

Colorado State University Libraries
Center for Collaborative Conservation
Seminar and Discussion Series

Transcription of Power, ethics, and deliberative democracy: exploring the contribution of passionate impartiality in diverse communities, 9/25/2012

Collection: Fall 2012

Title: Power, ethics, and deliberative democracy: exploring the contribution of passionate impartiality in diverse communities

Date: 9/25/2012

File Name: CCC_2012_Fall_Carcasson.mp4

Date Transcribed: November 2024

Transcription Platform: Konch AI

BEGIN TRANSCRIPTION

[00:01 - 01:20] Martin Carcasson: Other things, but I have to find a picture first. Yeah. My name is Martin Carcasson. Um, the title you see for the talk up there. Uh, basically what I do, we run a Center for Public Deliberation. It serves as an impartial resource for the Northern Colorado community. Basically, what I do is I train particularly undergraduates, but also some graduate students, uh, to be impartial facilitators. And then, we run events in the community. So these are some of the events that we've run in the last seven years. Uh, you know, part part of the story that seems important is when I started this center, the idea was to give students a chance to kind of get out of the classroom, to do some interesting things. I was doing some cool things in classes of getting them to talk about issues differently, but they never thought outside of class. So that started challenging me. So, we thought we would do this. We run some forums. You primarily thought that we would pick a topic and try to convince people to show up and then have a nice educational discussion, but as soon as they started learning these projects, people would come to us. They asked us to run one meeting for them. So basically, for the last seven years, we haven't run a single event that's in our own. We've been working with the city, working with the school district, working with the governor's office, working with the League of Women Voters, United Way, Early Childhood Council. All these different organizations coming to us that have been clear, that kind of fills this void and helping people have a different kind of conversation. So, most of what our meetings are is about 100 people or so will show up at our bigger meetings. Uh, we'll put them at round-tables.

[01:21 - 02:41] Martin Carcasson: Uh, we can do some large group process in the front of the room. And I've got clickers and those type of things, but then I can also take it to my students. And the two on the left here are my students that can run the individual tables. This is one of the things that we ran for the Portland Senior Center. Uh, and dealing with a topic called Growing Older in Fort Collins, looking at the issues as a silver tsunami, as all the, the baby boomers retiring and how that's going to change. I think a number of residents in our community over 65 is going to increase by 140% in the next ten years, which is a significant change the way our community works. So a lot of what we're trying to do is get people to talk to each other better. Uh, a lot about how do we get to move people from kind of polarizing, assuming the worst of each other to actually dealing with the real differences in an important way. So there's kind of one way that they don't do it casually. So what I'll do is for today's presentation, so I'm gonna talk a little bit about that, the perspective we come to on the nature of problem, particularly with the planning of the term called wicked problem. And then I'll run through this stuff pretty quickly, because I want to kind of get to the heart of the issue, which is the theory which is focusing on kind of power and ethics in our people [unintelligible]. Um, I will say, if you want me to go a lot slower, I gave a two hour talk at the library a couple weeks ago. The showing on Channel 14 you can still catch it or it's on YouTube or I can send it to you by email, and I go through these slides a lot slower, um, focusing on, on the front matter a little bit more.

[02:42 - 04:10] Martin Carcasson: Uh, so after the flaws of our current ways, I'll talk a little bit about our perspective on deliberative practice with those of you kind of, that know a lot about co-operation which won't necessarily be new and then get to the, to the focus of the series on some of the things that we're doing now on power ethics. Um, and I am a tenured faculty member here, so I do have research responsibilities. Uh, so I call myself a practical [unintelligible] in the sense of I'm doing the research, and then I'm actually more theoretical than the social scientist on my research. So, you know, obviously we do a lot for five big projects a semester, sometimes we'll be bouncing back and forth. And this last point of focusing on issues of power and ethics, especially some of the kind of research we're engaging right now that's starting to kind of push forward on the great chance for much of that. So the two questions that I really asked in my own work, both in my research in the practice, is how do we best address public problems in diverse democracy, and what kind of communication or engagement processes how to solve those. I'm a communication professor, I focus particularly on how we talk to each other. In my former life, when I was just a PhD student, I basically researched presidential rhetoric, and it was a whole bunch of papers about how badly politicians talk about issues, and I kind of got bored. Doing well, got a lot of publications, uh, but it was kind of boring about talking about how bad it is for the next week to say, okay, how can we improve it? How can we figure out a better way talking to each other versus just kind of talking past each other and thinking about that? So, one of the things that came up, and this is actually in the last

couple of years, we might be even used to you, um, you know, last time I talked about this was the distinction made between tame and wicked problems.

[04:10 - 05:41] Martin Carcasson: Is that, those terms familiar to anybody? In the security of company? Okay, so a few. Good, huh? But these were actually engineers, right? That were trained as engineers and then went out as part of working for cities. And they pretty quickly found out that what cities, the problems that cities were asking them to solve were very different than the problems they were trained to. They were trained to solve these linear problems. What they call tame and tame doesn't mean easy. It can be very, very complex and difficult. Right? But, there is some answer there, an actual research till they find the answer. But what they said is working in cities, they were dealing with what's called wicked problems. And the heart of it, I focus primarily on this is going to get through it. Look at problems inherently involve competing underlying values, paradoxes and tradeoffs that can't be resolved by science. And my argument is most of the problems of democracy, or in some ways, I'm arguing democracy itself is in a way a problem. We inherently have diverse audiences that brings things differently. They have different values and the complex problems we're dealing with intercept those values in a lot of different ways. So, my basic argument is the way those problems require us to talk to each other in very specific ways, and we're not getting it right. And it kind of ties to the prior to getting it makes it even harder for us to solve those problems. So, one quick example, but I've used a lot in this context that people haven't run to know a lot more about it. Uh, we helped the, the Water Institute here kind of run some educational forums and then some deliberation forums on water in the department to try to connect increases the understanding of the community about difficult water problems. Right? And I'm coming from a process perspective, not the expertise on water, but certainly we have people out there.

[05:42 - 07:11] Martin Carcasson: But what you know, one basic analysis that we do is: What are the underlying values that are important here? And the key point that it showed here is if you look at each of those nine boxes, there's nothing bad in there, right? I mean, in any of those boxes you just want to get to health, right? It's just isn't inherently a bad thing, right? But the issue isn't which of those we think is important. The issue is how we rank them, right? And if I ask you to take a piece of paper and rank them from 1 to 9, you see very different rankings, right? Or maybe in this room it wouldn't be so different, but we have the community to rank them and it would be very [unintelligible]. But the essence of the problem we're dealing with is how do we rank them, and what's the impact of one on the other and, in generally, kind of going back to the notion of paradox and tension, we can't get more than one without being left with some of the others, right? And that could be- Yes. But the dominant talk that we did is either adversarial talk or activist talk or expert talk, which tends to focus this on more critical talk and adversarial talk in particular, tries to focus on,

we think this problem is important in trying to or it essentially implies that people that disagree with them reject that logic. And it's kind of how we started these projects in the sense of explain that no one's anti-river. I mean, there's no one out there that just hates rivers, right? That if we just get rid of the river, everything will be better. Right now, there's certainly people that might put other things in front of the river, which is an important distinction that we need to work with. But again, the basic point that we try to do with our processes is: Let's actually get to the point of talking about what we actually disagree with, what we think, not what we think we disagree within the polarization.

[07:11 - 08:13] Martin Carcasson: Right? And what's worse in adversarial politics, we get both and it's very different than what works to help us going to work through different problems. So the theory behind it, this is from my background in argumentation and rhetoric and those type of things. So, uh, coming from Chaïm Perelman, a Belgian philosopher, is this notion that a value is inherently a good thing. You don't tend to have negative values that much, right? Um, so what makes it different in other ways? He argues that, well, basically we have the same values. What makes it different is how we raise them, right? You know, there are still some real differences from that thing. We always have a great conversation. We all hold hands and think about, yeah, right? But let's deal with a real differences versus the perceived differences. Another way I kind of play with this is: Take the preamble of the Constitution, it has five values embedded in it. We take those values and kind of translate them to get a little bit more common term. Um, we've got these five kind of dominant American values: Justice, security, quality, freedom for us and freedom for future generations. Right? Or are they bad and you want to want to get rid of any of those? But what's your top, which one trumps the other? What's the most important one? Can you just call it out?

[08:13 - 08:13] Audience: Freedom for us and future generations.

[08:20 - 08:21] Martin Carcasson: Freedom is most important to you. Anyone else?

[08:21 - 08:21] Audience: Justice.

[08:22 - 08:23] Martin Carcasson: Justice for you.

[08:24 - 08:24] Audience: Equality.

[08:24 - 08:40] Martin Carcasson: Equality first. Okay, so, but the person that picked equality doesn't mean he hates freedom, right? I mean and it's the way you rank them and how and why and how we can have real life situations with the choice that they made. I mean, do you see any tensions between those? That the more we get of one, you might get a little less of the other?

[08:41 - 09:56] Martin Carcasson: Right? There's an important tension. You know, there's, there's a tension between these two, in terms of the choices we make now, to what degree, to the curtail of the choices or there's kind of a big choice between here, especially in economic issues. History kind of shows the least of capitalism is the more freedom we have, the more inequality we have. So, if we want inequality, we have to violate freedoms. Not always, but there is kind of a tension there, right? And between security and freedom, right? I'm going to the airport tomorrow. That's going to be a clear tension between security and freedom, right? I want the plane to make it, right? But I don't want to get there three hours early and get strip-searched, right? So there's tension, and then justice itself can has a tension in itself, right? Because justice in lots of ways is [unintelligible]. But it's like, you know, getting what you deserve and the justice is that perfect tension between not getting more than you deserve and not less than you deserve. Um, so there's lots of tension to this. We tend to not have that conversation, right? These are primarily used in adversarial context as weapons. But I'm for freedom. You know, assuming the other side is against freedom, right? I'm for security. And the other side loves the terror, right? But that stuff works in politics and works for adversarial. And if I take off my liberation hat and put my communications consultant hat on, I would tell them to do that because it works. But it makes it harder for us to solve problems, right? But I will, I'll pop these up here real quick. I might get back to those a little bit later, but to kind of get on.

[09:56 - 11:21] Martin Carcasson: But, probably the one that's most important is kind of down here. Wicked problems because it's about all these tensions require conversations, require creativity, innovation, imagination and collaboration. Again it's the ways we talk to each other that make it harder for us to get those in. I think our politics has a lot of creativity, innovation, but most of it is kind of focused on making the other side look bad, right? So we just decided to get all that creative innovation on how to solve problems and how to how to live together. And so one way that I talk about it is in my work is make a distinction between these kind of three forms of politics. And by politics, I mean broadly how we solve problems together, right? Not just kind of legislators and elections and so forth. And it's obviously a simplistic typology, you mean, and mixed together in my favorite way. But but it helps kind of get through. I also, from here say all three of them have pros and cons, and all three of them are valuable. I also teach a social movement class. I have a lot of respect for activists that have changed the world in certain cases. So the problem isn't that we have adversarial politics. The problem is when all our politics is dominated by adversarial politics, those are the only voices we hear, because it makes it difficult for us to kind of move forward. So adversarial politics is, you know, the zero sum kind of start on one end, kind of mobilize people to your point of view, whether that's Democrats and Republicans or interest group politics, experts, is that the data says help us solve the problem. Um, also clearly important in lots of ways, but with a wicked problem at dealing with value paradoxes and value limits there is no expertise, right?

[11:21 - 12:47] Martin Carcasson: I mean, go back to the chart of the nine values for the water, right? We need experts in every single one of those boxes. There's no experts that can arrange those boxes for us and then say what's most important to us. Only the public can kind of do that. So obviously what I'm arguing for is the need for deliberative politics, which also has its own flaws, takes a lot of time, has a really high expectation of the public, um, requires and I'll talk about a little bit later, passionate and partial resources. That is a pretty kind of thin supply, right? That's impartiality. I purposely phrased that as an oxymoron. There's not that many people that are really fired up about not having an opinion. Uh, but that is something I think universities can play a really great role with and college students they train. Uh, they play a really great role. I guess, for the next hour on this slide. So I'll touch on a couple of things real quickly, but primarily from a communication perspective. There's a lot of problems when we have overly adversarial political. Um, that causes that polarization and cynicism that we ought to have in election years. It all kind of ramps up. Um, but the basic point on making a communication perspective is that too often our political system now rewards bad arguments and punishes good arguments. It just creates a whole incentive process that kind of tweaks things around and plays into flaws of human nature. I mean, we want them to be simple, inherently, psychologically. We want it to be good versus evil and be on the good side. There's so much easier for us to believe that people who disagree with us are evil or ignorant or just have bad values. And in some cases that may be true, but not nearly as many cases as we think.

[12:47 - 14:07] Martin Carcasson: When you start really digging into the issues and having a better conversation. Um, privileges organized, entrenched voices. Again, most of the voices we hear are from the individual perspectives, so we don't get the voices that are trying to struggle with that and trying to kind of deal with tensions in a way. Uh, one way of thinking about this is when I try to do is to provide an alternative to the dominant forms of public input. So walking up to the microphone at city council or the school board, or whether they're in between after or a membership or whatever, right? All of those are kind of one way, right? You don't have too many people in a city council to walk up to that microphone and say: "I'm really struggling with this issue. I mean, I really see both sides and they all have a difficult decision to make. Uh, you know, the arguments on this side are this. But if we go there, we have these tradeoffs that we have to struggle with. So, good luck!" We'll do that, right? You'll walk up saying that you're an idiot and you have to do this, or you need to pass this, and you're kind of leaving the city council, the decision making body, to do all the balancing and the struggle. Um, and so on. But the other quick point to make here with the zero sum game or the incentive incentivizes bad communication. The zero sum game, I imagine with y'all, if you're coming to this, you know what it is, right? It's inherently winners and losers, which is one of the big problems with your party politics, right? That anything good for the other side is inherently bad for the other

side. Right? So both sides really, while the point of politics is to solve problems, it's a different dimension, right?

[14:07 - 15:34] Martin Carcasson: One side comes up with a really good idea to solve an important problem. Neither side, at least partly, has to think: "dang!", right? "I probably have to fight against that!", even if it's a good idea. So you see that now that one side comes up with a good idea and then the other side feels it. And then the first side is against it because they don't want them to get credit for it, right.? And that's just a game of politics that just messes things up so much or the other way you can think about it with a two party. If you all know the political spectrum from from left to right, and I'm a politician on the right. You know, I speak to you to mobilize my base, right? And I speak to you to kind of try to find a way to keep you on my side. But I don't mean to bother them either, right? [unintelligible]. You never know what you might you want it. I mean, when you set up a process as a version of democracy it doesn't make sense for people from opposing perspectives to have a conversation. And that's kind of a problem. That's what we're trying to increase the capacity of. So, bottom line: Has serious problems that don't have technical solutions, have these paradoxes and values facing them, requires collaboration, innovation and coordinated action across these perspectives. And the way we talk to each other does the opposite of that. Make it harder for us to be in the same room and make it harder, we need mutual understanding. We're basically trying to create mutual misunderstanding and polarization. So instead of the delivery democracy movement, which again, people that came to this one probably have connections to a lot of these terms, lots of different words that people use it, but it's all kind of, the, the key connection is impartial, coming in and going to help have this conversation.

[15:35 - 17:04] Martin Carcasson: Process-people that are focused on the importance of a good process to lead to decision making, and the importance of people actually kind of talking to each other and knowing each other. The definition I have of public deliberation, this is in the set, the green one on the inside. I tweaked it as I go so that you don't, you know, and the one on public deliberation is on the top. Um, so an approach to politics and with citizens, not just experts and politicians, but a lot of my work, you'll see it, a Venn diagram on this one I talk about a little bit later, but a lot of the work that I do is bringing together experts, the public and decision makers. And I'm kind of in the middle being the translator, the mediator, the facilitator. Democracy requires high quality communication across those realms. And we often don't get it unless often working with facilitators or processed experts, because these conversations aren't natural. Um, people could certainly build a habit of having these conversations, but it is not kind of inherent to do that. One of the points that I typically make is part of the goal of center is to make itself irrelevant, that people can have these conversations on their own. Um, but I can't have enough job security for a while. And if they think

they're a couple, I'll be back. Come together, consider relevant facts and values. And both are important. But we need data, right? We need good information, but we also need to start with the values. Democracy is about values inherently, and decision making is about values from multiple points of view, which I'll come back later. One of the heavy burdens on me. So if I'm going to honor democracy then I have to honor equality and inclusion. And that becomes a big challenge. Listen to one another. We talked a lot about developing a capacity to witness.

[17:04 - 18:25] Martin Carcasson: That was fascinating to me. How many, I ask this question sometimes is like, how many classes have you had that was about expressing your own opinion, right? Whether that was like writing essays or public speaking or all these kind of things, right? And people get away every year. You have at least one, right? So we're talking about this year 20. How many classes have you had that focus on listening? And we don't like reading, right? We haven't heard of listening practice, right? And there's all of it. Somebody else on behalf of your private corporation, those type of things, there's lots of different kinds of listenings who I have had. Most people have never been exposed to that. And it's a huge Democratic field, the huge problem solving skills, and it just gets completed with a set of curriculum. So we have to train people on how to do that, consider their learning type tension and so choices and consequences. But I was talking about: This is a new line that's not in there that I added. Are willing to refine and adapt their opinions initially. I think this is a critical point. If democracy requires us to change our mind, right? I assume, who's had a really good conversation with other people in their community, they're going to change their mind, right? So my political science friends might reject that, right? No, interests are fixed, right? And politics is just about kind of this battle of who gets when, where and what. And you're just building coalitions to do that. I've seen it in seven years, people have their conversations and say, oh, I'm so relaxed, right? Democracy is constantly about finding that right balance between our individual interests, the individual interests of our others in our community, and kind of different notions of the common good.

[18:25 - 19:54] Martin Carcasson: And we have to have that conversation, right? Because if it's all this adversarial all in it for one. Well, and all we really get left with is this is kind of a basic free market kind of thing. And we need, democracy needs to be thicker than that, right? So this notion of refinement is, eh, the founders talked about this in The Federalist Papers and things like that. The assumption that we need democracy. Very John Dewey kind of democracy. Democracy is not just a mechanism for voting. Democracy is an ongoing conversation. It's about community making. And we need to bring that back more to it, to our community. The last, when we come to a decision for action, I mean deliberation, the term itself means weighing choices to make a decision. So some of our events are about decision making. Some of our events are framed as decision making. You

know, that group has no power in the sense that there's no decision to be made, like the water forum, you know, decisions being made by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Corps of Engineers and those type of things. But it was designed in the sense of what should we do as a community to increase the communication level, even though there wasn't necessarily decision making tied to it. So this is a map of the work that I do that we've developed. And a lot of this was developed after the first couple of years on that site that says dialogue, deliberation and debate. Um, that started between, I thought I would just be running some cool events, but then once we were asked to do things in our events, had more consequences to the decision makers. Myself doing something with that, that information or us kind of sparking community action and starting new programs. Then we realized that what happens before the event and after the event is probably more important than the event itself.

[19:55 - 21:15] Martin Carcasson: Um, so the deliberative issue analysis is, my background is also in argumentation and public policy. So really, how do you research these issues from an impartial perspective to really kind of lay out what you need to talk about. What are the underlying values, what are the tensions? What are the data needs that are available? How are people can misunderstand each other? What are the obstacles to kind of moving for all these kind of things we've talked about now. Also later to, to really set up to frame issues, to name and frame issues for productive discussions. Convening is getting the right people in the room, which is probably the hardest part of the work. And if it opens up a whole new dimension of community networking and stakeholder analysis and those type of things, then this whole thing, interactive communication, is going to get them in the room. You know, sometimes there's lots of different techniques for this, you know, a whole kind of world of toolboxes of doing this work, whether it's face to face or online or small group or large group or one day, or a week, or all these kind of things. Um, but I do use the term interactive communication, which should be repetitive, but most of our communication is one way. We split ways, right? We don't have conversations. There's kind of one. The big things have been building lately. We hear so much when we talk about democracy, the need for people to have voice. Would you agree with that? Right? People need to have voice. But if everyone has a voice but no one's listening. The voice isn't valued that much, right? So you need voice. But then we also need interaction. We need not only listening, but kind of talking back and forth in that refinement.

[21:16 - 22:34] Martin Carcasson: And that's what we don't get. So we have all these mechanisms of internet wonderful for getting heard or at least expressing yourself. I don't know if you're heard right? But they kind of put your opinion out there. But we need more interactive communication that actually people go back for. Again, think of the city council meeting. We actually found out just recently that, you know, probably up to a 100 will show up to speak and they all speak. City council

is required not to respond, right? That most interaction is illegal. And till the very end city council can't respond to certain things, but it's just an individual collection of opinion. You know, the question was literally the public watches and the microphone turns their back to the rest of the public and speaks for three minutes until the microphone turns red. That's an individual collective opinion, and we need interaction. We need conversation for proximity work, at least at the community level. And in the reporting is, is analyzing that. And and it's a cycle in the sense of each time you gather people to talk, we hope we learn new things and we kind of push forward. And that improves our issue analysis. So the next time we get together, we can talk even deeper. And to nail down a little bit, we throw a little bit more of attention with what you struggle with and then at some point we need to move to action. But I put action in the middle because it's not a linear process, right? So with a wicked problem, you never solve a wicked problem, you just might find better ways of balancing all these things and improve quality of life and those type of. But we're not going to solve the problem and it's done, right? So any action just kind of changes the dimensions in some way.

[22:34 - 23:59] Martin Carcasson: And that's when the problems, we look at problems is, we like to focus on one value. So we focus on kind of improving that value. And then the tradeoffs we lose somewhere else, right? So you had to kind of have that systemic view. So again this will be familiar to some of you already. I started putting this together as I went to deliberation conferences, which are a fascinating interdisciplinary kind of work. So obviously I'm in communication. Um, the first few times I showed this, uh, people would walk up and say, you have me on there. And I had to add a slide, right? Uh, I haven't done that lately. You know, last week someone says, any business on there? Um, but maybe one of y'all will come up to add you in there, but hopefully I capture most people. Uh, it's also very interesting extra disciplinary. They are organizations out there. So many different organizations. I work with public libraries. I work with United Way. I work with, uh, you know, a lot of these organizations out there, I'm gonna fly through these really quickly, just, and these are just some of the organizations I work with. NCDD and Public Agenda and Kettering Foundation, Everyday Democracy, America Speaks, UNDP. Uh, the United Nations has a public deliberation program, but they do this work internationally. Uh, Public Conversations Project, Reuniting America, American Democracy Projects, Capacity Commitment, Democracy U, The Democracy Imperative and the University Network for Collaborative Government, which were uh, my center is also part of. I always do that just to show it's not some crazy Colorado State profession. So many people think that they get yelled at by the other people as well, if you're, if you're tied to the center of public confirmation.

[24:00 - 25:22] Martin Carcasson: So the other paper I gave you, the sort of little four page paper I published a couple of years ago on the efficiency aspect. So don't worry, I'm not going to cover all of

the scene today, and I've actually talked about several of them. So the tough choices and balancing, balancing individual interest and public good, everybody kind of talked about, um, public judgment is the notion of the decision making process we need to go through. Um, I wanna skip this one and go to this one. Uh, this is another way of looking at the map of what we do. Uh, and this is actually developed by Sam Kaner. And you see that on the very bottom, Sam Kaner. Actually, you have it on your thing. Um, he developed that there are more organizations that are making tough decisions and how they want to have, for the decision making, you know, involving the employers and employees in the front line involving all parts of the company, uh, but it's amazing how much this kind of connects democracy, especially at community level as well. So any kind of difficult decision making process. They argue that you need to go through three different processes at least. So first you need divergent thinking. And too often we close it off uh, especially in meetings. Have you ever been in a meeting that everyone seemed to like an idea, and you're the only one. You think you're the only one that don't like it, but you don't want to say anything, right? If you say something the meeting is longer, and we hate meetings, right? Uh, where everyone's going to groan and all this kind of stuff. You kind of keep quiet. Then of course it bombs, right? And then once it bombs what do you say? Why are you looking at work?

[25:22 - 26:47] Martin Carcasson: And everyone had a view of whether to work together. So we have that process, right? Groups can do really bad things if it's not a good place to do it. So we need process to make sure we get divergent opinions. To make sure we get to sense, to make sure, not only the voices in the room speak up, but the right people are in the room to be able to speak up in the first place. That's a lot of our work we do. I think we do a pretty good job with this on some issues. Again, we have lots of voices out there, right? We have lots of logs and we have a list of different things, right? Uh, but if you, a lot of what happens with decisions is you don't have enough divergent opinion, and then you just skip to the decision at the end. And typically it's not a very good decision, right? There's this false sense of consensus because we didn't let anyone who disagreed talk, right? But the dilemma is, if you have really good divergent thinking, then you have lots of opinions in the room, right? And that can be seen in the groan zone. And I love this graphic when I'm training my student facilitators, because I can tell them if your table is really struggling, is it even working, right? It's supposed to be a struggle, but with your problem, it's tough. You got lots of different opinions in the room, right? So the groan zone, working through the groan zone and working through it is kind of a term that, that Daniel Nikolayevich uses, is kind of a critical part of democracy. And this is again what we're missing. We have lots of ways of divergent thinking, right? Groan Zone requires interaction. Groan Zone requires us to talk to each other. Groan Zone requires us to develop mutual understanding across perspectives, and we just don't get that with our own political, right?

[26:48 - 28:10] Martin Carcasson: That's the, that's why we need the small group. We need a collaborative medium to show the 30 students that are trained on that process and trained on this degree to help people talk through this. Um, so too often, if we have tons of divergent opinion, but we don't know how to do the Groan Zone, then we have false polarization, right? And I think this is what our political system is right now. We think we're so divided, red and blue states, right? But you, you would be amazed how often you get those red and blue people in the same room and have a conversation. They still disagree. Not nearly as much as they think, right? Because when you shift it from the other side, reject my values to the other side also holds my values, but holds other values that I hold higher. Yeah, lots of differences there, but much more manageable, right? And that's what the research shows, that these kind of meeting people don't change their mind all that much, but they change their mind altogether to disagree with them, which is huge, right? Going from this guy is evil or ignorant to he's wrong but I feel where he is coming from. That's a huge move for lack of pretense, right? Of realizing you know they've had some pretty good reasons or reasons that sound as good to me, right? You can have that conversation. We kind of work together with that. Um, yeah. The other problem we run into though, so all three of these are kind of the big pitfalls for me, um, is we can do a really good job with the Groan Zone, but that takes a lot of time. And sometimes you get stuck there, right? And that's the problem analysis, is that people kind of throw out their hands with them.

[28:11 - 29:34] Martin Carcasson: Okay, you know, that move to action, that convergent thinking is a whole different set of processes, right? Divergent thinking requires a set of processes, working through the Groan Zone requires a set of processes and convergent thinking, prioritizing action steps, moving to talk to action. That's a whole another kind of way that requires a lot of support. You were all probably involved in projects or great projects and really interesting conversations. Report was written and then you never ever heard about the book again, right? It gets up on a shelf in the middle of that. Um, so that becomes a definite part of it as it kind of goes through. And the only thing I don't like about the Groan Zone is it's a little too linear for me, but I just kind of stay in my cycle, right? Uh, so each time we're having a conversation, some of our meetings are just kind of focused on divergent thinking. Some of them the Groan Zone, some of them convergent thinking, some of them try to do all 3 in 1 meeting, typically pretty hard, right? But convergent thinking, I mean divergent thinking. You can do, uh, through the internet and those type of things, right? But the Groan Zone typically does require kind of interaction in some way. Uh, the really hard part about doing this, and this is a theory that we're struggling with now or trying to contribute to, is does everyone have to go through the Groan Zone? Can you have a surrogate group close to the Groan Zone? Um, can you have this kind of a stakeholder group within the Groan Zone and communicate it back out? Or can you see examples where that has worked and where that hasn't worked, and why?

It depends on trust and legitimacy, right? Um, but kind of going back and forth and kind of thinking about how do you do that?

[29:35 - 31:01] Martin Carcasson: Yeah. So the last thing I really want to talk to you about, open it up for, for questions is three of the other key aspects. So I'm impartial. And we went back and forth with the right term for it. And I had a great conversation three years ago at a conference about, you know, the neutral, the partial or the bipartisan. Is it, is it tripartisan or transpartisan, was another word that they used? Is it third party? And, uh and we settled on partiality. That's really what we want to do. Um, but then I came up with this notion of passive impartiality of, partly because I was trying to recruit really good students. What I do with my programs, I bring about 15 students a semester to take a three hour course, and they come back for one hour of practice in the second semester. So I have about 30 students, but half of them knew about half of the experience. So I just have to take the process. But I get that information can easily start with you, and it's kind of hard to recruit or really start students, but you can do the mutual. That doesn't sound very interesting. Um, and hopefully you get a sense, a brief passage about what we do. So we're passionate about democracy, we're passionate about [unintelligible], we're passionate about our community. We just believe we make more of an impact by being the process people, by helping people have a conversation we need to have. We are actually passionate about a lot of issues, but we don't have the kind of structure thing for, if you win, if I truly believe that I'm right, and if evidence is on my side and the best thing to do is what I believe, then I think with all my faith in the process and it's good to have that anyway, right?

[31:01 - 32:32] Martin Carcasson: So we have to put all our passion to process. But as we started doing that, you know, some of the big criticisms, really theoretical and deliberative democracy comes from kind of a different democratic or kind of a critical theory perspective, the things you have to make democracy by public forum, right? Well, who shows up to that forum, right? Well, actually, who even hears about that forum? Um, if they if they do hear about it, do they actually show up or are they working two jobs or the fox doesn't go there or, you know, whatever? Or if they didn't hear about it and they used to show up did we lose a couple of people, right? Because they're trying to form a communication in a way or are they comfortable in that situation? If they hear about it, if they show up, if they feel comfortable with the other people in the room and actually listen to them, right? Uh, so there's some, you know, criticism that they have some validity of deliberations a little bit few kind of type of status quo and few types of kind of dominate reflective tone. Um, and that takes all of those things seriously, right? That's this notion of passionate impartiality that while we're impartial about that topic, we are partial to democracy. We are partisan for democracy, which means inclusivity and equality are two values. You have normative value in that process, right? Uh, it's kind

of a lot to unpack here. But so this is kind of the responsiveness of some of the critiques, but some of y'all might be familiar with in terms of Fraser, Sanders, Young, Mouffe and Cloud, and they criticize and deliberate perspectives and, uh, but it's their sort of thing and try to respond to this, um, and Fischer, Forester, Kadlec and Fung are some of the political scientists, um, and communication scholars, um, that that support kind of this. How should we respond to that?

[32:33 - 33:54] Martin Carcasson: Um, and that, that respond to that importance of equality, inclusion back in the party comes through in all these stages, right? So how we do our analysis, how do we find those voices that aren't the dominant voices, right? How do we include them in the background material and as we're struggling. The convenient how do we get them in the room, right? Um, which is really hard work and a lot of different things to make sure it isn't just the usual suspects in the room, not just a powerful voice in the room. We train our facilitators to deal with this, right? So same thing when a voice is, if there's a powerful voice and an non-powerful voice. Our facilitator is going to violate impartiality for the sake of equality, right? So there's going to be or sometimes right. There's, there's a tension there that's an inherent part of our process in a way. Um, so we really started developing that when I developed passionate impartiality a few years ago. That's what we were focusing on is, okay, how do we do this and this at the same time? That's kind of hard to do. Right? So sometimes we end up like: A voice isn't being heard, we're going to think about, how that changed my students, hopefully it will be deductible with those voices in the room. But if we didn't get that voice in the room, without voices in the room, that maybe it isn't public opinion, right? There's a lot of moves that facilitators can make to try to get that voice heard. I'm inviting people to speak, to opening up that place and of saying a few little bits here. What will we hear from her to see if someone can feel that voice, right? Or if that doesn't even work, you can say, well, imagine what a single mother would do, she might make this argument.

[33:54 - 35:24] Martin Carcasson: There's lots of different ways on, and all of those, in a way, are finding a new personality, uh, within the struggle. But then when we did the writer forums last year, we realized it was a very similar thing to here, right? Um, criticizing the critical theorist in the sense of saying, you know, if you're powerful and she's not and I'm impartial, right? So then I'm starting to be powerful and I thought, I only want to intervene to the less powerful. So the same thing is if you have really good information you're going to make crap up, right? And I'm impartial, right? Well, I'm in favor of the person making crap up. Uh, so then we struggle with that as well. Say whoops, we need fact checkers constantly, right? But part of our goal is to improve the quality conversation, improve the way we make decisions. You gotta have to be respectful of that gap. My background is in argumentation. I know what good argument is, right? I know what good evidence is. I don't look at the sources and that can get tied into it too. So when we think about passionate impartiality is the

recognition of the tension between we want to be impartial and we need to kind of build up. One of the reasons that partiality is so important is to change the conversations. And depolarize means you have to be trusted. You have to be seen as this impartial, right? So each time we, we, we leave impartiality to do one of these two things we might be costing ourselves. But that's the contingency, to connect the power and ethics that we're kind of struggling with and figuring out how how can we use all three of these at the same time? Yeah, so there is a literature that, that kind of back it after we developed it, kind of refined different things.

[35:24 - 36:51] Martin Carcasson: So there's an interesting literature kind of across different disciplines about this notion of the deliberate practitioner, right? Now and one way of thinking about it is my job is from the public policy perspective is to be a mapper, to kind of lay out the choices, right? Not making the choices. The best way I kind of explained is, is to tell you the story of a class today that took over when I got here in communication with argumentation debate over [unintelligible] and every single communication department has this class of 24 students. They form 16. Before they pick a topic, they research the topic like crazy. You have to have all these evidence cards annotated bibliography and write a brief. And it's always a yes no issue. You know, should the United States close to the border or should we bomb or whatever it is, right? And they have a two on two debate. Then they switch sides and have a debate in the end and then they sort of smash it over. So I taught that class for several years, and I always got frustrated with it because it's after the second debate four smart college students, often, if you want, see the political issue, and after the second debate, I say, okay, we're no longer affirmative or negative or whatever. You're just a real person that stays for this semester. What do you think of this issue? What do you think most would say? I don't know, right? They got [unintelligible] roll call, right? Because the whole thing was framed as yes or no. Once they actually were and they picked a topic, they typically had a pretty strong opinion. Yes or no, right? And by the end of the semester, they didn't have a yes or no for that, because we forced them to be more side and argue, and they realize there isn't a clear yes or no. It's somewhere in the middle, right?

[36:51 - 38:14] Martin Carcasson: But that whole process, no one was looking for them, all right? Everyone was just looking for the answer. So we changed the class. Now, first half exactly the same. Basic topic for-, the debate candidates for pool, right? We've done well, right? There's good debate. There's facts. The problem is about 95% of debates actually, including the presidential debates, will happen, what we said, right? But a group debate can be a very useful tool to help clarify issues, right? We still teach them how to make them feel. Teaching them immerse yourself in the data. Feel the data alive, so that in the debate it can be functional to clarify it. And then in the second half of the class, they changed to the race. Their job to do before was to create a community discussion guide

to lay out the story, right? Here's the problem we all agreed on. The problem: Here's at least three choices that, that approach to this debate. There's no magic bullet. Solve the problem, right? We have to solve this so we can do a bit better, right? So every approach has: Here's some things that would do good but here's some tradeoffs, right? Yeah. This is what we lose if we take this perspective. And so this is a great metaphor for the role of the actual society. You have to make a decision for it, right? With the problems at least, what they can lay out for you. They can tell us where the data lies, they can tell us then where the value of another draw is and they hear, these are the choices of what's happening. And I think all of these kind of tap into that in some way, the local politics all the way up our choices to be a facilitator for communities to make better decisions. Um, but part of that is being an impartial.

[38:14 - 39:46] Martin Carcasson: You're laying out the choices as fairly as possible, and I do recommend to anyone to do their choice. Those have been talked about earlier in the notion of decision making requires all three of these. Um, and we put ourselves somewhat in the middle to try to translate. So we want to, you know, we want the good data, right? And this is probably a point worth making a lot of. Y'all are probably experts in the room. The slide that I had earlier about the drawback aspects of politics. Now that I think about it. We need to be data that it isn't just all the way there, right? The other argument I make is: Experts is or anyone in the room, if you're an expert or an advocate and you're like: Who shares their findings, right? Now, why do I bother listening to the other side? Uh, the issue is in such a polarized environment that it doesn't really matter that much, right? Because complex issues and you know, so and we know this from human nature that we were so sure we're right, right? We ignored that. And it actually when we're provided data that goes against our perspective it actually makes people smarter for purpose finding, right? So, so if you're trying to connect your perspective, whether it's so clear on my perspective, you have a vested interest in truth in the conversation because as the conversation in the process improves, your data matters more, right? It's not just ammunition that you and most of our research, I think, is walking the line between expert research and adversarial research are blurred, right? We forgot the same things in the conservative think tanks. Those ideas. We have no idea what [unintelligible] is for, right? So most people, I think they have a position and they research to find evidence to find that.

[39:46 - 41:07] Martin Carcasson: With a complex issue they're going to find that. That's why we need to get data, to be important again. Um, but then that means we need to figure out ways of having data come from, from more trusted sources in a sense. Yeah. So these are other kinds of these out there. We talked a little bit more, if you like. But these are what I talk about in terms of theory we're developing. And these are the key parts. This is what we get out of deliberative events that I don't think you get in other kind of public form, right? Um, and this is what we're, we're trying to

identify with a little bit of issue analysis. And then we try to kind of press on and learn about interactions when we do interactive communications. Uh, so identifying and result and attempting to resolve key obstacles, that's like misunderstanding. This is misperceptions, uh, polarization in the, you know, assuming negative motives for the other side. Fact questions that need to be resolved so we can identify those when we look at the different voices. And this is why adversarial policy is still very useful for me, right? Because I couldn't do my work if I didn't have all those voices out there. So if I go to the website, um, you know, the compounded message board. As horrible as the conversation often is, it is very useful for me because I can see how people are talking about things, and that helps me to understand the value and the argument people are rating. So when I get in the same room, I can kind of try to clarify that, um, they did that and these two are kind of two sides of the same coin, right? So identifying the common ground we could build on, which again, we have more common ground than most people think.

[41:07 - 42:46] Martin Carcasson: But then also identifying the actual real tension and differences. Like I said before, a lot of our work is shifting from the perception that our differences are this wide to they're actually this wide. Um, and to work through those, uh, and then last, a lot of the collaboration is, is the realization that there's a broad range of stakeholders. We use the term democratic government for this a lot. Um, as I mentioned in the 15 key aspects, um, so it's getting away from individuals solve problems and government solve problems to a whole range, um, from individuals to government, including nonprofits, including religious institutions, including this, this, this, this isn't exempt from democracy. So we need public, private and nonprofit kind of sectors kind of coming together, uh, as we deal with these issues. So one of the last things which might be, especially for those who are students that seem to be growing resources, is more and more organizations realizing that you change the conversation when you talk to each other differently, right? So these are just some of the partners that I work with or organizations across the country. Some of them are bottom up. Some of them are top down. More and more municipal governments and people are figuring out, we have to you have to work with public differently, right? If it's all adversarial. It's all good in the individual team. And if it's all whoever sends the most emails wins and just democracy doesn't work very well. It's so difficult to do anything big these days. So we need you to stop failing. Um, so they're realizing that you can change the conversation. Um, this notion of the move from PR to P2. This is the International Association of Public Participation. Um, talking about the move from PR to P2, right now, every city, every every school board, every, every county has a PR person and a community information officer or some term like that.

[42:46 - 44:09] Martin Carcasson: Uh, most of them have been trained at PR, which is primarily high development coverage, right? And that just doesn't work very well. Well, in terms it uses the DAD

method which is Decide, Announce, Defense. So, you make a tough decision. The extra favored tough decision. And the PR person kind of tells people and makes kind of, you know, they tell the truth and they hope no one shows up in the meeting because that means no one's angry enough to show up, right? The other word that they're using now is the side educated announcement which is there, right? So the work is, uh. So P2 is a thinking next generation, or I hope, because my students will be filling those slots. Uh, the next generation is going to be P2 people. People that know process, right? How to work with the public, not just how to communicate to the public, right? Uh, and not just to kind of make their public feel heard, but actually have people listen to each other, um, which are kind of important moves. The last thing I'll do is going to leave 15 minutes for questions here. Um, is that the last key aspect? Striving for a mutual ideal? Yeah. The notion of my goal is to improve the quality of meeting communication, um, and to, to improve how we solve problems. We're never going to perfect it. We're never going to do this right. Whenever you're dealing with tensions, we're always going to find a better way. But things continuously, continuously change. A lot of the criticism, a little bit of perspective and there's lots of flaws you can kind of point to, right? Um, but a lot of times we're attacked for not doing it perfect, but we're never gonna have the perfect, perfectly representative room.

[44:09 - 44:58] Martin Carcasson: We're never gonna have the perfectly framed material. We're never going to, you know, never, never had a facilitator always ask the right question. Um, but what I always push back on is: Have we improved the conversation? Are we better than our competitors, right? Um, that we maybe didn't get kind of all the right people in the room, but did we get more people in the room that normally that, you know, shows up at city council meeting or what? [unintelligible]. That's the constant work that we're doing is striving for this idea we're not going to reach. But as we go where we're constantly learning orientation with the idea of the cycle of hopefully each time we go through and each time we go through that cycle, would you be a little bit closer to that and learn more of that before the window stops and I can jump back to any slides you like, um, or talk more about any of these inquiry aspects if you like or you wanna part? Yeah.

[44:58 - 45:07] Audience: Um, I heard about how this model would apply to newly democratic countries where you're assuming freedom of speech here-

[45:09 - 45:09] Martin Carcasson: Oh, yeah.

[45:09 - 45:51] Audience: So where freedom of speech is not a given and people talk in this way, they do go to the meetings. So they do different types of things like think through other body language to, um, art, et cetera. So passionate, what do you call it? Passionate impartiality? Some would really not know. How do you know what to incite or not if you can't endanger somebody? Uh,

so they have to know about the context, just what you can or can't. Because in many of these new democratic countries they sort of dealing with the other person's humanity, right? So, I mean, I can leave it.

[45:51 - 47:29] Martin Carcasson: Right. So I mean, the first thing I would say is, yeah, I mean, a lot of what I do is this is within the context of the United States. We're assuming freedom of speech. We're assuming democracy is kind of a pretty universal value that people hold. But even in these new democracies they have some conversations and we had groups of students come from Iraq, uh, that I kind of digital and stuff, right? And for some of them, democracy, which they see as rule by the majority, is a very scary thing because there's a minority, right? So we have a lot of kind of basic normative assumptions. The United States allows us to work in ways that. With that being said, there's lots of people, not me, that are trying to apply the work. So I work a lot with federal foundation is one of the ones that still. So when I go into federal foundations there, being kind of some meeting is about half international capitalization. You know, I actually had one person from, i think from Zimbabwe, um, that came to one of my two student workshops, um, and loved it that we've been thinking about how do I apply it there? And he specifically talked about how they need to use art, they need to use plays, you know, to try to depolarize something that had a different context. And to do that, uh, the other thing I mentioned is you asked if you just search UN democratic dialogue, um, and get back to it in a second. But, um. This is, this is work in primarily Latin America right now, but they've got great case studies on there. And it's kind of following the, the, the Peace Corps model a little bit. But instead of kind of sending experts in to solve their problems they're sending facilitators in to help them have the conversations, kind of problem solving and stuff, uh, so they have some great examples and what they have.

[47:29 - 48:45] Martin Carcasson: This handbook is online for free and it's a 300 page handbook, um, that you can, you can find online, um, that kind of walk through and use a lot of the skills that I talk about by kind of putting it in a different context. Um, but certainly I think when in different kind of countries, different power relationships. Um, the degree to which passionate impartiality couldn't handle those powers. You know, I think in some places the tension between impartiality and honoring equality inclusion is so high that it's hard to be impartial, right? And I would even say that with tradition, there's certain issues that we're raising, right? Tools for humanitarian aid, um, [unintelligible] are. And the other problem that I'm missing is the talk about dialogue, deliberation and debate, right? We are going to do deliberation with the decision making together, right? Um, there's some issues that need a lot more dialogue with, with each deliberation. So when you're saying these newly emerging democracies, you're just kind of dealing with another person's humanity. That's probably more of a dialogue process. And dialogue is about developing trust and understanding

across perspectives. And you don't have a decision making effort. So there's some issues that we're asking, you know, like: What do you do in the same room to decide? But maybe we can do some more dialogue to kind of change the other position that might be deliberation. The Public Conversation Project was supposed to be more about dialogue.

[48:51 - 48:53] Martin Carcasson: Yeah. That hand over there. Yeah.

[48:53 - 48:58] Audience: So how about the idea of using these electronic folding devices to have a larger audience?

[48:58 - 48:58] Martin Carcasson: Yes.

[48:58 - 49:13] Audience: And not so much as, you know, that people think about things differently but start to draw new ones, because when people say, oh, there are different ways to look at this, or maybe I have more shared values, but for the size of people who maybe have a voice and perspective, they'll give you their input that way. You instantly get feedback.

[49:13 - 50:17] Martin Carcasson: Yes. Okay, I swear I didn't change them. Um, but yeah, so we have the 20 point technology. We have about 200 keypads. Um, I'm actually to be out in the game now, but, you know, I work with public executives at National Firm, and they have a center for the Advancement of Public Engagement that tells the papers that we have a paper on the use of keypads in these processes. And it's exactly that. We, we go from large groups to small groups, right? You can ask people and you get the results in the room and in the small groups. And these people react to the results. Um, and it's a chance to really kind of identify or another thing that we might ask is, you know, Likert scale questions, right? We should do that. Or you can have some degree that almost the entire room agrees. But to disagree, you can say, hey, here's me or you want to tell us what we're missing, right? You're able to give voice to that minority in a sense, in a different way. And a lot of times people come in thinking, you know, everyone's for that. So asking that question, when you see that it's actually pretty descriptive often opens up the channels of communication. People realize that people think differently and we just need to keep at it. It's like we have a small table, develop the contents of the keypad and then get it back to them.

[50:17 - 51:38] Martin Carcasson: So we ran something for the, for the Bike Safety Summit a few years ago after the like. And yet, you know, we had all the tables kind of brainstorm: What is the biggest safety issue? And they each kind of came up with this and they voted on their list with Todd. And then they ran the list up to me that they're a kind of top vote getter. And then I could put all the top vote getter on the keypad and get back to the entire group, and then they would rank them.

Right? Now we had a rank up problem, and we went back to the small group to brainstorm action. This was all kind of diversity and thinking, okay, so what we can do about this is the same process. They both gave you the top things to put it on their votes. And then we had a range kind of list of actions. And then we kept developing to say to everyone: Okay, stand up and go to the table number or the action that you're most passionate about. So at the end of the meeting, everyone, we had ten actions. We had ten tables. And the people with that table said, hey, we're going to start this one and we will pass it on. That kind of example was back in the convergence meeting about how we move forward, right? But even within that, there was some interesting kind of growing some stuff, realizing a lot of those bicyclists could have taken responsibility for actions, right? Realizing that it's. When we don't get to the Groan Zone, we don't have the conversations. We tend to kind of follow the wishful thinking, like, that's the nicest thing and the one that I skipped over. Now this one, which is similar to the Groan Zone, but this is Yankovic, which is this is the process we need to go through to kind of really have a strong kind of public, public judgment, right?

[51:39 - 52:49] Martin Carcasson: Um, it, early part, when we actually start working through human nature, we reach for solutions. We want it to be simple, right? This is what we want it to be. People that disagree with us to be evil or we want a magic bullet, right? Or we want, you know, the immediate devil figure. We just get rid of oil companies and all these rich problems will go away, right? That thing will come to be grateful. But that's not what, um, that's what we, how we push it to, how I push back on, on alternative energy, right? So people love alternative energy. It seems like a magic bullet, right? But I always ask if oil companies are evil, right? And the government doesn't work like, these alternative energy companies are just going to be the number one, right? They're just going to be in it for the common good, right? Is that me being confidence in a way? For a company, anything is: How can we afford it? Um, so that's that notion of, of weighing the choices that he's had some kind of help and these conversations can help that people get away from that wishful thinking. Um, and typically be able to consult those who are right. Which means I think moral leadership and sterile politics is typically blaming the other side. [Unintelligible] politics is taking more ownership. And those decisions are much more, more legitimate, more sustainable. Yeah.

[52:50 - 53:10] Audience: So in clarity conversation or in scenarios where you have, um, people coming together to talk about. [Unintelligible] Um, there is oftentimes not going to be, you know, the environment is not always ideal.

[53:10 - 53:11] Martin Carcasson: Right.

[53:12 - 53:24] Audience: And so how do you, um, I guess, incorporate longer term thinking than humans are generally supposed to do in order to weigh tradeoffs and more? I guess, yeah.

[53:29 - 54:52] Martin Carcasson: Yeah. Um, I mean, I think the first thing that pops in my head was that is kind of going back to that. I think that's one of the other big drawbacks of average or our typical political system. It's inherently short term, right? I mean, for a politician that has a two year term or a three year term or a four year term or whatever, to kind of think long term, um, is very difficult because they seem or anything long term doesn't work, because if you have that polarized system. What do you all gonna think the effect is? [unintelligible]. With arbitrary politics and the notion that we just need to mobilize our society if we get that 51% capacity. And the problem with that is if you get it 51%, you pass it through, but 49% are dedicated to making it fail. It's not going to work very well, right? Simple implementations are probably more important than the policy passed, right? There's also nothing to work long term, right? So, you know, the political system, every two years we switch who's in control in advance because everyone hates it when it's in there. So we get a lot out of you. So we kind of switch back and forth on hold. So any long term thing never works because that's not how it works, right? That's part of changing the conversation is kind of getting away from that. And I think these kind of conversations can happen, right? That when you get away from the, the dual purpose of politics, which is to win and to solve problems, you get away from the winning and focus more about the problem. I think you open up conversations. Talk a little bit more, right? It is the voice of nature a little bit more.

[54:53 - 55:37] Martin Carcasson: And with that, that's what we hope we tend to do. [pauses] So, those of you who are students. If you're interested, you can shoot me. My email is really easy. It's cpd@colostate.edu. So the center of public liberation. So we'll start the recruiting for the next group. My email is also, on the, on the back of the flyer as a pamphlet. Um, I guess it's the flyers that have a hold of it, once you fold it. Yeah. Uh, when I was starting out, I started a new class every semester as a three hour communication course. Uh, we also started to develop a master's program in it, so we should have it online hopefully within a year or so. So, thank you very much for your attention.

END TRANSCRIPTION