Institute for 21st Century Agoras

Anticipating the Challenges to the Obama vision of Bottom-up Democracy

Summary of Results from a Webscope application with an international panel (November, 15 to December 13, 2008)

http://obamavision.wikispaces.com

Prepared by:
Alexander N. Christakis and Gayle Underwood

Participants Anticipating the Challenges to the Obama vision of Bottom-up Democracy

Norma Romm
Pretoria, South Africa

Janet McIntyre
Perth, Australia

Ken Bausch
Atlanta, Georgia

Peter Jones
Toronto, Canada

Laura Harris
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Reynaldo Trevino
Mexico City, Mexico

Gayle Underwood
Michigan

Aleco Christakis
Philadelphia Crete

Kevin Dye
Boston, Massachusetts

Tom Flanagan
Boston, Massachusetts

Heiner Benking
Berlin, Germany

Larry Fergeson
Nicosia, Cyprus

Paul Hays
Sanda, Japan

Craig Lindell
New Bedford, Massachusetts

Roy Smith
London United Kingdom

Anticipating the Challenges to the Obama vision of Bottom-up Democracy

Summary of Results from a Webscope application with an international panel (November, 15 to December 13, 2008)

Prepared by:
Alexander N. Christakis and Gayle Underwood

Introduction

An international panel of thirteen experts/stakeholders in e-democracy and structured dialogue were engaged for three weeks in an asynchronous and synchronous virtual interaction employing the technology of the Webscope wiki.   The panel was invited to use the Structured Dialogic Design (SDD) process focusing on the following triggering question:

*"**In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision**?"*

[Note: Participants interested in the process of the disciplined dialogue employed in the Webscope wiki approach should visit www.harnessingcollectivewisdom.com].

Results

A summary of the work products of the international panel includes (all these products are in the public domain and are posted for review in: www.Obamavision.wikispaces.com These are:

- The list of fifty-nine inhibitors generated during Round 1 when the participants respond individually and silently to the triggering question.
- The record of the discussion for clarification of the meanings of the fifty-nine inhibitors (posted as Table 2 in Round 2 of the Websope wiki).
- The pattern displaying the classification of the fifty-nine inhibitors in thirteen similarity clusters with such labels as: Equity and Access, Facilitation, Paradigm shift, and other labels for clusters (see Figure 1 in the Websope site displayed in Round 3).
- The results of participants voting, on an individual and subjective basis, for the five inhibitors of higher relative importance in the context of the triggering question (see Table 3 at Round 4).

- The Root Cause Map of thirteen inhibitors of higher relative importance displaying the enhancement relationship among them, and drawing a distinction between strong and weak leveraged inhibitors (see Figure 2 at Round 5).

Interpretation of Figure 1 and Table 3:
The significance of structuring the fifty-nine inhibitors in thirteen similarity clusters is that the meanings of the inhibitors proposed by the participants become more transparent when seen in relation to other similar ideas. For example, by focusing on **Cluster 2: Equity and Access,** one can visualize the characteristics of the ideal model of bottom-up democracy where no citizens will be denied access because of lack of understanding of how to use the technology to participate.   By studying the inhibitors assigned to the various categories the reader gets a good appreciation of the challenges to be addressed in realizing the vision of an ideal bottom-up democracy, where the voices of all the citizens will be heard on an equitable manner.

It should be recognized, that the thirteen clusters exhibited in Figure 1 represent the dimensionality of the problematic situation (Problematique) that is being addressed by the international team The systemic principle of requisite variety demands that the design and development of a strategy for the actualization of the bottom-up democracy ideal should take into consideration all of the 13 dimensions identified in the problem definition inquiry of the group, as shown graphically in Figure 1:

http://obamavision.wikispaces.com/file/view/Figure_1-
_Amended_Classification_of_59_Inhibitors_to_Bottom-up_Democracy.pdf

In addition to making the meaning of the fifty-nine inhibitors more transparent, Figure 1 helps in the identification by the participants of the inhibitors of higher relative importance by means of individual and subjective voting. It is easier and more reliable for the participants to vote on the relative importance of the fifty-nine inhibitors by using the pattern of Figure 1. As shown in Table 3 (See Round 4 of the Webscope wiki), forty-one inhibitors received one or more votes. If the same five inhibitors had received all the 65 votes by the 13 participants, then there would be 100% agreement among the members of the panel in terms of relative importance. Because 41 inhibitors received at least one vote, the agreement in terms of relative importance is equal to 30%, which is 20% below the average measure of agreement obtained from over 500 applications of this approach to participative design and problem solving. The degree of agreement in terms of preference voting is an indicator of the complexity of the situation and the need to engage an interdisciplinary team in a disciplined dialogue for defining and solving a complex problem. Hence, the design and development of a bottom-up democracy should be considered as a complex challenge for the Obama administration, if they would like to see it happen in the next few years.

The five inhibitors that emerged as relatively more important are:

- **INHIBITOR 2: RISK OF EXCLUDING DISADVANTAGED PEOPLE.**
- **INHIBITOR 8: TECHNICAL TECHNOLOGICAL EXCLUSION.**
- **INHIBITOR 14: INSUFFICIENT ATTENTION GIVEN TO FACILITATOR CAPACITATION.**
- **INHIBITOR 18: SCALABILITY OF DISCUSSION TECHNOLOGY.**
- **INHIBITOR 23: SOCIAL CONTRACT OVERLOAD.**

It is advisable that the reader consults Table 2 (Round 2 in the Webscope) in order to get a better appreciation of the meaning assigned to the above five inhibitors by the authors who proposed them.

Interpretation of Figure 2:
Figure 2 (see http://obamavision.wikispaces.com/file/view/ObamaVision_Root_Cause_Map_Dec_13_2008_Preliminary.pdf) displays the relationship of enhancement among thirteen inhibitors that emerged as being relatively more important from the voting results presented in Table 3. This figure should be read from bottom up. Inhibitors located at Level I at the top of Figure 2 do not exert any leverage on other inhibitors because no arrows originate from those inhibitors. On the other hand, because enhancement propagates upwards, those inhibitors that are located deeper in the tree-like structure are stronger in terms of exerting enhancement leverage on other inhibitors located at the higher levels. The closer to the root of the tree, the deeper are the inhibitors and the stronger is their influence on other inhibitors along the branches of the tree. When an arrow connects two inhibitors it implies that the inhibitor at the beginning of the arrow will enhance the capacity to address the other at the end of the arrow. For example, looking at Level III of Figure 2, one sees that in accordance with the supermajority vote of the Webscope participants, the inhibitor that identifies the corporate control of the means of democracy (Inhibitor #22 at Level III) is capable of enhancing the capacity of addressing six other inhibitors along the pathways connecting it to higher level inhibitors. In other words, without addressing the domination of democracy by the private companies it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to make progress in terms of Inhibitors # 56, 53, 27, 2, 1, and 57.

When two or more inhibitors are in a box with bullets in front of them, such as Inhibitors #1 and 2 at Level I, it means that these inhibitors are in a cycle of mutual enhancement, i.e., making progress in addressing one will enhance the capacity to address the other, and vice versa. Cycles of inhibitors represent the emergence of new entities, like the combination of hydrogen and oxygen produces water. Cycles require special attention in terms of the community of stakeholders addressing the inhibitors included in the cycle.

The two inhibitors in Figure 2 that exert the strongest leverage on other inhibitors at higher levels are:

- **INHIBITOR 14: INSUFFICIENT ATTENTION GIVEN TO FACILITATION CAPACITATION.**
- **INHIBITOR 22: CORPORATE CONTROL OF THE MEANS OF DEMOCRACY.**

The reader is advised to visit the Webscope site and read a very interesting and succinct narrative interpretation of Figure 2:

http://obamavision.wikispaces.com/Results

Conclusion
By engaging the international panel of experts in a disciplined dialogue, the Institute for 21st Century Agoras, which sponsored this work, enabled them to derive a large number of inhibitors (59), clarify their meanings (Table 2), identify those of higher relative importance (Table 3), and

derive graphic patterns displaying the similarity and enhancement relationships among the important inhibitors (Figures 1 and 2). The dialogue made it possible for the participants to imagine and describe a collective understanding of the complex situation (Problematique) facing the Obama administration in their vision of realizing bottom-up democracy in the USA, and maybe other parts of the planet.

In the next Webscope application, if the panel is interested, they might want to reflect and elaborate on the meaning of this Problematique, and proceed to focus on a triggering question that will identify action options which if they were to be implemented by the community of stakeholders will bring about the ideal image of a bottom-up democracy.

Table 2

Table 2: Amended List of Inhibitors to the Obama Vision

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Inhibitor 1: technological knowhow and poverty (mcin01)

I think the major barrier is overcoming the difficulties some people face in accessing technology in USA. The learning skills needed are not great, but it needs time and some stability in one's life. If people live chaotic lives and do not have enough money to pay the bills it will be a barrier to web based services that could be overcome by touch screens in public places. This is the way India has overcome some of the barriers. Ir is possible! I think e-democracy has to have this sort of software made easy and accessible through touch screens in public and thru mobile phones. Other countries have found ways to achieve it. I will send you a link to a podcast of a lecture by G Bell - thinker in residence in South Australia from Intel. She covered this issue in her lecture this week. I am travelling to Perth and must catch my plane. I need to take time next week to get my wireless connection working on my computer- it has foxed most of the tech heads at university- you see what I mean- so close to being connected - but i have time barriers to getting myself sorted out! My husband is getting me hooked up to skype for next Saturday. So that will also make a difference to my abiltiy to communicate with you and my family much more easily.

(kmcdye) Your statement seems broader than your title as it encompasses:
Technology Access which is a function of:
-access to techology
-learning and knowledge
-time to learn
- ability to learn (seems to be implied)
- baseline education enabling learning about technology (seems implied)
-time to participate (seems to be implied)
The focus seems to be on time availability and chaotic schedule as barriers to learn and participate- which can be due to causes of poverty or of having a successfull busy life. Are both intended or is the intent of the statement primarily to highlight the poverty side.

(Aleco) Janet: Following Kevin's comments above, I would also like to point out, in my role as a member of the KMT, that it is preferable not to include two distinct ideas in one statement, but to rather split them in two statments. The reason for this, as you will discover in Rounds 3, 4, and 5, is that when we engage the group of stakeholders in constructing relational patterns, it becomes dificult to discern relationships among two inhibitors if one or both inhibitor is composed of a multiplicity of ideas.
This is a process comment by me and not a content comment. In my role as a member of the KMT I should not interfere with the content, which is completely the domain of expertise of the stakeholders who are declared in the SDD approach as the only "content experts" on the planet.

Inhibitor 2: Risk of excluding disadvantaged people (rsmith135)

a. For example the risk that processes might be set up by articulate people, for articulate people -thereby excluding people with impaired communication .
b. For example the risk that community meetings might be set up that suit people with transport - thereby excluding people without own transport, or ability to pay for travel on public transport.
c. Take a look at the photo from
Rob Kall: Bottom Up Democracy at PDA, Top-Down at DNC
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/rob-kall/bottom-up-democracy-at-pd_b_116604.html
While I am encouraged by this as an example of what legislators need to do, would you agree with me that this also excludes parts of our society?

Inhibitor 3: Layers of clay (Government administrators filtering the upward messages) (rsmith135)

"Layers of clay" was an expression used by senior managers at Ford in the 1990's.
They were frustrated that messages sent from bottom-up often failed to get through the layers of middle management.
(They were also frustrated that messages sent from top-down often failed to get through the layers of middle management.)

Inhibitor 4: Lack of facilitation skills and resource.(rsmith135)

CogniScope II

Generated by the participants at the Obamavision on Dec 1-13 2008, at www.obamavision.wikispaces.com
Prepared by GAYLE UNDERWOOD   [DELETE] = Idea was deleted or merged with another Idea   CogniScope 2 Software: www.LeadingDesign.org

1

Table 2   Table 2: Amended List of Inhibitors to the Obama Vision

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

I am in favour of processes focussed on bottom-up.
However, the demand on skills and resources will be high, and would probably exceed availability.
I fear that while many leaders use the vocabulary:
- they risk failing to comprehend the need to provide huge numbers of facilitators and process leaders.
- they risk failing to comprehend the need to provide rigorous selection and training of large numbers of facilitators and process leaders.

(kmcdye) People tend to believe that the internet as a 'resource' is extremely cheap and thus enabling of the bottom-up democracy which may normally be difficult in face-to-face sessions.

(rsmith135) Reference Kevin's question about what resources would be in short supply:
A good example is this wiki.
We have:
- skilled process designers
- skilled process leaders
- skilled moderators.
Question: At a national level:
- How many are needed?
- How many are available?
- Is there is a risk that there will be too few people with these skills to make the processes work?

Inhibitor 5: Lack of commitment by administrators to the government vision (rsmith135)

a. Bottom-up, participative processes, will probably require a huge change in philosophy and practice by government administrators.
I developed this illustration based on a helpful portrayal by Peter Senge on peoples reaction to change
Profile of peoples reaction to change
- Enthusiastic Early adopters will support in their waking hours
- Willing adopters will support in their working hours
- Neutral adopters will support if they think It is worth It
- Reluctant adopters will support if coerced
- Extremely reluctant adopters will support only as a last resort
b. For example
Obama: Hillary "doesn't believe in bottom-up democracy"
Pasted from
<http://www.prospect.org/csnc/blogs/tapped_archive?month=03&year=2008&base_name=obama_hillary_doesnt_believe_i>
Check out the last 30 seconds of this video of an Obama campaign event last Friday in Salem, Oregon. Asked to explain why, in a nutshell, people should choose him over Clinton, Obama said, "She doesn't believe, I think, in bottom up democracy. And if you don't believe in that, you're not going to change Washington. You'll tinker around the edges, but you're not going to bring the kind of change the American people are desperate for."

(kmcdye) Do you mean that the bureaucrats (administrators) will not commit to Obama's presumed vision of bottom-up democracy? (Not just 'will not commit to any government vision' right?)

(rsmith135) I mean that SOME bureaucrats (administrators) will not commit to Obama's presumed vision of bottom-up democracy? Execution of (any) high level policy requires many people at many levels to be aligned to make the vision into reality. It is natural that some people will not be in committed to the vision, and therefore under-achieve, or obstruct. An example is a quote from Barak Obama: "Hillary doesn't believe in bottom-up democracy . . . And if you don't believe in that, you're not going to change Washington". So, in the specific case of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, many people require to be aligned and committed.   Might this be hard to achieve?

Inhibitor 6: Risk of losing stamina to sustain 'resource-hungry' participative processes (rsmith135)

Table 2   Table 2: Amended List of Inhibitors to the Obama Vision

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

I have experienced a number of industry and civic participation programmes fizzling out in the long-term, when leaders lose the stamina to sustain the relentless demand on resources required by participative processes.   (I am in favour of participative processes.) Sadly, leaders are rarely willing to spend resources on getting it right first time, and are often willing to squander resources by starting over again after they got it wrong)

(kmcdye) Do you mean to say that the participative processes of which you speak tend to demand too much participation by leaders that are not driving the process?
If its a bottom-up democratic process, why would this be a problem? Does the leader have to lead the participants at the 'bottom'? Are you saying that this is a problem with the processes - that they demand too much time inappropriately? Or are you saying that there is an inherent shortfall in the capacity of leaders that will be a barrier / challenge to bottom-up democracy?

(rsmith135) Even in a bottom-up democratic process, skilled people are required to design the process, lead the process, and moderate the process.
There is a risk that leaders will lose the stamina to provide these skills on an on-going basis.
Examples I have witnessed on various occasions is great enthusiasm from leaders at startup.
But when we called upon managers to provide participants to design, and implement, and staff a working group, they have been progressively more reluctant to provide the people

Inhibitor 7: Confusions leading to exclusion of stakeholders with different lingual and cultural background (Heiner)
The dream that all people speak the same language is great - but unreal - as what is said and written and what is meant depends on the cultural setting and situational context. Speaking not the "right" language and having not the common meaning causes exclusion. And even worse, when people think they know and understand - but do not - the trouble is there. So alienation starts with not asking what stakeholdrs mean in certain contexts and doing it not F2F (face-to-face) reduces the chance to get the differences that matter. (gesture, smiles, frowning, any kind of body-language or silence as a way to communicate and react.

(kmcdye) Would you say that this problem includes the type of languaging problem depicted by Wittgenstein's 'duckrabbit'?

(Heiner) YES - but read my statements on sign and cultual systems. We presnted in the Wittgenstein Palais few years ago QUO VADIS CYBERNETICS, but maybe start herew with SuperSigns As Maps/Models: www.benking.de/systems/codata/ see MIST

Inhibitor 8: technical-technological exclusion (Heiner)
The discussion of inclusion and exclusion in our modern media-times is extensive. Internet makes exclusion less visible, so stakeholders start guessing if they are left out - or not. They might realise that they miss a certain feature or functinality, but typically they are just left out of the game - feel alienated and so segregation starts.

(paulrhays) There seem to be several ideas floating around in this idea.
1) inclusion/exclusion technologically, i.e. the digital divide
2) inclusion/exclusion politically, i.e. segregation
3) partial exclusion due to lack of some technological features or functions
Then are you suggesting that this partial technological exclusion, for example someone who can't use voice with the webinar, leading to feelings of segregation?

(Heiner) yes, I think so. But how to overcome it !? I feel we need to become multi-modal, many intelligences, senses, expressions,... have to come to a dance, form a pattern-language for shared orientations. Consider a blind man, he developed his work and walk-arounds consider animals having sonar, infrared, feel and smell and so can afford to avoid the missing optical sense. We looked with Yehudi Menhin into developing all senses in schools, and with Marylin Wilhelm immerse kids into cultures. See Yeduhi and Marylin here: benking.de/cob/COB-VL2-seeds-of-change.pdf so visit also deBono und Gardner and maybe end at looking into into bringeing together cultural systems and forms of presentation and expression. see supersigns and superstrure powerpoints: http://benking.de/systems/codata/ and the EWOC 2004 slide 3: Presentation ... Icons / Images Symbols. Index. The three sign systems (C.S. Peirce) set in relation to each ...
http://www.ihtec.org/fileadmin/archives/IHTEC/documents/ewoc-04-benking.ppt

CogniScope II   Generated by the participants at the Obamavision on Dec 1-13 2008, at www.obamavision.wikispaces.com
Prepared by GAYLE UNDERWOOD   [DELETE] = Idea was deleted or merged with another Idea   CogniScope 2 Software: www.LeadingDesign.org

3

Table 2 — Table 2: Amended List of Inhibitors to the Obama Vision

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Inhibitor 9: Overwhelming variety of individual concerns (phjones)

A significant factor inhibiting the realization of democratic participation is the overwhelming variety and volume of the concerns individuals will raise in an open-ended context. Without a clear framing of the scope for engagement, random participants (in an Internet environment) will assert claims based on their personal and closely-held concerns. In a bottom-up approach, these claims may not map to a common ground of understood and framed issues, leading to a confusing problematique and the impossibility of resolving differences between authentic contributions.

Inhibitor 10: Limited capacity for dialogic sensemaking (phjones)

Participants in a large-scale, internet-based idea contribution environment will be unable to meaningfully exchange with others to create a common ground. In a typical Internet exchange, people will find too many different contributions to be able to make sense of them.
Facilitators will also find a very limited ability to make sense of the extreme volume of independent claims, unless people have a way to collaborate on concerns held in common and to filter them before assigning a "vote" or priority.

Inhibitor 11: Lack of common purpose (phjones)

Unless the framing of bottom-up internet engagements is made very precisely, participants may expand the purpose of an issue or a context so that it suits their agenda. The framing of the concern at hand must be focused, and the language tested and clearly contextualized so that people can self-select their participation with some confidence of making a meaningful contribution.

Inhibitor 12: Insufficient access to technology (normaromm)

I am thinking here that not everybody in the USA may have easy, ready access to the technology needed to be able to participate. Perhaps those who are 'at the bottom' are also deprived on this score.

(Kmcdye) By 'capacitated' do you mean that have the necessary training? Or do you mean that they have access to necessary resources?

(normaromm) Hi Kevin So sorry I think I have missed the deadline for answering the question - I did not realise I had to do this by end Monday. Maybe I am still in time. I meant the necessary training - but now that you mention it, resources are also important. Actually I probably meant both training and resources, now that you mention it. It is interesting that as people ask others questions, the initial meaning of the statement can be thought through again. Thinking it through, I believe I meant training and resources. Thanks for helping me to think through the meaning of the statement!
Norma

Inhibitor 13: Insufficient understanding of how to use the system for participation (normaromm)

Many people may not understand how the system of participation is set up to indeed take on board their involvement.

Inhibitor 14: Insufficient attention given to facilitator capacitation (normaromm)

I am thinking here that those encouraging bottom-up democracy may underestimate how important it is for facilitators to be capacitated to lead the discussion process.

(Kmcdye) By 'capacitated' do you mean that have the necessary training? Or do you mean that they have access to necessary resources?

Inhibitor 15: Who frames the questions? (paulrhays)

George Lakoff writes about the control of the framing of the issues. In the case of abortion, is the question one of a woman's right to medical care and privacy or is the question one of when does life begin and the rights of the helpless. Depending on how the triggering question is framed, the outcome can be manipulated.

Table 2   Table 2: Amended List of Inhibitors to the Obama Vision

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

(Heiner) Paul, don't you think that we do need to ask also who "frames the answers" ? For me this is this old boundary-spanning debate. How do the problem and solution space match or overlap, and are these spaces not depending who is in cause and effect, and if this person is taking on the me, we you they, others,.. glasses - eyes - optics... So in a nutshell it is not the moderator who "manipulates" but we all mold realities to match our personal reality. Framing and boundary making, call it mental mobility is the central issue which needs to be adressed - as we are not right or wrong - but biased by our orientations and perspectives.

(paulrhays) I agree that the framing of the answers is important, but I am focusing here on the Triggering Questions. One of the basic problems in gathering stakeholders and organizing discussions is the release of control by those in power. Keeping the ability to frame the questions and hence the scope of the answers is a way of maintaining control.

(Heiner) fully agree: framing and spanning are central and critical !

(mcin01) Yes this is the key issue, everyone needs to be able to shape the agenda for a conversation by voting on triggering questions....

(Heiner) Are there frames within frames, or fields within fields, or patterns within patterns? I feel we have to outline that we speak about agreed-opon frames. and that we can move frames like we can move boundaries. Dataoverload on one side, and oversimplification on the other have to be both adressed as Aleco puts it with the laws of Variety and Parsimopny (Ashby, Miller, Warfied) for SDDP. I feel we need to think about the level of detail and context as any expression or symbol makes only sense in agreed and oriented frames of reference ! My work now since 20 years.... but maybe we can make ourself more aware of the needed temporal, spacial, cultural, ... dimensions in order to avoid confusion and fight over empty words.
2462 PANORAMA OF UNDERSTANDING 1) - 2) http://benking.de/systems/encyclopedia/newterms/#_Toc87362173
2463 PANORAMA THINKING 1) - 2)
http://benking.de/systems/encyclopedia/newterms/#_Toc87362174
0484 COGNITIVE SPACES 1)
http://benking.de/systems/encyclopedia/newterms/#_Toc87362165
Who ? is the Me, We, You, They, Others ?
I also refered to that in earlier postings:
Positions and Identities in Global Contexts: Awareness of Self and Others with me, you, we, they and "others" models
 http://benking.de/cob-paris.html

(kmcdye) This is indeed a huge issue. The study of framing is emerging as a whole field of inquiry at least since Kahneman and Tversky's seminal paper.
A good example of the approach dialogue around the issue of abortion you raise is 'Public Conversations Projects Dialogues on Abortion 1989-2002' (http://www.publicconversations.org/pcp/resource_details.php?ref_id=97)

(paulrhays) I am not familiar with Kahneman and Tversky, although I see from a quick google search that they are very respected economists.
I come from a linguistic tradition and George Lakoff at Berkeley, is a major advocate for metaphor as a fundamental cognitive process. He has brought his work, recently, into discussion fo the political arena. Here is a link to a recent news release about him: http://berkeley.edu/news/media/releases/2004/08/25_lakoff.shtml

Inhibitor 16: Participation fatigue (paulrhays)
The idea of bottom-up participation is great. We all want to be stakeholders, but we also have to have jobs and lives outside political discussions. We elect leaders because we want them to take care of the day to day stuff. We need policy wonks because they focus and have expertise in these areas. We cannot all stay that focused to cover all the issues all the time. Even in ancient Athens, they had to occasionally elect tyrants. One hint of this might be feelings many of us have after the election. We have been so focused on the issues and the campaign for so long, we feel lost?, fatigued?, strange? now that Obama is the presdent-elect.   At what point do people burn out and give up on participation. the corralary question is how can we focus the power of the people to use it effectively?

Table 2 Table 2: Amended List of Inhibitors to the Obama Vision

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Inhibitor 17: Technological distrust- or hacking the discussion. (paulrhays)

I think that there is a fear of technological solutions. Many people have seen the problems with technology in the voting machines across the country. They have seen the voting on TV shows weighted in favor of particular choices by spammers who hijack the process. There is a distrust that good ideas and many voices will get manipulated or even just deleted by more technologically savvy people. Or maybe people with way too much time on their hands.

Inhibitor 18: Scalability of discussion technology (paulrhays)

Discussion technologies, such as the one we are using, are effective in many situations. However, what is the maximum size for these technologies? How many stakeholders can be accomodated in a single discussion? With a potential 250 million stakeholders in the US alone, how can the discussion be managed? This is not just a question of physical coordination, but also technology. If every citizen sends a messag at the same time, how can the servers handle the load?

(kmcdye) By 'technology' do you mean the communication bandwidth, and server capacity? or does it include the broader concern with the process of engagement?
In the video posted in the lounge there is a 'segment on the lack of experience with scalable deliberative methods'
(http://obamavision.wikispaces.com/message/view/Lounge/7154227#7164601)

(paulrhays) What a great video, and for two points.
First, it makes clear that the technology we are talking about is NOT just the physical machinery, but also the social, interpersonal, bureaucratic, administrative, etc. machinery. It is, as Aleco says, the social evolution of humanity.
Second, most of these speakers were talking about local participation. Problems increase dramatically the more individuals involved. When I thought about scalability here, I was actually thinking about a hiring committee at our university where in an attempt to make it open and transparent, the committee expanded to where it became almost impossible to schedule interviews due to interference with the teaching duties. This is just a small example of the way problem creep in as the number of participants increase, and the problems can increase exponentially. This may put an upper limit on participation. The last speaker points the way to changing the attitudes of the society/government so that while there is a realization of the problems of scalability, there is also a commitment to continually pushing for involvement and finding new ways to engage the bottom. I think that here again the solution has to be one of diversity.

Inhibitor 19: Process Cacophony (kmcdye)

There will be a great variation in the quality of online fora for 'bottom-up' democracy.

Inhibitor 20: Market-Driven Democracy (kmcdye)

The form of democracy which comes to dominate in the online world is likely to become so because of market forces in which online fora are employed, rather than being derived from a constitutional foundation.

(paulrhays) Can you expand on this with an example so that I can understand exactly how these market forces might limit which forms dominate. Especially, how is this different from "Corporate Control of Means of Democracy"?

(Normaromm) I am not sure what you mean by the market forces here. How do they operate in relation to online fora?

(Kmcdye) By "market-forces" I mean the type of 'democratic' mechanism which leans on the aggregation mode of interaction rather than the deliberation mode. For example, online voting is akin to an online market. In online markets - prices are set. Online voting aggregates votes. The distinction between market-forces and corporate control
Any online fora which depends primarily on voting or polling is an aggregation mechanism which is similar to a market-mechanism. This type of forum is independent of its ownership / sponsorship / control. It could be public domain, independent, non-profit, or government owned and it would still be market-oriented. On the other hand, a great deliberation vehicle, nevertheless could be owned by a corporation.

Inhibitor 21: Mob Rule (kmcdye)

Table 2   Table 2: Amended List of Inhibitors to the Obama Vision

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Madison thought that by having a large republic would prevent 'Tyranny of the Majority.' The conditions that tended to ensure that no longer hold because of the internet, television, and radio. In preparation for framing the constitution Madison reviewed the history of republics. They were all fairly small. They all failed within a span of decades. Madison's insight that a large geographic scale would help prevent mob rule was due to:
1) The infrequent contact between regions would tend to preclude them developing too much alignment in belief systems / world views. Thus preserving diversity of perspective.
2)Events which may catalyze mob-like behavior we be communicated so slowly between regions that the impetus would not easily be synchronized across regions.
Both of these conditions are bypassed in large part by modern communication media.

Inhibitor 22: Corporate Control of the Means of Democracy (kmcdye)
Corporations can increase their influence in politics by controlling the online means-of-production of democracy.

(paulrhays) How is this different fom the "Market Driven Democracy" inhibitor?

(normaromm) How do corporations exert control over the online means of production?

(Kmcdye) The Corporate Control is about ownership and potential for manipulation because of power over the medium being employed.
Market-driven is about the method of bringing voices together - from a baseline of not bringing voices together in any significant way - by for example just employing polling.
One example of how a coroporation controls the online means of production is by sponsoring an organization, such as a 'think-tank' to conduct a 'push-poll.' A push-poll is a survey designed deliberately to drive the respondent towards changing their mind about some issue.

(mcin01) what measures are there to prevent manipulation?   Perhaps enabling people to expose the manipulative process.
   Deliberation can be manipulated just like votes can be manipulated.

(kmcdye) That is a good question, I do not know other than at the very least that it seems an important role of investigative journalist. Perhaps it calls for an organization that certifies e-democracy practices as satisfying certain criteria, conducts follow-up checks, and verifies results and process. This could be modulated for different democratic models - for example by changing the underlying Theory of Justice, or Theory of Democracy. One might also conduct classic evaluation according to a variety of criteria - such as the Discourse Quality Index.

Inhibitor 23: Social contract overload (tom_flanagan)
Charles Handy is said to have set the average carrying capacity for relations of trust at about 50. My concern is that we have a capacity for investing into relationships (with individuals or groups) where a significant measure of trust is needed. At some point, we can participate, but we can no longer be engaged

(Kmcdye) By 'social contract' are you alluding to Rousseau's 1762 treatise in which '... social contract implies that the people give up some rights to a government and other authority in order to receive or jointly preserve social order." Or are you using the phrase to characterize trust relationships? If the latter, the notion of contract would seem to be something you do not need within the context of trusting relationships. Or are you suggesting that some form of a social contract is required when collaboration endeavors to span more than fifty relationships? I could see you combining all three somehow of course.

(tom_flanagan) Obligated trust .... a contract among the many circles of aquaintances and friends that an individual has ... which, at some state, fill to capacity ... I can want to be an active partner to more than I can actually actively participate in ....
This is a step below information overload ... it consigns an individual to partipate in planning without the capacity to particpate in the subsequent collaborative action ... it is like the many, many committee meetings that administrators get called to join --- when their

Table 2   Table 2: Amended List of Inhibitors to the Obama Vision

direct action or their mobilized action capacity are not relevant.
I don't know about Rousseau's 1762 treatise .... it has been a while since we spoke
cheers
t

Inhibitor 24: Individual Cycle Time (tom_flanagan)

MIT's Charles Fine wrote a book titled "Clockspeed : Winning Industry Control in the Age of Temporary Advantage." I was impressed with the implications of different cycle times ... base on innovation waves and processing capaciites ... in different organizations, and how this relates to linking different types of orgaizations operationally. My point here is that different individuals will have different information processing rates based on traditions and capacities, and that those who process the information related to this wikirapidly and constantly may not be able to sense the struggles of other participants, and therefore may unintentionally leave them behind. The same issue relates to my understanding of Obama's vision for inclusive participation.

Inhibitor 25: Mending and merging through humor (tom_flanagan)

Many social interactions thrive specifically because through shared humor, individals develop a basis for sharing intimacies that forge trust. electronic text communication is a poor vehicle for sharing trust. My concern is related to generating trust, but more specifically for applied humor in cyberspace.

(Heiner) Dear Tom, do you mean just humour but all senses and aesthetics, or all senses and fine arts - se we can dance for recite (poetry) to mend and merge and morph realities and so overcome cognitive/conceptual barriers. Maybe look at Poetry Making and Policy making to make my question maybe more clear: http://laetusinpraesens.org/docs/poetpol0.php so can we arrange the marriage of realities and "lifes" !?

(mcin01) Do you think humour always translates across people, places and circumstances? What is funny to one person can be quite confronting to another person.
Personally I find that I need to be very formal and careful when trying to communicate respectfully. Even when people share a culture and they are old friends - or family (kith - more than kin with whom you have established a shared meaning and in jokes) being careful with humour is important.

Just a thought....laughter is so good when it works- but we need to read lots of cues to work out if we are on the mark - so to speak when we are trying to be funny.....
good wishes
Janet

Inhibitor 26: Disconnect - reconnect hurdles (tom_flanagan)

When I step away from the wiki, I get into other business. The pressure to step back into the wiki is a wee bit larger each time that I step away. My concern is that while asynchronous contributions are good, the iterative reconnection with what is accumulating over time is itself a bit draining. It is only a few key strokes, but then I know that I cannot "browse" efficiently. I like opening up the full expanse of a printed newspapter to take in the big view. Having this capacity for browsing would reduce the hurdles. There may be other ways, of course. I am speaking of an example to better explain what I see as a barrier.

(Heiner) Dear Tom - that is why I said we need interactivity with synchronised browsing and asynchron and synchron audio - depending on the numebr of people around "in the 'room'" - we also discussed voting and polling to have more closeness to see where people are conceptually - whcih is more easy when youa re in one physical room and can share body and face languages. I see the wiki as an opener and as a hurdle - How do you want to "re"??-connect the hurdels ?

(Paulrhays) Are you talking about physical limits, such as the lack of screen space to lay everything out for perusal, or maybe temporal limits, such as the time in and then time out of the discussion?

Table 2 Table 2: Amended List of Inhibitors to the Obama Vision

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

(Heiner) an item, an entity, a wall, a hurdle,...or call id guard-rails in political dicourse, all need common frames of references, otherwise they are n ot concrete and can not by related, specially in Cyberculture-Cyberspace.
http://benking.de/Global-Change/un-vision-television.html I feel we need to agree on common frames of references to gauge the human prospectus: http://benking.de/Global-Change/FIGXX-Melbourne-1994.htm
http://benking.de/systems/encyclopedia/newterms/#_Toc87362164
Using only words is like pissing in the wind. We need to add commen senses and agreements. we called it an embodied covenant or a world-house / ecudomy: http://benking.de/covenant/tagore/index-Dateien/frame.htm
http://www.newciv.org/nl/newslog.php/_v396/__show_article/_a000396-000038.htm
I hope i do not loose you, if - no problem, take it easy...

Inhibitor 27: Rushing to action (kbausch)
People lack the patience to calmly and systematically examine root causes in a group situation

(Kmcdye) In Paulo Friere's work on the Pedagogy of the Oppressed he characterizes action without dialogue as activism, and dialogue without action as verbalism.
Would you say the complement of your statement is Sluggish Dialogue, talk that does not lead to action? Should we make that as another statement.
Or is your idea that there is a lack of balance between reflection and action?

(Kbausch) I definitely agree with Friere. I think a complementary impediment labeled Sluggish Dialogue is in order. Calliingthis situation a Lack of Balance is too static a formulation

(mcin01) Dear Ken Rushing to action is part of the panic attack when we are threatened -fight or flight- we are programmed I think to act. So perhaps we could be programmed to talk as an action- if this becomes a cultural meme- when stressed talk do not fight or run away.... just a thought for a new democracy

Inhibitor 28: Quick fix methodologies (kbausch)
These methodologies elicit participation and good feeling, but at best they fasten group activities on erroneous priorities that over time exhaust the good will and energy of participants

Inhibitor 29: Cognitive overload (kbausch)
Online comments submitted in a variety of formats will overload the ability of any individual or group to make senze of a situation.

(kmcdye) Please provide some examples of what you mean by 'variety of formats'

Inhibitor 30: Private versus Public (Reinhold1)
Many of the stakeholders will not have an idea of where the frontier lies between the interest of local groups and the interest of the whole population,trying to advance a response from the authorities really focused on transcendental problems to be solved. Many people have no idea at all of what a State must put attention to. Many believe that individual problems can be solved by the actions of the stablished government.   It will be difficult to make an online selection of the important issues against the urgent ones, because we will no be able to sufficiently understand different contexts of the stakeholders. I am sure that the problems in Cyprus have different specificities than problems in USA, though they might become expressed similarly.

(Heiner) Reinhold, Local versus universal is quite a span to bridge, some peopel tried with local and global:
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Glocal#Development_of_the_concept
which is tough already - so how to open the space to the Universal ? Do you include languages, emmotions, cultural expressions of any kind? as is UNESCO's quest ?? or do you even go further, include in your "big picture" also emotions, amouts of happyness and suffering?? I ask because fellows from IM were also connected in something I call
an art of governance or decision making: Panetics as developed by Ralph Siu. You might have heard the names John Warfield and Ralph R. Widner. http://benking.de/isp-speakers.html. So how wide and deep is your "umbrella" ?
http://www.robert.algosphere.org/panetics/ammess.html. See there: The

Table 2 Table 2: Amended List of Inhibitors to the Obama Vision

quantification debate at the International Society for Panetics (ISP) seems to revolve around two or three questions : whether (is it possible? if yes, for what uses?) and how to quantify (Warfield 2000/03/26, Widner 2000/04/24). or: "We need a counterpart to economic quantification. Panetics is to pains what economics is to pleasures" (Koisumi 2000/03/22) and more on Widner here (in the slgosphere link above):Beyond our debate, our challenge is to develop tools that are practical (Widner 2000/04/05a)

(Reinhold1) Your comment lead me to specify better
Dear Heiner: You are right indeed with your observation. I do not know if I could change my contribution Inhibitor 30 to title it: Private versus Public. If I could do so, I would be delighted. I was probably very tired at night when I posted this inhibitor.
Nevertheless, when I write in the explanation paragraph that the problem is that we will not ne able to sufficiently understand different contexts of the stakeholders when we use the online technology, I was thinking, yes, of emotions, subjective appreciation of importance or relevance or urgence of local groups, who would like to be not only heard, but also receive specific attention to their requests. I was trying to contrast the needs and sorrows of the whole population of one country with the needs and sorrows of local specific
groups (for example: the common prisoneers in whole USA and the feelings of the entire population about the ways USA uses to rehabilitate criminals versus the feelings of the prisoners in Guantánamo). What I was trying to emphasize is that many societal problems might not be viewed in the same way by the installed governments than by individuals or small groups, even both have reason in maintaining their claims to be perceived by everyone.
Reynaldo

(Ken) Would you agree that every fruitful question has to state the context in which it is asked? Questions out of context will fritter away into philosophical emptiness.

(Heiner) yes - you can call it cyberculture or vapourware. WE tried to add the HUMAN RIGHT (60th anniversary now)to access to information being amended added with the right to access to context - a difficult - sensitive - but worth to consider issue. the right to question and dig deeper !! you are doing this with SDDP already a long way
but as we have seen with the world-map issues some time ago. You do care little about fit and poove and fideltiy of for example "foot-prints"..: Heiner Benking's Blog - quergeist.info: Obamas World ... Maybe this article mentioning Georg W. Bush and his Earth ... www.newciv.org/nl/newslog.php/_v396/__show_article/_a000396-000060.htm about fideltity and repeatability or "fit" as you have learned in school not to question and revisit. you remember for your book my questuion about the MAP you use!?
remember?: Culture Imperialism, some basics and concerns - [Diese Seite übersetzen]Recognizing and Responding to Cultural Imperialism .... Heiner Benking, Berlin. Entwurf für Symposium "Kulturimperialismus", Prof.
..benking.de/Global-Change/Cultural-Imperialism.htm or GW Bush and his worldviews/maps:
WORLD_VIEWS in transition - WORLDMAPS revisited World Maps, World Models, and World Views in Transition ... said Heiner Benking on the occasion of the International Intercarto InterGIS 12 Conference, ...
benking.de/Global-Change/worldviews-in-transition.htm
take care and ahve a nice weekend !

(Reinhold1) Your comment lead me to specify better Dear Heiner:
You are right indeed with your observation. I do not know if I could change my contribution Inhibitor 30 to title it: Private versus Public. If I could do so, I would be delighted. I was probably very tired at night when I posted this inhibitor. Nevertheless, when I write in the explanation paragraph that the problem is that we will not ne able to sufficiently understand different contexts of the stakeholders when we use the online technology, I was thinking, yes, of emotions, subjective appreciation of importance or relevance or urgence of local groups, who would like to be not only heard, but also receive specific attention to their requests. I was trying to contrast the needs and sorrows of the whole population of one country with the needs and sorrows of local specific groups (for example: the common prisoneers in whole USA and the feelings of the entire population about the ways USA uses to rehabilitate criminals versus the feelings of the prisoners in Guantánamo). What I was trying to emphasize is that many societal problems might not be viewed in the same way by the installed governments than by individuals or small groups, even both have reason in maintaining their claims to be perceived by everyone.

(Heiner) am fully with you: we stated that "the challenge is to expand the horizon of comapssion and reduce the suffering in the world": Ralph G.H. Siu hat eine Dukkha Skala (Einheiten für Leiden) entwickelt, ...www.benking.de/mitgefuehl-leiden.html

Table 2

Table 2: Amended List of Inhibitors to the Obama Vision

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Inhibitor 31: Is there a practical follow-up methodology?(Reinhold1)

Some might become frustrated because there is no design yet of a practical on-line methodology to closely look for the follow-up stage of bottom-up democracy.

(paulrhays) Are you referring to the creation of an action plan? Or other ways of actualizing the results of the discussion?

(Heiner) a good question - lets talk more about this !

(Reinhold1) Dear Heiner: Yes, I was talking about an action plan, once it has been produced by online activity of many people. There will be needed laws and norms for regulating the whole process in order to really make the big mental construct come to reality. The dialogue channel between people and government must be wisely designed. We need to become a fifth power after the fourth power of the mass media, the judicial, the legislative and the executive powers representing the real three already powers in action. I believe the complexity of designing a methodology that pleases all the people but also really engages in producing synergies among all involved actors, is a very difficult task, precisely on the grounds that we have already talked about: different space and time horizons and emotional contexts, the explicitly recognized common ethical root behind the whole effort (I agree with Ken on the Golden Rule) but I think it is needed more than that value: probably a consensus on what "fairness" or "equity" really mean to humans; and also the insight that we are obtaining real results in bettering the consciousness and action of humanity to attain a good Earth convivium or a better world if you like.

(Reinhold1) Dear Paul: You see... I identified you with Heiner, and looking again, I found that you posted the question of the action plan. Please forgive me. This is because Heiner had already asked me other things, apart from this one, and of course I know he is also involved in our dialogue on this Round 1 page. Thank you for your comprehension. I do not dominate this wonderful toy yet, and I find that our game with it expands everyday.
Yours,
Reynaldo

Inhibitor 32: Required insight of hypothetical results as worthwhile (Reinhold1)

No matter how a good problematique is constructed, I believe that its display only gives us and governmental authorities an hypothetical view of the more complex situation of reality, that may become easily transformed by not foreseen phenomena. If this belief pervades society before a scienific statement comes out from these experiences, many will want to loose contact with this kind of group work.

(normaromm) Do you mean that people need to be presented with a less hypothetical view in order that they will "stay on" in the participative process? That is, are you suggesting that a more "scientific" (and less "hypothetical") view should be provided at some stage? Or are you suggesting that people recognize that science itself can only make hypothetical statements? I am not sure either how you believe people should take account of unforeseen phenomena.

(reinhold1) Dear Norma: I will need to explain my statement by recurring to my experience with IM workshops facilitation. Once I led a workshop with two different groups (isolated from each other) but working on the same general theme: "The insertion of México in the progressively globalizing and global e-economy". Both groups came with different results regarding the "problematique" for suceeding in that process. Only some ideas were "similar" and I would say that others were complementary results. The maps looked utterly different. So I asked Aleco what that meant. He answered that we needed to go over a second-order level (a scientific one) to cope with these results. He also answered that in both cases "results represented hypothetical views" attached to the specific stakeholders each group had. I then understood that discovering "the right map" for that complex process regarding the e-economy Mexico needed to engage, required many new insights on many different "problematiques" produced over a single theme, and not only looking at "one problematique" achieved by only one group of stakeholders
When I say that it is required an insight of the value of getting "one problematique", I am referring on the one side that we are only at the beginning of applying the "Method of Science". Nevertheless, on the second side, I also find that having "one and only one problematique" is much better than nothing, at least for the group of stakeholders that produced it.
So, if we want to transcend the hypothetical level and go further to attain scientific results, I think that there is yet much work to do that

CogniScope II

Generated by the participants at the Obamavision on Dec 1-13 2008, at www.obamavision.wikispaces.com
Prepared by GAYLE UNDERWOOD   [DELETE] = Idea was deleted or merged with another Idea   CogniScope 2 Software: www.LeadingDesign.org

11

Table 2

Table 2: Amended List of Inhibitors to the Obama Vision

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

has not been already done.
Of course, I am implying that science can go beyond hypothesis and make statements that transcend unforeseen phenomena, because it goes through a correct process of abstraction to the root of the phenomena observed and implied. What I am questioning is if the fact of achieving "one problematique" by "one and the same group" is enough to state "that result" as a "scientific one", because I really doubt it after my experience. Frustration of active participants might come as a probable event, if they also find we are proposing hypothesis only, and if it could come to their minds that other results (hypothetical likewise) might reflect better the analysed complex situation.
I hope I explained my previous posting better to you. Please help me telling me what you think about this.
Thanks in advance,
Reynaldo

(normaromm) HI Reynoldo   I think I am a bit late in my response because I misread the deadlnes and thought Tuesday was end of Round 2 and start of 3. Anyway, I see you are worried that participants may find the results too hypothetical and may wonder whether another set of analysts posing a different way of setting the problem and framing answers in a different way may come up with a "better" analysis of the complexity of the situation. My feeling is that once participants are aware that in social life there is always another way of framing questions and answerse, then they become open to listening to alternatives and to broadening the scope of their thinking/analysis. That means that it is a continuous process of people being open to different alternatives, and they can make syntheses that "work" for action at particular points in time - but which are not seen as final.
I agree with kmcdye (Inhibitor 56) who said that if we embrace pluarity , we can orient ourselves to finding systems in which there is not a singular conclusion as to how to consider the situation (that is, not a consensus of thinking/analysis) but a dissensus that still "works". I think that people can manage to work with dissensus and that they do not need to believe that there is a "right" answer. In other words, I beleive that people can operate at the level of the hypothetical (to use your terms).Does this make any sense to you? Norma

Inhibitor 33: Can we state a common ethical root in stakeholders? (Reinhold1)
Multicultural environments are very important and need to be recognized, though you live in the same country. What is ethically important for a cuban segment of society, might not be for indigenous people of USA, and it also might not be for Asian countries immigrants. How can we put attention to minorities views and values without asking too much from the government? Are their values less important than the ones hold by native americans? Our values will not necessarily become appreciated by others, but they will certainly influence our way of thinking about and expressing societal problems. I feel that the online experience might exclude the possibility of making the bottom-up democracy a process to achieve real results, because of the different intersubjectivities implied.

*(Heiner) common root !? with space and time horizon ? - as Hans Joans considereed in his RESPONSIBILITY: Ethicns with Space and Time Horizon. Some people urged us to "watch out metaphors" so is your metaphor linear, flat, embodied, ... ? maybe you like: "Spacial Metaphors for Viewpoint Generation" to see that I am not just fiddeling with and over words but mean something shared and embodied: http://www.laetusinpraesens.org/docs/spatialm.php   http://www.sumscorp.com/articles/art50.htm
 http://www.uni-ulm.de/uni/intgruppen/memosys/symbol10.htm*

(Reinhold1) Dear Heiner: Perhaps I was discoursing on the same line as with inhibitor 30... I was not implying a complete consensus of a hierarchical value list for the whole humanity, appliable everywhere and everytime, because it is obvious that something like that does not exist. However, I believe that global consensus on a single value, perhaps few values, might be there as a point of departure, aside from religions or cultural traditions and views. I assume that the Cypriot Turks had something in common with the Cypriot Greeks that concluded in having a dialogue with concrete results. The problem lies in that "common ground or root" not being clearly and distinctly expressed by us all, so we really can't know what helped us come into agreement. Once, Aleco said: "perception moves the world". Words have, like Heidegger stated, the attribute to hide and to discover something at the same time. "Online words" are better to hide than to unveil real matters, and the proof is that I am needing to clarify my statement for you. Different Space and Time Horizons are certainly a problem for human beings, when it regards to the effectiveness of a really wide dialogue experience. I would say that I am not sure that I like being
affected by the financial crisis originated in the USA. In fact, I certainly hate to have become severely affected by something originated elsewhere outside my country. The title for this inhibitor number 33 is consequently expressed as a probably unsolvable question, or a "no way out" that is nevertheless influencing the whole dialogue and a bottom-up democracy process. The debate

Table 2   Table 2: Amended List of Inhibitors to the Obama Vision

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

would be without an end, because humanity has not become completely conscious itself.
Reynaldo

(Ken) The only universal ethical root would seem to be the Golden Rule. In this context that would be hearing each other and respecting each others authenticity.

(Heiner) The ONLY !? We discussed with HANS KÜNG last night in the INSTITUTE FRANCAIS and his FRENCH COLLEGUES from Ecole Superieur...he said we need to go beyond terms to feelings on commons. MAybe start here:
http://www.thur.de/philo/Benking/effe_en.html we looked with YEHUDI MENUHIN into included all senses all intelligences (Gardner) maye see also Marylin Wilhelm: http://www.thur.de/philo/Benking/effe_en.html and Maragrite and not just me and Yehudi.... I am FULLY with you for the GOLDEN RULE - we loved and sherished it but we need to go beyond ! see oikos - ecumene - ecudomy and global embodied coveant & EARTH CHARTA:
25 May 2007 ... For "House of Wisdom" above see also Oikos, Ecumene, Ecudomy [link] ... [< Back] [Seeds of Change - Heiner Benking's Blog - quergeist.info ...
www.newciv.org/nl/newslog.php/_v396/__show_article/_a000396-000038.htm

(Reinhold1) Dear Heiner: Perhaps I was discoursing on the same line as with inhibitor 30... I was not implying a complete consensus of a hierarchical value list for the whole humanity, appliable everywhere and everytime, because it is obvious that something like that does not exist. However, I believe that global consensus on a single value, perhaps few values, might be there as a point of departure, aside from religions or cultural traditions and views. I assume that the Cypriot Turks had something in common with the Cypriot Greeks that concluded in having a dialogue with concrete results. The problem lies in that "common ground or root" not being clearly and distinctly expressed by us all, so we really can't know what helped us come into agreement. Once, Aleco said: "perception moves the world". Words have, like Heidegger stated, the attribute to hide and to discover something at the same time. "Online words" are better to hide than to unveil real matters, and the proof is that I am needing to clarify my statement for you. Different Space and Time Horizons are certainly a problem for human beings, when it regards to the effectiveness of a really wide dialogue experience. I would say that I am not sure that I like being affected by the financial crisis originated in the USA. In fact, I certainly hate to have become severely affected by something originated elswhere outside my country. The title for this inhibitor number 33 is consequently expressed as a probably unsolvable question, or a "no way out" that is nevertheless influencing the whole dialogue and a bottom-up democracy process. The debate would be without an end, because humanity has not become completely conscious itself.
Reynaldo

Heiner) yes, Reynaldo ! perception rules the world, but how can something be shared without being concrete? I wrote about "Concreteness in Integral Worlds:
http://benking.de/gebser2001.html and "Show or Schau": http://benking.de/show-schau.html   I feel we have some deep common ground, specially when you state "humanity has not become completely conscious itself".   So how about raing the level and the width ? concretely ! Konrad Lorenz Institute was important for me - on the way....:
http://benking.de/worldview-compositions.html http://benking.de/culture/konrad-lorenz-emergenz-1997/sld001.htm
If we think about ethics, we should not do it in conjunction with pragmatics. The foudner of systematic neo-pragmatism - started also the general model theory, Herbert Stachowiak: http://benking.de/Stachowiak/modelle.htm

Inhibitor 34: Illusive Equifinality (kmcdye)
The proliferation of online venues for bottom-up democracy will outpace their thorough analysis regarding the robustness of each system. As a result, users and facilitators of such systems will never know if the results of their deliberations would be different if their process or technology were a bit different.
Equifinality is the notion coined by von Bertalanffy as a substitute for the notion of goals in open systems. The idea is that the same end point can be reached by multiple paths. Is this true of all forms of online democracy - regardless of which system is used - the same result will hold? To the extent that one can ascertain that convergence for a particular forum regarding a particular situation conducted in a particular family of systems is independent of perturbations in the means, can this assessment be done more cheaply than the cost of conducting the forum itself? If not, then these venues rarely be sufficiently evaluated in order to know if the system is producing chaos, being manipulated, or providing an air of democracy while actually just being a venue for watching a new kind of interactive TV.

Table 2

Table 2: Amended List of Inhibitors to the Obama Vision

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Inhibitor 35: The Moral Hazard of Anonymity (kmcdye)

Anonymous contributions in the context of rebellion against political oppression can be very valuable because of the freedom from accountability. Anonymity in deliberations also poses moral hazards due to that same freedom. The provision or accommodation of anonymity in online fora, while offering a type of freedom to the author creates a cost on the other participants in ascertaining the authenticity of the contribution. It is therefore left to the group to ascertain the verisimilitude of a contribution, its veracity.
The lack of accountability of anonymous contributors can, as a result, inject a high degree of noise into online communication, derailing the intent of the community. Then in the event of such a discourse abuse there can be a majority suppression of the anonymous contributor rather than enhancing trust. Policing this then can entail a high cost to the group's time so this is often left to moderators. Then the moderator is in the unfortunate position of authority over an individual's discourse. Deciding when to and when not to accommodate anonymity is still a challenge to the emergence of trust online. This debate on anonymity in the public sphere has been going on for half a century. At best a site can espouse its particular underpinnings in philosophy, social psychology, and political science. Unfortunately, people proliferating online fora will rarely have the necessary background reading on the topic to even know what the issues are.
The decision on whether or not to offer anonymity in online fora will continue to be happenstance due to the paucity of expertise on the topic by the fora developers and facilitators, and because a coherent framework is yet to come into being.

Inhibitor 36: Vehicle (LLHarris)

Lack of effective vehicle for average American/working people to contribute their voice.

(paulrhays) Is there, or should there be, one vehicle, or many. Then there are proficiency issues. Time issues for working people may also limit the use of what vehicles there are.

(LLHarris) This is my opinion that simply there is a lack of effective vehicle or vehicles. I think according to the structure of the dialogue you should add a statement about proficiency. My statement would include more than one vehicle. I'm just stating that there is a lack of vehicle. When developing vehicles the issues you have brought up should be considered.

Inhibitor 37: Lack of method (LLHarris)

Lack of method for government to reach out to people

(paulrhays) Broadcast is the usual form, but seems to be in a state of flux, as new methods of sharing information are implemented. Or are you referring to something other than the dissemination of information

(LLHarris) I'm talking about reaching out to "the People" for the purpose of building ground up civic enagement and public participation. Information dissemination would be part of it but it would also include how to solicit input and other forms of engagement.

Inhibitor 38: Lack of experience (LLHarris)

Lack of experience on the part of "the people" to provide pro-active solutions

(kmcdye) Could you provide a few specific examples - Lack of experience with what? solutions to what?

(LLHarris) Most folks are not trained to be pro-active. We tend to be reactive. Our cognitive skills are limited because the U.S. educational system does not teach us to decision-makers. So we tend to complain or define and redefine problems instead of actually developing creative and proactive solutions. An example would be teen pregnancy or teen STD's. The solution that some have come up with is abstinence – not really a practical solution. The point is that most people in the United States don't usually have experience providing solutions. We do not take an active role in community activities for the most part and we certainly don't have the opportunity to contribute ideas.

Inhibitor 39: One man. One Vote (LLHarris)

CogniScope II | Generated by the participants at the Obamavision on Dec 1-13 2008, at www.obamavision.wikispaces.com
Prepared by GAYLE UNDERWOOD   [DELETE] = Idea was deleted or merged with another Idea   CogniScope 2 Software: www.LeadingDesign.org

14

Table 2
Table 2: Amended List of Inhibitors to the Obama Vision

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Existence of "one man – one vote" mentality. Both "the people" and the decision-makers don't have experience with other forms of political participation. There is a need to change the way we view civic engagement.

(mcin01) yes participation at the local level in such a way that we create links with others and the environment is different from the compartmentalised approach of one vote for one term of office.
LOL
Janet

(paulrhays) Can you give more examples of political participation?

(LLHarris) Well, right now we have blinders on that political participation equals voting. But I think if we learn to think of politics differently, we can be very creative in how to get more people involved. My definition of political participation include working for a candidate, community organizing volunteering at the polls but all of these are limited to elections. Some of the governments of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, for instance, do not recognize their citizens unless they engage in certain community obligations, like religious duties, repairing and cleaning the irrigations systems or hosting meals for other community members. Specifically, in my statement, I am talking about civic engagement, being a part of the decision-making processes at all levels of government – participating in the creating solutions. Stake-holder problem sovling.

Inhibitor 40: Getting to root causes (LLHarris)

Few methods exist for uncovering the root causes of issues and very few people have ever participated in processes for doing so thus making it very difficult for "the people" to effectively tackle complex issues

(mcin01) Yes, people try to reduce complexity by compartmentalising and controling it- we can work with complexity and find patterns in ongoing iterations. We are doing it.
regards
Janet

(paulrhays) Can we expand the kinds of processes that reach for root causes?

(LLHarris) I only know of one - Root Cause Mapping or CogniScope developed by CWA but there may be others.

Inhibitor 41: Great Expectations (LLHarris)
Need to engage people without building their expectations that their specific ideas will be implemented immediately

(mcin01) Yes - but if we do not dream we will achieve nothing
LOL

(paulrhays) Are we talking about training the stakeholders, not just the facilitators? This could be a harder problem than that of resources for training facilitators.

(LLHarris) I'm not suggesting the solution to address this problem. I'm just stating the barrier. In the next Round, we will begin to suggest ways to address the most influential obstacles. I'm saying that we need a vehicle that allows the "participants" to understand that they are contributing their voice but that Obama's Administration may not be able to implement the suggestions right away. The fear is that people would get burnt out or cynical about a participatory process that resulted in nothing.

Inhibitor 42: Ownership of contact information (paulrhays)
If discussions are conducted by the Office of the President, then the government owns the lists of names, contact info, etc.

Inhibitor 43: Official transparency rules (paulrhays)

Table 2

Table 2: Amended List of Inhibitors to the Obama Vision

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

These rules may block a lot of bottom-up participation due to the onerous rules regarding recording and publishing all the comments.

(kmcdye)By 'block' do you mean preclude the participation because in anticipation of the transparency requirements people will give up before they try?

(paulrhays) No, I think it is a top-down problem in asking for bottom-up advice. AS I understand the rules, and I admit I haven't read the law, the transparency rules mean that all communications of the President must be preserved. So, an official request for participation by everyone would mean that eery response would have to be saved. And not only saved, but I think they all have tobe logged in some way. This may take resources that are not actually available. The same rules also prevent any federal employee from participating in political activities while on the job. There was a lot of complaint when the Bush administration created videos for news outlets promoting their policies. So, I think that conservatives might complain of any attempt to form policy from the bottom-up. It is a very fine line here, but one that needs to be clarified

Inhibitor 44: Maintaining currency (paulrhays)
Because of the nature of residual copies of texts/images/video on the web, making sure comments are current and relevant may be a problem

(mcin01) Not if the software updates as it is used. Our prototype software does this. Denise de Vries and I are happy and keen to work with Aleco and the team to meld our software capabilities.....
LOL
Janet

(paulrhays) This would assume that a single software package or a software standard is used. I think this might be a problem.

Inhibitor 45: Literacy (paulrhays)
There are serious problems with literacy in using a technology that functions on written texts for input/output.

(mcin01) If we make the touch screens that use icons and we also support the participation of the marginalised by giving training in hubs, then we can overcome this. Software exists that can address this concern
regards
janet

Inhibitor 46: Modality shifts (paulrhays)
The original modality of dialog was face-to-face. Then the shift was to written text. The current/next shift is to video. These shifts all force changes in the process, both positive and negative.

(kmcdye) Do you mean live video - or the exchange of video clips? An interpretation of the trend you identify seems to be a retreat from a high-bandwidth communication medium - face-to-face communication, to a low bandwidth one - text, back to a high bandwidth one. This seems to complete a loop back to the face-to-face. There is even technology that makes live video much closer to making eye-contact. Is your statement also concerned with the archiving of the video or primarily the effect on the process?
There is a school of thought that it is appropriate to employ multi-modalities, even in face-to-face settings. Similarly, online I believe there is a trend towards multi-modality. By modality shifts - do you include the shifting of modalities in an ongoing process?

(paulrhays) YEs, to all of that, especially multi-modalities, and shifting during the process. The next generation is multi-tasking and they are doing it in more effective ways. Wen I was a student I sat next to a guy who kept making editorial comments in his notes about the content of the lecture. What happens to a discussion where people are listening, but also fact checking, communicating others, and such. Face-to-face was high band width, but it was also very focused. Now, with everyone connected constantly, the focus has diffused. I think that multi-modality will change everything.
Welcome to the singularity.

Table 2
Table 2: Amended List of Inhibitors to the Obama Vision

Inhibitor 47: The persistant blindness of special interest (CraigLindell)
It is almost axiomatic in the sociology of knowledge that ruling groups can in their thinking become so intensely interest bound that they literally can not see certain facts that would challenge their sense of domination. (Mannheim)

(kmcdye) In the context of the Obamavision motif, of problems attaining technology-enabled, bottom-up democracy),
Are you saying that 'intensely interest-bound' state is an impenetrable ideology of the ruling class? That no matter how successful the bottom-up democratic processes are, that the "impenetrable ideology" of those in power reamains the limit?

Inhibitor 48: Fear of openness (CraigLindell)
I have a friend and Mentor who with the orks of Nikos kazantzakis went on a Grecian pilgrimage. One day he walked into the agora and was struck by the overwhelming feeling that Agoraphobia was not so much the fear of open space, but rather the fear of openness.

(mcin01) people are anonymous they are free. Yes this is because of lack of trust. It is the paradox that underpins democracy. Democracy must be free and open , but this is based on trust that is eroded when powerful stakeholders overstep the mark in the name of policing democracy ....but this threatens civil society.
Courage is necessary for survival of democracy
LOL
janet

(kmcdye) Would you say that this aprrehension of "openness" was like a fear in anticipation of becoming disclosive?

(mcin01) Do you think that these inhibitors could be addressed through participation from an early age - at all levels at school ?
Perhaps democracy could be re-designed to enable young people to take part in shaping their world. This would build a sense of attachment and a stake in society. In other words participation is both the means and the end to support democracy and wellbeing. If people are encouraged to participate and they can learn that they will not be identified in the process, then perhaps these inhibitors will be addressed
all the best
Janet

Inhibitor 49: Distrust of others (CraigLindell)
Thee is a pathological distrust of others in America. it is a if social darwinism has left us thinking about each other as the enemy or even worse something to be consumed. Thomas Berry and Bian Swimme in their book "THe new universe story s=uggested that we are on the edge of a new geological era in which we will meet other human beings as a collection of objects or a community of subjects.

(mcin01) If people are anonymous they are invisible and safe!

(aleco) This statment by Janet is again a comment to Craig's statment. Comments are acceptable as long as they are not negative.

(kmcdye) The universe is a communion of subjects, not a collection of objects." Thomas Berry While through our dialogue processes we seek to "a communion of subjects" are you saying that there is this counteracting force to viewing interaction with others as "a collection of objects"? And it is that which causes distrust? Or the distrust creates the 'collection of objects' perspective?

(paulrhays) I am not sure of this concept of distrust as pathological. Isn't there another side of the coin that people are independent and don't want to be told what to do? It seems that this could also give rise to the same social behaviour. Is this behavior connected with the large scale nature of bottom-up democracy for all the USA? Does this behavior occur in small discussions?

(craig) Good question Paul. Yes it is mostly an issue of scale. But it is also about how you are perceived. At an alumni seminar I

Table 2 Table 2: Amended List of Inhibitors to the Obama Vision

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

attended with about 12 others, as we introduced ourselvers there were a doctor and two lawyers among us. The doctor could not get over the hostility he felt for the legal profession. He simply chose not to participate in the discussion. So much of how we are governed is based on how we compete not on how we collaborate. And we tend to personalize the results. That is what I meant by pathological. The doctor could not engage the lawyer as another person but only as an object characterized by his profession. I, myself, feel that the legal structure in the United States is a betrayal of justice. Even my corporate attorney complaind that the legal system in the US is "set up so only the scoundrels win"

(mcin01) Do you think that these inhibitors could be addressed through participation from an early age - at all levels at school ? Perhaps democracy could be re-designed to enable young people to take part in shaping their world. This would build a sense of attachment and a stake in society. In other words participation is both the means and the end to support democracy and wellbeing. If people are encouraged to participate and they can learn that they will not be identified in the process, then perhaps these inhibitors will be addressed
all the best
Janet

Inhibitor 50: limited capacity to understand irony and paradox (CraigLindell)
Just as we have the cognitive limits of 7 + or - 2 linear relationships, I also think there are manay who neither understand irony or paradox. I think these limitations threaten successful process.

(mcin01) It is vital to communicate in a respectful way. This entails accepting that we need to communicate in ways that are meaningful for the other person. Communication is about fostering relationships and understanding.
regards
Janet

(Kmcdye) Why does this incapacity to appreciate these particular forms of rhetoric threaten the success of a process? Isn't that what dialogue processes are supposed to help?
Please provide a few examples of what you mean

Inhibitor 51: Fatigue even among enthusiasts (CraigLindell)
I have not been throught a workshop with SDD without becoming exhausted by the nm.

(mcin01) Yes but the software needs to be accessible on a range of bits of technology - if we could serf across phones to computers to palm pilots that interacted with everything via the cloud it would be easy.
LOL
Janet

(kmcdye) The fatigue of participating in a workshop is the face-to-face version? Do you think that this also pertains to a fatigue of the online mode of engagement? Is this statement particular to SDD or just in general - to a fatigue with any engagement in bottom-up democracy? Is it a type of fatigue, like one gets tired when first starting to exercise, that eventually feels like 'a good tired' and you want to do it every day?

(normaromm) did not understand the reference to nm - is this some special technology terminology? What does nm mean?

(CraigLindell) My experience with Tom is that the structured questions while efficient are quite taxing. But I have ADD and a very short attention span. I always want to be doing something else. My apologies for the nm I guess I was already onto something else On second thought however, when I was part of aq group my recollection is that it was easier.
craig
(mcin01) if you are really engaged you forget about time and get into a zone...I sometimes lose track of time when I am really engaged

Table 2

Table 2: Amended List of Inhibitors to the Obama Vision

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

in an activity- gardening or writing, for example

Inhibitor 52: digital divide (larryf)
If Internet technology is the means of participation then those who do not have access will be disenfranchised

(mcin01) Dear Larry Not if we find ways to make it accessible through touch screens in public places - if it can be done in India it can be done in the USA
regards
Janet

(Aleco) The statment made by Janet is an example of a comment on the contribution of Larry. Comments are acceptable aqs long as they are not negative about the statment of the author.

(larryf) Janet, This is a good example of how to circumvent this potential hazard. We should come up with more ways to ensure privacy such as this. Thank you.

Inhibitor 53: Tracking dissidents (larryf)
Technology allows for those participants who hold non-conventional or controversial views to be tracked, harassed and prosecuted by the government.

(mcin01) This is indeed true - technology is just a tool that can be used in positive or negative ways. It is the global covenant that is built through it that could help to fight back!
LOL
Janet

(kmcdye) Is the scope of your concern broader than the technology related to the venue for the bottom-up democracy work? or is it a concern specifically with for example online means of deliberation and the traceability of the participants via the web?
(Larryf) 1 - My concern is for the respect and privacy of those people who are asked to be engaged and contribute. It is also for their rights originally guaranteed in the Bill of Rights and their civil liberties as those have deteriorated in the past few years witnessed by the rhetoric and actions of those who propagate the war on terror's insistence that "you are either with us or with the terrorists", but also by the indication of the Obama admin to continue the policies of the Bush admin especially in not repealing the Orwellian entitled "Patriot Act'.
2 - Basically I do not trust the government to respect a citizen's right to free speech. Once those protected words of dissent are uttered I believe the person who spoke them can face harsh retaliation from the government and if they are transmitted by Internet then the obvious means of tracking will be technology.

Inhibitor 54: Trust (larryf)
The entire effort can be considered as just another farce by those who believe that this administration is just the puppet face of the ruling elite who actually run the country.

(kmcdye) This is a lack of trust of the ruling elite by prospective participants? Or is it a lack of trust of people driving whatever you consider to be 'the effort? If the effort is being driven bottom-up, and not by the ruling elite - is it also supscetible to this distrust of the ruling elites? So, is this a healthy skepticism?

(larryf) 1 - This is a lack of trust coming from the people.
2 - I consider the effort to be "engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology"
3 - The effort is actually coming from the administration as indicated in the Triggering question because it refers to Obama's attempt to engage the people and not the people's attempt to engage the admin.
4 - Is asking me if this is a healthy skepticism a value judgment?

Table 2
Table 2: Amended List of Inhibitors to the Obama Vision

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

(aleco) Asking you if this is a "healthy skepticism," especailly since the question is posted by Kevin Dye, is a healthy question and not a value judgment. So Kevin has not violated any rule yet.

(larryf) Dear Kevin, I think any type of skepticism is healthy especially if it gets people to discuss and think outside of their usual boxes. So, yes I think this is a healthy skepticism because it could lead to a way for people who do not trust the government to participate if their privacy could be protected.
best,

(kmcdye) Its interesting. Often when we talk about barriers or challenges there is a tendency to cast a negative tone on some of our statements. Here, you depict a natural force in our society, which can indeed act as an inhibitor on bottom-up participation - but with respect to what can also be viewed as a positive societal drive to ensure integrity.

Inhibitor 55: Unforeseen Structural Holes (CraigLindell)
In markets they are missing elements. In bringing a new product to market they tend to be places in the process where investment capital interests or customer interests wane at criotical points. For example in Bring a new product to market the innovators give you an innital lift and you think you are finally moving but once you have met their interest there is a trough or hole befor you attract the early adopters and another hole before you start to see a normal consistency of a rising of the s curve.

(kmcdye) In the context of 'bottom-up democracy,' does this pertain to the diffusion of a social movement? Are you saying that what might get started as a bottom-up democratic deliberation by the lead adopter type of personality is likely to stall out because of a lack of linkage with the followers type of personalities?

(paulrhays) Yes, can you relate this a bit more closely to the bottom-up movement we are talking about here?

(CraigLindell) I think this response may have come from my relative lack of understanding of SDD. As I think about it the SDD process always has the ability to go back and integrate thet which at an earlier period was unforeseen. My apoligies. This observation probaby should be removed.

(aleco) We can remove it Craig since you are the author. However, I would like to point out in my role as a KMT member that the triggering question focuses on inhibitors of realizing bottom-up democracy as informed by our SDD experiences and not necessarily inhibitors that emerged or relevant to the practice of SDD. You think aobut it and you make the final call.

Inhibitor 56: The Ineradicability of Antagonism (kmcdye)
There is an inherent tendency for online collaborative process to seek to drive towards consensus. The deliberative mode of democracy seeks a rationalist discourse and leaves open the question of how to address the clash of collective forms of identification and their resulting passions. Technology and process which can accommodate 'agonistic pluralism,' while avoiding a reduction to aggregative solutions is warranted.
(paulrhays) Are technology and process which can accommodate 'agonistic pluralism,' while avoiding a reduction to aggregative solutions possible and therefor a design feature we need to be mindful of, or is the lack of these a current problem that needs to be resolved?
(kbausch) Are you suggesting that "agonistic pluralism" is a desirable outcome?
(paurlrhays) am not suggesting it is desirable, but you seem to imply it is inevitable. So, is its accommodation something that is being done, or is it a problem we need to tackle? For example, do you think this is something structured dialogs can deal with? Or do we need to work out methods that include this accommodation?
(kmcdye) 'Agonism' is the pre-Socratic, so-called Heraclitean methodology of inquiry - agonistic inquiry. That is it is largely unprescribed, undirected, and agonizing. Most attempts at online fora channel people into a particular mode of interaction - which is very useful for efficiency and to reduce the learning curve. Agonistic inquiry says more something like - 'anything goes.' The pluralism part means that - let's find systems in which here is not a singular conclusion, a consensus - rather a 'disensus' that still works.
I don't think there are good systems out there for either one never mind the combination. 'Agonism' is the pre-Socratic, so-called Heraclitean methodology of inquiry - agonistic inquiry. That is it is largely unprescribed, undirected, and agonizing. Most attempts at

Table 2   Table 2: Amended List of Inhibitors to the Obama Vision

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

online fora channel people into a particular mode of interaction - which is very useful for efficiency and to reduce the learning curve. Agonistic inquiry says more something like - 'anything goes.'   The pluralism part means that - let's find systems in which here is not a singular conclusion, a consensus - rather a 'disensus' that still works. I don't think there are good systems out there for either one never mind the combination.

(mcin01) We need to test out ideas in a range of contexts and all the people who are to be affected should be encouraged to have a say. This is done through putting one idea and then considering opposing ideas and making a synthesis. this is good for science, democracy and ethics
all the best
janet

(kmcdye) This reminds me of work I did on design methods. I looked at catalogues / taxonomies of design methods expecting a great diversity. But most of them followed the so-called ASE paradigm - Analysis-Synthesis-Evaluation. ASE is locked into a Newtonian mindset. I became aware that the diversity needed to be increased.
Similarly, SDD was originally created in large part to address the 'interdisciplinarity' problem which was a big topic in the 1960s-70s. Of course this is largely concerned with the language problem and communications. But to the extent that they are disciplines within the Cartesian paradigm of science - there is again, not enough diversity in perspective.
So too, in democracy, it is easy to fall into the trap of assembling a group of stakeholders - that all hold the same worldview / value's system - and diversity of perspective must be increased. What you suggest - is that rather than leaving to chance that enough diversity of perspective would be generated by a particular group - that it should be deliberately injected. That is a very intriguing idea. Of course, employing a dialectic method of inquiry is more of a method Plato would use rather than an agonistic method - such as that of Heraclitus and the pre-socratics. We could diversify the methods of inquiry as well - along the lines of Churchman, or my work on the Architectonics of Inquiry.

Inhibitor 57: The Average Citizen as 'Deaf Spectator' (kmcdye)
Walter Lippman likened the average American - or 'outsider,' as he tellingly named him - to a "deaf spectator in the back row at a sporting event." "He does not know what is happening, why it is happening, what ought to happen" and "he lives in a world he cannot see, does not understand, and is unable to direct."
(The New Yorker, March 31, 2008, pg. 53.)
One of the most instructive and heated debates on the appropriate model of democracy in America transpired between Walter Lippman and John Dewey, in the early 20th Century. John Dewey of course the American Pragmatist, author on education and democracy. Lippman was a publisher and considered a father of the public relations profession as well as the field of media studies, and wrote three seminal books on the relationship of the press and democracy.
The debate concerned the assumed requirement for an informed citizenry by the founding fathers. Lippman contended that such assumption was reasonable only for the landowning class of city dwellers in colonial times. Already by the early 20th century Lippman felt that industrialized / capitalist society was too complex for the average citizen to understand in sufficient depth to make crucial decisions. Lippman tended therefore to defer to experts, leaning heavily on representatives, and a technocracy of experts, knowledge-based elites informing them, to make decisions on behalf of the populace. Lippman viewed public opinion merely as (what was then the early form of) polling. The role of the polis was simply to aggregate their votes on their representatives.
Dewey leaned more on conversation than information and the ability to deliberate and debate.
Of course, while we as civic engagement practitioners do not like to admit it, Lippman's model is the one that has come to dominate American democracy.
And we as practitioners and methodologists have not yet developed excellent models for marrying the knowledge elites with "The Deaf Spectators."

Inhibitor 58: Poverty , lack of knowledge and fear (mcin01)

Fear of technology and fear that people could be identified could undermine e-democracy and e-governance along > with poverty and lack of technical knowhow.
I suggested ways to overcome these concerns , namely:

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

1. Poor people should be able to access the internet through touch screens in transport hubs or on public transport

2. They should feel confident that they cannot be identified and

3. The software must be easy to use.

4. Training should be provided at internet hubs in shopping centres funded by a range of public , private and NGO services.

Inhibitor 59: Obviating decisions by non-participants (phjones)

The vision of collective contribution to democratic process must yield to policy at some point. Even with good faith participation, the contributions made in online dialogue may be obviated by political decisions made in subsequent policy trade-offs. Experienced policy makers, aware of this dynamic, may choose not to participate, yet they may make decisions for opposing positions.

Table 2 List of Inhibitors with explanations-Dec 3 08

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Inhibitor 1: technological knowhow and poverty (mcin01)

I think the major barrier is overcoming the difficulties some people face in accessing technology in USA. The learning skills needed are not great, but it needs time and some stability in one's life.

If people live chaotic lives and do not have enough money to pay the bills it will be a barrier to web based services that could be overcome by touch screens in public places. This is the way India has overcome some of the barriers. Ir is possible!

I think e-democracy has to have this sort of software made easy and accessible through touch screens in public and thru mobile phones. Other countries have found ways to achieve it. I will send you a link to a podcast of a lecture by G Bell - thinker in residence in South Australia from Intel. She covered this issue in her lecture this week.

I am travelling to Perth and must catch my plane. I need to take time next week to get my wireless connection working on my computer- it has foxed most of the tech heads at university- you see what I mean- so close to being connected - but i have time barriers to getting myself sorted out! My husband is getting me hooked up to skype for next Saturday. So that will also make a difference to my abiltiy to communicate with you and my family much more easily.

Inhibitor 2: Risk of excluding disadvantaged people (rsmith135)

a. For example the risk that processes might be set up by articulate people, for articulate people -thereby excluding people with impaired communication .

b. For example the risk that community meetings might be set up that suit people with transport - thereby excluding people without own transport, or ability to pay for travel on public transport.

c. Take a look at the photo from

Rob Kall: Bottom Up Democracy at PDA, Top-Down at DNC

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/rob-kall/bottom-up-democracy-at-pd_b_116604.html

While I am encouraged by this as an example of what legislators need to do, would you agree with me that this also excludes parts of our society?

Inhibitor 3: Layers of clay (Government administrators filtering the upward messages) (rsmith135)

"Layers of clay" was an expression used by senior managers at Ford in the 1990's.

They were frustrated that messages sent from bottom-up often failed to get through the layers of middle management.

(They were also frustrated that messages sent from top-down often failed to get through the layers of middle management.)

Inhibitor 4: Lack of facilitation skills and resource.(rsmith135)

I am in favour of processes focussed on bottom-up.

However, the demand on skills and resources will be high, and would probably exceed availability.

I fear that while many leaders use the vocabulary:

- they risk failing to comprehend the need to provide huge numbers of facilitators and process leaders.

- they risk failing to comprehend the need to provide rigorous selection and training of large numbers of facilitators and process leaders.

Inhibitor 5: Lack of commitment by administrators to the government vision (rsmith135)

a. Bottom-up, participative processes, will probably require a huge change in philosophy and practice by government administrators.

I developed this illustration based on a helpful portrayal by Peter Senge on peoples reaction to change

Profile of peoples reaction to change

- Enthusiastic Early adopters will support in their waking hours

- Willing adopters will support in their working hours

- Neutral adopters will support if they think It is worth It

- Reluctant adopters will support if coerced

- Extremely reluctant adopters will support only as a last resort

b. For example

Obama: Hillary "doesn't believe in bottom-up democracy"

Pasted from <http://www.prospect.org/csnc/blogs/tapped_archive?month=03&year=2008&base_name=obama_hillary_doesnt_believe_i>

Table 2 — List of Inhibitors with explanations-Dec 3 08

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Check out the last 30 seconds of this video of an Obama campaign event last Friday in Salem, Oregon. Asked to explain why, in a nutshell, people should choose him over Clinton, Obama said, "She doesn't believe, I think, in bottom up democracy. And if you don't believe in that, you're not going to change Washington. You'll tinker around the edges, but you're not going to bring the kind of change the American people are desperate for."

Inhibitor 6: Risk of losing stamina to sustain 'resource-hungry' participative processes (rsmith135)
I have experienced a number of industry and civic participation programmes fizzling out in the long-term, when leaders lose the stamina to sustain the relentless demand on resources required by participative processes.
(I am in favour of participative processes.
Sadly, leaders are rarely willing to spend resources on getting it right first time, and are often willing to squander resources by starting over again after they got it wrong)

Inhibitor 7: Confusions leading to exclusion of stakeholders with different lingual and cultural background (Heiner)
The dream that all people speak the same language is great - but unreal - as what is said and written and what is meant depends on the cultural setting and situational context. Speaking not the "right" language and having not the common meaning causes exclusion. And even worse, when people think they know and understand - but do not - the trouble is there. So alienation starts with not asking what stakeholdrs mean in certain contexts and doing it not F2F (face-to-face) reduces the chance to get the differences that matter. (gesture, smiles, frowning, any kind of body-language or silence as a way to communicate and react.

Inhibitor 8: technical-technological exclusion (Heiner)
The discussion of inclusion and exclusion in our modern media-times is extensive. Internet makes exclusion less visible, so stakeholders start guessing if they are left out - or not. They might realise that they miss a certain feature or functinality, but typically they are just left out of the game - feel alienated and so segregation starts.

Inhibitor 9: Overwhelming variety of individual concerns (phjones)
A significant factor inhibiting the realization of democratic participation is the overwhelming variety and volume of the concerns individuals will raise in an open-ended context. Without a clear framing of the scope for engagement, random participants (in an Internet environment) will assert claims based on their personal and closely-held concerns. In a bottom-up approach, these claims may not map to a common ground of understood and framed issues, leading to a confusing problematique and the impossibility of resolving differences between authentic contributions.

Inhibitor 10: Limited capacity for dialogic sensemaking (phjones)
Participants in a large-scale, internet-based idea contribution environment will be unable to meaningfully exchange with others to create a common ground. In a typical Internet exchange, people will find too many different contributions to be able to make sense of them. Facilitators will also find a very limited ability to make sense of the extreme volume of independent claims, unless people have a way to collaborate on concerns held in common and to filter them before assigning a "vote" or priority.

Inhibitor 11: Lack of common purpose (phjones)
Unless the framing of bottom-up internet engagements is made very precisely, participants may expand the purpose of an issue or a context so that it suits their agenda. The framing of the concern at hand must be focused, and the language tested and clearly contextualized so that people can self-select their participation with some confidence of making a meaningful contribution.

Inhibitor 12: Insufficient access to technology (normaromm)
I am thinking here that not everybody in the USA may have easy, ready access to the technology needed to be able to participate. Perhaps those who are 'at the bottom' are also deprived on this score.

Inhibitor 13: Insufficient understanding of how to use the system for participation (normaromm)

Table 2   **List of Inhibitors with explanations-Dec 3 08**

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Many people may not understand how the system of participation is set up to indeed take on board their involvement.

Inhibitor 14: Insufficient attention given to facilitator capacitation (normaromm)
I am thinking here that those encouraging bottom-up democracy may underestimate how important it is for facilitators to be capacitated to lead the discussion process.

Inhibitor 15: Who frames the questions? (paulrhays)
George Lakoff writes about the control of the framing of the issues. In the case of abortion, is the question one of a woman's right to medical care and privacy or is the question one of when does life begin and the rights of the helpless. Depending on how the triggering question is framed, the outcome can be manipulated.

Inhibitor 16: Participation fatigue (paulrhays)
The idea of bottom-up participation is great. We all want to be stakeholders, but we also have to have jobs and lives outside political discussions. We elect leaders because we want them to take care of the day to day stuff. We need policy wonks because they focus and have expertise in these areas. We cannot all stay that focused to cover all the issues all the time. Even in ancient Athens, they had to occasionally elect tyrants. One hint of this might be feelings many of us have after the election. We have been so focused on the issues and the campaign for so long, we feel lost?, fatigued?, strange? now that Obama is the presdent-elect.   At what point do people burn out and give up on participation. the corralary question is how can we focus the power of the people to use it effectively?

Inhibitor 17: Technological distrust- or hacking the discussion. (paulrhays)
I think that there is a fear of technological solutions. Many people have seen the problems with technology in the voting machines across the country. They have seen the voting on TV shows weighted in favor of particular choices by spammers who hijack the process. There is a distrust that good ideas and many voices will get manipulated or even just deleted by more technologically savvy people. Or maybe people with way too much time on their hands.

Inhibitor 18: Scalability of discussion technology (paulrhays)
Discussion technologies, such as the one we are using, are effective in many situations. However, what is the maximum size for these technologies? How many stakeholders can be accomodated in a single discussion? With a potential 250 million stakeholders in the US alone, how can the discussion be managed? This is not just a question of physical coordination, but also technology. If every citizen sends a messag at the same time, how can the servers handle the load?

Inhibitor 19: Process Cacophony (kmcdye)
There will be a great variation in the quality of online fora for 'bottom-up' democracy.

Inhibitor 20: Market-Driven Democracy (kmcdye)
The form of democracy which comes to dominate in the online world is likely to become so because of market forces in which online fora are employed, rather than being derived from a constitutional foundation.

Inhibitor 21: Mob Rule (kmcdye)
Madison thought that by having a large republic would prevent 'Tyranny of the Majority.' The conditions that tended to ensure that no longer hold because of the internet, television, and radio.
In preparation for framing the constitution Madison reviewed the history of republics. They were all fairly small. They all failed within a span of decades. Madison's insight that a large geographic scale would help prevent mob rule was due to:
1) The infrequent contact between regions would tend to preclude them developing too much alignment in belief systems / world views. Thus preserving diversity of perspective.
2)Events which may catalyze mob-like behavior we be communicated so slowly between regions that the impetus would not easily be synchronized across regions.

CogniScope II   Generated by the participants at the Obamavision on Dec 1-13 2008, at www.obamavision.wikispaces.com
Prepared by GAYLE UNDERWOOD   [DELETE] = Idea was deleted or merged with another Idea   CogniScope 2 Software: www.LeadingDesign.org

3

Table 2   List of Inhibitors with explanations-Dec 3 08

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Both of these conditions are bypassed in large part by modern communication media.

Inhibitor 22: Corporate Control of the Means of Democracy (kmcdye)
Corporations can increase their influence in politics by controlling the online means-of-production of democracy.

Inhibitor 23: Social contract overload (tom_flanagan)
Charles Handy is said to have set the average carrying capacity for relations of trust at about 50. My concern is that we have a capacity for investing into relationships (with individuals or groups) where a significant measure of trust is needed. At some point, we can participate, but we can no longer be engaged.

Inhibitor 24: Individual Cycle Time (tom_flanagan)
MIT's Charles Fine wrote a book titled "Clockspeed : Winning Industry Control in the Age of Temporary Advantage." I was impressed with the implications of different cycle times ... base on innovation waves and processing capaciites ... in different organizations, and how this relates to linking different types of orgaizations operationally. My point here is that different individuals will have different information processing rates based on traditions and capacities, and that those who process the information related to this wikirapidly and constantly may not be able to sense the struggles of other participants, and therefore may unintentionally leave them behind. The same issue relates to my understanding of Obama's vision for inclusive participation.

Inhibitor 25: Mending and merging through humor (tom_flanagan)
Many social interactions thrive specifically because through shared humor, individals develop a basis for sharing intimacies that forge trust. electronic text communication is a poor vehicle for sharing trust. My concern is related to generating trust, but more specifically for applied humor in cyberspace.

Inhibitor 26: Disconnect - reconnect hurdles (tom_flanagan)
When I step away from the wiki, I get into other business. The pressure to step back into the wiki is a wee bit larger each time that I step away. My concern is that while asynchronous contributions are good, the iterative reconnection with what is accumulating over time is itself a bit draining. It is only a few key strokes, but then I know that I cannot "browse" efficiently. I like opening up the full expanse of a printed newspapter to take in the big view. Having this capacity for browsing would reduce the hurdles. There may be other ways, of course. I am speaking of an example to better explain what I see as a barrier.

Inhibitor 27: Rushing to action (kbausch)
People lack the patience to calmly and systematically examine root causes in a group situation

Inhibitor 28: Quick fix methodologies (kbausch)
These methodologies elicit participation and good feeling, but at best they fasten group activities on erroneous priorities that over time exhaust the good will and energy of participants

Inhibitor 29: Cognitive overload (kbausch)
Online comments submitted in a variety of formats will overload the ability of any individual or group to make senze of a situation.

Inhibitor 30: Local versus universal (Reinhold1)
Many of the stakeholders will not have an idea of where the frontier lies between the interest of local groups and the interest of the whole population,trying to advance a response from the authorities really focused on transcendental problems to be solved. Many people have no idea at all of what a State must put attention to. Many believe that individual problems can be solved by the actions of the stablished government.
It will be difficult to make an online selection of the important issues against the urgent ones, because we will no be able to sufficiently understand different contexts of the stakeholders. I am sure that the problems in Cyprus have different specificities than problems in USA, though they might become expressed similarly.

Table 2   List of Inhibitors with explanations-Dec 3 08

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Inhibitor 31: Is there a practical follow-up methodology?(Reinhold1)
Some might become frustrated because there is no design yet of a practical on-line methodology to closely look for the follow-up stage of bottom-up democracy.

Inhibitor 32: Required insight of hypothetical results as worthwhile (Reinhold1)
No matter how a good problematique is constructed, I believe that its display only gives us and governmental authorities an hypothetical view of the more complex situation of reality, that may become easily transformed by not foreseen phenomena. If this belief pervades society before a scienific statement comes out from these experiences, many will want to loose contact with this kind of group work.

Inhibitor 33: Can we state a common ethical root in stakeholders? (Reinhold1)
Multicultural environments are very important and need to be recognized, though you live in the same country. What is ethically important for a cuban segment of society, might not be for indigenous people of USA, and it also might not be for Asian countries immigrants. How can we put attention to minorities views and values without asking too much from the government? Are their values less important than the ones hold by native americans? Our values will not necessarily become appreciated by others, but they will certainly influence our way of thinking about and expressing societal problems. I feel that the online experience might exclude the possibility of making the bottom-up democracy a process to achieve real results, because of the different intersubjectivities implied.

Inhibitor 34: Illusive Equifinality (kmcdye)
The proliferation of online venues for bottom-up democracy will outpace their thorough analysis regarding the robustness of each system. As a result, users and facilitators of such systems will never know if the results of their deliberations would be different if their process or technology were a bit different.

Equifinality is the notion coined by von Bertalanffy as a substitute for the notion of goals in open systems. The idea is that the same end point can be reached by multiple paths. Is this true of all forms of online democracy - regardless of which system is used - the same result will hold? To the extent that one can ascertain that convergence for a particular forum regarding a particular situation conducted in a particular family of systems is independent of perturbations in the means, can this assessment be done more cheaply than the cost of conducting the forum itself? If not, then these venues rarely be sufficiently evaluated in order to know if the system is producing chaos, being manipulated, or providing an air of democracy while actually just being a venue for watching a new kind of interactive TV.

Inhibitor 35: The Moral Hazard of Anonymity (kmcdye)
Anonymous contributions in the context of rebellion against political oppression can be very valuable because of the freedom from accountability.
Anonymity in deliberations also poses moral hazards due to that same freedom.
The provision or accommodation of anonymity in online fora, while offering a type of freedom to the author creates a cost on the other participants in ascertaining the authenticity of the contribution. It is therefore left to the group to ascertain the verisimilitude of a contribution, its veracity.
The lack of accountability of anonymous contributors can, as a result, inject a high degree of noise into online communication, derailing the intent of the community. Then in the event of such a discourse abuse there can be a majority suppression of the anonymous contributor rather than enhancing trust.
Policing this then can entail a high cost to the group's time so this is often left to moderators. Then the moderator is in the unfortunate position of authority over an individual's discourse.
Deciding when to and when not to accommodate anonymity is still a challenge to the emergence of trust online. This debate on anonymity in the public sphere has been going on for half a century. At best a site can espouse its particular underpinnings in philosophy, social psychology, and political science. Unfortunately, people proliferating online fora will rarely have the necessary background reading on the topic to even know what the issues are.
The decision on whether or not to offer anonymity in online fora will continue to be happenstance due to the paucity of expertise on the topic by the fora developers and facilitators, and because a coherent framework is yet to come into being.

CogniScope II   Generated by the participants at the Obamavision on Dec 1-13 2008, at www.obamavision.wikispaces.com
Prepared by GAYLE UNDERWOOD   [DELETE] = Idea was deleted or merged with another Idea   CogniScope 2 Software: www.LeadingDesign.org

5

Table 2   List of Inhibitors with explanations-Dec 3 08

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Inhibitor 36: Vehicle (LLHarris)
Lack of effective vehicle for average American/working people to contribute their voice.

Inhibitor 37: Lack of method (LLHarris)
Lack of method for government to reach out to people

Inhibitor 38: Lack of experience (LLHarris)
Lack of experience on the part of "the people" to provide pro-active solutions

Inhibitor 39: One man. One Vote (LLHarris)
Existence of "one man – one vote" mentality. Both "the people" and the decision-makers don't have experience with other forms of political participation. There is a need to change the way we view civic engagement.

Inhibitor 40: Getting to root causes (LLHarris)
Few methods exist for uncovering the root causes of issues and very few people have ever participated in processes for doing so thus making it very difficult for "the people" to effectively tackle complex issues

Inhibitor 41: Great Expectations (LLHarris)
Need to engage people without building their expectations that their specific ideas will be implemented immediately

Inhibitor 42: Ownership of contact information (paulrhays)
If discussions are conducted by the Office of the President, then the government owns the lists of names, contact info, etc.

Inhibitor 43: Official transparency rules (paulrhays)
These rules may block a lot of bottom-up participation due to the onerous rules regarding recording and publishing all the comments.

Inhibitor 44: Maintaining currency (paulrhays)
Because of the nature of residual copies of texts/images/video on the web, making sure comments are current and relevant may be a problem

Inhibitor 45: Literacy (paulrhays)
There are serious problems with literacy in using a technology that functions on written texts for input/output.

Inhibitor 46: Modality shifts (paulrhays)
The original modality of dialog was face-to-face. Then the shift was to written text. The current/next shift is to video. These shifts all force changes in the process, both positive and negative.

Inhibitor 47: The persistant blindness of special interest (CraigLindell)
It is almost axiomatic in the sociology of knowledge that ruling groups can in their thinking become so intensely interest bound that they literally can not see certain facts that would challenge their sense of domination. (Mannheim)

Inhibitor 48: Fear of openness (CraigLindell)
I have a friend and Mentor who with the orks of Nikos kazantzakis went on a Grecian pilgrimage.
One day he walked into the agora and was struck by the overwhelming feeling that Agoraphobia was not so much the fear of open space, but rather the fear of openness.

Inhibitor 49: Distrust of others (CraigLindell)
Thee is a pathological distrust of others in America. it is a if social darwinism has left us thinking about each other as the enemy or even worse something to be consumed. Thomas Berry and Bian Swimme in their book "THe new universe story s=uggested that we are on the

Table 2 List of Inhibitors with explanations-Dec 3 08

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

edge of a new geological era in which we will meet other human beings as a collection of objects or a community of subjects.

Inhibitor 50: limited capacity to understand irony and paradox (CraigLindell)
Just as we have the cognitive limits of 7 + or - 2 linear relationships, I also think there are manay who neither understand irony or paradox. I think these limitations threaten successful process.

Inhibitor 51: Fatigue even among enthusiasts (CraigLindell)
I have not been throught a workshop with SDD without becoming exhausted by the nm.

Inhibitor 52: digital divide (larryf)
If Internet technology is the means of participation then those who do not have access will be disenfranchised

Inhibitor 53: Tracking dissidents (larryf)
Technology allows for those participants who hold non-conventional or controversial views to be tracked, harassed and prosecuted by the government.

Inhibitor 54: Trust (larryf)
The entire effort can be considered as just another farce by those who believe that this administration is just the puppet face of the ruling elite who actually run the country.

Inhibitor 55: Unforeseen Structural Holes (CraigLindell)
In markets they are missing elements.
In bringing a new product to market they tend to be places in the process where investment capital interests or customer interests wane at criotical points. For example in Bring a new product to market the innovators give you an innital lift and you think you are finally moving but once you have met their interest there is a trough or hole befor you attract the early adopters and another hole before you start to see a normal consistency of a rising of the s curve.

Inhibitor 56: The Ineradicability of Antagonism (kmcdye)
There is an inherent tendency for online collaborative process to seek to drive towards consensus. The deliberative mode of democracy seeks a rationalist discourse and leaves open the question of how to address the clash of collective forms of identification and their resulting passions. Technology and process which can accommodate 'agonistic pluralism,' while avoiding a reduction to aggregative solutions is warranted.

Inhibitor 57: The Average Citizen as 'Deaf Spectator' (kmcdye)
Walter Lippman likened the average American - or 'outsider,' as he tellingly named him - to a "deaf spectator in the back row at a sporting event." "He does not know what is happening, why it is happening, what ought to happen" and "he lives in a world he cannot see, does not understand, and is unable to direct."
(The New Yorker, March 31, 2008, pg. 53.)

One of the most instructive and heated debates on the appropriate model of democracy in America transpired between Walter Lippman and John Dewey, in the early 20th Century. John Dewey of course the American Pragmatist, author on education and democracy. Lippman was a publisher and considered a father of the public relations profession as well as the field of media studies, and wrote three seminal books on the relationship of the press and democracy.

The debate concerned the assumed requirement for an informed citizenry by the founding fathers. Lippman contended that such assumption was reasonable only for the landowning class of city dwellers in colonial times. Already by the early 20th century Lippman felt that industrialized / capitalist society was too complex for the average citizen to understand in sufficient depth to make crucial decisions.

CogniScope II   Generated by the participants at the Obamavision on Dec 1-13 2008, at www.obamavision.wikispaces.com
Prepared by GAYLE UNDERWOOD   [DELETE] = Idea was deleted or merged with another Idea   CogniScope 2 Software: www.LeadingDesign.org

7

Table 2   List of Inhibitors with explanations-Dec 3 08

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Lippman tended therefore to defer to experts, leaning heavily on representatives, and a technocracy of experts, knowledge-based elites informing them, to make decisions on behalf of the populace. Lippman viewed public opinion merely as (what was then the early form of) polling. The role of the polis was simply to aggregate their votes on their representatives.

Dewey leaned more on conversation than information and the ability to deliberate and debate.
Of course, while we as civic engagement practitioners do not like to admit it, Lippman's model is the one that has come to dominate American democracy.
And we as practitioners and methodologists have not yet developed excellent models for marrying the knowledge elites with "The Deaf Spectators."

Inhibitor 58: Poverty , lack of knowledge and fear (mcin01)

Fear of technology and fear that people could be identified could undermine e-democracy and e-governance along > with poverty and lack of technical knowhow.
I suggested ways to overcome these concerns , namely:
1. Poor people should be able to access the internet through touch screens in transport hubs or on public transport
2. They should feel confident that they cannot be identified and
3. The software must be easy to use.
4. Training should be provided at internet hubs in shopping centres funded by a range of public , private and NGO services.

Figure 1

Figure 1: Preliminary Classification of the 58 Inhibitors to the Obama Vision.

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Cluster 1: TECHNOLOGICAL KNOWHOW

1: technological knowhow and poverty (mcin01)

2: Risk of excluding disadvantaged people (rsmith135)

8: technical-technological exclusion (Heiner)

12: Insufficient access to technology (normaromm)

13: Insufficient understanding of how to use the system for participation (normaromm)

36: Vehicle (LLHarris)

45: Literacy (paulrhays)

52: digital divide (larryf)

58: Poverty, lack of knowledge and fear (mcin01)

Cluster 2: INFORMATION FILTERS

3: Layers of clay (Government administrators filtering the upward messages) (rsmith135)

Cluster 3: FACILITATION

4: Lack of facilitation skills and resource. (rsmith135)

14: Insufficient attention given to facilitator capacitation (normaromm)

CogniScope II

Generated by the participants at the Obamavision on Dec 1-13 2008, at www.obamavision.wikispaces.com
Prepared by GAYLE UNDERWOOD   [DELETE] = Idea was deleted or merged with another Idea   CogniScope 2 Software: www.LeadingDesign.org

1

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Cluster 4: GOVERNMENT COMMITMENT

5: Lack of commitment by administrators to the government vision (rsmith135)

32: Required insight of hypothetical results as worthwhile (Reinhold1)

55: Unforeseen Structural Holes (CraigLindell)

Cluster 5: PROCESS CACOPHONY

6: Risk of losing stamina to sustain 'resource-hungry' participative processes (rsmith135)

16: Participation fatigue (paulrhays)

19: Process Cacophony (kmcdye)

23: Social contract overload (tom_flanagan)

24: Individual Cycle Time (tom_flanagan)

25: Mending and merging through humor (tom_flanagan)

26: Disconnect - reconnect hurdles (tom_flanagan)

27: Rushing to action (kbausch)

38: Lack of experience (LLHarris)

50: limited capacity to understand irony and paradox (CraigLindell)

51: Fatigue even among enthusiasts (CraigLindell)

Cluster 6: CONFUSIONS

7: Confusions leading to exclusion of stakeholders with different lingual and cultural background (Heiner)

29: Cognitive overload (kbausch)

CogniScope II

Generated by the participants at the Obamavision   on Dec 1-13 2008, at www.obamavision.wikispaces.com
Prepared by GAYLE UNDERWOOD   [DELETE] = Idea was deleted or merged with another Idea   CogniScope 2 Software: www.LeadingDesign.org

2

Figure 1   Figure 1: Preliminary Classification of the 58 Inhibitors to the Obama Vision.

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Cluster 7: MOB RULE

9: Overwhelming variety of individual concerns (phjones)

10: Limited capacity for dialogic sensemaking (phjones)

18: Scalability of discussion technology (paulrhays)

21: Mob Rule (kmcdye)

33: Can we state a common ethical root in stakeholders? (Reinhold1)

35: The Moral Hazard of Anonymity (kmcdye)

41: Great Expectations (LLHarris)

Cluster 8: PURPOSEFULNESS

11: Lack of common purpose (phjones)

15: Who frames the questions? (paulrhays)

20: Market-Driven Democracy (kmcdye)

22: Corporate Control of the Means of Democracy (kmcdye)

30: Local versus universal (Reinhold1)

34: Illusive Equifinality (kmcdye)

Cluster 9: CONFIDENTIALITY & TRUST

17: Technological distrust - or hacking the discussion. (paulrhays)

42: Ownership of contact information (paulrhays)

43: Official transparency rules (paulrhays)

48: Fear of openness (CraigLindell)

49: Distrust of others (CraigLindell)

53: Tracking dissidents (larryf)

54: Trust (larryf)

CogniScope II

Generated by the participants at the Obamavision   on Dec 1-13 2008, at www.obamavision.wikispaces.com
Prepared by GAYLE UNDERWOOD   [DELETE] = Idea was deleted or merged with another Idea   CogniScope 2 Software: www.LeadingDesign.org

3

Figure 1

Figure 1: Preliminary Classification of the 58 Inhibitors to the Obama Vision.

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Cluster 10: METHODOLOGY

28: Quick fix methodologies (kbausch)

31: Is there a practical follow-up methodology? (Reinhold1)

37: Lack of method (LLHarris)

40: Getting to root causes (LLHarris)

46: Modality shifts (paulrhays)

Cluster 11: PARADIGM SHIFT

39: One man. One Vote (LLHarris)

56: The Ineradicability of Antagonism (kmcdye)

57: The Average Citizen as 'Deaf Spectator' (kmcdye)

Cluster 12: CURRENCY

44: Maintaining currency (paulrhays)

CogniScope II

Generated by the participants at the Obamavision on Dec 1-13 2008, at www.obamavision.wikispaces.com
Prepared by GAYLE UNDERWOOD   [DELETE] = Idea was deleted or merged with another Idea   CogniScope 2 Software: www.LeadingDesign.org

4

Figure 1   **Figure 1: Preliminary Classification of the 58 Inhibitors to the Obama Vision.**

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Cluster 13: DOMINATION

47: The persistant blindness of special interest (Craig Lindell)

CogniScope II

Generated by the participants at the Obamavision   on Dec 1-13 2008, at www.obamavision.wikispaces.com
Prepared by GAYLE UNDERWOOD   [DELETE] = Idea was deleted or merged with another Idea   CogniScope 2 Software: www.LeadingDesign.org

5

Figure 1   Figure 1: Amended Classification of 59 Inhibitors to Bottom-up Democracy

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Cluster 1: TECHNOLOGICAL KNOWHOW	Cluster 2: EQUITY & ACCESS	Cluster 3: FACILITATION
1: technological knowhow and poverty (mcin01)	**2:** Risk of excluding disadvantaged people (rsmith135)	**4:** Lack of facilitation skills and resource. (rsmith135)
8: technical-technological exclusion (Heiner)	**12:** Insufficient access to technology (normaromm)	**14:** Insufficient attention given to facilitator capacitation (normaromm)
36: Vehicle (LLHarris)	**13:** Insufficient understanding of how to use the system for participation (normaromm)	
45: Literacy (paulrhays)		
52: digital divide (larryf)		
58: Poverty, lack of knowledge and fear (mcin01)		

CogniScope II

Generated by the participants at the Obamavision   on Dec 1-13 2008, at www.obamavision.wikispaces.com
Prepared by GAYLE UNDERWOOD   [DELETE] = Idea was deleted or merged with another Idea   CogniScope 2 Software:

1

Figure 1

Figure 1: Amended Classification of 59 Inhibitors to Bottom-up Democracy

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Cluster 4: ACKNOWLEDGEMENT & COMMITMENT

5: Lack of commitment by administrators to the government vision (rsmith135)

41: Great Expectations (LLHarris)

Cluster 5: ENGAGEMENT LIMITATIONS

3: Layers of clay (Government administrators filtering the upward messages) (rsmith135)

6: Risk of losing stamina to sustain 'resource-hungry' participative processes (rsmith135)

7: Confusions leading to exclusion of stakeholders with different lingual and cultural background (Heiner)

16: Participation fatigue (paulrhays)

19: Process Cacophony (kmcdye)

24: Individual Cycle Time (tom_flanagan)

25: Mending and merging through humor (tom_flanagan)

26: Disconnect - reconnect hurdles (tom_flanagan)

29: Cognitive overload (kbausch)

38: Lack of experience (LLHarris)

44: Maintaining currency (paulrhays)

50: limited capacity to understand irony and paradox (CraigLindell)

51: Fatigue even among enthusiasts (CraigLindell)

Cluster 6: IMPLEMENTABILITY

23: Social contract overload (tom_flanagan)

27: Rushing to action (kbausch)

32: Required insight of hypothetical results as worthwhile (Reinhold1)

55: Unforeseen Structural Holes (CraigLindell)

CogniScope II

Generated by the participants at the Obamavision   on Dec 1-13 2008, at www.obamavision.wikispaces.com
Prepared by GAYLE UNDERWOOD   [DELETE] = Idea was deleted or merged with another Idea   CogniScope 2 Software:

2

Figure 1

Figure 1: Amended Classification of 59 Inhibitors to Bottom-up Democracy

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Cluster 7: ADDRESSING VARIETY

9: Overwhelming variety of individual concerns (phjones)

10: Limited capacity for dialogic sensemaking (phjones)

18: Scalability of discussion technology (paulrhays)

21: Mob Rule (kmcdye)

35: The Moral Hazard of Anonymity (kmcdye)

Cluster 8: PURPOSEFULNESS

11: Lack of common purpose (phjones)

15: Who frames the questions? (paulrhays)

20: Market-Driven Democracy (kmcdye)

30: Private versus Public (Reinhold1)

33: Can we state a common ethical root in stakeholders? (Reinhold1)

34: Illusive Equifinality (kmcdye)

Cluster 9: CONFIDENTIALITY

17: Technological distrust - or hacking the discussion. (paulrhays)

42: Ownership of contact information (paulrhays)

43: Official transparency rules (paulrhays)

53: Tracking dissidents (larryf)

CogniScope II

Generated by the participants at the Obamavision   on Dec 1-13 2008, at www.obamavision.wikispaces.com
Prepared by GAYLE UNDERWOOD   [DELETE] = Idea was deleted or merged with another Idea   CogniScope 2 Software:

3

Figure 1

Figure 1: Amended Classification of 59 Inhibitors to Bottom-up Democracy

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Cluster 10: METHODOLOGY	Cluster 11: PARADIGM SHIFT	Cluster 12: TRUST
28: Quick fix methodologies (kbausch)	**39:** One man. One Vote (LLHarris)	**48:** Fear of openness (CraigLindell)
31: Is there a practical follow-up methodology? (Reinhold1)	**56:** The Ineradicability of Antagonism (kmcdye)	**49:** Distrust of others (CraigLindell)
37: Lack of method (LLHarris)	**57:** The Average Citizen as 'Deaf Spectator' (kmcdye)	**54:** Trust (larryf)
40: Getting to root causes (LLHarris)		
46: Modality shifts (paulrhays)		

CogniScope II

Generated by the participants at the Obamavision   on Dec 1-13 2008, at www.obamavision.wikispaces.com
Prepared by GAYLE UNDERWOOD   [DELETE] = Idea was deleted or merged with another Idea   CogniScope 2 Software:

4

Figure 1

Figure 1: Amended Classification of 59 Inhibitors to Bottom-up Democracy

Triggering Question: *"In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?"*

Cluster 13: DOMINATION

22: Corporate Control of the Means of Democracy (kmcdye)

47: The persistant blindness of special interest (CraigLindell)

59: Obviating decisions by non-participatnts (phjones)

CogniScope II

Generated by the participants at the Obamavision   on Dec 1-13 2008, at www.obamavision.wikispaces.com
Prepared by GAYLE UNDERWOOD   [DELETE] = Idea was deleted or merged with another Idea   CogniScope 2 Software:

5

Figure 2   Influence Pattern of Inhibitors

Triggering Question: In the context of Obama's vision for engaging stakeholders from all walks of life in a bottom-up democracy employing Internet technology, what factors do we anticipate, on the basis of our experiences with SDDP, will emerge as inhibitors to the actualization of his vision?

Level I

(Inhibitor 18) Scalability of Discussion Technology

(Inhibitor 53) Tracking Dissidents

Inhibitor 27: Rushing to Action

•**(Inhibitor 2)** Risk of Excluding Disadvantaged People
•Cycle with **(Inhibitor 1)** Technological Knowhow And Poverty

(Inhibitor 57) The Average Citizen as 'Deaf Spectator'

Level II

(Inhibitor 4) Lack of Facilitation Skills and Resources

(**Inhibitor 56)** The Ineradicability of Antagonism

(Inhibitor 23) Social Contract Overload

(Inhibitor 45) Literacy

Level III

(Inhibitor 22) Corporate Control of the means of Democracy

(Inhibitor 9) Overwhelming variety of individual concerns

Level IV

(**Inhibitor 14)** Insufficient attention given to facilitator capacitation.

Key

Y

X

Addressing X Significantly Helps in Addressing Y