen agenda vooraf. Niemand – een van de belangrijkste manco’s van het huidige systeem – er is zo veel mis – de burger inspraak besluit, invloed heeft via zijn vertegenwoordigers invloed heeft op zogenaamd de besluitvorming. Maar het belangrijkste onderdeel is de agendering.

De agendering vindt achter gesloten deuren plaatst en niemand weet hoe dat tot stand komt. Dus zeggen we: de agenda wordt door de deelnemers bepaald. En mogelijk is dat zelfs een van de meest revolutionaire veranderingen van het G1000 proces. Dit is een heel fundamentele. Daarmee komt de zeggenschap echt bij de burgers te liggen.

Want er is wel een onderwerp gegeven maar hoe dat uitgewerkt wordt, langs welke issues en lijnen en naar welke oplossingen toe, dat is volledig aan de burger.

(...)

Dan zijn dus geen burgers, dat zijn woonconsumenten. Op het moment dat die en anderen met elkaar in gesprek gaan over elkaars belangen en wat ze belangrijk vinden, ontdekken dat die andere ook dingen belangrijk vindt die op een heel level liggen dan die kleine ongenoegen. Wat we zien gebeuren – is dat deelnemers binnen no time het eigen belang relativeren ten opzichte van het eigen belang. Er ontstaat een bewustzijn van het eigen belang, dat noemen we ‘common ground’, die is er binnen no time, heel broos en breekbaar. In het vervolgtraject, zijn we eigenlijk allemaal erop gericht dat we ervoor zorgen dat die common ground verankerd wordt in het bewustzijn van de mensen. Zodat het niet zomaar verdwijnt en uitgewerkt wordt in concrete voorstellen en ideeën. Maar dat fenomeen dat mensen dat eigen belang relativeren dat is waar elke politicus van droomt en wat feitelijk zo eenvoudig bewerkstelligd wordt, ervan uitgaande dat je de spelregels hanteert, en bewaakt. Dit is het echte geheim van de G1000.

(...)

Dat is allemaal een kostbare aangelegenheid dus ook waardoor ook op lokaal niveau de G1000 nauwelijks betaalbaar is. Je moet je voorstellen dat het voor Heerenveen 1,5 ton kost en met inzet van ambtenaren kom je aan 3 ton, dat is veel geld voor een lokale gemeente.

Een van de dingen die we gedaan hebben, is het introduceren van een G1000 light. Een burgerberaad, daar doen we hetzelfde met max. 150 deelnemers, dan kan een deel van de techniek thuisblijven. Dat maakt het veel goedkoper. In de toekomst, wil je houdbaar model hebben, dan zou je eigenlijk willen dat het 1 keer in een halfjaar een G1000 plaatsvindt in een gemeente.

Daarin doen vraagstukken die dan opportuun zijn over de toekomst/richting van de gemeente met een groep gelote burgers besproken worden. Elke keer een nieuwe groep gelote burgers, zodat gaandeweg, alle burgers in de gemeenschap aan de beurt komen en onderworpen worden aan het heilzame effect van het burgerbewustzijn. Andere noemen dat burgers onderwezen worden in de democratie. Ik zal het niet snel zeggen, omdat burgers autonome wezens zijn die in staat zijn om over eigen behoeften te beslissen. Daar hoeft niets aan onderwezen te worden, dat weten ze zelf ook wel.

Eén keer in het halfjaar, waarbij de uitkomsten gewoon door de ambtenaren uitgewerkt worden en na een paar maanden weer voorgelegd worden aan de oorspronkelijke deelnemers van de burgerraad, zo van was dat wat jullie bedoelden? Dan erover stemmen en klaar.

Dat is een veel eenvoudiger model, kost minder geld, maar veronderstelt een ambtelijk apparaat wat dus zo geprofessionaliseerd is in het organiseren van G1000- en het omgaan met burgers, en het respecteren van de gelijkwaardigheid, dat ze de verleiding weerstaat van een wethouder die dan toch zijn eigen agenda probeert door te duwen.

(...)

En dan is het een kwestie, een sluitstuk dat burgers verplicht worden om deel te nemen, zoals ze dat in het buitenland ook doen, als je wordt uitgenodigd voor een jury, dan moet je er gewoon zijn. En dan heb je gewoon, dan is ook de representativiteit opgelost, dan heb je gewoon de ideale uitbreiding van het representatieve stelsel met een direct democratisch stelsel, een participatiestelsel. En dan heb je bepaalde vraagstukken die daar worden behandeld en anderen die ergens anders worden behandeld.

-Een systeem naast het bestaande.

Voor heel veel operationele zaken moet je gewoon het huidige stelsel in tact houden. Het direct participatieve model is zo veel beter. Om alle redenen die ik al genoemd heb en omdat er niet een winnende coalitie met de oplossing aan de haal gaat, maar er zit gewoon een complete afspiegeling van de hele bevolking, dus je bent gewoon met het geheel bezig.

(...)

Ja, natuurlijk. Overal waar mensen beslissingen moeten nemen, het is een super eenvoudige vorm. In de kern is het: je gaat met mensen aan tafel, je neemt de tijd om uit te vinden wat de ander belangrijk vindt, je trekt daarin conclusie: dit vinden we met elkaar belangrijk en vervolgens zeg je: laten we het uitwerken in concrete oplossingen. In mijn eindplaatje. Eerst het nationale: dit kan op elk niveau, zelfs binnen alle organisaties. Ik doe het met scholen, bij verenigingen, de Consumentenbond. Overal waar mensen samen tot gesprek moeten komen, is dit een fantastische vervanging bottom-up van het oude systeem wat top-down was.

#### *English*

"Then, a dialogue exists. The starting point is: no agenda. Participants lead themselves. It is an open space principle; they lead themselves, there is no agenda set beforehand. There are a lot of things not going well in the current [representative] system. The people are supposed to have influence through the representatives in parliament, on decision-making. But the most crucial phase is agenda setting.

Setting the agenda takes place behind closed doors, and nobody knows how it works exactly. So, that is why we say: the people set the agenda. And that is possibly one of the most revolutionary changes of the G1000 process. It is a very fundamental one. It really makes sure that the people have a say.

There is a general topic, but how they discuss and approach it, and which solutions they come up with, is entirely up to the citizens.

(...)

Then they are not citizens, but almost consumers. The moment that they get together and discuss about the interests and about what they consider to be important, they discover things that are far more important than the small issues they had in mind. What we notice, is that the participants are relatively fast in putting their own interest aside and support the general interest. There is a sort of collective awareness, a common ground. During the next steps, we try to get that common ground

more stable and more attached to the mind of the people. This is in order to make sure it does not disappear that easily and to make sure it can be developed into proposals and ideas. But that phenomenon, that people are able to put their own interest aside, is something all politicians are dreaming about. In fact, it can be done quite easily when you follow this method according to the rules. That is the real secret of the G1000.

(...)

It is all very costly, so it is hard to finance the G1000 on a local level. Imagine that a city like Heerenveen would have to pay around 150,000 euros, and with the participation of the civil servants included, it is 300,000 euros. That is a lot of money for a municipality.

One of the things we did, was introducing a G1000 light. The citizens' council is the same, but with maximum 150 participants, so part of the 'technical side' can be left out. This makes it cheaper. In the future, when you want to make this system sustainable, a G1000 should be organised at least once every half a year.

There, you can let participants who are selected by draw decide on current affairs of a municipality, related to a future policy. Every time, there should be a new group of citizens, so everyone gets its turn and can join the 'curing' effect of citizens' awareness. Other people might say: they are taught about democracy, but I won't call it like that. Because, people are autonomous and are capable of deciding about their own needs. You don't have to teach people about that, they know it.

Once every half year, in which the outcomes are developed further by civil servants, and will be presented to the original participants of the civil council to make sure this is what they had in mind. Then they would have to vote about it, and it's done.

This is a much easier model, it costs less money, but does require a civil servants apparatus that needs to be professionalized in organizing a G1000, in dealing with citizens, and in respecting equality that they do not get seduced by the opinion of one of the aldermen with his or her own agenda.

(...)

A last important thing is that people will need to be obliged to take part in it, like they do abroad; if you get an invitation for a jury, you have to go. And then, you would also solve the problem of representativity. It would be the best way to broaden the representative system with a system of direct democracy, a system of participation. For some questions or issues, the representative system would work, for others the direct democratic system does.

-It is a system next to the existing one.

For a lot of operational issues, you will need to have the current system. The direct participative model is much better, because of the things I mentioned and because there is no coalition that presents its conclusion; it is a representative body of the whole community. So it is about inclusion.

(...)

Yes, of course. In every situation in which people need to take decisions [about the model being applied elsewhere], it is a super easy model. The most important principle is: you go and discuss things with people and get to know what other people consider to be important. Then, you say: let's get to solutions together. I would say, first, have a look at this at national level, but it can be done at

each level, even within organisations. I do this at schools, at associations, the ‘Consumentenbond’ [an organisation for consumers’ rights]. Every time people get together and where they have to come up with a solution together, this is a fantastic replacement of the old top-down system into something bottom-up.”

### Quotations Loes Schippers

#### Sub-question 3:

*Quotation 12*

*Dutch*

“Burgers zijn niet extreem in hun eisen, dat was iets wat opviel. Ook in niet rondom het budget. Vanuit de gemeente was dat een angst, er werd namelijk aangegeven dat er geen geld beschikbaar was voor de plannen, wat voor verwarring zorgde bij de deelnemers en ook de vraag opriep wat dan uitgevoerd kon worden. Achteraf bleek dat er best wel een budget gevonden kon worden, maar dat soort dingen wisten we als deelnemers niet.”

*English*

“Citizens do not have extreme wishes, that was something I noticed. Also not when it came to budget. The city feared that beforehand, they said [to the participants]; there is no budget available for the plans, which caused confusion and raised the question how the ideas should be executed. Afterwards, it turned out that there was a budget available, but the participants weren’t aware of these kind of things.”

### Quotations Job Kantelberg

#### Sub-question 3:

*Quotation 13*

*Dutch*

“Of we dit vaker gaan doen weet ik niet [precies zo’n zelfde G1000-methode], maar we kunnen wel een soortgelijke methodiek toepassen. De G1000 is erg duur en kost veel ambtelijke inzet. Mensen hebben ook in de avonden en weekenden gewerkt en dat was allemaal op vrijwillige basis. Als je dat ieder jaar gaat doen, dan moet je toch de overuren gaan rekenen en dat wordt erg duur. Dus op zich ja, maar dan niet zo groot [over nog een keer zo’n procedure].”

(...)

“Het zal wel altijd zo blijven dat een burgerbesluit niet zonder de raad kan worden aangenomen, het heeft namelijk geen wettelijke kracht [over of het past bij de huidige besluitvormingsprocedures]. Je kan wel als raad een afspraak maken; we nemen het altijd aan, wat de burger ook besluit. Dat hebben we met het vuurwerk ook gezegd, als het onder de 15.000 euro blijft, dan kunnen we ermee akkoord gaan. Dat zijn dus kaders die je van tevoren kan afspreken, om ervoor te zorgen dat een burgerbesluit vrijwel altijd zo wordt overgenomen. En het blijven ook politici, dus die willen niet publiekelijk zich niet aan hun beloften houden.”

*English*

“If we are going to do this again [exactly the same G1000 method], I don’t know. But we could use a similar method. The G1000 is very expensive and it also requires a lot of effort from civil servants. They have been working during the evening and weekends and all on a voluntary basis. If you want to do this every year, you have to compensate them of course and that will turn out to be very expensive. So, in principle: yes, but not that big [about organizing another G1000].”

(...)

“It will always be the case that a citizens’ decision can not be implemented without the city council, because it does not have any legal power itself [about the G1000 fitting into the current decision-making procedures]. What you can do, is making an agreement with the city council: we always go ahead, whatever the citizens decide. That is what we did with the firework policy, we said: if it costs less than 15,000 euros, we can accept it. These are frameworks you can decide on beforehand to make sure that the citizens’ decision will always be implemented in the same way. And, we are talking about politicians; they do not want to break their promises publicly.”

## Annex 4: coding process

To indicate how I came up with the conclusions, I added the process of selective coding (step 3 in the coding process, after open coding and axial coding). The first two steps are connected to the transcriptions of the three interviews. Upon request, these can be send also.

### Selective coding

#### STEP 1

Here, parts of the interviews (as the name behind the labels show) are connected to central concepts.

##### 1. CITIZENS EXPRESSING THEMSELVES

###### *Citizens want to express their opinions*

- Non-governmental way of citizen participation (HARM),
- Need for citizens to get together and to experience a sense of community (HARM),
- The most important thing is that people realize that they are the 'boss' and that they need to feel more responsibility (LOES).
- I participated because I liked the initiative concerning democracy, not the topic (LOES).

##### 2. POWERFUL GOVERNMENTS

###### *Government(s) have become too powerful*

- Government acquired power over the years (through the process of professionalizing several institutions) to do whatever she wants (HARM),
- Dangers of having a bureaucratic system (HARM),
- After elections: less impact from citizens, more impact from lobby groups (HARM),
- Bureaucracy and politics are the same governmental technical complex, which is far away from the people's reality (HARM).
- Establishing a system for having direct influence on the political system was difficult (HARM).
- Citizens don't know the G1000 system, only professionals who also believe that there is something wrong with the current political system (HARM).

##### 3. NEW G1000 PROCEDURE

###### *The G1000 procedure changed over the years*

- Two central points of G1000: direct influence on political system and sense of community (HARM),
- Lots of ideas, but too many practical problems to make it happen (HARM),
- After two years we choose a different strategy (HARM).
- Adjusting the G1000 system/procedure to make sure the outcome can be implemented in the bureaucratic system (HARM).
- G1000 procedure consists of three steps (HARM),
- Less participants for each step of the G1000 procedure (HARM),
- Three groups of people take part in a G1000 procedure (HARM),
- The 'selecting participants by draw' is the only thing we got from the Belgian system (HARM).

##### 4. G1000 AND CITY PARTNERSHIP

###### *G1000 working together with a municipality to have a more powerful outcome*

- We choose to work together with a municipality in order to strengthen the outcomes of a G1000 procedure (HARM),
- Signing a partner agreement with a city to make sure that the G1000 organisation stays independent (HARM),

- A city organising a G1000 procedure, according to the G1000 rules and under G1000 supervision (HARM).
- We are going to organise more G1000 procedures in cooperation with cities or even with provinces (HARM).

## 5. CITY ADOPTS OUTCOME

### *Outcome of the process is accepted by the city now*

- The outcome of this updated G1000 procedure is a 'citizens's decision' and so far always accepted by the citizens council (HARM),
- The citizens' decision is accepted because it is 'answering a question the city had' (HARM).
- Bureaucracy will only accepts things that it recognizes (HARM).
- The city council supported the procedure but not all of its members liked the decision made by the people due to the topic (JOB).
- Looking back: we are happy about it. The dialogue was supported by everyone, although the costs were high and people did not find the topic suitable (JOB).
- The outcome of the citizens council was adopted by the city council. It was not executed in detail, but most of it was (LOES).

## 6. A DEMAND FOR CHANGING THE CURRENT SYSTEM

### *The current representative system needs to change*

- Dutch people trust democracy but the participation in the representative system is low (HARM),
- There is something fundamentally wrong with the political system: problem of legitimacy (HARM).
- All sorts of organisations try to get influence on the bureaucratic system without someone saying something about it (HARM).
- The differences that politicians create are seen as war by the ordinary citizens which makes them feel unsafe (HARM),
- Media and politicians create a sense of unsafety (HARM).
- Polarisation becomes a reality (HARM).
- Some participants were not trusting the city (LOES).

## 7. AGREEMENT THROUGH DIALOGUE

### *The G1000 system is about finding agreement through a dialogue*

- Only when meeting other people in real life at G1000 meetings, people are able to exchange their views and opinions (HARM),
- The talks are based on equality and having a dialogue (HARM),
- We are trying to find compromises instead of differences (HARM).
- People usually agree on 90 percent of the cases. Since ideologic 'zuilen' are gone, people miss that sense of community to agree with each other (HARM),
- We ask people to only look at the things they agree on, find a common ground (HARM),
- People feel relieved if they hear that they don't have to find an agreement that day (HARM),

## 8. NO AGENDA AT G1000

### *The G1000 talks don't have an agenda*

- There is no agenda (HARM),
- The agenda is made by the participants (HARM),

## 9. REPRESENTATION AT G1000

### *The entire local community is represented*

- Participants are from the local community (HARM),
- The representative system can be updated since now you can bring large groups of people together to let them discuss things (HARM),

- We are looking for a new approach (HARM),
- We are trying to find a solution with the entire community (HARM),
- There was a good representation of the city (LOES),
- People joined for three different reasons (LOES),
- The topic chosen determines who is joining (LOES),
- The amount of people asked to join was 10.000, in the end 100 remained (LOES).
- The city itself was involved in June, but more in a 'helping' role (LOES).
- The city feared beforehand that the people would come up with extreme things (LOES).
- The participants did not have any governing experience, so for them it is hard to estimate something like a budget (LOES),
- The monitor group is trying to keep the procedure transparent and keep the others informed about the rest of the procedure (LOES).

## **10. AN ACCEPTED G1000 OUTCOME**

### ***The outcome of a G1000 procedure should be sufficient***

- Ideally, you would not need any other form of agreement from the city at the end of a G1000 procedure (HARM),
- Politicians are also just people who are participating in the process (HARM),
- City council members should participate fully (HARM).

## **11. NON-CITIZEN GROUPS PARTICIPATING**

### **Willingness of the non-civilian groups to participate to a G1000 procedure**

- The civil servants are always enthusiastic and might only experience problems with the execution of the policy ideas (HARM),
- The business people do not feel the need to go through this entire process (HARM),

## **12. INTEGRITY OF ALL PARTICIPANTS**

### ***Integrity of the people involved is important***

- One of the upcoming G1000 is getting difficult to organize due to issues with integrity (HARM),
- We need to have the word and signatures of all political institutions at city level involved to make sure that the rules not change during the game (HARM),
- People get more conscious (HARM),
- People get more conscious and manage to focus on the interest of the group (HARM).
- We are making sure that the integrity of the people is kept (HARM),
- We are keeping every part of the procedure transparent for the participants (HARM).

## **13. APPLY ON NATIONAL LEVEL**

### ***The G1000 model on national level***

- 'The Hague' is not interested in the G1000 and sees it more of a threat (HARM),
- G1000 can be used to give guidance to the system (HARM),
- Our ambition is to get the G1000 model to the national level (HARM),
- The G1000 system is applicable at every level, also within organisations; everywhere were people come together (HARM),
- We are having a look at the other possibilities of the G1000 system, about a specific topic or on national level for instance (HARM),
- On a national level we want to select till we have a complete representative population (HARM).

## **14. DIFFICULTIES OF A G1000**

### ***The difficulties of organizing a local G1000 procedure***

- The selection on local level starts by selecting people by draw, but in the end you have to work with the people that show up (HARM),

- Now, it takes up to a half year to prepare the civil servants of a city for a G1000 procedure (HARM),
- It is extremely expensive to organize a G1000 procedure (HARM),
- It is extremely expensive to organize a G1000 procedure, therefore we also have a 'light' version now (HARM),
- A G1000 is expensive: costs and hours. But we can do a similar procedure on our own (JOB),
- G1000 is a sufficient procedure but also a bit difficult (LOES).
- You could change the procedure a bit, for instance asking people to join through the media, as long as transparency and honesty are there (LOES).

## 15. FUTURE ADAPTATIONS OF G1000

### *The future adaptations to the G1000 procedure*

- In the end, it would be ideal if with that light version as many people as possible take turns in participating in a G1000 procedure (HARM),
- If it would be compulsory, the issue of representation would be solved also (HARM),
- For a lot of operational issues, you should have the current system (HARM),
- The system allows a G1000 to be part of it. At some point the law would have to change to take it to another level, but for now, it is possible (HARM).
- A city council will always be needed because the G1000 has no legal power. But there are several things you can provide with the citizens like a budget to work with to find a solution (JOB).

## 16. A NEXT G1000 IN ENSCHEDE

### *A future G1000 in Enschede*

- We haven't decided yet on a next topic, but it has to be something that everyone can relate to or affects like safety, garbage or 'livability' of the city (JOB).
- I asked the mayor at a New Year's party about the next G1000 (LOES).
- I wanted to be involved in the next G1000 and were able to follow a training concerning this (LOES).
- A G1000 doesn't necessarily has to go via this procedure (LOES).
- Together with the citizens, there are more topics discussed: it's a kind of agreement (LOES).
- More cities are exploring the possibilities of citizens participation anyway; it's not necessarily because of the G1000 (LOES).

## 17. CITY'S INITIATIVE

### *The city contacting G1000*

- The city council in general focusses a lot on citizen participation. The even made a second 'coalition agreement' stating this (JOB),
- We reviewed several options of citizens' participation (JOB),
- We contacted G1000 and asked if we could be involved as city also (JOB),
- The process took from march to June (JOB),
- Some politicians said: what are we here for? (JOB).
- In Enschede, we wanted to ask the people's opinion about the firework policy. At the same time, the city itself was looking at ways to 'experiment' and the mayor came up with the idea of a G1000 (JOB).
- The entire process was from spring to November 2017 (LOES).
- The people who were asked to join were happy to be part of it (LOES).

## STEP 2

Here, connections between concepts are found.

### 1. CITIZENS EXPRESSING THEMSELVES

2. powerful governments → make → citizens expressing themselves

6. a demand for changing the current system → equals → citizens expressing themselves

7. agreement through dialogue → because of → citizens expressing themselves

12.integrity of all participants → leads to → citizens expressing themselves

## 2. POWERFUL GOVERNMENTS

Powerful governments → make → 3.new G1000 procedure

4.G1000 and city partnership → to stop → powerful governments

6.a demand for changing the current system → in order to stop → powerful governments

13.apply on a national level → to deal with/you get to deal with → powerful governments

## 3. NEW G1000 PROCEDURE

2.powerful governments → demands for → new G1000 procedure

4.G1000 and city partnerships → results in → new G1000 procedure

5.city adopts outcome → because of → new G1000 procedure

10.an accepted G1000 outcome → because of → new G1000 procedure

14.difficulties of a G1000 → demands a → new G1000 procedure

17.city's initiative → asks for a/is possible because of → new G1000 procedure

## 4. G1000 AND CITY PARTNERSHIP

2.powerful governments → lead to → G1000 and city partnership

G1000 and city partnership → creates → 3.new G1000 procedure

5.city adopts outcome → because of → G1000 and city partnership

10.an accepted G1000 outcome → because of → G1000 and city partnership

11.non-citizen groups participating → thanks to → G1000 and city partnership

14.difficulties of a G1000 → demanded a → G1000 and city partnership

G1000 and city partnership → might lead to → 16.a next G1000 in Enschede

17.a city's initiative → equals → G1000 and city partnership

## 5. CITY ADOPTS OUTCOME

City adopts outcome → thanks to → 3.new G1000 procedure

City adopts outcome → because of → 4.G1000 and city partnership

10.an accepted G1000 outcome → equals → city adopts outcome

14.difficulties of a G1000 → but → city adopts outcome

15. future adaptations of G1000 → to make sure → city adopts outcome

16.a next G1000 in Enschede → should ensure → city adopts outcome

17.city's initiative → make sure that → city adopts outcome

## 6. A DEMAND FOR CHANGING THE CURRENT SYSTEM

1.citizens expressing themselves → is an effect of → a demand for changing the current system

2.powerful governments → lead to → a demand for changing the current system

13.apply on national level → would meet the → a demand for changing the current system

16.a next G1000 in Enschede → ensures → a demand for changing the current system

17.city's initiative → because of → a demand for changing the current system

## 7. AGREEMENT THROUGH DIALOGUE

1.citizens expressing themselves → equals → agreement through dialogue

3.new G1000 procedure → ensures → agreement through dialogue

4.G1000 and city partnerships → is about → agreement through dialogue

6.a demand for changing the current system → makes sure there is a → agreement through dialogue

8.no agenda at G1000 → equals → agreement through dialogue

9.representation at G1000 → is important for → agreement through dialogue

10.an accepted G1000 outcome → because of → agreement through dialogue

11.non-citizen groups participating → find → agreement through dialogue

12.integrity of all participants → is important for → agreement through dialogue

#### 8. NO AGENDA AT G1000

1.citizens expressing themselves → because of → no agenda at G1000

No agenda at G1000 → because of → 6.a demand for changing the current system

7.agreement through dialogue → equals → no agenda at G1000

#### 9. REPRESENTATION AT G1000

1.citizens expressing themselves → is important for → representation at G1000

2.powerful governments → that is why → representation at G1000

6.a demand for changing the current system → asks for equal → representation at G1000

representation at G1000 → is important for → 7. agreement through dialogue

12.integrity of all participants → equals → representation at G1000

#### 10. AN ACCEPTED G1000 OUTCOME

an accepted G1000 outcome → because of → 3.new G1000 procedure

an accepted G1000 outcome → because of → 4.G1000 and city partnership

an accepted G1000 outcome → equals → 5.city adopts outcome

an accepted G1000 outcome → because of → 7.agreement through dialogue

14.difficulties of a G1000 → but eventually lead to → an accepted G1000 outcome

15.future adaptations of G1000 → must make sure → an accepted G1000 outcome

17.city's initiative → made sure there is → an accepted G1000 outcome

#### 11. NON-CITIZEN GROUPS PARTICIPATING

Non-citizen groups participating → thanks to → 4.G1000 and city partnership

Non-citizen groups participating → find → 7.agreement through dialogue

12.integrity of all participants → ensures → non-citizen groups participating

#### 12. INTEGRITY OF ALL PARTICIPANTS

Integrity of all participants → leads to → 1.citizens expressing themselves

Integrity of all participants → is important for → 7.agreement through dialogue

Integrity of all participants → equals → 9.representation at G1000

#### 13. APPLY ON NATIONAL LEVEL

Apply on a national level → to deal with/you get to deal with → 2.powerful governments

Apply on national level → would meet the → 6.a demand for changing the current system

14.difficulties of a G1000 → will need to be taken care of before → apply on national level

15.future adaptations of G1000 → equals → 13.apply on national level

#### 14. DIFFICULTIES OF A G1000

Difficulties of a G1000 → demands a → 3.new G1000 procedure

Difficulties of a G1000 → demanded a → 4.G1000 and city partnership

Difficulties of a G1000 → but → 5.city adopts outcome

Difficulties of a G1000 → but eventually lead to → 10.an accepted G1000 outcome

Difficulties of a G1000 → will need to be taken care of before → 13.apply on national level

15.future adaptation of G1000 → will need to take into account → difficulties of a G1000

#### 15. FUTURE ADAPTATIONS OF G1000

Future adaptations of G1000 → to make sure → 5.city adopts outcome

Future adaptations of G1000 → must make sure → 10.an accepted G1000 outcome

Future adaptations of G1000 → equals → 13.apply on national level

Future adaptation of G1000 → will need to take into account → 14.difficulties of a G1000

#### 16. A NEXT G1000 IN ENSCHEDE

A next G1000 in Enschede → should ensure → 5.city adopts outcome

A next G1000 in Enschede → ensures → 6.a demand for changing the current system

17.city's initiative → could lead to → a next G1000 in Enschede

#### 17. CITY'S INITIATIVE

A city's initiative → equals → 4.G1000 and city partnership

A city's initiative → make sure that → 5.city adopts outcome

A city's initiative → because of → 6.a demand for changing the current system

A city's initiative → made sure there is → 10.an accepted G1000 outcome

A city's initiative → could lead to → 16.a next G1000 in Enschede

### Step 3

Here, the connections presented above are attached to the research questions.

#### Main question:

*What are the implications of the use of the G1000 model for citizen participation at the local-decision making level?*

- 1.citizens expressing themselves
- 8. no agenda
- 6.a demand for changing the current system
- 9.representation at G1000
- 11.non-citizen groups participating
- 12.integrity of all participants
- 14.difficulties of a G1000

#### Sub question 1:

*What are the effects of existing decision-making procedures on citizen participation at a local level?*

- 2. powerful governments
- 4.G1000 and city partnership
- 5.city adopts outcome
- 14.difficulties of a G1000
- 17.city's initiative

#### Sub question 2:

*How could different procedural rules be adopted and what are the likely effects on citizen participation at a local decision-making level?*

- 3. new G1000 procedure
- 4.G1000 and city partnership
- 5.city adopts outcome
- 7.agreement through dialogue
- 10.an accepted G1000 outcome
- 13.apply on national level
- 15.future adaptations of G1000
- 16.a next g1000 in Enschede