

当代西方参与式民主理论的发展及对我国的启示

○ 董石桃

(湘潭大学 公共管理学院, 湖南 湘潭 411105)

〔摘要〕当代西方参与式民主理论的发展备受关注,参与式民主实践全面兴起。目前西方的参与式民主理论研究主要体现在对参与式民主理论的辩护、批评研究、参与式民主和协商民主理论的关系,参与式民主实践的考察等方面。深入研究当代西方参与式民主理论对中国民主建设具有较大的启示意义。

〔关键词〕参与式民主理论;中国民主;启示

在20世纪60年代至70年代,参与式民主理论以强劲的势头发展起来。它的理论和实践,被美国的政治科学家(包括达尔等),认为是自由民主的一种替代性选择。^[1]参与式民主理论主张公民对于影响他们生活有关决策的参与权,主张高程度的公民参与和自我管理,特别是超越传统政治理解之外的社会领域的参与。进入20世纪90年代以来,全球范围参与式民主实践的兴起预示着该理论新的发展势头。在新社会运动、城市管理改革以及生态保护运动等方面,参与式民主理论得到前所未有的传播、贯彻和实施。美国政治学者杰弗里·海默指出,最近的研究和新的现象表明,未来10年内可能会看到参与式民主理论重新兴盛和复苏。^[2]国内学者对于参与式民主理论还缺乏全面了解,这需要我们参与式民主理论进行较为系统的梳理和研究,以推动我国公民积极有序参与理论与实践的深入发展。

一、参与式民主理论的系谱

根据已有的文献考证,“参与式民主”作为指代一种特殊民主理论的新词

作者简介:董石桃(1979—),湘潭大学公共管理学院教师,浙江大学政治学博士。

汇,最早来源于1960年美国学者阿诺德·考夫曼的“参与政治”主张,^[3]考夫曼深受杜威、米尔斯和古德曼的影响。^[4]他认为,参与政治的好处是可以对人们的权利思想、感情和行动作出贡献。其关于“参与政治”的主张被许多积极的民主人士阐述为“参与式民主”。1964年,美国的学生民主社会协会(SDS)的成员在密歇根州的休伦港会议上阐述了其中第一个参与式民主理论。^[5]随后“参与”越来越经常在美国20世纪60年代末和70年代的政治生活和政治学中出现。

在政治学科中最早精确地对参与式民主理论进行阐释的是佩特曼的著作,她的著作产生了广大的影响。^[6]佩特曼描述了一种工业民主化以及公民通过工厂领域的参与获得民主的技能以接受教育和赋权的体制。在佩特曼阐释参与式民主10年后,麦克弗森支持参与式民主“通过议会或国会结构实现”,他尤其关注拥占性社会和经济不平等对实现参与式民主实现的影响。他指出了20世纪市场社会的一个巨大悖论,即拥占性个人主义的现实性与资本主义民主无法实现每个人能力最大化之间的背离。这一背离进而破坏了资本主义社会大厦之根基,极有可能导致拥占性市场社会陷入严重的危机,缓解这一危机的主要手段就是将竞争性政党制度与参与民主结合起来。只有公民不间断地直接参与社会和国家的管理,自由和个人发展才有可能充分实现。^[7]

简·曼斯布里奇也对参与式民主理论发展做出了重大贡献,她对“竞争”和“统合”民主进行明确区分,竞争性民主“假设公民的利益是在不断地冲突”,而统合民主国家“假设公民有一个单一的共同利益……”,统合性民主以共同利益和平等为基础,以大家取得共识为程序。利益不冲突、规模小、情谊与信仰是这种直接民主的主要特征。她把代议制称为“竞争性民主”,因为这种间接民主假设公民的利益是不断冲突的。代议制、大多数人统治、一人一票是这种民主的主要形式和特征。曼斯布里奇的这一概念框架尽管并没能产生广泛、深刻的社会影响,但对之后的参与式民主理论发展起了一定作用。克罗宁的《直接民主》关注的是制度的创新和完善,该书研究了三种直接民主的制度设计:公民倡议、全民公决和召回制度,^[8]他的研究结论是:参与式民主经常并非总是统合性的。^[9]

20世纪80年代,巴伯出版了迄今仍然有着广泛影响的参与式民主理论著作。^[10]在哲学层面,巴伯指出自由主义民主将引发许多严重的后果,最典型的是它摧毁了传统个人与社会之间维系纽带的同时而没有创造一种新的纽带。在实践层面,巴伯发展起了一种参与式的政体模式——强势民主。巴伯不仅仅将参与式民主理论局限在工作场所,还将其扩展到社会的各个领域。这个主题由卡罗尔·古尔德继续加以扩展了。卡罗尔·古尔德对“民主理论的根本性反思”,声称民主决策不仅要应用到政治领域,而且要应用到经济和社会领域。^[11]随后,越来越多的综合性的、深刻的参与式民主理论的著作得到出版。顺应这种趋势,巴克拉克和伯特维克呼吁参与式民主的复兴,他们的著作不如巴伯和古尔德的系统(作者仅仅将参与式民主定位在工厂民主),但都致力于努力重建参与式民主理论,重点是重建马克思主义的阶级分析理论。^[12]20世纪90年代以来,尽

管有许多政治科学家仍对参与式民主理论有着浓厚兴趣,但是系统研究参与式民主理论的文章却不多,所以,梅塔孟德尔·雷耶斯呼吁,我们应该积极推动参与式民主理论研究,^[13]重申其规范的原则,寻求经验证据来支持它的可行性。

二、参与式民主理论的辩护

对参与式民主理论进行支持和发展的主要有沃尔夫、卡蓝默、让-雅克·巴弗莱克、赫尔德等人。沃尔夫(Joel D. Wolf)为参与式民主理论提供了较为全面的辩护。沃尔夫维护参与式民主在大型组织中的运用的可能性。在沃尔夫看来,米歇尔斯理论中关于组织寡头化的趋势以及大规模组织中大众控制的难题是参与式民主理论必须回答的问题。事实上,米歇尔斯的理论对民主本身是一个严重的挑战,使民主再也没有信心重建公民参与的理论,而是融入了更多的精英主义的内容,参与式民主理论的提出是民主理论重建的一个契机。维护参与式民主必须克服正式的代表性组织中参与和大众控制的难题,为此要对参与式民主理论本身进行修正,如推动组织中的小型群体发展,实现平等和非剥削性的社会关系,并且推动它和更大集体的联系。同时对那些不公正的方面积极回应,为大众参与提供动力,从而为实现现代性的协会组织和政党组织的大众控制提供基础。^[14]沃尔夫为参与式民主的辩护,体现了对现实政治的考量。

皮埃尔·卡蓝默将参与式民主理论融入治理中进行整体思考,从而试图让参与式民主更加坚实,并使其成为治理变革的杠杆。他认为,“无论多么专制,多么不民主的政权,倘若在民众的眼里不具有某种合法性是不可能持久的……目前民主危机的特征是在执政者的合法性和权力行使的合法性之间出现了一道裂痕。这个现象在所有的民主国家都能看到,我们在国际调查中发现,政治领袖的形象严重受损。认为政治领袖卓有才能,优先追求共同财富,时刻在公共财富和个人自由之间寻找平衡的人越来越少。在国家层次实行的传统的代议制民主,在层级、理解问题的方式、组织与社会的对话以及机构的分工等方面,都不符合当代社会的现实和面临的挑战……参与式民主的第一个功能就是尝试修补民主大厦,重新构建合法性”。^[15]很显然,在皮埃尔·卡蓝默眼中,参与式民主理论的进一步发展将是治理和善治不可或缺的基础。

让-雅克·巴弗莱克从代议制缺陷中论述参与式民主的发展必然,“我们所说的代议制民主,其成型和发展并不包括公民参与制定公共政策和作出决议这部分内容。公民并非通过投票参与一般愿望的实现过程,而是通过投票指定那些能够具体而迅速地促进法律的制定并限制所谓的人民权力的人:投票只是在选举的当天属于公民,而在选举之后就会成为统治者的专利”。但是问题是如何推进参与式民主的发展,他认为,“若欲促进参与民主的发展,最重要的问题就是开设一些渠道,使个人或机构能够通过这些渠道获得必要的条件,以便掌握权力并在改变他们的生活与环境中发挥真正的作用……我们可以提出这样一种假说:关于参与式民主的最重要的问题在于,了解如何促使公民在自己应该行

使的权力和委托的权力之间作出选择,在什么是必须委托给某些机构的和什么是必须直接由人民决定的之间做出选择”。^[16]

三、参与式民主理论的批评

20世纪90年代以来,参与式民主理论影响有所减弱,为什么如此?简·曼斯布里奇将其归纳为三个方面的原因:第一个原因是在整个20世纪80年代,60年代和70年代流行的参与式民主实践的衰落,可以说,参与式民主理论的衰落是因为底层公民参与实践的衰落。^[17]第二个原因是参与式民主理论缺乏可追踪的经验证明,它难以兑现其向公民提供政治教育的承诺。正如曼斯布里奇写道,“在参与对教育影响的案例中,理论假定可能不容易被相对较少的实证研究所捕获”。第三个原因是关于推动公民参与实践资金的匮乏。正如政治理论家马克·沃伦(Mark E. Warren)指出,“参与式民主理论经常被一种模糊的乌托邦主义困扰,它很难解决现代化社会中的复杂性、范围和规模的问题”,^[18]对沃伦来说,参与式民主理论家假定人们都是有能力的、并且热情地希望参与到自我管理的自治中,这是天真和幼稚的。沃伦认为参与式民主理论是浪漫主义的教条——不仅仅在于这个世界是如此复杂,而且人们很难在公共领域中具备自我管理的有效能力,更不要说在工厂和家庭中了。沃伦写道,“个人可能发现,做出决定是一个沉重而无效率的负担,大部分人将退回到怀疑和冷漠中去”。^[19]

迄今为止,对参与式民主理论的批评性研究无疑是犀利的。萨托利仍然是从经典的自由民主理论出发,认为参与式民主在概念上最接近的是直接民主和公民表决,而他认为这些在现代社会已经失去直接民主的条件。公民表决民主也是一种加剧冲突而不是缓和冲突的民主方式。另外决策民主的参与存在效率和成本的问题,萨托利反复强调,参与只有在小团体中才有意义。^[20]但是他不得不承认参与式民主对弥补代议制民主的重要作用。在最近的一本关于参与式民主理论史的著作中,罗伯特·杰·蓝茜(Robert J. Lacey)认为,“在休伦港宣言发布后的40年之后,参与式民主理论的影响逐渐受到限制,甚至到现在已经不存在了”。^[21]另外,罗伯特·杰·蓝茜认为参与式民主理论的影响从某种程度上来说主要限于学术界。根据这种观点,参与式民主理论可能遭受和实践同样的命运,尽管它到现在还没有失效。总之,在有些理论家看来,参与式民主理论正散发着缓慢衰落的余辉。很多批评者不仅试图为参与式民主理论找出替代的方案,也试图为其他更多的民主理论找出替代者。^[22]一般性民主理论的大量繁殖,加上不足的经验证明,使参与式民主理论遭遇到乌托邦主义的指控。

这种趋势被著名的民主理论家夏皮罗所强化。在最近的一本关于民主理论流派的总结性著作中,夏皮罗省略掉了参与式民主理论的文献。他认为,民主理论的争议发生在“聚合性民主”和“协商民主”之间,参与式民主理论的词条没有出现在他的著作中。也就是说,夏皮罗认为,参与式民主理论也是一种协商民主理论。夏皮罗的读者可能会认为,参与式民主理论不再和当代民主理论有着大

的关联,以至于让我们来讨论它。但是,夏皮罗对当代民主理论的研究至少存在两个问题:首先,尽管参与式民主理论的文献有减少的趋势,并且不时遭到批判,但是它仍然出现在美国的政治科学文献中。其次,如果我们从许多西方政治科学家所戴着的盲目的、美国中心主义的有色眼镜视域中脱离开来,我们发现,参与式民主的理论和实践仍然在世界各国存在,并且积极地得到繁荣和发展。

四、参与式民主和协商民主

从20世纪90年代开始,大部分民主理论家的关注点从参与式民主理论转向自由主义的精英理论、协商民主理论。协商民主理论家似乎很希望将他们的理论确定为参与式民主理论的合法的继承者。与此同时,参与式民主理论的支持者却继续努力地捍卫他们的独特性,90年代以来,有些参与式民主理论家继续发展其理论,并批评协商民主理论——他们自称其理论是“参与式”的,事实上并没有对参与式民主的理论来源作出贡献。^[23]

因而,美国政治学界关于参与式民主理论的文献经常将参与式民主理论和协商民主理论混淆起来,这种窘困的例子可以在黛安娜·C·缪茨(Diana C. Mutz)最近的一本书中看到。黛安娜·C·缪茨支持协商民主理论家的观点,即“面对面地将不同的观点表达出来无疑是应该受到鼓励的”,因为这将培养参与者的开明性。不过,缪茨在结论中却认为,“我的经验研究表明……参与式民主理论和协商民主理论之间存在根本的冲突”。经验表明协商民主“可能阻碍公民参与,部分地是因为参与者的笨拙、舆论可能有时使朋友和合作者也对立起来”。^[24]因此,协商可能产生更少的或者不多的参与,因为这个缘故,“协商民主和参与式民主并不是携手并进”。^[25]尽管如此,缪茨对于“什么是参与式民主”的阐述仍然是有疑问的,这源自于她对于参与式民主理论的选择性阅读,或者是她试图重新定义它。立足于佩特曼和巴伯的理论阐释,缪茨将参与式民主定义为“人们参与政治过程有意义的机会……”,这个定义一般包括“在国家层面更多的直接投票,更多的公民加入社区层面的政治机构中”。^[26]尽管这种解释大部分是对的,但是这种狭隘的解释是选择性的,并且忽视了参与式民主的关键原则。^[27]自相矛盾的是,缪茨对阿尔蒙德和维巴在《公民文化》一书中关于民主有问题的定义表示很大的关注,缪茨写道,“公民文化指的是具备较高忍耐程度和参与度的理想的政治环境……从某种意义上来说公民文化融合了协商民主和参与式民主的特征”。^[28]奇怪的是,在描述精英民主理论家和大众民主理论家关于选举和其他形式的民主参与的论述时,缪茨犯了同样的错误。^[29]概念的混淆和选择性的阅读导致协商民主和参与式民主间产生问题争论。一般来说,所有参与式民主理论的观点之一是支持工作场所的民主化。缪茨认为,工作场所构建了协商民主所需要的社会网络。但是,具有讽刺意味的是,正是这个同样的社会网络,阻碍了公民表达自己的观点。那么,现在的问题是,“我们如何协调协商民主和参与式民主?”^[30]即使我们同意缪茨的观点的有效性,即参与可能破坏协

商,那么反过来,我们会发现,佩特曼和巴伯说论述的参与式民主远远比缪茨认为的范围要广。看起来,缪茨好像是从协商民主的角度来论述参与式民主,协商民主提出了关于讨论和争议的具体制度——包括“协商投票”,或者偶尔在节假日进行限制性的协商,“协商日”代表真正的民主。^[31]

弗兰克·布莱恩(Frank M. Bryan)的著作《真正的民主》是另一本可以冠之以“参与式民主理论”的突出作品,^[32]但其贡献也存在问题。布莱恩在著作中主要考察著名的新英格兰会议。作者承认,“我是一个真实民主的信仰者”,^[33]这种激情推动他进行研究。但他并不是通过纯粹的规范辩护,而是整理了大量令人印象深刻的乡镇会议内部工作。布莱恩在考察中运用了样本调查、定量分析、历史经验、故事描述等等方法。布莱恩来认为真正的民主是直接民主,“在那里,人们对重大的事情做出决策,通过在场的面对面的集会推动立法”。但对布莱恩来说,要使直接民主成为必要,必须只限于新英格兰会议的公共领域,对于早期参与式民主理论的其他关键领域,如工作场所和家庭没有论述。

阿肯·弗恩(Archon Fung)最近的一本著作《授权式参与》,^[34]隐约地提到了参与式民主,这本书实际上是对芝加哥地方民主的评论。但是,弗恩心目中的“参与”理念是怎样的呢?作者写道,“考察中央和微观层面的政治参与和协商的具体制度和实践将有助于我们理解协商是如何运作的以及告诉我们它是什么”。^[35]这里的“它”,读者会发现指的是“协商”,弗恩假定它和参与是一致的。本质上来说,协商民主理论是一种参与式民主理论,但对参与式民主理论来说,协商仅仅是必要条件,而不是充分条件。弗恩强调怎样“参与”在当代民主理论中独特地意味着强调参与,他研究了协商作为芝加哥地方邻里之间和社区间的政治参与,但是,他没有提及佩特曼以及其他参与式民主理论家的理念。他看到了民主参与(协商)发生在传统公共领域内,但是没有提及工厂和家庭领域内的参与。弗恩可能会问:难道这些还不意味着参与式民主是活生生的吗?如果不是足够好的话?这之中的每一项工作都使民主政治“参与”成为他们分析的一个变量,但是他们的观点和早期的参与式民主理论相似性有多大呢?而且在多大程度上来说,他们所描述的参与是专指协商而不是其他形式的参与呢(比如说工厂民主)?通过对这些研究内容的考察表明,他们并没有在解释“参与式民主”为何比之前的“参与”弱化?

这些都是很重要的问题,因为它迫使我们进行思考,协商民主理论,特别是协商,是否是参与式民主理论的充要条件?如果是的话,那么,布莱恩和弗恩的研究就是参与式民主理论的研究模式之一。如果这就是我们的结论,那么这些关于“参与式民主理论”的著作就反映了美国政治科学界关于参与式民主理论争论最重要的转折:即某种程度上来说,旧的参与式民主理论已经被协商民主理论所取代。事实上,如果说协商民主理论是一种新的参与式民主理论,那么自然前者将取代后者;如果我们坚持佩特曼、巴伯等主张的参与式民主原则,那么还需要对当前的协商民主理论进行清晰的分析。

五、参与式民主实践的考察

通过对参与式民主理论文献的考察,我们发现,在国际上参与式民主实践越来越兴盛。为什么参与式民主实践在全球范围内兴起?为回答这个问题,本文将对迅速增加的参与式民主实践研究文献进行选择性的评述。

最近的一本论文集考察了那些试图不仅仅通过“自由民主”理论^[36]来推动民主化的主张。这本论文集进行国际化的考察和综合性的分析,代表了对美国之外参与式民主理论和实践的关注点的新考察。编著者桑托斯通过对自由民主模式霸权性所造成问题的批判性考察,触及了如何发展民主的“新动力”。经过印度大众化运动、南非反抗种族隔离制度、莫桑比克妇女争取政治权利的斗争、哥伦比亚争取民主权利的斗争,参与式民主理论接受了检验。《民主的民主化》一书的第四部分“参与式民主在行动中”特别值得一提,因为它直接回应了那些认为参与式民主缺乏经验证据的观点。透过哥伦比亚、巴西、印度等国的翔实案例,我们可以看到参与式民主对当地社会和居民正面和负面的情况。但在作者全方位分析参与式民主及其影响时,巴西的经验吸引了成千上万学者的关注。这些研究表明,在国际上,参与式民主的理论和实践都已经在发育成长。

参与式民主实践似乎在当代巴西向我们提出了尖锐的问题。威廉·J·尼棱(William R. Nylen)已经直面分析了巴西的“参与式民主”和“精英民主”。^[37]通过集中分析巴西的两个具有代表性的中等城市:贝尔提姆(Betim)和贝罗豪瑞贞特(Belo Horizonte),尼棱的研究致力于分析验证参与式民主理论的基本命题:(1)政治参与包括大部分非精英分子;(2)通过自治参与,先前被排除的群体能够获得赋权;(3)因为公民的跨部门的直接参与使代表更加具有代表性。^[38]通过对参与者的人口特征分析,尼棱的结论是:“大众和非精英分子占主导地位已经被贝尔提姆和贝罗豪瑞贞特两座城市所证明。”^[39]至于参与者在何种程度上被赋权,尼棱的数据“对参与式民主理论提出的命题提出了挑战,参与过程的公民赋权……表明了公民分离的问题”。^[40]最后,从某种程度上,提高一些公民的参与程度,将使政治代表性对所有公民更加真实,尼棱说,“我们发现有三个特别的主张支持了这种观点”。^[41]参与式民主理论一些前提性假设的有效性证据是混合的。当然,单独一个案例并不能完全证明任何假设的有效性。

简佩罗尔(Gianpalol)也撰写了关于巴西参与式民主的研究文章,^[42]特别值得一提的是,他考察了“参与”的质量问题。博西凯伊(Baiocchi)研究的问题是,“参与式治理对公民的生活有什么冲击?”^[43]他特别分析了参与式民主潜在影响的三个问题:(1)公民参与是否完全在国家领域之外是一种自主的生活方式?(2)不断的公民参与实践在多大程度上为民主的发展提供了合适的前提假设论证?(3)社会运动和公民参与在何种程度上被区分开来?这些问题都在民主研究的文献中没有被提及。^[44]为了回答这些问题,作者聚焦于巴西阿雷格里港的参与式预算的实践。这种参与式预算是一种地方层面的会议,在其中,社区中的

公民首先对他们社区所需要的公共项目做出决定,然后由社区的代表根据公民提出的要求对这些项目的可行性做出最后的决定。作者的结论是,国家层面之外的参与式预算是有效的,因此,“参与式政府可能有更多的公民参与……”^[45]其次,正如许多民主理论家所假定的,经常的参与式预算实际上包含了协商,但是,正如他们的推断,“这并不是一个流畅的过程……”^[46]再次,社会运动和公民参与被证明正相关,“综合这两类因素,这种政治文化既使激进的社会运动制度化,又拓展成为公民参与的途径”。^[47]这样,博西凯伊的结论和参与式民主理论基本契合,当然,这些数据看起来既证明又驳斥了参与式民主理论。除了这些发现以外,尼梭和简佩罗尔(Gianpalol)的著作证明了参与式民主理论和当前实践的关联性,美国之外的实践至少证明了参与式民主理论家对于民主参与的正确性,巴西的研究数据既为参与式民主理论提供了支持,当然,有的研究也提供了反对性的证据,正如政治学家阿德曼(Per Adman)通过经验研究提出,“政治行为既不受工作中公共技能的影响,也不受我们所观察到的工作场所中参与技能的影响”。^[48]很多的研究得出了相反的研究结论。但是,不管这些研究支持还是驳斥参与式民主理论,都毫不含糊地证明参与式民主理论的活力。

六、参与式民主理论和中国

近年来,在中国,公民参与也越来越成为社会热点和焦点问题。关于公民参与的研究也方兴未艾,对于扩大公民有序政治参与研究有各种各样的方法,各种各样的观点。但是迄今为止,国内外大部分成果都是局限于自由民主理论视域中选举参与的实证研究,缺少多样化民主理论的视野分析。在我国,有学者也指出,“公众参与在我国还只是地方性实践,对这一理论研究仍然非常缺乏,日常大众乃至一些政治家使用公众参与的概念还较为模糊而缺乏科学的确定性”。^[49]有学者也曾经抱怨,“对公民参与的讨论和研究相对较少,我们总是把更多的关注或是放在自由、平等、正义、人权等民主的普遍价值上,或是放在民主制度、民主文化和民主机制的中国特色上,对公民参与的一般性理论研究不多”。^[50]中国公民参与要很好地发展,有必要学习和引进国外先进的公民参与理论、方法和技术,同时探索适合自己的、推动公民有序参与的各种新方法。深入研究当代西方参与式民主理论,探讨公民积极有序参与的价值基础和实现路径,对中国的民主政治建设至少具有如下几个方面的重要意义:(1)有助于我们全面深入透视西方主流的自由民主理论。我们在探索自己的民主发展形式过程中,必须认识到,自由主义民主理论只是西方民主理论的一种形态,尽管它在西方占据主流地位,但西方民主理论并不仅仅是自由主义式的民主。参与式民主理论是在分析、批判自由民主理论的过程中发展起来的,是对自由民主理论的完善和超越,因而对自由民主的不足有着比任何其他理论更为深刻的认识,这无疑为我们提供了一副现成的、优质的透视镜,帮助我们借鉴自由民主理论经验的同时,对其不足保持清醒的头脑。(2)有助于我们批判地借鉴协商民主理论的研

究成果。协商民主是在参与式民主理论的基础上进一步深入探索了公民积极有序参与的可行道路,属于广义的参与式民主理论范畴。离开对参与式民主理论的深入分析,我们对协商民主的发展历程和内在逻辑的理解将大打折扣。近年来,国内在引进和介绍协商民主理论时,就存在急功近利的倾向,没有将研究的视野进一步拉长,特别是对于参与式民主理论和协商民主的内在联系缺少分析,这对协商民主理论自身的进一步发展和中国协商民主的理论和实践将产生不良的影响。(3)为中国扩大公民有序政治参与提供有益的借鉴。扩大公民有序政治参与、培养积极而理性的公民而不是消极而原子化的臣民是中国民主发展的前提和基础。“民主政治的核心问题是人民的政治参与,人民的参与过程是实现民主的根本途径。因此,积极鼓励公民的政治参与,将是贯穿中国所有政治改革的一条主线”。^[51]从这些方面来看,参与式民主理论能够为我们提供良好的理论资源和实践启示。(4)为我国的基层民主建设提供有益的启示。参与式民主理论要求将“政治”的范围延伸至政府以外的领域,主张参与从基层、从社区开始,自下而上,最终达到国家层次上的参与。参与式民主理论认为,在现代条件下,只有个人有机会直接参与地方层次的决策才能实现对日常生活过程的控制。更重要的是,在诸如工作场所这些地方中的参与机会,个人将有更多的机会学习资源生产和控制中的重要事务,并在适当时候有机会参与国家范围的决策。无论在地方还是国家层次上,真正参与性社会的结构都应当是保持开放和流动的,以使人们能够更好地学习新的政治形式。这些观点对我国基层民主建设渐进推进的方略,具有很强的启示意义。

注释:

[1] Robert A. Dahl. *A Preface to Democratic Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956. *Who Governs?: Democracy and Power in an American City*. New Haven: Yale.

[2] Jeffrey D. Hilmer. *The state of participatory democracy theory*, Paper presented at the 66th Thannual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL, 2008, April, pp. 3 - 6.

[3] Arnold S. Kaufman. "Human Nature and Participatory Politics," In *The Bias of Pluralism*, ed. William E. Connolly (New York: Atherton Press, [1960]1969), pp. 178 - 200.

[4] C. Wright Mills and Paul Goodman, and in turn on SDS and the Port Huron Statement, see Robert B. Westbrook, John Dewey and American Democracy (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), pp. 549 - 550.

[5] James Miller. *Democracy Is in the Streets: From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago*. Simon and Schuster, 1987, chap. 6.

[6] Carole Pateman. *Participation and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

[7] C. B. Macpherson. *Political theory of possessive individualism*. Oxford University Press, 1962.

[8][9] Jane J. Mansbridge. *Beyond Adversary Democracy*. New York: Basic Books, 1980, pp. 40, 3.

[10] Benjamin R. Barber. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. California: University of California Press, 1984.

[11][12][29][30] Carole C. Gould. *Rethinking Democracy: Freedom and Social Cooperation in Politics, Economy, and Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988; pp. 46 - 50, 74, 103, 136.

[13] Meta Mendel - Rayes. *Reclaiming Democracy: The Sixties in Politics and Memory*. New York and Lon-

Dong Shitao

Review on Contemporary Western Participatory Democratic Theory and Its Enlightenment to China

From the 1960s to 1970s, there is a strong growth of the development of participatory democratic theory. Participatory democracy proposes the citizens to take part in the making of decisions which concerns with their life, and it also claims that the citizens should have more opportunities to participate in national political affairs and encourages their self management, besides, it emphasizes civic participation in the social areas beyond the traditional understanding of politics. With more than twenty years' development, in the 1990s, the appearance of the study on participatory democracy in practice is the sign of a new era of participatory democratic theory. In the areas of "movement for a new society", "innovation of city management" and "movement for ecological conservation", there is an unprecedented spreading and implementing of participatory democratic theory. There is a lack of comprehensive understanding of participatory democracy in domestic academia. In order to make up for the defects, the author aims to make a systematic study of participatory democracy, so as to promote the development of both the theory and the practice of orderly civic participation in China.

I. Genealogy of Participatory Democratic Theory

The new word "participatory democracy" was originated from Arnold S. Kaufman's proposition for "participatory politics" in the year 1960. The earliest sophisticated description of participatory democracy from a political scientist is Carole Pateman's book on this subject. In this book, she describes a polity in which industry has been democratized and citizens are educated and empowered by the democratic skills they learn through participation in the workplace. Nearly ten years after Pateman presented her model of participatory democracy, Macpherson argued for a participatory democracy which "operates through a parliamentary or congressional structure", who is especially concerned with the prohibitive effects social and economic inequalities have on the realization of participatory democracy. Jane Mansbridge, too, contributed to the development of participatory democratic theory by drawing a distinction between "adversary" and "unitary" democracy. Later, another scholar Cronin, in his book *Direct Democracy*, who investigates three kinds of direct democratic polity design, which are "popular initiative", "referendum" and "recall system". Cronin concludes that "participatory democracy is often—if not always—unitary". In the 1980s, on a philosophical level, Barber points out the serious consequences caused by liberalism democracy. On a

practical level, Barber develops a theoretical model of a participatory polity, that is “strong democracy?”. This is a theme that is expounded upon by Carole Gould, who asserts that “democratic decision – making not only should apply to politics, but should be extended to economic and social life as well”. From then on, a number of the most comprehensive and thoughtful books on the subject of participatory democracy were being published. Acknowledging this trend, Bachrach and Botwinick call for a restoration of participatory democratic theory.

II. Development of Participatory Democratic Theory

Joel D. Wolf defends the possibility of the exertion of participatory democracy in large organization. In Wolf’s view, in order to support participatory democracy, it is necessary to restrain the difficulties of participation of the formal representative organizations and mass control, which can provide motivity for the citizens and provide the underlying basis for the realization of the modernistic associations and party organizations. Pierre Calame, who gives a comprehensive consideration to the participatory democratic theory, integrating participatory democratic theory into governance theory and tries to strenthen the former, making it as the lever of the governance theory invation. Pierre believes that the foremost function of participatory democracy is try to mend the theory of democracy and rebuilt its validity. Jean – Jacques Affleck discusses the necessity of the development of participatory democracy from the point of view of the limitaitons of representative institutions. In his view, the right of ballot only belongs to the citizens for just one day, which is the patent of the governors after the day of voting. If we want to promote the development of participatory democracy, the most important quastion is to establish more channels, as which can help the individuals and organizaitons to get the indispensable conditions for wielding power and then making the best use of the power in improving their life and environment.

III. Critics on Participatory Democratic Theory

Sartori thinks that the proximal notions of participatory democracy are direct democracy and referendum, whereas, he points out that the conditions for direct democracy are disappeared in modern society. Sartori hammered the fact that only in small organizations participatory making sense. Robert Jay Lancy considers that, to some extent, the influence of participatory democratic theory is mainly limited in academic circle, and this was intensified by the famous democracy theorist Schapiro. In Schapiro’s latest book on the schools of democracy thoery, the literature of participatory democracy does not appear. Schapiro argues that the state of democratic theory is characterized by the debate between “minimalist aggregative” and “deliberative” models. The term “participatory democracy” does not appear together in his book. Shapiro assumes that participatory democratic theory has been subsumed in deliberative democratic theory; that is to say, the author assumes

that deliberative democracy is also a species of participatory democracy. Whereas, Shapiro's account of contemporary democratic theory is problematic for at least two reasons: First, participatory democratic theory continues to appear in the literature of American political science, though the number is in a much diminished way and it is frequently being criticized. Second, if we remove the typical American - centric blinders of many western political scientists, we will have a better understanding of participatory democratic theory and practice, not only surviving but positively thriving in countries all over the world.

IV. Participatory Democracy VS Deliberative Democracy

American political science often tends to dwell on the muddled conceptual relationship between deliberative democratic theory and participatory democratic theory. Some examples of this quandary can be found in the recent work of Diana C. Mutz. Diana is in favor of the viewpoints of the deliberative democratic theorists, while she concludes that "my empirical work... has led me to believe that there are fundamental incompatibilities between theories of participatory democracy and theories of deliberative democracy." It is this sort of conceptual confusion and selectivity that renders the debate between deliberative theorists and participatory theorists problematic. Frank M. Bryan's *Real Democracy* is a book objecting of inquiry the much celebrated New England town meeting and there are a lot of impressive case studies of the internal jobs of town meeting. For Bryan, the "real" democracy entails direct democracy, but then he limits democracy to the "public sphere" of the New England town meeting. A recent book of Archon Fung mainly discusses how deliberation actually works in neighbors and intercommunity democracy in Chicago. There is no mention of the ideas of Pateman and other participatory theorists. This compels us to consider whether or not the tenets of deliberative democratic theory, particularly deliberation, are necessary and sufficient conditions for participatory democracy. If we decide that they are, then Bryan's and Fung's studies are exemplars of participatory democracy. And if that is our conclusion, these works of "participatory democracy" reflect the most significant shift in the debate about participatory democracy in American political science. Namely, the extent to which older theories of participatory democracy have superseded by deliberative theories of democracy. If, indeed, deliberative democracy is the new participatory democracy, the former may be said to have certainly superseded the latter. But, if we hold firm to the key tenets of participatory democracy as described by the scholars such as Pateman, Barber, Gould, and Bachrach and Botwinick, contemporary deliberative democracy must be judged theoretically distinct.

V. Studies on Participatory Democracy in Practice

In recent years, participatory democracy in practice is becoming increasingly popular, which boosts the rapid increase of the research bibliography in

this field around the world. One recent collection of essays represents the exploding interest in participatory democratic theory and practice outside of the United States. According to Boaventura de Sousa Santos, the editor of the volume, the contributors to the volume touch on those “new dynamics” by critically evaluating the hegemonic liberal representative model of democracy by demonstrating the ways in which that model is problematic. From popular democratic movements in India, to participatory democratic struggles against apartheid in South Africa, to women struggling for political access in Mozambican society and to Columbian citizens fighting for democratic rights, the theory of participatory democracy is strongly tested. Participatory democratic theory and practice seems acutely manifest in contemporary Brazil. William R. Nylen has thoroughly analyzed the confrontation between “participatory” and “elite” democracy in Brazil. Focusing on the representative medium – sized Brazilian cities of Betim and Belo Horizonte, Nylen has made a lot of field research in order to test fundamental claims of participatory democratic theory, and the conclusions are as following: first, political participation includes mostly non – elites; second, previously excluded groups become empowered by participating in their self – governance; third, representation becomes more representative due to the cross – section of citizens who directly participate and thus represent those who choose not to. Gianpalol, too, has written about participatory democracy in Brazil and investigates the quality of that participation. More specifically, Gianpalol focuses his attention on the practice of participatory budgeting democracy in Porto Alegre. The author concludes that the participatory budgeting effectively functioned outside of the state realm. The work of Nylen and Gianpalol demonstrate the continuing contemporary relevance of participatory democratic theory. Evidence from outside of the U. S. suggests that at least some of what the participatory democratic theorists suspected about the affects of democratic participation is accurate. The Brazilian studies discussed above provide ? provable data in support of, and in opposition to, the theoretical claims of participatory democratic theorists. Yet, moreover, regardless whether these studies affirm or refute the claims of participatory democratic theorists and despite the obliviousness of most American political scientists, these studies unquestionably demonstrate the continuing vitality of participatory democratic theory.

VI. Participatory Democracy and China

Recently, “citizen participation” is also increasingly becoming a society-hot and a focus question in the academia in China. At the same time, most of the researches inside and outside are limited to election participation in the horizon of liberal democratic theory. There is a lack of analysis from the view of diversified democratic theories, and the study and understanding of the western participatory democratic theory is not thorough enough. It is necessary to make an intensive study of the contemporary western participatory dem-

ocratic theories, methods and techniques, as which will do good to the development of citizen participation in China. The important significances of studying contemporary western participatory democratic theory including: 1) To help us to have a comprehensive and thorough understanding of the mainstream of the western liberal democratic theories, simultaneously, reminding us to keep a sober mind to the weaknesses of these theories. The emergence of participatory democratic theory is originated from the analysis and critique of liberal democratic theory, and it is a perfection and surpass of liberal democratic theory. The understanding of the inadequacy of it is further than any other theory, which also provides us a ready-made, high quality photoscope—help us not only make use of the experiences of liberal democratic theory, but also keep a clear mind about its shortcomings. 2) To contribute to draw on critically the experiences of the research findings of deliberative democracy. Deliberative democracy is developed on the basis of participatory democratic theory with the discussion of how to resolve the orderly active participation of citizens, which belongs to generalized participatory democratic theory. Without a deep analysis of the participatory democratic theory, we can not make a comprehensive understanding of the development history and inner logic of the deliberative democracy. 3) To provide useful experience and lessons for enlarging the orderly political participation of Chinese citizens. The increasing of citizen's orderly political participation and the cultivating of positive and rational citizen rather than passive and atomized citizen are the basis and premise of Chinese democracy development. Encouraging the citizens to take part in political affairs is the most important focus of political reform in China. In a word, participatory democratic theory gives us a good supply of both theoretical and practical resources. 4) To provide helpful experience for the construction of Chinese grass-roots democracy. Participatory democratic theory requires the extending of the conception "politics" beyond the area of government, which calls for the participation from grass roots, from the small community, and from bottom to top until involvement in national affairs. Participatory democratic theory is revelatory in the gradual advancing of Chinese grass-roots democracy.

Public Management School of Xiangtan University

don: Routledge, 1995.

[14] D. Joel Wolfe. A Defense of Participatory Democracy. *The Review of Politics*, Vol No. 3 (Jul., 1985), pp. 370 - 389.

[15] [法]皮埃尔·卡蓝默:《破碎的民主:试论治理的革命》,北京:三联书店出版社,2005年。

[16] [法]让-雅克·巴弗莱克:《参与民主:今日的实践预示明日的理想》,赵超译,《当代世界与社会主义》2008年第4期。

[17] Jane Mansbridge. "On the Idea that Participation Makes Better Citizens," In Stephen L. Elkin and Karol Edward So? tan, eds., *Citizen Competence and Democratic Institutions* (University Park, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999, p. 315.

[18] [19] Mark E. Warren. "What Should We Expect from More Democracy? Radically Democratic Responses to Politics," *Political Theory* 24 (1996), pp. 242, 58.

[20] [美]萨托利:《民主新论》,上海:上海人民出版社,2008年,第126页。

[21] Robert J. Lacey. *American Pragmatism and Democratic Faith*. Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2008, p. 9.

[22] John S. Dryzek "Democratic Political Theory" In Gerald F. Gaus and Chandran Kukathas eds. *The Handbook of Political Theory*. Thousand Oaks and London: Sage Publications, 2004, pp. 143 - 154.

[23] Emily Hauptmann. "Can Less Be More? Leftist Deliberative Democrats' Critique of Participatory Democracy," *Polity* 33 (2001), pp. 397 - 421.

[24] [25] [26] Diana C. Mutz. *Hearing the Other Side: Deliberative versus Participatory Democracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 3, 133, 135.

[27] [28] Benjamin R. Barber. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. California: University of California Press, 1984, pp. 307, 132.

[31] James S. Fishkin. *Democracy and Deliberation: New Directions for Democratic Reform*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991. Bruce Ackerman and James S. Fishkin, *Deliberation Day* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.

[32] [33] Rank M. Bryan. *Real Democracy: The New England Town Meeting and How it Works*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2004, p. 10.

[34] [35] Archon Fung. *Empowered Participation: Reinventing Urban Democracy*. Princeton, NJ.: Princeton University Press, 2004, p. 11.

[36] Boaventura de Sousa Santos ed. *Democratizing Democracy: Beyond the Liberal Democratic Canon*. New York and London: Verso, 2006.

[37] William R. Nylen. *Participatory Democracy versus Elite Democracy: Lessons from Brazil*. New York: Palgrave Macmillian, 2003.

[38] [39] [40] [41] William R. Nylen. *Participatory Democracy versus Elite Democracy: Lessons from Brazil*. New York: Palgrave Macmillian, 2003, pp. 6, 63, 70, 90.

[42] [43] [44] [45] [46] [47] Bianpaolo Baiocchi. *Militants as Citizens: The Politics of Participatory Democracy in Porto Alegre*. Stanford, CA.: Stanford University Press, 2005, pp. 5, 3 - 5, 139, 139, 139, 139.

[48] Per Adman. Does Workplace Experience Enhance Political Participation? A Critical Test of a Venerable Hypothesis. *Political Behavior*, 30 (2008), pp. 115 - 138.

[49] 蔡定剑:《公众参与及其在中国的发展》,《团结》2009年第4期。

[50] 俞可平:《公民参与的几个理论问题》,《学习时报》,http://www.china.com.cn/xxsb/txt/2006-12/19/content_7531039.htm.

[51] 俞可平:《思想解放与政治进步》,《新华文摘》2007年第22期。

〔责任编辑:书 缘〕

— 229 —