

Department of Political Science

Chair: Political Science

**Deliberative Democracy in China?
An improbable form of government in the heart
of the East.**

Supervisor

Prof. Michele Sorice

Candidate

Stefania Denni

ID number

075692

Academic year 2016/2017

*I understand Democracy as something that gives
the weak the same chance to be strong*

Mahatma Gandhi

I would like to dedicate my thesis to my mom, Silvia, without whom I wouldn't be here doing what I love. She has always supported me no matter what and is continuing to do so.

Index

Introduction

Chapter I: Deliberative Democracy

- 1.1 Deliberative Democracy definition
 - 1.2 Characteristics (taking into consideration several authors and models, underlining the strengths and weaknesses)
 - 1.3 When we first started talking about deliberative democracy
 - 1.4 Deliberative democracy in political movements
 - 1.5 Relationship between deliberation and participation
-

Chapter II: Deliberative democracy in non democratic states

- 2.1 Non democratic countries
 - 2.2 Why these countries didn't become democratic
 - 2.3 Applying democracy in countries which are not considered to be democratic
 - 2.4 Deliberative Democracy and equality
 - 2.5 Consequences and results
-

Chapter III: China

- 3.1 China's background
- 3.2 Political regimes in China
- 3.3 Western theories of Deliberative democracies and the Chinese practice of deliberative governance
- 3.4 Deliberative democracy with Chinese characteristics
- 3.5 Deliberative institutions in China
- 3.6 The four deliberative polls in China

3.7 Success or failure

Conclusion

Bibliography

Riassunto

Introduction

When we hear talking about democracy it is more likely for us the people to think about Western societies, due to the development of this political system in such countries.

It has been since the ancient Greece in the city of Athens, that the word Democracy first came out. In the 4th to 5th century BC, the city of Athens had a very good political system, where a male citizen had equal political rights, freedom of speech, and the possibility to directly participate in political life. It was the first form of Democracy ever. Of course it had its limits; the only ones who were allowed to enter political life were the male people, women were excluded.

Throughout the centuries, democracy has developed in both a positive and negative way. During different historical periods this political system had faced also severe challenges. The development of such political system has brought it to mutate and from it other forms of democracy were born. Each state has its own form of democracy, there is no single one for each state. There is a basic definition of democracy, so to say that it should meet several standard criteria, like for example: free and fair elections, universal suffrage, the right to vote, the right to speech and uncensored media. Countries don't all respect the basic definition of democracy and thus each of them has its own form but it is still considered a Democratic regime.

Since 1949, China has become an authoritarian regime with the communist party as the strongest and most influence party of the whole country. It has become the second largest economy in the world in less than 70 years and is thought that in the next ten it will surpass the United States and become the largest economy in the world with an income per capita near the top of all developing countries. Corruption is a big issue in China, as well as pollution and gender inequality. Yet economic reform will accelerate, political reform will continue and the one-party system will be holding firms. It is clear that all these aspects make China a continue developing country, and democracy is not well seen from the Chinese government.

This paper will contribute in showing the study of deliberative democracy in China. The first chapter is the introductory one, which gives an overview on what Deliberative democracy is, giving a definition of the latter in first place and then considering its characteristics, analysing the strengths and weaknesses of this political system. Moreover, it will talk about deliberative democracy throughout history, taking into consideration who were the first scholars to talk about it and the most influential ones who became the fathers of it and the presence of deliberative democracy in different political parties and movements. The first chapter will conclude with

examining the relationship between participation and deliberation, two very important aspects that coexist together and form the basic principle of democracy in general.

The second chapter will analyse non democratic regimes and the possible presence of deliberative democracy in those. The first section is dedicated in explaining what features have non democratic countries, defining them and taking into account the different forms of non democratic regimes such as hybrid regimes, totalitarian regimes, etc. The second section of this chapter is an analysis of the possible reasons explaining why in the transition from a form of government to a democracy have failed in becoming a democratic state, and becoming a sort of "mix" between more forms of government. The third section is about applying democracy to countries that are actually a completely different form of government. The fourth section is mainly about the role that equality has in deliberative democracy and underling its important in order to have the desired outcome. Finally the second chapter ends with a very brief overview of the results and consequences of equality in deliberative democracy. This argument will then be faced in the following chapter.

The third and last chapter of this paper is the actual study of deliberative democracy in China. The first section gives a background of the Chinese history, starting from its very beginning 6000 years ago but concentrating mostly on the period from 1949 onwards which have been the beginning of the People's Republic of China. Moreover, the second section explains in details China's political regimes, taking into consideration the period before Mao's rise to power and the changes that China had to face. The third section explains the western theories of deliberative democracy and analyses the Chinese practice of deliberative governance explaining the two experiments held in two villages in China, Zeguo and Wenling, concerning deliberative polling and analysing the outcomes of it. The following section is about deliberative democracy with Chinese characteristics, explaining what best fits the Chinese form of government. The forth section is strictly linked to the fifth one. The latter, explains the different deliberative institutions that are present in China and explaining what is their role within the society. The second to last section concentrates in explaining the deliberative polls in China. Firstly, the definition of deliberative polling will be given, underlining the strengths and weaknesses of it and then explaining the outcomes of deliberative polling in China. The final section of the third chapter will be the conclusion in which we will find out whether deliberative democracy may be a possible form of government in China.

The present paper will have a brief conclusion with some final remarks on deliberative democracy in China and the possible changes that this form of government could bring to China.

Chapter One: Deliberative Democracy

1.1 Deliberative democracy: the definition

Nowadays, we use procedural definitions of democracy. There were a lot of states that claimed to be democratic in the 1950s and the 1960s (e.g. Democratic Republic of Germany, Hungary etc.) because they had the idea that democracy was a regime where the government expressed the will of the people, not caring about the procedures: they were aiming and some of them reached the original notion of democracy. This form of government used to be identified as something that should lead to a common good. Hence, democracy is an outcome that allowed the regime to achieve the common good (according to this definition, many authoritarian countries could be considered democracies).

“The 18th century philosophy of democracy may be couched in the following definition: the democratic method is that institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions which realises the common good by making the people itself decide issues through the election of individuals who are to assemble in order to carry out its will.” Schumpeter

A key characteristic of a democracy is the continuing responsiveness of the government to the preferences of its citizens, considered as political equals. Robert Dahl addresses the contrast with substantive democracy. The departure point is that he assumes that the defining feature of democracy is responsiveness: democracy has to take into account the preferences of its citizens.

There are three steps for a regime to be called a democracy - Citizens must have unimpaired opportunities: to formulate their preferences; to signify your preferences to your fellow citizens and the government by individual and collective action (freedom of speech and freedom of association); to have their preferences weighted equally in the conduct of the government, that is, weighted with no discrimination because of the content or source of the preferences; that is also the reason why the treatment of preferences must be universal: no distinction between preferences expressed by different individuals, regardless of the content or the person themselves.

The final move is to explain how these process translates into some specific institutional guarantees, hence what are the procedural requirements to ensure that these conditions take place. What are these institutional guarantees?

Elected officials in which the Government has to be elected; free and fair elections where, for example, you must have more than one party and electoral rights have to be equal across different social groups etc.; inclusive suffrage, meaning that there must be a totality of the population over

some specific age; right to run for office: People have to be free to become candidates, not restricted by any criterion (no specific social group); freedom of expression; Alternative sources of information: this criterion qualifies most democracies as not very democratic and to formulate your preferences you need not only the ones controlled by the government; associational autonomy related to the fact that associations do not have to be authorised by the government, they are free to pursue their goals as long as they are legal. To have a genuine discussion about government policies and a potential opposition to the action of the government. These are the necessary conditions for a regime to be defined as a democracy.

Dahl's definition of democracy involves two factors: Participation and Opposition. Elections are not enough, what you need is also a lively and vibrant opposition: regulations and constitutional guarantees allow the expression of contestation towards government action.

Moreover, Dahl adds two more important characteristics: Constitutional guarantees, meaning that constitutions should enshrine and guarantee human rights without exception and control over executive power in order to limit the possibility for the president to achieve too much power.

Participatory democracy, a democracy with consensus building and in which people can participate in democracy not only through elections but also to take part at every activities of political and social life. It prefigures a society in which people can participate regularly for example in the deliberative territorial assemblies or in citizens jury. Deliberative democracy is always associated with the participatory one.

Participatory and deliberative democracy involves deliberation which looks for the huge consensus. In it it is not important to have some basically defined definitions. It merges together the formation of collective identities and the idea that this collective identity can be transformed.

The Scottish national party is a different kind of nationalist party that we usually conceive. It is against racism and xenophobia, its aim is inclusiveness and it is located into the left wing of United Kingdom.

It is a merge of participation and delegation in which the leader is important but not so important.

Colin Crouch is an English political sociologist which wrote the book "*Democracy: an anti-egalitarian mutation?*". In his book he spoke about the anti-egalitarian mutation of democracy.

Why?

Let us start with the evolution and devolution of liberal democracy. He remembers that liberal democracy is based on: growing intervention of the state in the market, parties

and states sovereignty

He defines a point of crisis exactly in the first point because the state cannot change the market but at the same time it must check and regulate the market. This happens in all the liberal democracy but in the neoliberal approach (school of Chicago) the State should disappear. According to them the state should be “light”, but in the history liberal democracy are based upon the presence of the state. He thinks that the neoliberal approach to globalisation imposed transformations in social and economic factors that have caused a general shift in balance of power dynamics: from the state to the market, from representative institutions to the executives (in practical terms the governments became more important than the Parliament) from the nation-state to the governmental national organisations (think about the prominence of European Union).

1.2 Characteristics of Deliberative Democracy

Deliberative Democracy is a form of the democracy in which deliberation is central to decision making. It adopts elements of both consensus decision making and majority rule but what makes it different from the actual traditional theory of democracy is that authentic deliberation is the primary source of legitimacy for the law.

Deliberative democratic theorists stress the capacity, right and opportunity of citizens to participate in deliberation.

Jürgen Habermas’ work on communicative rationality and the public sphere is identified as the major work in this area even though the roots of deliberative democracy can actually be traced in Aristotle’s notion of politics. Many scholars have then analysed deliberative democracy. For example James Fishkin has designed a model in which he describes five essential characteristics for legitimate deliberation. The first in his model is “information” in which participants are given access to accurate information that they believe to be relevant. Secondly, “Substantive balance” is the extent to which arguments offered by one or another side are answered by considerations offered by those with counterarguments. Moreover, “Diversity” is the extent to which, in a discussion, participants represent the major position. “Conscientiousness” in which participants weigh the merits of the arguments and finally “Equal consideration” in which there is no distinction within the participants and the arguments offered by them are considered equal between all.

Furthermore in Fishkin’s definition of Deliberative Democracy, citizens must participate in the decision-making process.

John S. Dryzek is another main exponent of the Deliberative Democratic theory. In his work “Foundations and Frontiers of Deliberative Governance” the author tries to answer several questions: How can deliberative legitimacy be achieved in large-scale societies where face to face

deliberation is implausible? What can and should representation mean in such systems? What kind of communication should be valued and why? Dryzek (2000,4) resists the liberal assimilation of deliberative democracy and “reemphasises oppositional civil society and public spheres as sources of democratic critique and renewal”.

In the article “Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy” Joshua Cohen outlined five features which, according to him, outlined the root principles of the theory of Deliberative Democracy. First, he defines deliberative democracy as an ‘ongoing and independent association’ which is expected to continue in an undetermined future. Secondly, Cohen focuses on the members of the association stating that “members share the view that the appropriate terms of association provide a framework or are the results of their deliberation”. Thirdly, stating that “deliberative democracy is a pluralistic association” means that participants have different preferences and ideals. Moreover, Citizens consider deliberative procedures as source of legitimacy and prefer each law to be transparent in order to be easily understood under deliberation. Finally, in an association, each member respects each others deliberative capacity.

In Gutmann and Thompson’s definition, deliberative democracy is defined as “a form of government in which free and equal citizens and their representatives justify decisions in a process in which they give one another reasons that are mutually acceptable and generally accessible, with the aim of reaching decisions that are binding on all at present but open to challenge in the future”. According to them, deliberative democracy must meet four requirements: Reciprocal, accessible, binding and dynamic or provisional. These criteria refer to the reasons that citizens and their representatives are expected to give one another. The first criteria states that "the reasons should be acceptable to free and equal persons seeking fair terms of cooperation.” Secondly, Accessible stresses the fact that the informations should be given in public and the content must be understandable to the people. The third requirement says that the reason giving process leads to decisions and laws that become binding for a certain amount of time. Finally the last requirement is that people have to be flexible to change their minds and continue the reason giving process that may change previous decisions.

With these four requirements analysed by them they meet the four main elements that are found in most conceptions of deliberative democracy.

As many other forms of government, deliberative democracy is continuously changing and developing. Many scholars study it and try to adapt it to the different nations and their forms of government but it is here that they meet several strengths and weaknesses of deliberative democracy.

James Fearon, a proponent of deliberative democracy underlines the fact that this model of democracy tend to generate ideal conditions of impartiality, rationality and knowledge of the relevant facts and this will more likely tend to make the decision making process and the decisions reached more morally correct. Allowing participants to acknowledge and deduce what is morally correct, Deliberative democracy, according to Fearon, has an epistemic value making it an "Epistemic Democracy", so to say: "a recent paradigm in democratic theory. Put generally, in the epistemic interpretation, democratic decision-making processes are valued at least in part for their knowledge-producing potential and defended in relation to this. Epistemic democracy further combines deliberative and aggregative approaches to democracy but shifts their focus towards an outcome-oriented consideration for how well democratic procedures such as deliberation and voting help democratic decisions approximate a procedure-independent standard of correctness." (Cohen 1986).

Studies by James Fishkin have come to the conclusion that deliberative democracy tends to produce outcomes which are superior to those reached in other forms of Democracy; it produces less partisanship and more sympathy with opposing views, it generate more respect for reasoning rather than opinion, a greater commitment to the decisions taken and a more widely shared consensus, promoting social cohesion between people from different backgrounds. The most claimed strengths in deliberative democracy easily incorporate scientific opinion and base policy of ongoing research due to the facts that: time is given to all participants to understand and discuss the science involved, including in the deliberative process also scientific peer review, adverbial presentation of competing arguments, referred journals. But the greatest weakness in the deliberative democratic model is that it fails in addressing the problems of voting. In his work "When people speak; deliberative democracy and public consultation" Fishkin introduces what he calls the "Deliberative opinion polls", that is, a way to apply deliberative democracy to real-world decision making. Since the publication of his book, dozens of deliberative opinion polls have been conducted across the United States. This consists in taking a statistically representative sample of the nation which are gathered to discuss an issue in conditions that further deliberation. The group is then polled and the outcome of the poll and the actual deliberation can be used both as a recommending force and in certain circumstances, to replace voting.

Charles Blattberg, a political philosopher critiqued deliberative democracy on four grounds. Firstly, the rules for deliberation that deliberative theorists affirm interfere with, rather than facilitate, good practical reasoning. Secondly, deliberative democracy is ideologically biased in favour of liberalism as well as republican over parliamentary democratic systems. Moreover,

deliberative democrats assert a too-sharp division between just and rational deliberation on the one hand and self-interested and coercive bargaining or negotiation on the other. Finally, deliberative democrats encourage an adversarial relationship between state and society, one that undermines solidarity between citizens.

1.3 When we first started talking about Deliberative Democracy

What we call democracies today are actually a result of different revolutions and developments throughout the centuries in political thinking, especially in the Western hemisphere. In the 17th century with the creation of the centralised nation-state, in the late 19th century and in the 20th century it developed the idea of the "modern welfare state", believing that the state should provide to the people things like education, and that bureaucrats should be elected for their merits and the solutions they propose to resolve problems within the society. It was in this period that we started seeing the rise of technocrats and intellectual people influencing government policies. A new idea in this new welfare state is that "Taxation of the entire population to provide benefits for the unfortunate and the removal of the "Poor Law" stigma from social welfare. The poor were now victims, not layabouts." (John Micklethwait & Adrian Woolridge. *The Fourth Revolution: The Global Race to Reinvent the State*.). People started paying taxes and poor people started being seen as victims, and the welfare state started growing its roots throughout the countries, becoming very strong. Even when, during the Second World War, the idea of democracy has been challenged by Fascism it managed to overcome it winning the war. From that moment onwards, democracy provided peace, stability and prosperity for its own citizens.

Taking into consideration the minimal definition of democracy, countries have never practiced "pure democracy" unless we consider the Ancient Athens, but firstly it wasn't a country but a city state and secondly it did not take into consideration slaves and women from the political process. But, Athenian democracy was both deliberative and largely direct, most of the decision making were made by the people directly. Athenian democracy came to an end in 322BC. Democracy was then revived after 2000 years, which were mainly characterised by monarchical systems. Becoming a political system, decisions were made by representatives rather than directly by the people becoming deliberative from its beginning.

The deliberative aspect of democracy was not widely studied by scholars before the twentieth century. It was only in 1990s that that deliberative democracy began to attract substantial attention from political scientists.

According to John Dryzek, early works on Deliberative Democracy was part of efforts to develop a theory of democratic legitimacy. Consequently, scholars such as Ross started advocating deliberative democracy as an alternative to representative democracy; Fishkin believed that this model could be complementary to traditional representative democracy. Moreover, 'as deliberative theory has developed and matured, it has also become more internally differentiated' (Neble 2007, 530). Deliberative democrats differ on the questions of what sorts of communication count as deliberative, where deliberation should take place, who should deliberate and how, and what should be the expected outcome of deliberation (Dryzek 2000; Chambers 2003; Gutmann and Thompson 2004; Thompson 2008).

There are four generations of deliberative democracy. The first generation has as its main exponent Habermas. Here, scholars emphasises normative theorising. He argued that legitimate decisions in a democratic polity could emerge only through a discursive procedure that allows all affected to have a say in the making of collective decisions. The normative theorising was also central in Cohen's (1989) approach to democratic legitimacy, and in the early work of Dryzek (1990), which advanced a radical conception of discursive democracy allowing the projection of a transnational and non- anthropocentric view of democracy. (The fourth generation of deliberative democracy)

Dryzek falls into the second generation of scholars. He and other scholars like Young, expanded the definition of deliberation in order to make it more sensitive to the increasing plurality and complexity in contemporary democracies. They problematised the consensus and rational argument requirements of deliberation and brought deliberative democratic theory in close connection with several other fields including feminism, multiculturalism, and environmental politics. However, the scholars of the second generation usually refrained from engaging in the specifics of detailed institutional design and empirical analysis of deliberative practices.

The third generation came along to try and fill in the gaps left out by the second generation. Nevertheless it is a more revised and integrated form of the previous generation. The main trend of the third generation is the practicability of deliberative democracy in a society, namely the design of deliberative institutions and the empirical analysis of these. In doing so, the scholars of the third generation drew particularly on the growing body of literature on various participatory practices such as Citizens' Juries, Planning Cells, Consensus Conferences, and Participatory Budgeting. In the 1990s, Fishkin (1995) advanced the idea of the deliberative polls, as a new way to conduct public opinion research.

The fourth generation is much more recent and is in continue development and change. brings great potential and crucial problems to the theory and practice of deliberation. There is need of robust empirical evidence that establishes the claim that non-deliberative parts can fulfil vital systemic functions more effectively than deliberative ones.

1.4 Deliberative democracy in political movements

“The political parties created democracy, and modern democracy is unthinkable save in terms of the parties” (Schattschneider 1942)

Through the development of British history, members of the Parliament assembled into two parties: supporters of absolute monarchy vs. supporters of constitutional monarchy, aka Tories and Whigs. Different views of how government should be handled: party of intra-parliamentary origin, where you already have a Parliament. All across Europe there were a variety of conflicts and many of them had already found their representatives within the Parliament. For instance, another conflict was between country and urban interests, but there was no mass-party organisation: it was just members of the Parliament organising themselves in a different way (*competitive oligarchy*). Once you have a competitive oligarchy, a number of issues rises: most of the citizens cannot vote, even though they have legitimate. So some of them start constructing their own parties, in some cases they were successful in electing some candidates: they tried to convince members of Parliament and monarch to increase suffrage. This is how universal suffrage came out in Britain, from the labor movement. Different countries had different paths.

The Centre for Deliberative Democracy at Stanford University describes its process as follows:

"A random, representative sample is first polled on the targeted issues. After this baseline poll, members of the sample are invited to gather at a single place for a weekend in order to discuss the issues. Carefully balanced briefing materials are sent to the participants and are also made publicly available. The participants engage in dialogue with competing experts and political leaders based on questions they develop in small group discussions with trained moderators. Parts of the weekend events are broadcast on television, either live or in taped and edited form. After the deliberations, the sample is again asked the original questions. The resulting changes in opinion represent the conclusions the public would reach, if people had opportunity to become more informed and more engaged by the issues."

Political movements are developed accordingly to set states' government. Deliberative democracy adapts to each state. Political participation is one of the crucial means that can be activated by the citizens. It was meant as an activity related mainly to electoral behaviour and selection of personnel: scholars referred to political participation as those acts representing through representation of political institutions, restricted to activities directly connected to elections. From the 1970s onwards, political participation was enlarged to include other phenomena beyond the representative sphere: in the seminal study "Political action", Burts etc. captured what was going on; in the US civil rights and anti war movements, in Western Europe they saw the emergence of student, environmental, feminist movements, non-electoral forms of political participation. So they added a new set of political activities, proposing a distinction between conventional and unconventional forms of political participation:

- Conventional forms of political participation
- Unconventional forms of political participation: writing to a newspaper, refusing to pay rent, rates or taxes; boycotts; obstructing traffic; personal violence; unofficial strikes; non-violent demonstration; damaging property; signing a petition; occupying buildings.

Against the elitist view of democracy, they maintained that this new form of participation did not hinder but thought of them as direct involvement of citizens without intermediation of political actors, beyond political parties this brings to a challenge to social science and to traditional elites.

Participation is seen as something that strengthens democracy. Are social movements useful in practice?

The relationship between political parties and social movements

The 1960s were a crucial point in time: emergence of other agents of political representation (before, political parties had a monopoly). This was the first time in which this phenomenon emerged. Sometimes there are discrepancies regarding this process:

"The entire spectrum of protest movements from the 1970s onwards, have not connected with political parties" (Poguntke, 2006)

"The actors, the fate and the structures of political parties and social movements are closely intertwined" (Goldstone, 2003)

Conceptualisation of party responsiveness

Party responses to the social movements are changes taking place, how much do parties change in their discourse and in their goals.

Operationalisation of party responsiveness to social movements

Rather than declining, a movement has often shown to be latent: movements at some point enter this sleep mode, when the networks become deactivated but as soon as a sufficient external event emerges, the system reactivates much more easily.

Social movements sometimes become institutionalised and enter a political organisation.

There is a problem with the representatives of political institutions: political parties are no longer capable of providing adequate representation of the citizens' needs and demands; there are some trends in the party crisis, a dual trend: The first is progressive lowering of voter turnout, party membership has become meaningless, levels of trust towards political parties has declined steadily. And the second, increase in participation through non electoral means, unconventional ways.

1.5 Relationship between deliberation and participation

Participatory democracy is a form of government whereby citizens invest their time and knowledge to participate in informed decision-making on laws and policy. Deliberative democracy is a variant of the participatory one. In a deliberative democratic model, participation is essential; citizens invest time to deliberate arguments discussed before voting or deciding by consensus on the laws which will govern them. If the laws don't enact with consensus, the majoritarian model is used, and this gives laws their legitimacy. The two coexist together, participation is at the basis of deliberation, there wouldn't be deliberation without participation. Political participation in the past was restricted to elections and representative institutions. From the 1960s onwards, the conceptualisation of political participation was enlarged. Increased political participation is claimed to be the main element that political talk and citizen-to-citizen deliberation bring to society. (Fishkin, 1995). Many scholars consider it the building block of deliberation: "the elementary building block of participatory democracy" (Katz, 1994, p. 30).

Despite these benefits, found by analysing the aggregate effects produced by deliberation and political talk, some scholars argue that deliberative and participatory democracy may be mutually exclusive (Mutz, 2006). This is because in order to be deliberative, a discussion should focus on "political alternatives" (Berelson, 1952, p. 323) and expose people to dissimilar perspectives (Mutz, 2008; Thompson, 2008). This may lead to citizens to move away from democratic process.

Chapter II: Deliberative Democracy in non democratic states

2.1 Non- democratic countries

The word "regime" is a neutral term it simply defines the set of rules and institutions that the government issue. The minimalist definition of democracy defines it as a regime having:

- a. Universal suffrage
- b. Free competitive, recurrent and fair elections
- c. More than one party
- d. Different and alternative media sources (crucial for support and mobilisation in a given society)

Przeworski defines democracy as the incumbents which can also lose elections considering the fact that there is a multi party system so competition is fair.

Linz provided a classification of all the regimes in the world and he developed its ideal type of each kind of regime. That of democracy is based on four features which are important to emphasise the characteristics of non-democratic regime. Firstly, responsible pluralism that is to say, the government is accountable for what it does. Not only in politics but also in economy, society and in the internal life of organisation. In the internal life of parties, leaders in a given party, are selected through democratic procedures this leads to primary elections. Secondly, respect for minorities and rule of law. Moreover, opposition is guaranteed and leadership is regularly selected through free elections.

Taking into consideration the basic definition for democracy, other different governmental forms are generated.

Totalitarianism , according to Friedrich , is based on four points: a totalising ideology, so one main ideology that must be adopted by the government and applied to the citizens. Secondly, a single party inspired by that ideology and led by a dictator, a powerful secret police that is to say the control of the internal life of the society with the use of terror to secure the regime and the monopoly of the economy (private economies are not allowed) and of mass communication and weapons

Brzezinski defines totalitarianism as the outcome of a revolution which bring to the end of the separation between state ad society; a total politicisation.

Arendt was a jewish and defines totalitarianism as a regime based on terror.

Neumann says that totalitarianism is not simply a dictatorship but it has two characteristics : the power exercised by the dictator according to a specific ideology and with the mean of a mass organisations with high mobilisation; as a consequence pre-existing institutions are systematically destroyed or weakened.

Linz in 2000 adjusts his previous definition and defines three features of totalitarianism. Firstly, Monism. Here there is only one actor which is able to mobilise citizens. The tasks of the party are:

- Realise the idea
- Ideology
- Mobilise people
- Recruiting and formation of a new elite
- Control of collateral organisations

Within the mass party the figure of the leader emerges thanks to his charismatic character, this leadership acts with a limited power and an unpredictable behaviour in other words: personality cult. Secondly, a developed and exclusive ideology. Meaning an ideology per se but it does not mean the presence of a totalitarian regime. The ideology has the purpose to provide legitimacy to the leader and the organisation in general. Of course it should be autonomously directed in the sense that the source of legitimacy and interpretation should come from the regime itself and not from other external organisation (e.g. church). This is why it can be adapted along time. Finally a strong mass mobilisation for political and cultural ends

The main differences between Nazism and communist regimes are:

- Führerprinzip (extreme cult of personality) vs limited inter party democracy
- Institutionalization of paramilitary organizations
- Origin (liberal-democracy vs. authoritarian regimes)

Throughout history an evolution of totalitarianism occurred, for example USSR. After Stalin death there is no more an institutionalisation of ideology around the leader

In 1964 a very important work was published by Linz , he lived in Spain under Franco , he defined Franco's regime as an authoritarian regime since it didn't reflect the features of totalitarianism.

Hybrid regimes are a relatively recent acquisition due to the fact that compared to 50 years ago democracy and elections have become so popular that no regime wants to be classified as an authoritarian one , they want to be related to electoral fairness. It is a neutral notion, we are not talking about democracy, we are in middle between democracy and authoritarianism. The term was coined for authoritarian regimes which were losing their characteristics and moving towards

democracy. The characteristic that was identified is that they did not become actual democracy : not a full acquisition of procedural requisites of democracy; very often there's the lack of civilian control of the military; some sectors of the population are deprived either in economic or political terms, they do not enjoy the same rights as the rest of the population; weak judiciary power. When an authoritarian regime starts to move towards democracy, it starts to change. It is not simply a transitional phase since it lasted also for 50 or 60 years. Morlino says that it is not always the case that the move is from authoritarianism to democracy.

Incumbents (the ruling party) may: routinely abusing state resources, denying opposition a fair media coverage, harassing opposition candidates/supporters, manipulating electoral results. It is not a democracy.

Institutions and rights are conditioned by veto players:

- Not elected actors:
 - armed forces
 - religious hierarchies
 - economic oligarchies
 - a hegemonic party
 - a monarch attempting to condition decision-making

The definition:

It is a set of institutions which are: persistent (stable or unstable) for about a decade (at least), preceded by authoritarian rule, a traditional regime (also colonial) or even a minimal democracy, emergence of some limited pluralism and form of independent and autonomous participation, and there must be the absence of at least one of the four aspects of a minimal democracy (universal suffrage; free and fair elections; more than one party; different and alternative media sources)

Morlino's article tries also to provide a classification of the hybrid regimes according to three aspects of this kind of regime:

1. Representation actors/freedoms
 - Electoral process;
 - Political pluralism and participation
 - Freedom of expression and beliefs
 - Freedom of association and organisation
2. State functioning
3. Rule of law and personal autonomy

There are three types of hybrid regimes:

1. Limited democracy
2. Democracy without state : widespread illegality, the state is incapable of performing properly and to exercise their authority.
3. Quasi-democracy : in which you have deficits in all the 3 dimensions

2.2 Why this countries did not become democracies

The post-Cold War world has been marked by the proliferation of different Hybrid Regimes. Many scholars have tried to define these kind of regimes as incomplete or as transitional forms of Democracy but as Levitsky and Way have pointed out, these regimes either remained hybrid or moved in an authoritarian direction.

During the 1990s, especially in Africa, Post communist Eurasia and Latin America, the regimes were a combination of democratic rules with authoritarian governance.

As a result scholars should stop thinking of these cases as a transition to democracy but rather classify all of the regimes differently and not only as hybrid. Yet most studies are characterised by two weaknesses, first there is a democratising bias, in the sense that mixed cases are treated as a form of diminished democracy or are moving towards a democratic regime: but this implies a transition to democracy, but this is not often the case. Countries like Belarus and Azerbaijan moved in an authoritarian direction.

Second, some terms such as semi-democratic or semi-authoritarian tend to go over important differences among regime types. Latvia, El Salvador and Ukraine were all considered hybrid regimes, yet they all differ within their historical roots and this implies differences for economic performance, human rights and their prospects of democracy.

Way and Levitsky come up with a further hybrid regime: the Competitive Authoritarianism .

Competitive authoritarianism must be distinguished from Democracy on the one hand and full-scale authoritarianism.

In competitive authoritarian regimes, formal democratic institutions are widely viewed as a mean to obtain power and exercise political authority.

Modern democratic regimes all meet four criteria: 1) Executives and legislatures are chosen through open and free elections 2) all adult citizens have the right to vote 3) political and civil rights are protected 4) elected authorities possesses real authority to govern.

Yet in Competitive Authoritarian regimes these four criteria are very often violated and this creates an uneven field between government and opposition. Elections are held but incumbents deny the opposition adequate and routinely abuse state resources.

Yet if competitive authoritarian regimes falls short of democracy they will also fall short of full-scale authoritarianism, this is so because it is nearly impossible for incumbents to eliminate or reduce formal democratic rules. There must be a coexistence of the two political forms.

Due to the persistence of meaningful democratic institution in competitive authoritarianism four arenas of contestation exist through which opposition forces may challenge, weaken and sometimes defeat autocratic incumbents. 1) The electoral arena 2) the legislature 3) the judiciary and 4) the media.

The electoral arena is the most important feature for a democracy to make it work. In authoritarian regimes electoral systems either do not exist or aren't seriously contested. Elections competition is eliminated either "de Jure" like for example in China or Cuba or "the facto" like in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan. As a result opposition forces do not present a serious electoral threat to incumbents and elections are non competitive. In Competitive Authoritarianism, on the contrary, elections are bitterly fought and although the electoral process may be characterised by large scale abuses of state power, biased media coverage and an overall lack of transparency, the presence of international observers limits the capacity of incumbents to engage in large scale fraud.

Secondly, in authoritarian regimes, legislature either do not exist or are controlled by the ruling party. In Competitive authoritarianism legislature tend to be relatively weak but the occasionally become focal points of opposition activity, this is likely to happen when incumbents lack strong majority parties like it happened in Russia and Ukraine in the 1990s.

Furthermore, the third arena is the judicial one. In Competitive Authoritarian regimes, governments continuously tries to subordinate the judiciary often via impeachment or through bribery, exhortation. Although competitive authoritarian government may punish judges who rule against them, this will generate important costs in terms of domestic and international legitimacy.

Finally, the media in fully authoritarian regimes are completely controlled by the state and in that case are legal. Their utility is to influence the people. Independent magazines and newspapers are prohibited by law as it is in Cuba or de facto eliminated as in Uzbekistan. In competitive authoritarian regimes independent media is legal and often influential. Journalist even though they are frequently threatened and attacked tend to emerge as important opposition figures. Independent media also plays the role of watchdog, investigating and exposing governments malfeasance.

As already exposed, there are aspects of Democracy and of Autocracy that coexists in this form of regime. Yet due to this difficult coexistence, several countries saw their regime crack down, but as a result the succession was not democratisation.

However in regions closer to the west like Latin America and Central Europe, the removal of autocratic incumbents have generally resulted in democratisation, but in regions where western linkage were weaker, like in Russia and China, competitive authoritarian regimes were more likely to persist or to move in an authoritarian direction.

Throughout history competitive authoritarianism emerged out of three different paths: 1) after the decay of a full-blown authoritarian regime, where due to a weak opposition, incumbents took control over the regime 2) after the collapse of an authoritarian regime, and elections were weak 3) After the decay of a democratic regime where democratic institutions were undermined.

Many authoritarian regimes have survived the third wave of democratisation or in some other cases the collapse of one kind of authoritarianism yielded not democracy but a new form of non-democratic rule.

Yet, the post-Cold War liberal hegemony global economic change, developments in media and communications technologies and the growth of international networks aimed at promoting democracy and Human Rights contributed in reshaping the opportunities and constraints facing authoritarian elite. As a result some forms of authoritarianism have become more difficult to sustain.

2.3 Applying democracy in countries that are not considered to be democratic

"Patterns of democracy" is an empirical analysis of thirty-six democracies which aims at giving a two dimensional pattern, on the basis of the contrast between majoritarian and consensus forms of government, explaining which democracy is more appropriate for creating stability and order in a country. The author Arend Lijphart compares the forms of government of thirty-six countries concluding that the consensus democracies, thanks to their effective policy-making and the quality of their democracy, makes them more suitable as a form of government compared to the majoritarian one.

In order to have a thorough basis to compare his two hypothesis of best form of governments, he argues that his decision of the countries were based on different criteria. First, the population was to be of at least a quarter of a million and had been continuously democratic from 1989 or earlier in order to assure that the democracies studied are not spherical entities but reasonably stable and consolidated systems. Furthermore, each democracy is analysed from its first democratic election in

or after 1945 until 2010. There is a variation of the time span from sixty-five years (1945-2010) for several European countries to twenty-two years (1988-2010) for Korea. The author decided to take a time span of more than twenty years as the minimum period. The types of sampling used are both the purposive sample and a theoretical sample since the author decides the thirty-six democracies on the basis of the ten variables listed below and wants to demonstrate a theory based on the quality of the consensus democracy in respect to the majoritarian one.

Lijphart discusses the social and economic characteristics that can be expected to influence the type of democracy and democratic performance of the thirty-six countries. He uses as datasets for the measurements of the quality of the government and the quality of democracy the: Worldwide Government Indicators and the data of the Democracy index project of the economist intelligence units. The population in his research are the thirty-six democracies and his sample are all the countries taken into consideration for his research question.

Consensus and Westminster democracies differ along two dimensions, the executive-parties dimension and the federal-unitary dimension, each of which have five criteria. The author underlined these ten differences in terms of dichotomous contrasts between the majoritarian and the consensus models.

The five criteria of the Executive- parties dimension. The five differences on the executive-parties dimension are:

1. Concentration of executive power in single-party majority cabinets versus executive power-sharing in broad multiparty coalitions.
2. Executive-legislative relationships in which the executive is dominant versus executive-legislative balance of power.
3. two party versus multiparty systems
4. Majoritarian and disproportional electoral systems versus proportional representation.
5. Pluralist interest group systems with free-for-all competition among groups versus coordinated and corporatist interest group systems aimed at compromise and concentration.

Here Lijphart presents Britain as the archetypical majoritarian democracy. It was almost purely majoritarian on the most of the ten indicators (from 1945 - 1996). New Zealand as well is taken as an example since it was also almost purely majoritarian.

As a second dimension we have the Federal- unitary one. Here the five differences are the following:

6. Unitary and centralised government versus federal and decentralised government

7. Concentration of legislative power in a unicameral legislature versus division of legislature power between two equally strong but differently constituted houses
8. Flexible constitutions that can be amended by simple majorities versus rigid constitutions that can be changed only by extraordinary majorities
9. Systems in which legislatures have the final word on the constitutionality of their own legislation versus systems in which laws are subject to a judicial review of their constitutionality by supreme or constitutional courts
10. central banks that are dependent on the executive versus independent central banks.

Lijphart illustrates the concept of consensus democracy by presenting as cases, Switzerland, Belgium and the European Union.

There are two strengths and two weaknesses in this result of the research proposed by Lijphart. To begin there is no need to choose between giving priority to governing effectiveness and high quality democracy in the sense that consensus democracy allows both to work in synchrony. The second strength is that it is not difficult to write constitutions and other basic laws in order to fortify the institutions.

One of the two weaknesses is that both international and cultural traditions may present strong resistance to consensus democracy. Certain regions of the world, such as the Eastern, Western, Northern and southern hemisphere by different forms of government that are obstacles for the consensus democracy.

Finally, the last disadvantage is that consensus democracy, without a consensual political culture, is not able to take root as a form of government.

2.4 Deliberative Democracy and equality

Equality plays a significant role in Democracy. Taking into consideration one of the latter definitions by Barry: "By a democratic procedure I mean a method of determining the content of laws (and other legally binding decisions) such that the preferences of citizens have some formal connection with the outcome in which each counts equally" (Barry 1991,25). It is assumed that equality plays a decisive role in democracy but what kind of equality is best suited for Deliberative Democracy.

Indeed, democratic deliberation requires a criterion of legitimacy and this requires a strong form of equality, more precisely, it requires equal opportunity of access to political influence (influence as more than mere voting). Dworkin distinguishes between influence and impact: "The intuitive difference is this: someone's impact in politics is the difference he can make, just on his

own, by voting for, or choosing, one decision rather than another. Someone's influence, on the other hand, is the difference he can make not just on his own, but also by lending or inducing others to believe or vote or choose as he does" (Dworkin 1987,9). Considering this definition, equality of opportunity required by democracy will have both procedural and substantive dimensions.

First, deliberation presupposes equality of resources needed to ensure that an individual's assent to arguments advanced by others is needed uncorked (material wealth and educational treatment). Secondly, it requires equal capacity to advance persuasive claims (the ability to reason, articulate ideas, etc.).

Considering representative institutions, they presuppose the sort of public debate that is characteristic of deliberation. The relationship between equality and representative institutions must be organised in such a way that they do not isolate individual representatives or their constituents in an unfair way.

Deliberative democracy makes strong demands on our criterion of political equality. Participants in the deliberative process must be actively engaged in a discourse of argumentation and persuasion.

The task for any participant in such a process is to develop and communicate reasons for action that will influence others to endorse her preferred collective outcomes. If she is unable, for whatever reason, to effectively accomplish this task, she will be unable to affect the collective decision-making process. Through this failure her interests and goals will most likely go unaccounted for in the democratic process. And this violates the fundamental notion that democratic outcomes are the product of the interests of equal citizens.

Cohen defines the substantive dimension of equality for deliberative democracy as follows: "[t]he participants are substantively equal in that the existing distribution of power and resources does not shape their chances to contribute at any stage of the deliberative process, nor does that distribution play an authoritative role in their deliberation" (Cohen 1989b, 33). It is clear in this definition that social distribution of power and resources and the achievement of real political equality are connected to each other. In order to understand in a better way such definition, we need to take into consideration several fundamental criteria: equal opportunity of political influence, uncoerced participation and free voluntary decision making, equal opportunity to influence others, politically relevant capacities. The first refers to the ways in which the asymmetries in the distinction of power and resources can affect deliberation. Equality entails that the possibility that a participant might influence the preferences of other deliberators can be roughly the same for all participants. This makes sure that all participants are given the same chances to

participate in the process of mutual influence; the centre of democratic deliberation. This shows that in a society is needed a well distributed balance between power and resources which gives the right resources for each citizen to participate to the process.

Uncoerced participation and free voluntary decision making. In democratic deliberation participants decide, accordingly to their political preferences and the political discussion, how they want to vote on the various political questions. When the time comes to make one's final decision on who to vote, political equality should avoid that the differences of preferences affect the individual's choice. The possession of material resources and the social power that follows from it are actually what may affect the uncoerced nature of political decision making. Promises and threats are considered to be one of those material resources. Promises work through the benefits that they may provide to others in exchange for favours that may lead to an easier win and this violates the notion of equal opportunity of influence. The establishment of laws may be a solution in avoiding this from happening. A society that wants to offset these effects of material asymmetries on political equality may have to resolve the possible conflicts between the requirements of political equality and their commitment to freedom of action in the economic sphere.

Equal opportunity of political influence involves more than constraints on the adverse effects of resource asymmetries on uncoerced political decision making. Deliberative democracy envisions the active participation of citizens in a process of mutual discussion and persuasion. Such participation requires that each citizen may be able to advance arguments that others might find persuasive. Thus, political equality must attend to the conditions under which all citizens would be able to engage in discussion at this level.

Real equality of influence is unachievable under democratic procedures because the very nature of the process makes the outcomes uncertain and subject to the exigencies of political debate and deliberation (Dworkin 1987).

Rawls accords no explicit attention to issues of equality of capacity. He assumes only that citizens "do have, at least to the essential minimum degree, the moral, intellectual, and physical capacities that enable them to be fully cooperating members of society over a complete life" (Rawls 1993, 183).

What kinds of capacities are relevant to democratic deliberation and thus to a conception of political equality? Firstly, the capacity to formulate authentic preferences. People act freely and voluntarily in regard to the legitimacy of the democratic process. Secondly, another relevant capacities relates to the effective use of cultural resources. Minorities are required to express their ideas and needs in the dominant groups in a society. Finally, the basic cognitive abilities and skills

is the most relevant of the three. Here, Sen highlights the problems and difficulties in acquiring the information necessary to diminish uncertainty and thus to make effective decisions (Sen 1992, 148–149).

All these factors are relevant for measuring political equality. They are relevant to a citizen's ability to influence others to support their preferred outcomes. But, "we cannot deduce what is politically fair from abstract principles of political equality: we have to draw on empirical judgments of what is likely to happen as well as what seems in principle to be fair" (Phillips 1995, 38).

Bohman argues that political equality requires a guarantee of a minimum threshold of "effective freedom":

"A good empirical indicator of such a deliberative capacity is whether or not citizens or groups of citizens are able to initiate public deliberation about their concerns. This ability to initiate acts of deliberation thus provides a measurable threshold for political equality and reasonable cooperation. . . . Poverty in this sense is a measure of minimal political equality in a democracy: it sets the threshold requirement of publicity in deliberation in terms of the equal capacities to participate effectively. The development of such abilities is the "floor" of civic equality, since they offer citizens greater possibilities of deliberative uptake for their differing reasons, some of which may not yet be publicly recognised as worthy of consideration." (Bohman 1996a, 128).

It is for this reason that he established a criteria that will recognise unacceptable inequalities in capacities when citizens are completely ineffective, meaning completely incapable of initiating public deliberation on their own: concerns: "[d]eliberative democracy must fulfil demands for equality in the means for effective participation at least enough so that no citizen is so poor as to fail to influence outcomes or to avoid exclusion" (Bohman 1996a, 148).

2.5 Results and consequences

Equality in deliberative democracy is not an easy matter to deal with. For Deliberative Democracy, political equality guarantees the effective participation and thus a concern with the capacity of individual participants to engage in the process of mutual persuasion.

Chapter III: China

3.1 China's governmental background

As the most populous country in the world The People's Republic of China has over 1.3 billion of citizens. It is a single party state governed by the communist party of China. The National People's Congress is the highest power in China. The Chinese government allows for no open challenge to the communist exclusive control of political power. Democratisation have been very limited if actually non existent. Parties like the China democracy party were banned by the Communist Party in China.

Over 6000 years ago China was an empire, when the empire fell a republic was formed and then quickly collapsed. The Nationalist party emerged but the not so prompt for Chinese peasants. The nationalist ally with the communist party in order to unify the nation however they broke this alliance and caused a new civil war. The communist party won and the nationalist retreated and thus the begin's the People's Republic of China which is commonly subdivided in three chapters. From 1949 to 1957 the PRC mostly acted like the Soviet Union did, which was the most powerful communist country at the time. The second chapter is considered an intermediary period after Mao's death and succession became a problem for the nation. In 1978 the country's leader became Deng Xiaoping and he brought along a series of economic reforms which continues today.

The power structure of China is very complex. The public elects and appoints the township governments which then appoints the township governments. The same happens with the county congress that then elects the county governments. The county Congress then appoints the municipal congress which then appoints the municipal governments. The municipal congress elects the provincial congress, this congress appoints the provincial governments and all of this process makes up the local governments and legislatures. The provincial Congress appoints the National People's Congress. The NPC appoints the standing committee which together makes the Legislature. The NPC, in turn, elects the supreme people's procuratorate and the Supreme people's court which together makes up the judiciary. The NPC appoints the premier, the standing committee and the state council, all of these three together form the Government. The National's People's Congress also elects the president, however the president is a ceremonial office only, the real power is the communist party only. The bottom of the party is the National party congress which elects the Central committee and the Standing committee and the general secretary. The latter acts as the

leader of the communist party. The Standing committee of the politburo controls all the committees at the bottom of it.

Although the Chinese communist party does not allow other committees other than that, it gave consent for some to act. These are: China revolutionary Committee of the Kuomintang, China Democratic League. China Democratic National Construction Association, China Association for the promotion of Democracy, Chinese Peasants and workers' Democratic Party, China Zhi Gong Dang and Jiusan Society.

PRC consider itself mainly atheist, however after the cultural revolution, the government started to tolerate religions. The ruling party are very unreligious and believe that religion is going to be something that will fade away cause scientific thinking will take over it. The government encourages a very limited number of religions; Taoism, Islamism Protestantism, Buddhism and catholicism. Because of the limited allowance to practice religion in China, there are not many religious leaders; the most known are: Samuel Lamb for the Catholicism, C.S Song was and Asian theologian.

China has the largest number of standing army in the world (2.2 million people) and it's called the People's Liberation Army. It includes the army, air force, navy and strategic nuclear force. Reform and modernisation appeared to be the most important theme in the Chinese military; it includes large land based military and smaller nuclear groups. As the major military leaders we have Mao's grandson, Mao Xinyu who was the major general in the liberation army.

Recently, one of the greatest issues that affected the whole world is the economic crisis. For what regards China the economic crisis caused China to have more inflation and a large local government debt. China is one of the major producers of rice, wheat, corn, potatoes, tea, peanuts and millets. Some of its major crops are cotton, apples, fish and pork. Iron and steel are produced through mining. China also produces armaments, petroleum, chemical fertilisers and cement. Main partners in trade are the United States, Hong Kong, Japan, South Korea and Germany. They make up the main partners in import trades. The most important economic leaders are Hu Jintao, Wen Jiabao, Xi Jinping and Li Keqian; all of them are members of the Politburo Standing Committee and are responsible for China's economic affairs.

Globalisation has proven to quickly modernised China which is something which has been happening since the opium war. One of the biggest reason why this globalisation has occurred is because its the so called open door policy.

China is allied with many countries but its major ones are North Korea, Pakistan, Iran, possibly Syria, Russia, Sudan, Serbia, Zimbabwe, Cuba and Venezuela. Some recent war such as

the Invasion of Tibet, the Korean War, the Vietnam war, the Sino-Indian war, the Sino-soviet border conflict and the Sino-Vietnamese war. Some recent Chinese treaties include the: Peaceful use of Nuclear energy; an agreement signed in June 29, 1998. The main idea of this treaty was a cooperation concerning peaceful uses of nuclear technologies. The Peace Corps was signed the same day and concerned the United States volunteer programme in China. On March 1992 the Nuclear Nonproliferation treaty was signed and it prevented the spread of nuclear weapons.

China works against terrorism globally and regionally in many different ways. Since the September 11th attack to the Twin Towers, China has worked with the United States against terrorism.

Tensions between China and Taiwan have always been present because of how Taiwan was formed. Even though economic relations between the two have improved, politically and militarily tensions are still present. China wants to unify with Taiwan but the latter does not want to. Ever since China has sent nuclear submarines in Japanese waters, the two have been arming themselves to respond to the other. Both the US and China have economies that match together, so economically they are linked however they compete with each other in some economic fields and share different economic ideologies. The border dispute between China and India has caused military tensions between sides and troops have been stationed by both sides near the borders since then.

Documentation has proved that China has human and civil rights issues. The absence of laws insuring human rights is one of the main reasons why this occurred. People abused by China's forces include, detention, forced confessions, torture and mistreatment of prisoners. As well as oppressing the basic rights of freedom; speech, press, assembly, association, religion, privacy, workers' rights and birth limitations.

China's domestic issues include; gender imbalance, political oppression, overpopulation, the large gap between rich and poor and finally population.

3.2 Political regimes in China

The term "People's Republic of China" was born under the era of Mao the 1st of October 1949 immediately after the second World War. Its history is typically divided into the "Mao era" and the "Post Mao era". The former lasted from the founding of the People's Republic of China to Deng Xiaoping's grip onto power and policy reversal at the third Plenum of the 11th Party Congress on December 22nd, 1978.

Mao's government carried out mass executions of landowners, instituted collectivisation and implemented the Laogai camp system but this caused millions of deaths due to the executions and harsh conditions in labor camps. During this period, economically speaking, the country followed the same path as the Soviet Union did using the Five-Year Plans, the first dated in 1953 to 1957. Productions were transferred from private entities to the public ones and industries were nationalised in 1955; in this way the state controlled the economy of the country.

On June 25th, 1950, the People's Republic of China had to face its first international conflict against Korea. Kim Il-sung's North Korea forces crossed the South Korean borders and eventually advanced as far as the Pusan Perimeter in South East Korea. The United Nations forces as well as the American ones, entered into war against North Korea. The Soviet Union and China saw this union of the two and the possible victory as a major political problem. However, China was left alone by the Soviet Union to face the Korean war, saving the regime in Pyongyang, North Korea's capital. On June 27th the US 7th fleet was sent to the Taiwan Straits in order to prevent a communist invasion of the island and an attempt of reconquest of it.

The participation of China in the Korean war asserted it as a new power to not be taken lightly. The first major offensive of the Chinese forces was pushed back in October, but by Christmas 1950, the "People's Volunteer Army" under the command of Gen Peng Dehuai had forced the United Nations to retreat back to the 38th Parallel. However, the war was very costly in terms of lives to the Chinese side; not just volunteers were mobilised for the war and also the lack of experience in modern warfare and of modern military technology. Declining a UN armistice, the two sides fought intermittently on both sides of the 38th Parallel until the armistice was signed on July 27, 1953. The Korean War ended any possibility of normalised relations with the United States for years. As a result to the war, Mao declared that the nation would lean to the East, meaning that its main allies would be the Soviet Union and the Communist Bloc.

The Soviet Union provided considerable economic aid and training during the 1950s. Many Chinese students were sent to study in Moscow. Factories and other infrastructure projects were all based on Soviet designs, for China was an agrarian country with little established industry. The 8th Party Congress that year declared that socialism had more-or-less been established and so the next few years would be devoted to rest and consolidation.

Moreover, Mao announced a new economic programme called the "Great Leap Forward", aimed at rapidly raising industrial and agricultural production. Within a year, almost all of Chinese villages were reformed into working communes where people could live and work together. But the results were devastating. Normal market mechanisms were disrupted, agricultural production fell

behind, and people exhausted themselves producing shoddy, unsellable goods. Because of the reliance on the government providing and distributing food and resources and their rapid depletion due to poor planning, starvation appeared even in fertile agricultural areas. From 1960 to 1961, the combination of poor planning during the Great Leap Forward, political movements incited by the government, as well as unusual weather patterns and natural disasters resulted in widespread famine and many deaths. This brought to a Cultural revolution.

The disaster of the Great Leap Forward decreased Mao's stature as national leader and even more so as an economic planner. Under Mao's direction, China became the 5th country in the world to possess an atomic bomb in 1964 conducting a successful nuclear test.

Mao's era has shaped the People's Republic of China. The ideology surrounding Mao's interpretation of Marxism–Leninism, also known as Maoism, was codified into China's Constitution as a guiding ideology.

3.3 Western theories of Deliberative Democracies and the Chinese practice of deliberative governance

Western theories of deliberative democracy and the study of Chinese democratisation tend to remain completely separate enterprises to the detriment of both. Being something that was born in societies such as America, England, Australia, deliberative democracy has ignored the possibility to be adapted to China. Deliberative theories of democracy often deal with a close relation between democracy and deliberation and this assumption is well grounded in Western societies. This idea may not well fit in the Chinese society due to its peculiar link between authoritarianism and deliberation; this is called “an authoritarian deliberation”. Deliberation must not necessarily be a democratic one; for example the supreme court of the United States is definitely deliberative but not necessarily democratic.

An authoritarian type of deliberation may even exist in democratic societies; executives may encourage discussion and deliberation but make their own final authoritative decision.

But what does it mean a Chinese authoritarian deliberation? It means that it is authoritarian in the sense that the top leaders are not elected and therefore deliberation takes place under one party domination. Even though the state plays a significant role in developing, mobilising and promoting deliberative institutions, deliberation takes place under authoritarian conditions. The deliberative aspect here lays down in the fact that arguments and reasons solve collective problems: participants and local leaders exchange opinions, makes argument and counterarguments, and change their

preferences through public deliberation. An authoritarian regime wants to use the tool of deliberation to solve difficult issues and delegate power. Social conflicts and the level of oppositions may be reduced by consultation and deliberation. Moreover, public deliberation can be an effective decision making process, also effective in problem solving and a way to overcome polarisation.

Habermas (1994, 32) claims, “In the first place, deliberations within the decision-making bodies need to be open for and sensitive to the influx of issues, value orientations, contributions, and programs from their informal environments.” Dryzek (1990, 128) also argues, “A policy science of participatory democracy can therefore expect resistance from government institutions. It can flourish only by creating, operating within, and confronting the state from an autonomous public sphere.” After analysing the various sites for deliberation he comes to the conclusion that the most important loci of deliberation are the civil society and the public sphere. The Chinese state has played a significant role in promoting deliberative institutions sponsoring deliberative meetings, selected sites, and putting issues not the agenda. The state has passed three major national laws requiring public hearings and consultation and this improves the authoritarian capacities of governance as well as the different consultative and deliberative institutions for political participation.

Deliberation can be a mean for conflict resolutions. Dryzek and List listed four different ways this is possible; it provides people with new materials, facts and information on a given issue; draws attention to new arguments regarding different issues; induces people to reflect on their preferences; and creates a situation of social interaction. Two more ways in which deliberation may contribute in solving conflicts are given by Elster and are; through civilising force of hypocrisy” and through “negative advertising”. They both encourage the emergence of truth in a speech.

Sunstein (2003) finds that under institutional arrangements in which deliberators vote as a group and in which members are asked to sign on to a group decision, group discussion will produce polarisation: “members of a deliberative group predictably move toward a more extreme point in the direction indicated by the members’ pre-deliberation tendencies” (Sunstein 2003, 81).

Both democracy and authoritarianism may find benefit in diminishing the amount of polarisation and a well-designed deliberative institution can avoid or reduce polarisation despite the difference in political regimes. Moreover China is characterised by their confucian tradition in which it emphasises harmony. It strongly affirms the idea of “political correctness” and of “searching for a middle way” which helps to avoid polarisation and for this reason China has less possibilities of facing polarisation than the west does.

3.4 Deliberative Democracy with Chinese characteristics

Democracy is not completely unknown in China, there have been several movements pro-democracy and there have been different experiments at a local level of deliberation in China. How? With deliberative institutions, so to say, public hearings, consensus conferences, citizens evaluations, mediation meetings, heart to heart forums, local elections preceded by extensive discussion and Deliberative polling. All of these political means help discussions to arise, what is important thought is the kind of political effects discussions may provide. Deliberative institutions may be subject to the influence of various interests in society and for this reason the institutional designer must be aware of the different political effects of individual deliberative institutions. The aim of these institutions is to block the political power of local cadres.

Professor He discusses “citizen evaluation meetings” that give ordinary people the opportunity to evaluate the performances of cadres. However, such meetings stop taking place when party secretaries “lose face”. Local elections, with secret balloting and no constraints on political participation, may be the optimal solution. If they are free and fair, elections can have the effect of removing corrupt or incompetent officials from power. But some deliberative institutions may be insufficient to balance distribution; such institutions seemed to have emerged in Zhejiang Province which is one of the provinces in China with the most unregulated form of capitalism. Being characterised by strong wealthy and capitalist farmers, here the new rich people have fought for their own interests to be represented. But, the task of deliberative institutions should be to avoid disproportionality in favour of the interests of the rich.

A solution for this disproportionality would be Fishkin’s Deliberative Polling. Here, participants are chosen randomly in order to ensure that the rich and other groups are not disproportionate and thus have a disproportionate influence in the deliberation. Even though this solution could be adapted it is yet very expensive and for this reason difficult to adopt. Perhaps the only way to reduce the influence of the wealthy people is to design a political institution that explicitly represents the interests of the poor and the marginalised, as well as government-sponsored citizen education programs, educating the poor and the marginalised about the political participation. As Professor He notes: “In order to constrain the power of wealth in a process of deliberation, deliberative institutions are financed by local governments through the party’s

leadership.” Moreover he states: “Following the communitarian criterion of collective solidarity and social trust, some deliberative institutions do solve some thorny problems, help to maintain local stability and security, and enhance collective solidarity.” For the local deliberative democracy in China, the biggest issue is to design deliberative institutions which enhance collective solidarity without harming the interests of the worst-off.

Professor He analyses deliberative institutions at a local level; John Dryzek and Ethan Leib believe that such institutions may be effective also at a national level. The former argues for a national political institution composed of randomly selected citizens. “ I would suggest that the evidence from the very high quality of lay citizen deliberation as revealed in consensus conferences, citizen’s juries, planning cells, and deliberative opinion polls points to the possibility of an upper house composed of ordinary citizens selected at random from the population that would serve for perhaps one year at a time. Such a proposal was advanced by the think tank Demos in the context of recent British debates about reform of the House of Lords.” .

Random selection, however, in modern context would mean that such institutions would be formed of uneducated farmers from the countryside because they constitute the majority of the population. Other forms of national deliberative democracy, such as Confucianism, may be more likely to happen; notes, “Confucian scholars established public forums in which they debated and deliberated national affairs.” (Baogang He). Confucianism may lead a society to be wise and a public-spirited elite. In fact in mainland China, already exists an institution with a Confucian heritage; the Chinese People’s Political Consultative Committee (CPPCC). It is designed to encourage deliberation and provide political consultation on major state policies and important issues concerning national affairs. But unfortunately, being the CPPCC the least influential organ of the government there is a big gap between the two realities. “The key to democratic supervision lies in developing democracy, letting everyone air his or her views freely, and creating conditions and opportunities for everyone to speak his or her own mind, tell the truth and air different views” (General Affairs Office 2004, 181). Once again the Confucianism proposes a alternative that may better suit contemporary China: deliberators may be chosen by Confucian-style examinations. Such examination are more likely to be taken seriously rather than alternatives requiring randomly chosen deliberators.

3.5 Deliberative Institutions in China

In the past years, participatory and deliberative institutions are starting to emerge in China. These are helping citizens’ develop skills and are modernising politics in China. Developing and

improving deliberative institutions in China may be considered as an opportunity to create democracy. According to Dryzek (1996), “democratisation should be seen as advocating participation, deliberation, franchise scope, and authenticity.” Suzanne Ogden (2002,257), states that: “deliberation in the Chinese political system as a means of reaching consensus,” notes that it “could prove to be an important building block for democratisation,” and continues saying that: “Consensus building may be limited largely to the elite, but the Chinese system is still more open to democratic resolution of conflicts through discussion than are dictatorial systems, where neither consensus building nor elections are institutionalised.”

Throughout the years Chinese government, in order to contain the collective actions made but the citizens mainly of villages, has adopted diverse strategies prohibiting any unofficial national associations, punishing who lead this movements. Contemporarily, the government introduced a public hearing system, village elections and participatory and deliberative institutions in order to reduce protests and increase the government’s ruling power. These institutions worked as stabilisers to maintain local order and a solution to keep “ a harmonious society” (President Hu Jintao). However, rapid economic development created unequal distribution, corruption, high rate of unemployment, high level of migration and community disorder. Through the political experiments of deliberative institutions, it was discovered that regular and frequent participatory and deliberative meetings have solved community-related problems, avoided major mistakes in public policymaking, and saved money, personnel, and time in governing local affairs, thereby reducing the number of the people’s petitions and complaints. In this regard, deliberative institutions can be seen as a “valve” to release the pressure upon China’s fast-moving machine. At the same time, the Chinese government takes action to suppress dissident groups, control intellectual activities, and close down some internet discussion forums. (Leib). In order to follow the Western path of democratisation, Beijing has used deliberative institutions as a form of democracy in order to avoid a radical and substantial political reform that would threaten the Chinese Communist Party’s power.

“ All deliberative institutions share the following features, (1) bringing people to the table and encouraging them to talk and discuss before reaching any conclusion, (2) giving participants sufficient time to engage in a deliberative process where there is minimal, but not always, sufficient time available for discussion, and (3) encouraging participants to exchange opinions and respect each other in spite of disagreements. There are a variety of deliberative and consultative institutions, each encompassing local forms, flavor, and features.”. (Leib, E, and He, B., 2006).

The most important institutions are: the consultative and deliberative meeting, the citizen evaluation meeting and the residential or village representative assembly. The Consultative and

Deliberative meeting institution (in Chinese terms *tingzheng hui*) has as an aim to gather opinions, solve community-related problems, gain support for local projects, reach consensus on certain issues and policy and, finally, to clarify preferences, positions and principles. Such meeting works through three stages: the introduction by community leaders, public debate and community leaders answer the questions participants raise. However, deliberative meetings may fail to meet unanimity due to the existence of the different opinions within the committee.

In the Citizen evaluation meetings, ordinary people are given the possibility to rate and evaluate the performances of local cadres. Again, here there are three stages: the first is where major leaders give their reports on the performance of local leaders in the meeting; the second stage is where citizens raise questions in order to get clarifications and finally the last stage is where citizens fill in an evaluation form in order to give an opinion of the leaders. here, in this form of institution, the roughest part and the most problematic thing is the correct filling in of the boxes; it is made in a secret place in order to avoid open discussions.

The final institution is the residential or village representative assembly. Here 15 to 30 people are involved in deliberative discussions of community-related issues. According to Tangxia Village Self-Governing Regulations, “The VRA is the villagers’ democratic consultation body under the leadership of the village party committee. It represents the villagers in exercising democratic management of village affairs.”.

The effects of such institutions are several. From enhancing local government to the empowerment of citizens; however there are problems and limits concerning these. there is always to consider the fact that deliberation in China always takes place under an authoritarian regime in which the biggest danger is the elite management of the deliberative process. Chinese people are not actually equal nor truly free. free. China’s case as Iris Marion Young’s (1999, 102) argues: “in the real world of politics, where structural inequalities influence both procedures and outcomes, democratic procedures that appear to conform to norms of deliberation are usually biased toward more powerful agents.”, in order words, deliberative institutions lack of a centralised and impartial monitoring system and faces cultural limitations. Yet, the most successful institutional meetings take place at a local level rather than in a national one.

One of the most struggling task is to balance two main fundamental values of democracy: deliberation and equality. Being a very unbalanced country in terms of equality and being participation a fundamental thing for democracy a solution was found by James Fishkin. Fishkin has invented a set of polling techniques in which, through a random selection, it gives the possibility to every single citizen to be elected.

3.6 The Four deliberative Polls in China

Deliberative Polling have mainly be conducted in Western societies like the United States, Britain and Canada, to Denmark and Australia. In China the first Deliberative Polling was conducted in 2005 in the town of Zeguo, Wenling City and Zhejiang Province. It has been the first case in modern times to fully represent and deliberate participation. Many meetings held in China addressed issues like for example water supply, rubbish collection, school sites, salaries for migrant workers, land contracts, which were all issues of local governance. What is exactly deliberative polling and what is its purpose? Deliberative polling is somewhere in the middle between a scientific experiment and a public consultation and has the scope of creating an informed public opinion and which is able to deliberate on a political issue. Usually public opinion is passive, not well informed, not very rational and not aware of what discriminates within the political positions, DP tries to create the conditions for a well informed and thoughtful public opinion. The method for doing so is to get a random sample out of the population and then it is “polled” over a certain matter, the members of a committee are invited to discuss over the matter in a sort of convention. The participants are given informative schedules on the matter and then, in small groups they discuss about it. They are confronted with experts and political leaders and produce a common deliberation on the issue discussed. After the deliberation they are “polled” once again and in case of changes in terms of information and opinions, they are written down.

There are two main base models of deliberative polling: the first is the “interaction face-to-face; hereto sample taken as a representative of the population is hosted for two/three days and there is an interaction within small groups. The second is by interaction at the computer (on line): her the sample representing the population is interrogated via internet, it is an interaction guided by the computer with the web cam. There may be the possibility to join the two methods of deliberative polling doing first one and then the other.

The main results of deliberative polling are an immediate improvement of the informative conditions, an increase in the participation on the issue, a change in the opinions, and a more precise idea on the matter. There are different criteria in posing the questions and more types of questions: open questions: (Who are you?, What is your job); introductory questions (When have you heard about); Transition questions: (Has... improved your ...); Substantial questions; (How would you define...); final questions: (What is the most important matter in the issue we have discussed?).

The first deliberative poll in China took place in Zeguo, where a random representative sample of close to 250 citizens gathered in the town to consider prioritizing certain infrastructure

projects. The results were positive and the infrastructural issues in the town were solved. Wenling city, in China is known for inaugurating deliberative polling. It is a well established city with a good private economy, the results democratic deliberation have actually been positive, yet they are still very far in terms of representation due to the fact that these polling are based on self selected participants.

3.7 Success or Failure?

As an authoritarian regime it is obvious the direction that China is taking, the government does not allow public elections and punish those who goes against the political regime. The press is heavily censored, the internet is blocked and the social networks that are allowed to be used are the one decided by the Chinese government. The situation ha become heavier when in 2012 Xi Jinping took the power. The communist party is firmly in power with the strongest political leader and no other alternative of political parties. Chinese authorities have shown no interest in considering democratic elections. Yet, the Chinese government have introduced election within villages in the 1980s in order to avoid corruption between leaders and maintain social order and by 2008, more than 900 million villagers have obtained the right to vote. Voters nominates candidates and vote in a secret ballot for a committee of candidates who serve three year terms. For Chinese government, favour democratic elections is good in order to have more social stability. Electors are more knowledgable, interested and most importantly, participant in the political life of their society. It is also easier to find mistakes and is cheaper to resolve them. Experiments that are taken in the Chinese towns are a proof of the success of deliberation. It is difficult to talk about both success and failure. As stated before, Chinese political regime is well consolidated and difficult to change. Yet the fact that the government itself has approved different aspects of democracy can be considered as a step forward for possible democratic elections. At a national level it is far more difficult to achieve the desired results.

To conclude, Deliberative democracy is the most suitable form of government for a possible Chinese political transition. Participation has already started to arise within China as well as the presence of different democratic parties.

Conclusion

The aim of this paper has been to analyse whether or not deliberative democracy can be suitable to China's form of government.

The first chapter was mainly an overview of what deliberative democracy is, starting from democracy in general and then moving onwards to the deliberative one in specific. One of the main authors cited in this chapter is Dahl. As basis for a regime to be called democracy he puts two elements: Participation and opposition. Participation will then be a crucial point in order to explain deliberative democracy. In the second section of this chapter, several scholars are taken into consideration, starting from Habermas up to Fishkin. The latter has come up with the Deliberative polling, a scientific method in order to make deliberation as equal and impartial as possible. It is a random sampling which leads to discussion over issues within small groups in society. Furthermore, there is the analysis of how deliberative democracy affects political movements. A crucial point here is the type of political parties. Political movements are developed accordingly to set states' government. Deliberative democracy adapts to each state. Political participation is one of the crucial means that can be activated by the citizens.

This chapter concludes by underlining the relationship between deliberation and participation.

Deliberative democracy is a variant of the participatory one. In a deliberative democratic model, participation is essential; citizens invest time to deliberate arguments discussed before voting or deciding by consensus on the laws which will govern them.

The second chapter deals with non democratic regimes. The first section is an overall of non democratic regimes with Lindz definition. Linz provided a classification of all the regimes in the world and he developed its ideal type of each kind of regime. That of democracy is based on four features which are important to emphasise the characteristics of non-democratic regime. Firstly, responsible pluralism that is to say, the government is accountable for what it does. Not only in politics but also in economy, society and in the internal life of organisation. In the internal life of parties, leaders in a given party, are selected through democratic procedures this leads to primary elections. Secondly, respect for minorities and rule of law. Moreover, opposition is guaranteed and leadership is regularly selected through free elections. The main focus is on the totalitarian regime considering the definition of Friedrich and Brzezinski.

Furthermore, in this section hybrid regimes are taken into account. The term was coined for authoritarian regimes which were losing their characteristics and moving towards democracy. The

characteristic that was identified is that they did not become actual democracy : not a full acquisition of procedural requisites of democracy; very often there's the lack of civilian controller the military; some sectors of the population are deprived either in economic or political terms, they do not enjoy the same rights as the rest of the population; weak judiciary power. When an authoritarian regime starts to move towards democracy, it starts to change. In the second section, there is the analysis on why some regimes, during their development and change into a democracy have failed in completing the process of democratisation. The post-Cold War world has been marked by the proliferation of different Hybrid Regimes. Many scholars have tried to define these kind of regimes as incomplete or as transitional forms of Democracy but as Levitsky and Way have pointed out, these regimes either remained hybrid or moved in an authoritarian direction. Yet, the post-Cold War liberal hegemony global economic change, developments in media and communications technologies and the growth of international networks aimed at promoting democracy and Human Rights contributed in reshaping the opportunities and constraints facing authoritarian elite.

As a result some forms of authoritarianism have become more difficult to sustain. In the third section, we discuss applying democracy to non-democratic countries. As a basis of this study there is the book written by Lijphart "Patterns of democracy" which is an empirical study on thirty-six different countries and their different form of democracies, not fully developed. Lijphart discusses the social and economic characteristics that can be expected to influence the type of democracy and democratic performance of the thirty-six countries. The last section focuses on the importance that equality holds in deliberative democracy. As a conclusion, equality in deliberative democracy is not an easy matter to deal with. For Deliberative Democracy, political equality guarantees the effective participation and thus a concern with the capacity of individual participants to engage in the process of mutual persuasion.

The final chapter is the actual focus of this paper: China. The first section gives an overview on China's history, considering mainly the period from 1949 onwards, focusing on the government's behaviour towards other forms of government. The ideology surrounding Mao's interpretation of Marxism–Leninism, also known as Maoism, was codified into China's Constitution as a guiding ideology. The third section, Western theories of Deliberative Democracies and the Chinese practice of deliberative governance focuses on the deliberative democracy in western societies and on deliberation as practiced in China. Both democracy and authoritarianism may find benefit in diminishing the amount of polarisation and a well-designed deliberative institution can avoid or reduce polarisation despite the difference in political regimes. Moreover China is

characterised by their Confucian tradition in which it emphasises harmony. It strongly affirms the idea of “political correctness” and of “searching for a middle way” which helps to avoid polarisation and for this reason China has less possibilities of facing polarisation than the west does. The fourth section regards deliberative democracy with Chinese characteristics. Democracy is not completely unknown in China, there have been several movements pro-democracy and there have been different experiments at a local level of deliberation in China. How? With deliberative institutions, so to say, public hearings, consensus conferences, citizens evaluations, mediation meetings, heart to heart forums, local elections preceded by extensive discussion and Deliberative polling. A solution for this disproportionality would be Fishkin’s Deliberative Polling, which will be better defined in the following sections. The chapter continues with explaining the deliberative institutions which are present in China. One of the most struggling task is to balance two main fundamental values of democracy: deliberation and equality. Being a very unbalanced country in terms of equality and being participation a fundamental thing for democracy a solution was found by James Fishkin. Fishkin has invented a set of polling techniques in which, through a random selection, it gives the possibility to every single citizen to be elected. The chapter ends with analysing the four deliberative polls in China and arriving to the conclusion to which this experiment is a success or a failure.

It is difficult to talk about both success and failure. As stated before, Chinese political regime is well consolidated and difficult to change. Yet the fact that the government itself has approved different aspects of democracy can be considered as a step forward for possible democratic elections. At a national level it is far more difficult to achieve the desired results.

Bibliography

- Bohman, J. (1997). Deliberative Democracy and Effective Social Freedom: Capabilities, Resources and Opportunities. In *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics*, eds. J. Bohman and W. Rehg, 321 – 348. Cambridge and London: MIT Press.
- Cohen J., *Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy*, in Matravers D. e Pike J., *Debates in Contemporary Political Philosophy*, Routledge in association with The Open University, Londra & New York, 2003.
- Dryzek, J. (2000). *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dryzek, J. (2010). *Foundations and Frontiers of Deliberative Governance*, Published to Oxford Scholarship Online: January 2011
- Elstub, S., Ercan S, Mendoça R.F, *The fourth generation of deliberative democracy*, *Critical Policy Studies*, 2016 VOL. 10, NO. 2, 139–151
- Elster, J. (1998). *Deliberative Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- *The Search for Deliberative Democracy in China*, Eds. Leib, E. J. & He, B., New York: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 133-148, 149-160, 175-196
- Ethan J. Leib, *Ethan J. Leib, The Chinese Communist party and Deliberative Democracy*, University of California, Hastings College of the Law, 2005.
- Fishkin J. S., *Deliberative Polling: Executive Summary*, in *The Center for Deliberative Democracy – Stanford University*.
- Fishkin J. S., He B., Luskin R. C. e Siu A., *Deliberative Democracy in an Unlikely Place: Deliberative Polling in China*, in *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 40, N° 2, 2010.
- Fishkin J. S., *When the People Speak: Deliberative Democracy and Public Consultation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2009.
- Gutmann A. e Thompson D., *Democracy and Disagreement*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge & Londra, 1996.
- Gutmann A. e Thompson D., *Why Deliberative Democracy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2004. pp 3-7

- He, B. (2006a). Western Theories of Deliberative Democracy and the Chinese Practice of Complex Deliberative Governance. In *The Search for Deliberative Democracy in China*, Eds. Leib, E. J. & He, B., New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- He, B. (2006b). Participatory and Deliberative Institutions in China. In *The Search for Deliberative Democracy in China*, Eds. Leib, E. J. & He, B., New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schumpeter J. A., *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, Harper, New York, 1942.
- Lijphart. A., *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-six Countries*, Yale University Press; 2nd Revised edition edition (31 July 2012)
- Thompson D., *Deliberative Democratic Theory and Empirical Political Science*, in *Annual Review of Political Science*, N° 11, 2008.
- Salenvall Petra, *The continued search for Deliberative Democracy in China- a case study of Deliberative Polling in Zeguo Township*, Uppsala University
-

Riassunto

Quando sentiamo parlare della democrazia, è più probabile che noi la gente pensi alle società occidentali, a causa dello sviluppo di questo sistema politico in tali paesi.

Il termine "Democrazia" deriva dal greco e significa "potere al popolo". Il termine nasce nell'antica Grecia, per la precisione nella città di Atene. Nel IV al V secolo A.C. la città di Atene aveva un ottimo sistema politico, dove un cittadino maschio aveva stessi diritti politici, libertà di parola e possibilità di partecipare direttamente alla vita politica; tale sistema politico fece sì che divenne la prima forma di democrazia nella storia. Naturalmente aveva dei limiti; Gli unici ad avere il permesso di entrare nella vita politica erano il popolo maschio, le donne non erano considerate escluse.

Durante i secoli la democrazia si è sviluppata in modo positivo e negativo. Durante i diversi periodi storici questo sistema politico affrontò grandi sfide. Durante lo sviluppo di tale sistema politico ci furono dei fattori che ne hanno portato al mutamento e da essa derivano altre forme di democrazia. Ogni stato ha la propria forma di democrazia, non ne esiste una adattabile ad ogni Stato. C'è una definizione fondamentale della democrazia, nella quale si devono rispettare dei criteri standard, come ad esempio: elezioni libere e giuste, diritto di voto universale, diritto al discorso e stampa non censurata. Non tutti i paesi rispettano i criteri base della definizione di democrazia e quindi ognuno di loro ha adattato un regime democratico alla propria forma di governo, ma, tuttavia, ancora considerato un regime democratico.

Dal 1949, la Cina è diventata un regime autoritario con il partito comunista come il partito più forte e influente di tutto il paese. È diventata la seconda economia più grande del mondo in meno di 70 anni e si pensa che nei prossimi dieci supererà gli Stati Uniti e diventerà l'economia più grande del mondo con un reddito pro capite vicino alla cima di tutti i paesi in via di sviluppo. La corruzione è un grosso problema in Cina, oltre che l'inquinamento e la disuguaglianza di genere. Tuttavia, la riforma economica continua ad accelerare, la riforma politica proseguirà e il sistema di partito singolo rimarrà. È chiaro che tutti questi aspetti rendono la Cina un paese in via di sviluppo continuo e la democrazia non è ben vista dal governo cinese. Per di più avendo la Cina raggiunto tali incredibili risultati sotto un regime comunista, un cambiamento della forma di governo non gioverebbe al paese.

Questo documento contribuirà a mostrare lo studio della democrazia deliberativa in Cina. Il primo capitolo è quello introduttivo, che dà una panoramica su quello che è la democrazia, dando

una definizione di quest'ultimo in primo luogo e poi considerando le sue caratteristiche, analizzando i punti di forza e le debolezze di questo sistema politico. Inoltre discuterà sulla democrazia deliberativa in tutta la storia, tenendo conto di quali sono stati i primi studiosi che ne hanno parlato e dei più influenti e la presenza di una democrazia deliberativa in diversi partiti e movimenti politici. Il primo capitolo concluderà con l'esame del rapporto tra la partecipazione e la deliberazione, due aspetti molto importanti che coesistono insieme e costituiscono il principio fondamentale della democrazia in generale.

Il secondo capitolo analizzerà i regimi non democratici e la possibile presenza di una democrazia deliberativa in quelle. La prima sezione è volta a spiegare quali sono le caratteristiche dei paesi non democratici, definendoli e tenendo conto delle diverse forme di regimi non democratici quali regimi ibridi, regimi totalitari, ecc. La seconda sezione di questo capitolo è un'analisi delle possibili ragioni che spiegando perché nella transizione da una forma di governo ad una democrazia, il paese non è riuscito a diventare uno stato democratico a tutti gli effetti ma è diventato una sorta di "mix" tra più forme di governo. La terza sezione riguarda l'attuazione della democrazia in paesi che sono in realtà possiedono un'forma di governo completamente diversa, come ad esempio un regime comunista. La quarta sezione tratta principalmente il ruolo che l'uguaglianza ha nella democrazia deliberativa e sottolinea la sua importanza per raggiungere il risultato desiderato. Infine il secondo capitolo termina con una breve panoramica dei risultati e delle conseguenze dell'uguaglianza nella democrazia deliberativa. Questo argomento sarà poi affrontato nel capitolo seguente.

Il terzo ed ultimo capitolo di questo documento è lo studio effettivo della democrazia deliberativa in Cina. La prima sezione dà una panoramica della storia cinese, a partire dai suoi inizi 6000 anni fa, concentrandosi per lo più sul periodo dal 1949 in poi, che fu l'inizio della Repubblica popolare cinese. Inoltre, la seconda sezione spiega in dettaglio i regimi politici della Cina, tenendo conto del periodo precedente all'aumento del potere di Mao e dei cambiamenti che la Cina ha dovuto affrontare. La terza sezione spiega le teorie occidentali della democrazia deliberativa e analizza la pratica cinese della governance deliberativa spiegando i due esperimenti svolti in due villaggi della Cina: Zeguo e Wenling. Tale esperimento riguardava il sondaggio deliberativo che permette di poter avere una deliberazione imparziale in una società e analizzando i risultati di esso, vengono fuori dei dati positivi. La sezione seguente riguarda la democrazia deliberativa con caratteristiche cinesi, spiegando ciò che meglio si adatta alla forma di governo cinese. La quarta sezione è strettamente legata alla quinta. Quest'ultima spiega le diverse istituzioni deliberative presenti in Cina e spiega quale sia il loro ruolo all'interno della società. La seconda fino all'ultima sezione si concentrano nel spiegare i sondaggi deliberativi in Cina. In primo luogo, sarà data la definizione del voto deliberativo, sottolineando i punti di forza e le sue debolezze e poi spiegando i risultati dell'indagine deliberativa in Cina. La sezione finale del terzo capitolo sarà la conclusione in cui scopriamo se la democrazia deliberativa può essere una possibile forma di governo in Cina. Il presente documento avrà una breve conclusione con alcune osservazioni finali sulla democrazia deliberativa in Cina e sui possibili cambiamenti che questa forma di governo potrebbe portare in Cina.

L'obiettivo di questo documento è stato quello di analizzare se la democrazia deliberativa possa essere adatta alla forma di governo della Cina.

Il primo capitolo è stato innanzitutto una visione d'insieme della democrazia deliberativa, partendo dalla democrazia in generale e poi proseguendo verso quello deliberativo specifico. Uno degli autori principali citati in questo capitolo è Dahl. Come base per un regime chiamato democrazia mette due elementi: la partecipazione e l'opposizione. La partecipazione sarà poi un punto cruciale per spiegare la democrazia deliberativa. Nella seconda sezione di questo capitolo vengono considerati diversi studiosi, a partire da Habermas fino a Fishkin. Quest'ultimo è venuto con il voto di deliberazione, un metodo scientifico per rendere la deliberazione il più possibile uguale ed imparziale. Si tratta di un campionamento casuale che porta alla discussione su tematiche all'interno di piccoli gruppi nella società. Inoltre, viene fatta un'analisi di come la democrazia deliberativa influenza i movimenti politici. Un punto cruciale qui è il tipo di partiti politici. I movimenti politici sono sviluppati di conseguenza per impostare il governo degli Stati. La democrazia deliberativa si adatta a ogni stato. La partecipazione politica è uno dei mezzi cruciali che possono essere attivati dai cittadini.

Questo capitolo si conclude sottolineando la relazione tra deliberazione e partecipazione. La democrazia deliberativa è una variante di quella partecipativa. In un modello democratico deliberativo, la partecipazione è essenziale; I cittadini investono tempo a deliberare argomenti discussi prima di votare o decidere per consenso sulle leggi che li governeranno.

Il secondo capitolo riguarda i regimi non democratici. La prima sezione è un complesso di regimi non democratici con la definizione di Linz. Linz ha fornito una classificazione di tutti i regimi del mondo e ha sviluppato il suo tipo ideale di ogni tipo di regime. Quella della democrazia si basa su quattro aspetti importanti per sottolineare le caratteristiche del regime non democratico. In primo luogo, il "responsible pluralism", vale a dire quando il governo è responsabile di ciò che fa, non solo nella politica ma anche nell'economia, nella società e nella vita interna dell'organizzazione. Nella vita interna dei partiti, i leader di una determinata festa, sono selezionati attraverso procedure democratiche questo porta a elezioni primarie. In secondo luogo, il rispetto per le minoranze e lo stato di diritto. Inoltre, l'opposizione è garantita e la leadership è regolarmente scelta attraverso elezioni libere. L'attenzione principale è sul regime totalitario, considerando la definizione di Friedrich e Brzezinski.

Inoltre, in questa sezione vengono presi in considerazione i regimi ibridi. Il termine è stato coniato per regimi autoritari che perdono le loro caratteristiche e si muovono verso la democrazia. La caratteristica che è stata identificata è che non sono diventati democrazia reale ossia non hanno avuto una completa acquisizione dei requisiti procedurali della democrazia. Molto spesso c'è la mancanza di un controllo civile da parte dei militari; alcuni settori della popolazione sono stati privati in termini economici o politici, non godono degli stessi diritti del resto della popolazione; e vi è un potere giudiziario debole. Quando un regime autoritario comincia a muoversi verso la democrazia, comincia a cambiare. Nella seconda sezione esiste l'analisi sul perché alcuni regimi, durante il quale lo sviluppo e il cambiamento in una democrazia, hanno fallito nel completare il processo di democratizzazione. Il mondo post-guerra fredda è stato segnato dalla proliferazione di

diversi regimi ibridi. Molti studiosi hanno cercato di definire questi tipi di regimi come incompleti o come forme di transizione della democrazia, ma come hanno indicato Levitsky e Way, questi regimi sono rimasti ibridi o si sono mossi in direzione autoritaria. Tuttavia, la trasformazione economica globale dell'egemonia libera della guerra fredda, gli sviluppi nelle tecnologie dei media e delle comunicazioni e la crescita delle reti internazionali intese a promuovere la democrazia e i diritti umani hanno contribuito a riformare le opportunità e i vincoli che affrontano l'élite autoritaria.

Di conseguenza alcune forme di autoritarismo sono diventate più difficili da sostenere. Nella terza sezione tratta dell'applicazione della democrazia a paesi non democratici. Come base di questo studio c'è il libro scritto da Lijphart "Patterns of Democracy", che è uno studio empirico su trentasei diversi paesi e la loro diversa forma di democrazie, non completamente sviluppata. Lijphart discute le caratteristiche sociali ed economiche che si possono prevedere per influenzare il tipo di democrazia e la performance democratica dei trentasei paesi. L'ultima sezione si concentra sull'importanza che la parità tiene nella democrazia deliberativa. Come conclusione, l'uguaglianza nella democrazia deliberativa non è una cosa facile da affrontare. Per la Democrazia deliberativa, l'uguaglianza politica garantisce l'effettiva partecipazione e quindi una preoccupazione per la capacità dei singoli partecipanti di impegnarsi nel processo di persuasione reciproca.

Il capitolo finale riguarda l'obiettivo principale di questo documento: la Cina. La prima sezione fornisce una panoramica sulla storia della Cina, considerando soprattutto il periodo dal 1949 in poi, concentrandosi sul comportamento del governo verso altre forme di governo. L'ideologia che circonda l'interpretazione di Mao del marxismo-leninismo, noto anche come maoismo, è stata codificata nella Costituzione cinese come ideologia guida. La terza sezione, le teorie occidentali delle democrazie deliberative e la pratica cinese della deliberativa governance si concentra sulla democrazia deliberativa nelle società occidentali e sulla deliberazione viene praticata in Cina. Sia la democrazia che l'autoritarismo possono trovare vantaggi nel diminuire la quantità di polarizzazione e una istituzione deliberativa ben progettata può evitare o ridurre la polarizzazione nonostante la differenza nei regimi politici. Inoltre la Cina è caratterizzata dalla loro tradizione confuciana in cui viene sottolineata l'importanza che ha l'armonia, sia in ambito politico che nella vita di tutti i giorni. Essa afferma fortemente l'idea di "correttezza politica" e di "ricerca di un modo intermedio" che aiuta ad evitare la polarizzazione e per questo la Cina ha meno possibilità di affrontare la polarizzazione rispetto all'occidente.

La quarta sezione riguarda la democrazia deliberativa con caratteristiche cinesi. La democrazia non è completamente sconosciuta in Cina, ci sono stati diversi movimenti per la democrazia e ci sono stati diversi esperimenti a livello locale di deliberazione in Cina. Come? Con istituzioni deliberative, per esempio, audizioni pubbliche, conferenze di consenso, valutazioni dei cittadini, riunioni di mediazione, forum di cuore a cuore, elezioni locali precedute da un'ampia discussione e un dibattito deliberativo. Essendo la Cina caratterizzata, come già detto in precedenza, da una forte disuguaglianza nella società, molti esperimenti svolti sulla democrazia non risultano semplici da sostenere. Una soluzione per questa mancanza di proporzionalità sarebbe il sondaggio deliberativo di Fishkin, che verrà definito meglio nelle seguenti sezioni. Il capitolo continua a spiegare le istituzioni deliberative che sono presenti in Cina. Uno dei compiti più difficili è quello di

equilibrare due valori fondamentali della democrazia: deliberazione e uguaglianza. Fishkin ha inventato una serie di tecniche di polling in cui, attraverso una selezione casuale, dà la possibilità a ciascun cittadino di essere eletto. Il capitolo termina con l'analisi dei quattro sondaggi deliberativi in Cina e arriva alla conclusione a cui questo esperimento è un successo o un fallimento.

È difficile parlare sia di un eventuale successo sia di un fallimento. Come si è detto, il regime politico cinese è ben consolidato e difficile da cambiare. Tuttavia il fatto che il governo stesso abbia approvato diversi aspetti della democrazia può essere considerato come un passo avanti per raggiungere le elezioni democratiche. Dei buoni risultati sono stati ottenuti nei villaggi più piccoli, grazie anche ad una stabilità politica maggiore e anche una migliore possibilità di controllare e risolvere eventuali problemi nella società. E' ovvio che a livello nazionale è molto più difficile raggiungere i risultati desiderati e specialmente raggiungere un regime democratico a tutti gli effetti.