

IAP2 International Conference, 22-23 October 2009, Fremantle, W.A.
“Tackling the Tough Issues”

Key note: '**Climate Change: the Need to Change Community Engagement Paradigms and Practices**'

Janette Hartz-Karp

Curtin University Sustainability Policy (CUSP) Institute

Climate change is potentially humanity's biggest challenge. Addressing it is crucial to our survival. We cannot fail. However we face enormous obstacles. Urgently, we need to find ways to turn the obstacles into opportunities.

The first large obstacle is that we try to understand climate change with our usual 'business as usual' thinking processes, but this is the wrong paradigm. Climate change is a complex phenomenon; it is dynamic, constantly changing, with an irreversible history and an unpredictable future. The sort of thinking we need to usefully grapple with such a phenomenon is antithetical to our usual linear, cause and effect, short term mode of thinking. To tackle it, we will have to radically change *how* we think, applying systems thinking and adaptive management, with the aim of developing resilience, rather than our usual search for the solution, the 'silver bullet', that will resolve all our problems.

Being a complex phenomenon also implies entanglement, an inseparable web of relationships; we're all interdependent. Irrevocably, the unintended consequences of our individual actions will affect the world; yet we cannot resolve this crisis alone. Unfortunately, our preoccupation with individual at the expense of collective concerns, self at the expense of altruistic interests, and win/lose, competitive behaviour at the expense of cooperative actions, have been and will continue to be significant impediments to progress towards achieving greater resilience. We will need to develop new ways of learning together to co-create a more sustainable future.

Despite the political rhetoric, there is little to no likelihood of a technological 'fix' that will allow us to go back to 'business as usual'. Physical and social scientists alike are now suggesting that our greatest hope is in finding new ways of getting people to cooperate, for example:

The technology we need most badly is...the knowledge about how to cooperate to get things done. ...Our problem now is that there is no way forward, at least if we're serious about preventing the worst ecological nightmares, that doesn't involve working together politically to make changes deep enough and rapid enough to matter. (McGibben, 2006, np)

According to social theorist Tom Atlee, we need to develop societal "co-intelligence" or "wise responsiveness", which rests on the simple yet revolutionary thesis that:

Given a supportive structure and resources, diverse ordinary people can work together to reach common ground, creating wise and deliberate policy that reflects the highest public interest. (Atlee, 2003, p.viii)

Atlee also emphasises that getting people together doesn't automatically mean they will arrive at co-intelligent solutions. He notes:

When Google CEO Eric Schmidt says, "A community will always make a better decision than an individual," he is unfortunately overlooking the proven -- and widely recognized -- phenomenon of 'groupthink'. The truth is that there are conditions where collective activity generates collective intelligence and others in which such activity generates collective stupidity. Much knowledge exists about the different conditions that predictably lead us into one state or the other. We need to get smart about using that knowledge. (Atlee, 2009, np)

In my view, just as there has been a slow take-up of scientific findings about climate change and systems thinking, there has also been a slow take-up of the data and knowledge about the sort of engagement that produces collective intelligence and a communitarian spirit.

Given that climate change represents one of those rare moments in history when it is ordinary citizens who are leading the charge, cajoling governments to act, this lack of take-up of what we know is proving to be a double-edged sword. On the one hand, we are not able to take advantage of the people's voice since there is no effective pathway to creating a coherent public viewpoint. On the other hand, without this, governments can persist in prevaricating, falling back on the 'uncertainty' argument (as if there could be certainty in a complex system) to account for their inaction.

The thesis of this paper is that climate change has presented us with the challenge and opportunity to think systemically, co-intelligently and for the common good, with the outcomes of those deliberations influencing individual and community behaviour as well as policy and decision-making locally and globally. If we just applied the knowledge we have, and sought opportunities to pioneer new ways of learning and acting together, we could find ways to make our planet safe for future generations.

It all seems fairly straight forward, so the burning question becomes - why haven't we been able to do it?

Two of the preconditions for action would appear to be met:

Of primary importance, the sense of urgency is there. The UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has recently increased the direness of its predictions - potentially worse impacts than their prior worst-case scenario, coming sooner than previously predicted. Even more to the point, we are already experiencing some of the consequences of climate change - the increased incidence and intensity of floods, cyclones, fires and droughts that have caused inestimable damage and loss of human life.

So why, despite the widely acknowledged urgency of the situation, are we still inert, prevaricating, individually, nationally and globally? This is not difficult to answer. The complexity of climate change acts as a key deterrent: What can *we* do that would make any real difference? This attitude, combined with a lack of will to change our behaviour to become more sustainable, means it's easier to do nothing and wait for others to act, rather than to initiate action ourselves.

The second precondition for action also seems to be met. We believe we're experienced in engaging people and in getting governments to act. After all, much of the western world has been doing public consultation or community engagement for decades. Activists have been pushing governments to act for even longer.

So why are physical and social scientists calling for a 'new technology' of engagement and cooperation? In my view, this too is not difficult to answer. Much of what we have been doing as government/industry/community agents and practitioners of public engagement has been about protecting 'business as usual' and the way of life we have. Efforts led variously by government, industry and communities have often been narrow, one-off, short-term, one-sided, and/or motivated by self, group or local interests, with everyday citizens remaining in blissful ignorance or apathy. Unfortunately, engagement initiatives led by citizens have had difficulty, in the main, in influencing decision-makers. Alternatively, activists, who have railed against government and community inertia, have regularly precipitated an equally forceful reaction, mostly resulting in no action.

By continuing with what we have always done, we have not asked the questions that matter; we have not engaged people in ways that matter, and we have made little impact on people's behaviour and on our systems of governance so the engagement we do *does* matter.

To those of us who have been doing our best, working at continuous improvement, maybe even achieving considerable success, this might sound harsh and unfair. However, let's be honest. How many of us feel we have been able to make a significant contribution to turning the ship around, globally or even locally, to effectively tackle climate change? While I don't have the answers to the tough task ahead, there are some clues that are worthwhile pursuing.

Radical Redesign - Surfacing and Busting Assumptions

If 'business as usual' engagement is inadequate, our only option is to reinvent a new design. "I already do that," some of you may be thinking. Doubtful. If your new design fits the pre-existing model you have in your head of how engagement should work, then it's likely to be a modest variation rather than a 'new technology of cooperation' - a radical redesign. Creating is tough; it's much easier to modify the old. Organisational Development has taught us that inventing a new design requires a fundamental re-think that involves surfacing and breaking our existing assumptions (Hammer, 1995). The first tough task is to surface tacit assumptions that we have all taken for granted.

Assumptions about who to involve

In our current practice of community engagement, we have assumptions about *who* we need to involve:

Firstly, we tend to assume that everyday people, often ignorant of the issues, haven't the time, interest or ability to make judicious decisions about complex issues. In any case, while everyday people may be able to give input, finding solutions is what elected officials and experts are trained and paid to do.

Secondly, we tend to assume that we need to focus our efforts on engaging those immediately impacted by a decision. This covers other assumptions, including that what we do will have only local, immediate impacts. It also assumes that self-interest or rational

self-maximisation will be paramount - for governments, industry, communities and individuals. The locals will be needed only if government and industry want to implement their decisions. Citizens and communities will be interested only if their self-interest is impacted and their concern will be to maximise their self-interest.

What if we were to bust these assumptions wide open?

In respect to the capability of everyday people, we would assume that everyday people have the innate intelligence to understand complex issues; that they have the ability to reach coherent, communitarian outcomes; and that decisions about issues critical to our future can't be left to 'experts'.

This does not mean that everyone would need to understand everything. However, experience has shown that those taking part in deliberations on complex issues rapidly rise up the ladder of understanding to competently make judicious decisions. This idea of ordinary people's inherent intelligence is not new. Some two thousand five hundred years ago, Pericles advised the Athenians that while only a few may originate a policy, we are *all* able to judge it. However, it is not just this ability to 'judge' that is important, it is also the importance of everyday people's "practical wisdom" (Booth, 2006, p.13). Being outside mainstream expertise and knowledge, "practical wisdom" is critical to untangling the threads of complexity by applying personal and community values of what is considered 'right' and 'good', interwoven with local, historical and interpersonal knowledge.

This call to engage everyday people leads to the obvious question - how can we get coherent, deliberated decisions when we have populations of millions? Aligned with this is, even if we could get coherent, deliberated decisions, how can we make them matter, so they influence policy development and decision-making?

One response has been to radically expand the numbers of people involved. The digital revolution and social media have made it possible for millions to participate in conversation and action. In the USA, President Obama has focused on this as a way of revolutionising governance. However, as he is beginning to learn, it might be *an* answer, but it is hardly *the* answer. The US web sites created to facilitate this conversation among people and boost public participation in governance have overwhelmingly attracted postings and conversations that can only be called peripheral to the critical issues facing the country, sometimes verging on the ridiculous. Other issues have been posted by or taken over by special interest groups, seen to be outside the mainstream. In short, if the Obama administration hoped to instigate co-intelligent governance by the people, the results have been highly disappointing. Even worse, there is now much criticism that the Obama administration has been using these social technologies to 'sell' its own messages, rather than to open government to the people.

The other problem with social media is that it has not enabled a coherent voice of the people - rather disparate voices 'having their say'. E-government has fallen well short of deliberative ideals, with most involving 'drop and go' monologues rather than reasoned discourse with others.

Another response to the issues of size and influence of engagement has been to 'scale out' face-to-face deliberations to become too big to ignore. Numbers do count, at least

politically. To be influential, deliberations need to achieve political and social significance - the one entails more likelihood of achieving the other. Public face-to-face deliberations typically involve scores, sometimes hundreds and rarely thousands of participants. However, these numbers are miniscule compared to the whole population. Acknowledging this, organisers of deliberative public engagement often devise ways of 'scaling out'. These include expanding the numbers of participants involved, such as with 21st Century Town Meetings where hundreds if not thousands participate in small group discussions using networked computers. By holding simultaneous 21st Century Town Meetings across the country, organisers have electronically linked many thousands of participants. Other ways of scaling out include the smaller deliberative group being charged with taking the issues to the broader public, holding additional regional and local meetings, if not deliberations. E-deliberation has been used in tandem with face-to-face deliberation, or independently, with submissions, wikis, blogs, etc. online. Deliberative organisers have also tried to link deliberations to public discourse occurring at the same time, with newspaper articles, radio and TV interviews and programs. Of interest, one newspaper, the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, has regularly facilitated such deliberations, enabling it to "sustain a deliberative civic conversation even across multiple topics" (Levine et al, 2005, p. 4). Unfortunately, this is an exception.

Most of these scaling out methods were used in the British Columbia and Ontario Citizens' Assemblies on electoral reform; in a broad range of AmericaSpeaks 21st Century Town Meeting processes, including the USA 'National Conversation on Climate Change'; and in the local WA 'Dialogue with the City' process on future sustainable planning for the Perth metropolis.

There is an opposing argument to the criticality of scaling out engagement initiatives which suggests that size doesn't matter, what is important is whether those participating in the deliberations are representative of the population (Carson, 2001; Atlee, 2009). This view relies on the tried-and-true methodology of scientists using a random sample of the population as a highly predictive way of understanding the whole population. Our democratic governments do this all the time when they convene judicial juries, public opinion polls and population surveys. This approach is similarly applicable at local, regional, national and international levels. Deliberative examples where a random sample microcosm of the population was used to determine the whole population's views include WA's Citizens' Juries on health and planning issues; WA's Deliberative Polls on planning and infrastructure issues; the NSW Climate Consensus Project; the recent World Wide Views deliberation on climate change that involved over 40 nations, including Australia; and the international European Union Deliberative Poll involving one person randomly selected from each nation within the EU.

What about the assumption that everyday people will not be interested in complex issues that do not impact their immediate self interest? Our recent experience with Australia's first Citizens' Parliament blew that assumption wide apart.

The desired constituency of the Citizens Parliament held early this year, was one randomly selected person from each federal electorate across Australia, i.e. a total of 150 participants. The topic was, 'How can we strengthen our system of government to better serve the people?' This is a complex issue, which was hardly likely to be considered 'sexy' by most Australians. According to surveys, Australians are overwhelmingly

disinterested in our political system of government and are highly cynical about politicians (Willheim, 2006; Yencken, 2008). We, the organisers, expected a very low response rate. We sent out a total of 8,000 invitations to a random sample of 60 people per electorate. To our enormous surprise, almost 3,000 responded positively. Even more extraordinary, they responded with emails and telephone calls saying how ‘excited’, ‘honoured’, and ‘privileged’ they felt to be ‘chosen’ (despite the fact they knew it was a random sample).

This interest was not stimulated by the promise of remuneration. Unlike the Canadian Citizens’ Assemblies where participants were given a \$150 daily fee, we were asking a lot of our participants and not offering a lot in return. We expected them to attend a one-day regional meeting (travel expenses paid), participate for around 3 months in online deliberation (if they could access a computer and internet), read materials prior to the main event, and attend a 4-day deliberation in Canberra (travel, accommodation and food paid; as well as \$50 a day, although this was not promised at the outset).

While we are not sure exactly why we had such a positive response rate, evidence to date shows it was a combination of factors - no-one had ever asked them before to do something like this; the invitation (which looked something like a wedding invitation) caught their interest; the co-chairs who signed it were known and highly respected; this was an Australian first; the recipients thought they could learn something; and welcomed the fact that the organisers thought they had something to offer. Whatever the reason, it does demonstrate that everyday people are not disinterested in being engaged when they are asked to do so, and when they think it matters; i.e. that they are not motivated solely by self-interest.

In terms of *who* to involve, if we’re to bust our taken-for-granted assumptions, we would also have to assume that those immediately impacted by an issue/decision are *not* necessarily the best placed to make judicious decisions about them. They are only one piece in the jigsaw puzzle of complex issues, which have interdependent parts, unintended consequences and long-term impacts on future generations.

Here is our problem. In breaking our assumptions of *who* to involve, we are calling into question most of our stakeholder engagement. Renowned author and engagement practitioner, Lyn Carson, has written about our usual methods of engagement as follows: public meetings that attract “the incensed and the articulate”; writing submissions that attract “the highly informed and better educated”; the activities of activists and lobbyists that attract “ghettos of like minded people who easily reinforce their shared views”; and the advisory groups that are the “refuges for political appointees” and “the chosen few activists” the establishment tries to “co-opt” (Carson, 2001, p.8).

Obviously, in terms of radical redesign, we would need to go broader than stakeholder engagement. We would need to involve those who are disinterested, even ignorant of the issues to be resolved; that is, everyday citizens. This is critical for at least two reasons:

The first is that everyday people are important to effective deliberation. Experience has shown that participants unaligned to any particular viewpoint are more likely to approach the issues with an open mind, to be willing to listen to the views of others, and to explore trade-offs and common ground. While participants may start out ‘ignorant’ of the issues - though many may not be - with good facilitation/moderation, they rise to the occasion,

rapidly learning enough about the issues to competently deliberate (Potapchuk et. al. 2005; Lukensmeyer and Brigham, 2005; Fishkin, J. 2006).

The second reason is because unaligned people are important to democratic legitimacy. Engaging only the interested and informed is not a legitimate representation of ‘the people’. If, as a society, we thought that was legitimate, we would not have made voting compulsory, nor would we have made jury duty compulsory. We obviously assume not only that every individual is a competent thinker, but also that we have both rights and responsibilities in our society. Not to apply the same assumptions to citizen deliberation does not make sense.

Despite the cynicism about traditional community engagement, this does not mean that the public, government or media have welcomed radical redesigns that involve representative participation. The following have been some of the responses to such ‘minipublics’ I have helped to organise: “Too much democracy” was one WA headline when so many were involved; and “Minister denies democracy” was another when participation was via random sampling. Activists have bluntly responded that they know best and that their issue should not be left to ‘ignorant’ and ‘uninterested’ residents who are being rewarded for their civic disinterest. Likewise, government agencies have balked at random sampling as too ‘unpredictable’ and ‘politically suicidal’ if the ‘squeaky wheels’ are not participants. However, it is not that stakeholders, activists and other community interest groups no longer have a role; it is simply a different role. Rather than being the deliberators, they become the ‘expert witnesses’ - with equally valued viewpoints that participants need to understand and explore.

Assumptions about how to involve

In terms of our assumptions, it’s not only who is involved, but *how* they are involved that needs to be surfaced. If we are to move beyond self-interest towards co-intelligence and communitarian interest, we need to assume that given the right environment, people will seek to find common ground and the common good. Experience with ‘deliberative public engagement’ has shown that this is not only possible, but is a likely outcome with well designed and well facilitated discourse. However, as those of us who have spent decades trying to do this know, it is far from easy.

Achieving deliberative public engagement - An evaluation template

In a recent article on evaluation, John Gastil (2009) laid out a stringent test for determining the success or otherwise of a deliberative public engagement. The criteria are daunting, but important if we are to keep in mind what best practice might mean:

1st criterion: design integrity

The 1st criterion is design integrity, without which the deliberation would not reach basic standards. This involves a) unbiased framing of the issue that is transparent, open to criticism, and fairly represents conflicting views; b) best practice deliberative methods for rigorously analysing the problem, generating and evaluating solutions; c) achieving this in a respectful and egalitarian manner; and d) ensuring that participants are representative of the population.

This is a minefield for practitioners to negotiate. Take one of the elements, unbiased framing, which is critical to the deliberations but fraught with difficulty. Sometimes the project instigators have developed a framework over which the designer/practitioner has

limited influence. From experience, this is a recipe for disaster. On other occasions, the engagement is framed in a visionary manner, however that too is problematic as it dictates a direction for the deliberations. For example, the Dialogue with the City deliberation process was framed as ‘Making Perth the World’s most Liveable City by 2030’. This was criticised by some as biased; it mitigated against those who wanted continued outward suburban growth (framed by some as ‘suburban sprawl’). Deliberations about climate change have similar problems. Should the deliberations be framed as ‘climate change’, or does that framing lead to fear and anxiety? More positive frames including ‘Transition Towns’ or ‘Carbon Neutral’ or ‘Sustainable Cities’, still assume human instigated climate change. Do these frames act to obfuscate dissent and hence sideline the views of those in conflicting positions (framed by some as ‘climate change deniers’)? Even when framing is achieved in text book style as in Australia’s first Citizens’ Parliament, involving all parties, taking conflicting views into account, and leaving it as open as possible, this can lead to a trade-off between broad/open and in-depth deliberations. Although the initial framing is potentially *the* defining issue of the deliberative public engagement, unfortunately there is very little guidance or evidence as to how to get this ‘right’.

2nd criterion: sound deliberation and judgement

Gastil’s 2nd criterion is sound deliberation and judgement. For this to occur, the deliberations a) must begin with “manifest disagreement” or evidence of genuine differences in experiences and values; b) the deliberative group must be able to work through their differences to reach broad agreement; and c) judgements made need to be informed and coherent, with participants able to explain reasons for their own views and arguments behind alternative views.

Applying this 2nd criterion, which has been firmly grounded in deliberative theory, there are few deliberative engagements that would pass muster. Once again, exploring further just one of the elements involved can be insightful. Gastil considers initial ‘manifest disagreement’ or evidence of genuine differences between participants to be a ‘make or break’ element of deliberativeness. A gathering of like-minded people talking in the room might be nice, but it cannot be called truly deliberative. This is based on research that shows how those with similar views simply reinforce those views if given the opportunity to deliberate (Sunstein, 1995). My own experience with deliberative surveys/polls highlighted this lesson. In our deliberative polls, firstly a survey was sent to a relatively large random sample of the population. Of those who responded, around 150-250 agreed to deliberate for a day, not to decide anything together, but to learn more about the issues from all viewpoints. The community survey was then administered again to the participants at the beginning and the end of the deliberation day. In most cases, the views of those in the deliberations fairly closely resembled the views of the broader population. In one instance, however, for a variety of reasons, those in the room disproportionately represented the views at one extreme of the spectrum. By the end of the deliberations, after listening to all points of view, their views were even more skewed towards this extreme. This was hardly an outcome that could be spruiked to the decision-makers involved as a useful deliberative output. These skewed results represented neither a coherent public view nor a communitarian outcome.

The diversity of views and values of the population will be critical if a deliberation is to arrive at a coherent, co-intelligent public response. But knowing this does not make it easy to implement. For example, when it comes to climate change, deliberations are far more likely to attract so-called ‘climate change believers’ than ‘climate change deniers’.

Moreover, there is the real question of whether there is time to continually go back to deliberating whether climate change exists “while Rome burns”. For this reason, in new research hopefully to begin next year in Geraldton WA, a combination of engagement techniques are being used - like-minded groups developing climate change solutions they determine to be important; social media/digital technology, attracting a broader net of people, particularly the young, to raise community awareness and action; as well as large scale face-to-face deliberation of diverse citizens determining the direction and priorities for the town which will then be considered by decision-makers.

3rd criterion: influential conclusions/actions

The 3rd criterion is influential conclusions/actions. The recommendations need to influence policy-making and, if relevant, result in wider public action.

This is one of the most difficult aspects of deliberative design. It is routinely difficult to get decision-makers to commit, at the outset of the deliberative process, to the degree of influence the outcomes will have. Research has shown that this author’s partnership with a decision-maker, the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, was the exception rather than the rule (Carson, 2007, p.5-6). In each instance, at the outset of the deliberative process, the Minister committed publicly to the extent of influence the outcomes would have - from committing to trial the outcome of one Citizens’ Jury, to taking the outcomes to Cabinet as with Dialogue with the City, to simply committing to take the recommendations seriously and explain publicly why she could or could not adopt them.

By contrast, in the deliberations I have designed with local councils, I have not once been able to get them to commit at the outset to the extent of influence the deliberations would have (other than to say they would consider them), though in practice, following the deliberations, they have often adopted the recommendations. The problem with this ‘hit and miss’ outcome is that it is bound to seriously affect the deliberations. Deliberative participants who know their outcomes will have an impact, like jurors on legal juries, take their responsibilities very seriously, carefully weighing the evidence and the options before recommending an outcome. One cannot routinely expect the same level of judicious deliberation if participants do not know if their time and effort will have any real import or impact.

In the climate change deliberations planned for Geraldton, from the outset of the process, partnering agreements will clarify each organisation’s commitment to the level of influence of each element of the deliberations. In addition, there will be regular public updates to make this transparent. The research will examine if there are any differences in the quality of the deliberations given different levels of commitment from public officials.

4th criterion: secondary benefits

Gastil’s 4th and last criterion is secondary benefits. This involves long-term transformation not only of participants’ attitudes and behaviours, but those of the broader public, including public officials.

In most deliberative engagement there is neither the time nor the money to determine if there have been any secondary benefits, that is, long-term transformations. If this is written up at all, it is usually an after-the-fact explanation that endeavours to make a causal link between the deliberation and later public behaviour and policy change. It is not possible to test whether this proposed link is accurate or a product of other

historical/social/political changes. In the climate change research being conducted in tandem in Alberta Canada, Leeds UK and Geraldton WA (an attempt to connect the local with the global), secondary benefits are a specific element of the research and implementation design. It is hoped this will lead to a clearer understanding of the potential long-term effects of influential, deliberative processes.

Conclusion

So what does the tackling of the big issue of climate change teach us? In the first instance, we have to change our mode of thinking if we are to address complex issues. We need to think systemically and adaptively with the goal of resilience, rather than our usual linear, cause and effect thinking that is focused on short-term solutions and fails to articulate our uncertainty. Deliberative designers and practitioners need to devise innovative ways to help participants make this shift, and it won't be easy.

We need to think cooperatively and collectively, constantly aiming for co-intelligence. To achieve this will require a significant change to our notions of governance, so we enhance the probability of communitarian joint action. It has become clear that our hierarchical, top-down systems of governance are not able to cope with the complexity of climate change. We need to find new ways of cooperating and collaborating, involving everyday people in ways that enable them to reach coherent public decisions that take into account the long-term interests of our ecosystem. These joint decisions need to have a ready pathway to influence our policy development and decision-making as well as a greater likelihood of transforming our behaviour.

Doing more of the same community engagement we have come to know so well will not help. We will need to radically re-think our assumptions about community engagement and radically redesign how we carry it out. We now have a sound body of theory and growing body of practice that can help us lead the way. With radical redesign, our public engagement would be less about how to educate people about expert views, and more about exploring those views, surfacing and reconciling different viewpoints, and giving participants' practical wisdom the space and value to thrive. It would become a matter of course for governments to mainstream those outcomes in their decision-making processes. Such deliberative public engagement would regularly augment our representative system of governance; giving substance to the call that "government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth" (Lincoln, 1863)

Our role as deliberative practitioners would be to ask what kind of conversations could most make a difference to climate change (avoiding frames that are too narrow and silo-driven, or fear-mongering and divisive). We would need to persistently ask how we might engage people as we've never engaged them before (to develop co-intelligent, co-creative and sustained responses that would help our communities become more resilient). Finally, we would need to ask how such engagement could become integral to our governance structures (a way of life that we couldn't imagine not being there). In so doing, we could co-create ways to act effectively together to make our planet safe for future generations.

References

Atlee, T. (2003), *The Tao of Democracy: Using Co-Intelligence to Create a World that Works for us all*, The Writers Collective, Cranston, Rhode Island.

Atlee, T. (2009). <http://www.evolvingcollectiveintelligence.org> accessed 13.9.2009.

Booth (2006) "Public engagement and practical wisdom" in S. Paulin (ed) *Community Voices: Creating Sustainable Spaces*, University of Western Australia Press, Australia, pp. 12 -27.

Carson, L. (2001) "Innovative Consultation Processes and the Changing Role of Activism", *Third Sector Review*, Volume 7, No. 1, pp. 7-22.

Carson, L. (2007) "An Inventory of Democratic Deliberative Processes in Australia", <http://www.activedemocracy.net/articles/engaging%20comm%20summary%20070115.pdf>, accessed 15.03.2008.

Fishkin, J. (2006). "The nation in a room: turning public opinion into policy" *Boston Review*, March/April 2006.

Hammer, M. and Stanton, S. (1995). *The Reengineering Revolution: A Handbook*, HarperCollins Publishes Inc. NY.

Levine, P. Fung, A. Gastil, J. (2005). "Future directions for public deliberation", *Journal of Public Deliberation* Vol. 1, No. 1, Article 3.

Lincoln, A. (1863) *The Gettysburg Address*, Soldiers' National Cemetery, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, USA, Thursday Nov. 19th 1863.

Lukensmeyer, C. and Brigham, S. (2005). "Taking democracy to scale large scale interventions - for Citizens", *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, Vol 41, No 1, March 2005, pp 47-60.

McKibben, B. (2006). "How close to catastrophe", *The New York Review of Books* 53 (18), www.nybooks.com/articles/19596, accessed 18/2/08.

Potapchuk, B. Carlson, C. and Kennedy, J. "Growing governance deliberatively: lessons and inspiration from Hampton, Virginia," in Gastil, J. and Levine, P (Eds) *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, Jossey Bass, California. USA, pp. 254-270.

Sunstein, C. R. (1995). "Incompletely theorized agreements." *Harvard Law Review* 108: 1733–1772.

Willheim, E. (2006). "Government by regulation – a case of democratic deficit?", Democratic Audit of Australia, http://democratic.audit.anu.edu.au/papers/20031204_wilheim_regulation.pdf, accessed 24.02.2008.

Yencken, D. and Henry, N. (2008). *Democracy Under Siege*, Albert Park Australia, The Australian Collaboration