



Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal...

Equality and diversity in democracy: how can we democratize inclusively?

Jone Martinez Palacios

Article information:

To cite this document:

Jone Martinez Palacios , (2016), "Equality and diversity in democracy: how can we democratize inclusively?", Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal, Vol. 35 Iss 5/6 pp. 350 - 363

Permanent link to this document:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EDI-04-2016-0030>

Downloaded on: 07 November 2016, At: 01:54 (PT)

References: this document contains references to 28 other documents.

To copy this document: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

The fulltext of this document has been downloaded 25 times since 2016*

Users who downloaded this article also downloaded:

(2016), "Motherhood: an impediment to workplace progression? The case of Cyprus", Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal, Vol. 35 Iss 5/6 pp. 364-382 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EDI-02-2016-0019>

(2016), "Increasing diversity through goal-setting in corporate social responsibility reporting", Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal, Vol. 35 Iss 5/6 pp. 328-349 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EDI-01-2016-0005>

Access to this document was granted through an Emerald subscription provided by emerald-srm:563821 []

For Authors

If you would like to write for this, or any other Emerald publication, then please use our Emerald for Authors service information about how to choose which publication to write for and submission guidelines are available for all. Please visit www.emeraldinsight.com/authors for more information.

About Emerald www.emeraldinsight.com

Emerald is a global publisher linking research and practice to the benefit of society. The company manages a portfolio of more than 290 journals and over 2,350 books and book series volumes, as well as providing an extensive range of online products and additional customer resources and services.

Emerald is both COUNTER 4 and TRANSFER compliant. The organization is a partner of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and also works with Portico and the LOCKSS initiative for digital archive preservation.

*Related content and download information correct at time of download.

Equality and diversity in democracy: how can we democratize inclusively?

Jone Martinez Palacios

Department of Political Science, University of the Basque Country, Leioa, Spain

350

Received 18 April 2016
Revised 9 September 2016
Accepted 20 September 2016

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to propose a theoretical framework for democratize inclusively through participatory and deliberative apparatus.

Design/methodology/approach – The paper draws on literature from inclusion in deliberation, gender in participation and intersectionality to critically analyze the democratic deepening. By bringing into dialogue with one another “the norm of parity of participation” (Fraser, 2006), “communicative democracy” (Young, 1993) and the “matrix of domination” (Collins, 1990) a response to one of the questions that has been put to European and North American thought in democracy since the 1960s is proposed: how is it possible to democratize inclusively?

Findings – The reproduction of domination through apparatuses for the extension of democracy is both possible and probable. So, to democratize inclusively, it is necessary to bring the theories on vertical and horizontal inclusion into dialogue with each other. With the aim of establishing a dialogue between the two, it is necessary to export complex thought regarding oppression and inequality into the design of deliberative and participatory apparatuses. For that, consider that designing democratization processes based on the fact that the intersectional experience of oppression is not an exception but rather an everyday occurrence allows participatory procedures to be made more inclusive.

Practical implications – This paper proposes a tool designed with a focus on dialogue among the norm of parity of participation, communicative democracy and the matrix of oppression, based on 11 direct questions for the inclusive design of deliberative or participatory procedures. Facilitators, experts and social agents involved in deliberative or participatory processes will be able to use this question-based instrument in their work.

Originality/value – This paper has applied value because it offers a conceptual key to the design of and thought about participatory inclusive processes. The originality of this approach lies in its shift away from partial analyses of horizontal and vertical inclusion. It is of use both to facilitators of participatory processes and educators and researchers concerned with democratization. It offers an instrument for working on reflexivity with regard to inclusion in democratic extension, based on a series of key questions that can be used as a checklist. In comparison with other forms of considering inclusion in democracy, the proposal considered includes complex thought on oppression based on the critique of simple identity, as well as on an intersectional perspective.

Keywords Participation, Democracy, Deliberation, Intersectionality, Horizontal inclusion, Vertical inclusion

Paper type Conceptual paper

It's not necessary to believe that a political consensus to focus on the lives of the most disadvantaged will happen tomorrow in order to recenter discrimination discourse at the intersection. It is enough, for now, that such an effort would encourage us to look beneath the prevailing conceptions of discrimination and to challenge the complacency that accompanies belief in the effectiveness of this framework. By so doing, we may develop



language which is critical of the dominant view and which provides some basis for unifying activity. The goal of this activity should be to facilitate the inclusion of marginalized groups for whom it can be said: "When they enter, we all enter" (Crenshaw, 1989, p. 73).

Introduction

At present, democratic regimes are facing the challenge of inclusion in at least two of its forms: vertical inclusion and horizontal inclusion[1]. Vertical inclusion is the process by which states that are extending democracy seek to resolve the democratic malaise, by means of inviting citizens and other economic and social agents to participate in the process of public decision making. Horizontal inclusion is the process by which these same states respond to the problems of oppression deriving from the systematic concealment of the knowledge and life experiences of all non-normative agents, that is to say, those people and social groups considered to be at the fringes of the social norms employed by means of the different systems that permeate the social structures making up the social world (systems of gender, race, class, age, sexual tendency, physical capacity or spirituality, among others). This form of inclusion is related to the desire to create the conditions to grant symbolic power – in Bourdieu's (1994, p. 55) use of the term – to knowledge derived from the life experiences of those agents traditionally excluded from the political field.

From the 1990s onwards, both horizontal inclusion and vertical inclusion have been the source of a rich and stimulating academic production in the fields of political science and political philosophy. At around this time, the following initiatives emerge: the implementation of administrative reforms bringing new public sector management and governance in the UK, New Zealand and Australia; the first participatory budgeting projects in Latin America (1989, Porto Alegre) and Canada (1999, Guelph); and democratic theory adopts the approaches of the "deliberative turn". Furthermore, during this same period, feminist political theory's thoughts on oppression and inclusion embrace the approaches of black feminism on intersectionality to reveal the importance of developing "analyses of contemporary social phenomena that explore the connections among race, class and gender oppression and use new reconceptualizations of family, community and power in doing so" (Collins, 1990, p. 224).

However, the abundance of approaches to horizontal and vertical inclusion which, ultimately, share the common goal of designing more just and democratic societies, does not automatically mean a common research agenda and policy in the field of political science and political philosophy. In fact the very tendency to treat the matters of horizontal and vertical inclusion separately reveals a source of inhibition of the possibilities of making the most of both theoretical bodies' democratizing desires. I consider that a more fluid dialogue between them is crucial when it comes to democratizing inclusively. This paper defends the need to seek conceptual enclaves that facilitate dialogue between the programmes of horizontal and vertical inclusion and explores the potential of thought on inequality and oppression to act as such an enclave. In order to do this, a dialogue is established between feminist theories of democratization and intersectionality theories.

This conceptual paper starts from the idea that the absence of a fluid dialogue unifying the literature covering the two kinds of inclusion is the motivation behind some of feminist criticism's approaches to theories on democratic expansion. Specifically, it proposes that notions of group inequality and oppression occupy a central role in feminist political theory when it comes to establishing connections

between the two questions. This leads to the consideration that, in order to develop a dialogue between vertical and horizontal inclusion, it is crucial to explore in depth the forms in which situations of – additive, asymmetrical, autonomous and intersectional – inequality are thought about, produced and resolved[2] – in democratization contexts, both at the biographical and institutional levels. Doing so inevitably involves incorporating complex thought on inequality and oppression into the political theory of democratic expansion. In order to do this, it is proposed that a dialogue be established among the political thought of Nancy Fraser (1997, 2008) and Fraser and Honneth (2006 (2003 original version)), Iris Marion Young (1997, 2000) and Patricia Hill Collins (1990, 1998) by means of the authors’ three conceptual contributions: “norm of parity of participation (NPP)” (Fraser and Honneth, 2006), “communicative democracy (CD)” (Young, 1993) and the “matrix of domination (MD)” (Collins, 1990)[3].

In order to explain this proposal, the paper is divided into three parts. The first situates the argument regarding the importance of complicating thought concerning the ways in which inequality appears in democratizing procedures, through a revision of the contributions of feminist political theory on democratization. The second examines extending democracy from the point of view of intersectionality, to democratize inclusively. This is done based on three arguments: the exportation of complex thought on oppression, the multiscale analysis of the experiences of oppression and an assessment of resistance to domination. In the third part, it is concluded that democratizing inclusively involves incorporating a complex understanding of the systems of oppression that structure social life into the design, planning and implementation stages of vertical inclusion procedures. Here, a series of 11 questions is proposed – for reflection with respect to the practice of the participatory agent, facilitator or researcher regarding the matter of democratization – based on dialogue among the NPP, CD and the matrix of oppression. These questions can be raised at the different stages of the planning, design and implementation of a participatory procedure, or when establishing any theoretical – conceptual dialogue on the idea of inclusive democratization.

Democratizing inclusively or the importance of the adverb

The deliberative and participatory proposals framed within the generalist theory of democratic expansion always incorporate discourse about the importance of vertical inclusion. They seek to democratize inclusively, although they put more attention on the verb than on the adverb. Looking at the work of some of the authors who have studied the deliberative turn (Fishkin, 2009, pp. 33-34; Warren, 2009, pp. 6-16, Smith, 2009, p. 12; Fung and Wright, 2003, pp. 26-34; Ban *et al.*, 2012) and participatory democracy (Ibarra, 2008, p. 23; Santos, 1998, pp. 21-22), it can be stated that:

- (1) There is a consensus in including, among the constituent principles of their proposals, the notion of equity by which they show an interest in participatory and deliberative democracy being horizontally inclusive.
- (2) The concern with equity focusses on the group level and on an autonomous kind of inequality (e.g. a concern for woman to be present as a social group that is reasoned based on the allusion to a univocal experience of sexism). In this theoretical body, the axes of domination, which explain these dominations, are partially identified – gender, race and class (in the case of Fung, Smith and Santos) are spoken about, but intellectual capacity, for example, is not – and the focus is on their autonomous effects.

- (3) Horizontal inclusion is not central in these works. This explains why there is no propositional approach – beyond identifying the importance of the principle of equality for good participation – to mitigate the reproduction of domination in democratizing contexts.

In a kind of gender division of academic research, feminist political theory, focussing on the debates about democratization, has investigated the limits of incorporating thought on horizontal inclusion into democratizing procedures in the terms described above. Authors such as Nancy Fraser and Iris Marion Young reveal, from different theoretical angles – respectively, poststructuralism and positional or structural difference – the risk that the situations of oppression derived from the domination systems (race, gender, social class, functional capacity) be naturalized within democratic extension procedures unless they incorporate complex consideration regarding oppression and inequality into their theoretical and practical planning. These authors' conceptual approaches are characterized by exporting complex thought on identity into the debate on democratic extension; dealing with their proposals offers the possibility of reflections about the reproductive role of the social agent, which in turn are connected, as will be seen below, with the concerns and approaches of the intersectional perspective. That is why this paper presents Fraser's NPP and Young's CD proposal as two compatible strategies for achieving inclusive democracy.

Parity of participation norm: bringing the need to attend to complex situations of oppression into democratization processes

The NPP is a norm by which “independently of whether it is redistribution or recognition that is being sought, claimants should show that current arrangements block equal participation in social life. [...] According to this principle, justice requires social arrangements that permit all (adult) members of society to interact with one another as peers” (Fraser and Honneth, 2006, pp. 42-44). With the NPP, Nancy Fraser introduces the normative framework of reference for complex situations of oppression and inequality into democratization contexts.

The author starts from the identification of what she calls “groups with a complex composition” that result from the intersection of social class, race and gender (2006, p. 24). As they do in other fields of power, in deliberative and participatory bodies these groups experience exclusion from the point of view of that complex composition. So, to soothe the domination that arises during participatory decision making – passing from the “I” to the “us” (Mansbridge, 1990, p. 127) – Fraser and Honneth (2006) proposes the application of the NPP and “show[ing] publicly that the conditions for a truly democratic public reasoning are not present” (p. 49).

In this context, the NPP is a conceptual tool that situates the demand to incorporate complex thinking on oppression and inequality into vertical inclusion approaches, which makes it an important conceptual enclave between the two dimensions of inclusion.

Fraser and Honneth's (2006) instrument has, at its centre, a complex notion of oppression that includes its economic, institutional, symbolic and cultural aspects, given that, in order for the NPP to be applied, at least two conditions must be present: the objective condition of parity of participation, that is to say “the distribution of material resources such as to ensure participants' independence and ‘voice’”; and the intersubjective condition of parity of participation, which requires that “the institutionalized patterns of cultural value express equal respect for all participants and ensure equal opportunity for achieving social esteem” (p. 42).

Fraser's approach is interesting as a normative framework for democratizing inclusively because it contains a metalevel of deliberation directly linked to vertical inclusion. Her proposal for bringing together vertical and horizontal inclusion and soothing inequalities would consist in applying the parity of participation norm to debates about debates.

Following the author's thought, the existence of "subaltern counterpublics", or parallel discursive arenas (feminist, anti-racist, anti-heteronormative), indicates the domination of a majority public in debate and participation processes (Fraser, 1997, p. 115). This in turn reveals the existence of intrinsic patriarchal, racist and heteronormative biases in forms of participating and deliberating. By applying the NPP reflexively to these proceedings, it becomes clear that the objective and intersubjective conditions of the principle have not been met, creating situations of intersectional inequality and injustice that would require a response involving redistribution and recognition policies.

To illustrate the way in which the NPP offers a normative framework to complex oppression situations, the example is given of a group of deaf Basque women who wish to access a vertical inclusion procedure such as participatory budgeting. It is important to know that these women do not have official words in sign language for concepts that might be used in participatory apparatuses such as: self-esteem, sustainability, performativity, queer or gender[4]. Applying the parity of participation norm to the metalevel of the debate it can be seen that: the institutionalization of a majority form of debate based on dialogue, without sign language, denies them parity of participation because they do not have access to the debate's content and, furthermore, even if there was a possibility to hire a sign-language interpreter for the participatory process for when the deaf group attends, it would oblige them to have an exceptionally organized agenda, denying them the right to improvise their participation. The expansion of the definition of participation and deliberation based on the position of deaf Basque women does not deny participation to any other group, it only extends it to other social positions.

So Fraser's model offers a normative framework of reference within which the demand for greater horizontal inclusion, from a complex perspective of oppression and inequality, can be reconciled. This framework can be brought into dialogue with other conceptual enclaves, such as CD and the MD, which offer a greater precision regarding procedures for deactivating inequalities in democratization processes.

CD: measures for democratizing taking into consideration complex thought about oppression and inequality

Iris Marion Young understands that the majority approaches of the deliberative model have been developed with some limitations when it comes to horizontal inclusion. The author detects four lacks in democratization's forms of inclusion. First, she finds that they privilege a supposedly universal interpretation of what a good argument is, ignoring other forms of expression and communication and, in the process, those who employ those forms. Second, according to Young, those approaches privilege unity and general interest as if these were objective and universal. Third, she considers that, by assuming that face-to-face discussion is the best form of dialogue, the domination inherent in this kind of communication is lost from sight. Lastly, deliberative approaches involve an assumption of an order linked to reason and rationality, that is supposedly universal yet which is not within reach of everyone (Young, 2000).

It is clear from Young's critique that the author seeks to incorporate complex thought about inequality and oppression at the group level into democratization theories, giving this more substance by means of her CD proposal (Young, 1990).

Therefore, this constitutes an important conceptual enclave in the dialogue between the two dimensions of inclusion.

Her proposal is founded on the desire to respond to the different forms of objectivized and incorporated group inequality that arise from systems of oppression based on race, gender, class and functional diversity (2000, p. 286). So, CD must be understood as democracy that can deactivate “internal and external” (Young, 2000) complex exclusion, by means of the incorporation of other forms of expression, traditionally belittled and embodied by groups of people who experience different forms of inequality.

Specifically, with the goal of stopping these processes from producing situations of exclusion, the US author proposes three tools for deliberation: greeting, rhetoric and narrative (2000, pp. 53-80). With the greeting, she introduces the political value of explicitly recognizing the other. Knowing that person’s name is a principle for understanding the position from which they speak and for establishing positive conditions so that debate, deliberation and participation can take place adequately. With the rhetoric tool, she offers a proposal regarding the effects of formulating a restrictive form of discussion that ignores the figurative, aesthetic and emotional language used by many subjectivities to express themselves. Lastly, narrative, or the experiential statement of the facts, is a formula that admits reasoning based on experiences and talking about them, which offer an important source of knowledge.

Therefore, Young’s contributions would improve the conditions for participation of many social groups who experience situations of intersectional exclusion. An enlargement of the notion of participation and deliberation through a broader communicative model so that these social groups can enter means, following Crenshaw, that we all enter.

So far, it has been explained that the contributions made from the fields of poststructuralism and positional difference to the debate at the juncture of vertical and horizontal inclusion make it possible to see the importance of seeking conceptual enclaves that include the complexity involved in the experience of oppression in reality, and also to focus on the different forms of inequality that derive from this oppression. It has been pointed out that the NPP is valuable given that it allows the establishment of the normative framework of the requirement to pull vertical inclusion approaches horizontally, bringing a complex experience of oppression to the centre. The CD proposal is also valuable because it introduces specific measures so that we can all enter into democratization processes. Below, the potential that complex thought on inequality and oppression offers to act as an enclave in the undertaking of democratizing inclusively is explored further and in order to do this this paper will enter the terrain of thought on intersectionality.

Inclusion from an intersectional point of view

In 1989, Kimberlé Crenshaw named a kind of exclusion experienced by many black women in which different axes of oppression such as race, social class, age or gender intersect, creating a “new” inequality. This is not a novel or rare way of experiencing oppression; rather it is a way of describing it by registering, with a greater degree of exactness, the complexity with which systems of domination act. Since that time, intersectionality theory has undergone an expansion in both the academic and the activist fields (Wanggren and Sellberg, 2012). However, until now, this theoretical body has been little used in the debate about models of democracy. It is for this reason that democratization and intersectionality are, at present, terrain to be explored, given that intersectionality theory is, above all, a theory that complicates the forms in which oppression and inequality are experienced. If it is accepted that democratizing

inclusively involves exporting complex thought to vertical inclusion theory, then intersectionality theory is a valuable theoretical enclave.

In order to advance in the task of seeking conceptual enclaves between vertical and horizontal inclusion programmes, putting democratization and intersectionality into dialogue with one another is interesting for three reasons:

- (1) Because intersectionality theory is, above all, a horizontal inclusion theory that provides interpretive frameworks and responses to help understand the complexity involved in situations of oppression. This complex interpretation of oppression takes place by means of (a) attending to its dynamic character – since it works with the possibility of being both oppressor and oppressed at the same time – (b) identifying invisibilized forms of experiencing oppression through the progressive detection of a series of axes of domination which, arranged in a hierarchical way, oppress those who experience their effects.
- (2) Because of the scale on which intersectionality theory has usually been developed: the individual or biographical level. Intersectionality theory has worked in depth at the individual or biographical level at which oppression is experienced. This level has traditionally been overlooked by democratic extension theories, which have focussed more on the discrimination suffered by certain social groups during the decision-making process. However, given that oppression always involves an individual or biographical level, even if it also goes beyond this, it is important to explore those elements of intersectional thought that can put the questions which can be used to design inclusive deliberative and participatory procedures and introduce multiscale thought about domination.
- (3) Due to the central place that the notion of resistance holds in black feminist intersectionality thought. The intersectionality theory developed based on black feminist epistemology is, above all, a theory of resistances. Each one of the domains in which oppression occurs is also a location for resistance. Therefore, looking at democratization from the point of view of intersectionality gives us the opportunity to look at the forms of resistance that, more or less reflexively, are being used by many people who experience complex forms of oppression.

One of the writers who has contributed greatly in terms of intersectionality as applied to democracy is Patricia Hill Collins (2009), who, without intervening in the deliberative debate, indicates elements of great importance so that vertical inclusion through deliberation can contemplate the complexity that oppression acts with. Specifically, this author's "MD" can be a source for three central ideas when it comes to seeking conceptual enclaves focussing on a complex idea of inequality and oppression.

First, her idea derived from the first characteristic of all matrices of domination, regarding the dynamism inherent in oppression situations. Experiencing oppression is complex both because the position occupied by the agent varies, and because of the scale on which it is experienced. The MD formulated by Collins introduces two matters rarely taken up in the participatory and deliberative democracy debate:

- (1) The assumption that we experience changing positions of power: "depending on the context, an individual may be an oppressor, a member of an oppressed group, or simultaneously oppressor and oppressed" (Collins, 1990, p. 225). Therefore, anyone designing a participatory apparatus, anyone "consuming" it and anyone implementing it does so under the dynamic condition of oppression.

As is explained below, accepting this fact introduces the possibility of establishing dialogues for solidarity among experiences of oppression, and from there employing empathy to agree the terms of democratic expansion in such a way that we all enter.

- (2) The assumption that the different axes of oppression intersect according to the scale: “People experience and resist oppression on three levels: the level of personal biography; the group or community level of cultural context created by race, class and gender; and the systemic level of social institutions” (Collins, 1990, pp. 226-227).

Second, there is relevance in her idea, derived from the second characteristic of all MDs, regarding the importance of the context in which the domination situations and the corresponding resistance occur. This permits a better understanding of the structural, disciplinary, hegemonic and intersubjective nature in which oppression operates in acts such as deliberating or participating. Therefore, applying the MD to the Canadian context, in which there are ever more vertical inclusion apparatuses (Fuji, 2009), would allow us to see that democratizing within hegemonic parameters is unjust. Here I offer the example of an institutionalized and generalist decision-making process (participatory budgets), implemented in an English-speaking context. In this situation, the voice of a French-speaking woman from one of the first nations does not reach other participants and is not listened to in the same way as that of a white English-speaking man. This is the case because:

- At a structural level, the law has delayed the formal participation of some social agents, such as first-nation women, blocking them from the right to vote and thereby institutionalizing the distancing and incomprehension of these agents from the system used to intervene in the decision-making process.
- At a disciplinary level, participation is channelled through a complex bureaucratic design by representatives who belong to a white, non-aboriginal participatory elite, which, in the participatory budgeting process, ends up prioritizing the proposals of those who intervene in the debate through the use of technical grounds and arguments.
- At a hegemonic level, there is a way of participating in which alternative epistemologies are not included, either on the linguistic level or in terms of other aspects that are symbolic of the social reality. For example, on the posters convening neighbourhood meetings for the participatory budget, there are no credible images of first-nation women.
- At an interpersonal level, day-to-day interactions with the administration are reduced to a relationship of support (through applications for social benefits, among others); this makes the agent perceive the state and its products as an abstract and superior element which, carrying out a notion of justice in which it has not participated, exercises daily acts of violence. The same administrative body whose actions complicate people’s lives, invites those same agents to participate.

Finally, a further interesting proposal arising from Collins’ work is the idea of dialogue and communication among the different ways of experiencing oppression. The MD offers a rarely mentioned notion regarding the very close link between intersectionality and participation and deliberation: the first as a form of guaranteeing the horizontal inclusion of the second and third, and participation and deliberation as ways of knowing

“the other”. That is to say, knowing in order to understand the oppression of the other and, from there, knowing others without imposing on them a hierarchy; by means of dialogue, first and foremost and from there creating opportunities for communication and inclusive participation. Specifically, Collins’ “safe places” offer an element that highlights the dialogic dimension of her approach. She says of these places that “while domination may be inevitable as social fact, it is unlikely to be hegemonic as an ideology within that social space where black women speak freely” (1990, p. 95). She conceptualizes them, taking into consideration dialogue and understanding among black women. However, what interests us here is salvaging the idea that the safe place or, more broadly, sisterhood, speaks of dialogue among oppressions as a way of knowing the other, her position and from there expanding the notions used to define the world.

Collins explains that the agent’s social positions – the result of different structures of oppression – are constitutive of an intersectional analysis. Based on this she develops the dimension of voice and dialogue that this paper is referring to and says that: “everyone has a voice, but everyone must listen and respond to other voices in order to be allowed to remain in the community. Sharing a common cause fosters dialogue and encourages groups to transcend their differences” (Collins, 1990, p. 237). Although it is the case that everyone has communicative abilities, whatever they are, deliberative apparatuses are not designed so that those who do not use the valued rational argument form can participate. As has been explained above, it is possible to find this same idea in Fraser and Young, given that Collins, Fraser and Young all criticize simple identity politics. However, following Collins allows the introduction into this cartography of a central idea of intersectional thought, thus expanding the inclusive nature of democratization.

Following Collins’ MD, assuming that oppression is complex, among other reasons because: it is experienced at different personal biographical, group or community levels, or at the systemic or social institution level; and it is possible to be a dominated and dominating agent, it can be stated that all agents have experienced, more or less systematically, feelings of being oppressed and of oppressing. If it can be assumed that everyone has at some point experienced the effects of intersectional inequality, why not appeal to the experience resulting from this oppressive experience to initiate an inclusive dialogue? Is it possible to establish a stable understanding based on different positions of oppression whose goal is, at a first stage, to agree the need to broaden the norms of participation and deliberation? The answer to this question is important, given that from it comes the possibility of this dialogue producing a learning about the value of inclusion that involves the incorporation of the motto “when they enter, we all enter” by those who design, implement and “consume” the procedure.

Conclusions and questions about inclusion in extending democracy

This paper began with a question and a quote from Kimberlé Crenshaw’s (1989) famous text “Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex”. This reflected a wish to express that the crucial idea when responding to the question of how we can democratize inclusively was given by that author at the end of the 1980s when she said that “when they enter, we all enter”. The quotation from her work is an invitation to look at the lives of those who experience complex forms of oppression, and then design strategies of vertical inclusion. Salvaging Crenshaw’s idea means bringing complex thought regarding oppression to bear on vertical inclusion approaches.

The answer offered here is that, in order to democratize inclusively, it is necessary to export complex thought regarding oppression and inequality into the design of

deliberative and participatory apparatuses. This paper has defended the need to seek conceptual enclaves that facilitate dialogue between vertical and horizontal inclusion. Throughout the paper the potential for thought on inequality and oppression to act as an enclave has been explored and it has been explained that both feminist political theory on democratization and intersectional thought have an important role to play when it comes to detecting spaces for dialogue.

Therefore, given everything said up until now, it can be deduced that in order to democratize inclusively it is necessary to understand a complex conception of oppression. First, this means understanding and assimilating the fact that all vertical inclusion procedures are planned, designed and implemented in a context in which relations of oppression are complex. Different domination systems are involved in these relations, meaning there is no pure form of inequality. Specifically, it is important to bear in mind that the very concept of oppression is interpreted in many ways around the world. This means considering that in fact every society has its different axes of oppression, adapted according to that society (gender, class, caste, functional diversity, spirituality, strength of body and mind, etc.), which clearly brings us to the idea that oppression is experienced in a complex way in the lives of social agents. However, it also means reflecting on the fact that the very notion of oppression is subject to differences of interpretation according to the political and social regime in which it is located. So, in authoritarian systems and stratified societies in which physical violence is part of government action and is institutionalized, oppression incorporates the gender or race system, but is experienced differently from in non-authoritarian systems and multicultural societies, in which obviously physical violence exists, but has to hide and is punished institutionally.

Second, this means assuming that, as products of a certain context, vertical inclusion procedures have to confront a patriarchal, Eurocentric, heteronormative, classist and ablest inertia. The reproduction of domination through apparatuses for the extension of democracy is both possible and probable. My proposal is that complex thought on oppression and inequality allows the deactivation of these probabilities. Most specifically, it is considered here that designing democratization processes based on the fact that the intersectional experience of oppression is not an exception but rather an everyday occurrence allows participatory procedures to be made more inclusive. So, designing a participatory budget in a way that considers the position of deaf Basque women to be exceptional is less inclusive than considering that position as a privileged one according to which the budgetary process can be designed.

This final part of the paper focusses on the way in which the conversation among the three concepts that arise from a complex understanding of oppression, the NPP, CD and MD, help with the specific task of producing inclusive democratization spaces. This is done by suggesting a series of direct questions that might offer the possibility of advancing both in the experimentation with, and in the theoretical planning of, vertical inclusion procedures. Table I offers a summary of the specific learning that can be taken from each of the three authors' proposals in order to proceed with putting such questions.

As has already been stated, the elements of Table I are not all equally applicable, but the three complement each other in the search for enclaves for inclusive democratization. The NPP situates the demand for thinking about vertical inclusion procedures based on a complex notion of oppression and inequality. The CD is a specific proposal for making participation and deliberation broad enough for us all to enter, formulated based on a complex conception of oppression. The MD is a tool that allows us to reflect on the complexity with which oppression is experienced and resists

EDI
35,5/6

360

Nancy Fraser
Norm of parity of participation

Iris Marion Young
Communicative democracy

Patricia Hill Collins
Matrix of domination

The possibility of using the parity of participation norm at the meta-debate level and therefore ensure its objective and intersubjective condition

The importance of considering the existence of different forms of communication

The visibility of intersectional inequality which also exists in democratization processes

The possibility of incorporating figures for communicative inclusion such as: the greeting, rhetoric and narrative

The possibility of attending to the individual, group and institutional scales on which the oppression is experienced. Without forgetting the structural, disciplinary, hegemonic and interpersonal context of power relations
The possibility of detecting, in each sphere of power, resistance to domination
The conception of a dynamic idea of oppression
The possibility of appealing to the oppression experienced by each individual at a moment of her or his existence and, from there, establishing the possibilities of understanding, over and above the discourse, the need to conceive inclusive forms of organizing participation and deliberation

Table I.

Synthesis of the central elements of the NPP, CD and MD proposals

Source: Author's elaboration

that oppression; applied to thought about vertical inclusion this tool offers creative possibilities based on dialogue, empathy and resistance.

So, based on the conviction that questions can advance thought by making visible problems, people, agendas, social positions and strategies that would otherwise remain hidden, a series of questions is proposed that can be put at the different stages of the planning, design and implementation of a participatory procedure.

This series of questions would start by bringing Crenshaw's question into the design of the democratic extension process: is everybody there? Are conditions present that allow the voice, presence and worldview of marginalized people to be guaranteed? Furthermore, we could ask ourselves, following Fraser: are conditions present for applying the parity of participation norm at the debate's metalevel? A third line of questions would connect with Young's proposal: does the procedure allow for the existence of different forms of communication? Does the apparatus start from a universal notion of participation and deliberation, or does it rather include other forms of communication from the beginning and not as exceptions? Is use made of the figures of the greeting, rhetoric and narrative in order to include other experiences and opinions? Lastly, a fourth line of questions would involve asking: does the design take into consideration the existence of a complex inequality that is also present in the design, implementation and "consumption" of

democratization procedures? Does it also attend to the fact that this complex inequality acts at different levels and requires that those who design procedures, those who implement them and who moderate them be alert at all times? Is it possible to appeal to the feeling of oppression experienced by everyone at some time during their lives in order to recall the unease felt and thus build empathies and solidarity that are the basis of apprehending the discourse of inclusion? Does the design consider the learning of resistances to oppression? That is to say, does it recognize and incorporate the knowledge that exists in individual, group and institutional strategies already employed by many dominated agents?

These 11 questions only touch on the complexity of the problems tackled in this paper. However, applying them will no doubt reveal problems, new questions and challenges – such as, for example: how can these questions help to consolidate inclusive democratization processes at global or transnational scales? Are they subject to the frequent criticism made of the application of the intersectional perspective due to the difficulties of implementing it at a plane beyond the individual one? – paradoxes and contradictions that will at least bring horizontal inclusion to the fore in democracy extension programmes.

Therefore, in the immediate term, this series of key questions can be incorporated into the practice of participating agents or facilitators of democratic extension processes who wish to democratize inclusively. In this way, it can act as an initial checklist for those who work in the public sector or the private service sector when starting to design the process and when implementing it. Furthermore, the matters raised can be used by research and educational personnel who are studying the theory of democratization through participation and/or deliberation.

Up until the stage of criticism of early theory of the deliberative idea, the study of democratization predominantly took place based on a notion of inclusion from a simple identity perspective. This has allowed reflection on additive, autonomous or asymmetrical oppression in contexts of democratic extension. Critical philosophies of deliberation and participation in democratic extension processes (such as those of Fraser and Young) introduced frameworks of thought about complex identity, and thus a more appropriate way of approaching the oppression that can be experienced by social agents in democratic extension processes.

Lastly, moving towards conceptual approaches and series of questions in which the intersectionality idea is explicitly incorporated – as is the case with the analytical and interpretive proposal put forward in this text – makes it possible to articulate the conceptual learnings of critical thought on democratic extension, and at the same time, prepare the researcher for the conceptual challenges that arise in the complex societies (whether stratified or multicultural ones) in which intersectional inequality is a fact that requires responses.

Notes

1. Although “inclusion” and “inclusivity” are frequently considered as synonyms, there are authors who distinguish between them, proposing the first as referring to an initial stage in the process of integration, and the second as referring to the situation in a post-multicultural society (Dei, 2010; Berns-McGown, 2013; Fleras, 2014). Therefore, the noun “inclusivity” is used in the literature with the aim of avoiding the possible assimilationist implications of the form “inclusion” (to include in something already given that, although changeable, cannot be altered in terms of its structure), and thus it is emphasized that structures need to be altered in order to incorporate diversity. This debate has not consolidated a research agenda on the matter of democratic extension theory. So the most common form in the literature on participatory and deliberative democracy is “inclusion”, which, depending on the author and

her or his theoretical position, acquires a more or less postmodern nuance. In this text, the form “inclusion” is used, since it is the most common in the field to which this contribution belongs. However, it is emphasized that this does not mean that the approach set out below belongs to what Sandercock (2003) calls “differences-in-society”.

2. Marta Cruells (2015, pp. 31-50) offers an explanation with different examples of the possible effects of inequality. The author’s position does not reject the possibility that all these effects operate in reality. Specifically, autonomous effects make reference to the oppressive consequences brought about by a single axis of oppression (e.g. the gender system). Talking about asymmetrical effects means accepting that it is possible to distinguish a degree of unequal influence in the axes of oppression, depending on the context. Referring to additive effects means considering situations in which the effects of discrimination of the different axes of oppression (race, gender, class, and others) accumulate. Lastly, “when we say that an intersectional inequality is produced because of race, gender and social status, we are not saying, for example, that an African-American woman of lower class accumulates the three inequalities that work autonomously, but rather that the inequality experienced by this woman is a different inequality, one that is the result of the intersection of these three inequalities” (Cruells, 2015, p. 45).
3. Theories on inclusion taken from these three authors are strategically selected for the proposal presented here because they date from the stage that Mansbridge *et al.* (2006) calls “criticism of early theory of the deliberative idea” (p. 5) – which runs from the mid-1990s to the early 2000s – during which the concept of inclusion took hold in the deliberative and participatory ideal. This means that the three thinkers’ concerns on inclusion that give rise to the conceptual proposals selected for this article – dated between 1990 and 2000 – are directly linked to the context in which the debate, and the problems of inclusive democratic extension that concern us here, occurred.
4. I would like to thank Andrea Momoitio who offered the information that led me to this reflection at the presentation of *Pikara Magazine* on 11 September 2015 at the University of the Basque Country, Spain.

References

- Ban, R., Jha, S. and Rao, V. (2012), “Who has voice in a deliberative democracy? Evidence from transcripts of village parliaments in South India”, research paper series, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA, pp. 1-36.
- Berns-McGown, R. (2013), “‘I am Canadian’. Challenging stereotypes about Young Somali-Canadians”, IRPP, Institute for Research on Public Policy, 15 January, available at: <http://irpp.org/research-studies/study-no38/> (accessed 31 August 2016).
- Bourdieu, P. (1994), *Raisons Pratiques. Sur la théorie de L’action*, Points, Paris.
- Collins, P.H. (1990), *Black Feminist Thought. Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*, Routledge, London.
- Collins, P.H. (1998), *Fighting Words. Black Women and the Search For Justice*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN.
- Collins, P.H. (2009), *Another Kind of Public Education. Race, Schools, the Media and Democratic Possibilities*, Beacon, Boston, MA.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989), “Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: a black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics”, *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, Vol. 1989 No. 1, pp. 139-67.
- Cruells, M. (2015), “La interseccionalidad política: tipos y factores de entrada en la agenda política, jurídica y de los movimientos sociales”, doctoral dissertation, Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, 5 March.
- Dei, G.J.S. (2010), *Learning to Succeed: The Challenges and Possibilities of Educational Development for All*, Teneo Press, New York, NY.

- Fishkin, J. (2009), *When the People Speak: Deliberative Democracy and Public Consultation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Fleras, A. (2014), *Immigration in Canada*, UBC Press, Vancouver.
- Fraser, N. (1997), *Justice Interruptus. Critical Reflections on the "Postsocialist" Condition*, Routledge, London.
- Fraser, N. (2008), *Scales of Justice: Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World*, Columbia University Press, New York, NY.
- Fraser, N. and Honneth, A. (2006), Spanish version employed (2003 original version in German: Umverteilung oder Anerkennung?, Shuhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt). ¿Redistribución O Reconocimiento? *Un Debate Político-Filosófico*, Morata, A Coruña.
- Fuji, J. (2009), "Deliberative democratic practices in Canada: an analysis of institutional empowerment in three cases", *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 42 No. 3, pp. 679-703.
- Fung, A. and Wright, E. (2003), *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*, Verso, London.
- Ibarra, P. (2008), *Relational Democracy*, Center for Basque Studies, University of Nevada, Reno, NV.
- Mansbridge, J. (1990), "Feminism and democracy", *The American Prospect*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 126-139, available at: <http://prospect.org/article/feminism-and-democracy>
- Mansbridge, J., Hartz, K.J., Amengual, M. and Gastil, J. (2006), "Norms of deliberation. An inductive study", *Journal of Public Deliberation*, Vol. 2 No. 1, Article 7, available at: www.publicdeliberation.net/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1029&context=jpd
- Sandercock, L. (2003), *Cosmopolis II: Mongrel Cities in the 21st Century*, Continuum, London.
- Santos, B. (1998), *Reinventar a Democracia*, Ed., Lisboa, Grávida.
- Smith, G. (2009), *Democratic Innovations*, Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Wanggren, L. and Sellberg, K. (2012), "Intersectionality and dissensus: a negotiation on the feminist classroom", *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, Vol. 31 Nos 5/6, pp. 542-555.
- Warren, M. (2009), "Governance-driven democratization", *Critical Policy Studies*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 3-13.
- Young, I.M. (1990), *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Young, I.M. (1993), "Justice and communicative democracy", in Gottlieb, R. (Ed.), *Philosophy: Tradition, Counter-Tradition, Politics*, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, pp. 23-42.
- Young, I.M. (1997), *Intersecting Voices: Dilemmas of Gender, Political Philosophy and Policy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Young, I.M. (2000), *Inclusion and Democracy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

About the author

Jone Martínez Palacios is Assistant Lecturer in the University of the Basque Country's Department of Political Science. She forms part of the Consolidated Research Group PARTE HARTUZ (UFI EMAN) and runs the *Feminist and Democracy* research area. She has published a number of works on participatory democracy and feminist theory, including: "Sozio ingurumen gatazkak eta sozio ingurumen demokrazia" (2011), "La participation des femmes aux mobilisations environnementales" *Raison présente* 186 (2013, pp. 27-39), "The sex of participatory democracy. An analysis of the theoretical approaches and experiences of participatory democracy from a feminist viewpoint", *Democratization*, Vol. 23 No. 5, pp. 940-959. Jone Martínez Palacios can be contacted at: jone.martinez@ehu.es

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm

Or contact us for further details: permissions@emeraldinsight.com