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DEMOCRACY AND DISSENT

THE CHALLENGE OF INTERNATIONAL RULE MAKING

Frank Vibert
NORMATIVE ASSUMPTIONS

• INTERNATIONAL RULE MAKING A ‘GOOD THING’.

• WE WILL NEED MORE OF IT IN FUTURE.
THE TWO BASIC PROBLEMS

- INTERNATIONAL RULE MAKING NOT DEMOCRATIC;

- INTERNATIONAL RULE MAKING PRONE TO FAILURE
WHAT IS NEW IN ANALYSIS

• CITIZENS AS RECEIVERS OF RULES MADE BY OTHERS.

• FOCUS ON FAILINGS OF EXPERT GROUPS.

• USE OF TWO FRAMEWORKS:
  – MULTI LEVEL GOVERNANCE (FORM OF AUTHORITY)
  – DIFFUSION FRAMEWORK. (PROCESSES OF DIFFERENT ACTORS – EXPERTS, GOVTS, CITIZENS – AT DIFFERENT STAGES OF RULE MAKING).
DIAGNOSING THE DEMOCRATIC DEFICIT

• CONCILIATION?

• CONGRUENCE?
  – INSTITUTIONAL
  – VALUE.

• DISSENT?
HARNESSING DISSENT

• TRANSFORMATION
  – SOCIALISATION & COMPETITIVE POLITICS
  – RESPONSIVENESS & POWER SHARING.

• MEDIATION
  – LEGAL PLURALISM
  – COSMOPOLITANISM?

• SPECIFIC GOVERNING RULES
DIAGNOSING SOURCES OF FAILURE

• EXECUTIVE.
  – Poor leadership; mistakes by govts.

• CULTURAL/ORGANIZATIONAL.
  – Group think; negotiated compliance.

• COGNITIVE.
  – Failures of method in interpreting data, causalities, missing information and uncertainties.
Epistemic weakness

• ‘The IMF’s ability to correctly identify the mounting risks was hindered by a high degree of groupthink, intellectual capture, a general mindset that a major crisis in large advanced economies was unlikely, and inadequate analytic approaches’.

• IEO/IMF Jan 10 2011.
## EXPERT GROUPS & COGNITIVE FAILURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared Principled Beliefs</th>
<th>Common Notions of Validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Framing</td>
<td>Categorisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchoring</td>
<td>Herding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Causal Beliefs</td>
<td>Common Problem Solving Venture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td>Action induced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmatory</td>
<td>Availability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMBATTING COGNITIVE FAILURE: PRINCIPLES

• ‘RAISING THE STAKES’; putting reputation & status on the line.
• COMPETING PROBLEM DEFINITIONS.
• CONTINUOUS CHALLENGE –from inception though evaluation.
COMBATTING COGNITIVE FAILURE: PRACTICES

• COMPETITIVE EVALUATION.
• PROCESS TRACING
• QUANTIFYING UNCERTAINTIES
• CAUSAL EVALUATION
## PROCEDURES AND EXPERT FAILURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elite Characteristic</th>
<th>Challenge Method</th>
<th>Target of Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared principled beliefs</td>
<td>Competitive evaluation</td>
<td>Framing/anchoring bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared notions of validity</td>
<td>Confidence levels</td>
<td>Herding/categorisation bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared causal beliefs</td>
<td>Process tracing</td>
<td>Attribution/confirmation bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common problem solving venture</td>
<td>Continuing audit of causalities</td>
<td>Action induced/availability bias</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTITUTIONAL FIXES?

• G 20 ?
• Hybrids ? (combining expert groups with universal membership orgs. IPCC/UNEP/WMO).
• UN? Revive Economic & Social Council?
• No. Institutional arrangements will remain fluid.
• Need to focus on processes –challenge processes.
• Challenge process for governments?
Effectiveness & democracy

- A conflict ??? – Dahl etc.
- Not necessarily: common link is the need for procedures that permit challenge
  
  - To governments
  - To expert groups
  
  - More effective rule making
  - More democratic.
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