

Table of contents

- 7 Introduction**
- 15 Jacek Sroka, Joanna Podgórska-Rykała**
The Evolution of Participatory Budgeting in Poland –
Towards Deliberation or Plebiscite?
- 37 Monika Augustyniak**
Participatory Budget in France – Selected Issues
- 51 Agnieszka Sobol**
Deliberation as a Path towards the Development of Participatory
Budgeting (a Case Study of the City of Antwerp)
- 65 Liliana Podwika**
The Characteristic of Participatory Budget Process Based on Brazil
and Poland Examples
- 81 Marcin Rachwał**
Participatory Budgeting as a Form of Conventional
Political Participation
- 97 Paweł Ostachowski**
Benefits and Threats Related to the Participation Budget Using
the Example of the Biggest Cities in Poland
- 109 Kamil Brzeziński**
Some Comments on the Appearances of Participatory Budgeting
in Poland
- 149 Marcin Kępa**
Participatory Budget *versus* Participation of a Social Factor
in Dispute Resolving Methods within Public Procurement
in Selected EU Countries
- 165 Magdalena Wiśniewska**
Integration of Immigrants through Participation – Determinants
and Good Practices

Introduction

The title of this study reflects the intention of its editors to include texts relating to both theories and specific deliberative practices with participatory budgeting as a leitmotiv in a concise study.

The basic questions which the theory and practice of public policy try to answer is the question about desires in democratic conditions and at the same time an effective formula for balancing centralization and decentralization in decision-making processes.

The answer is not easy and not the same for all cases. Each time it will de facto be a partial answer – better or worse suited to the so-called spirit of the times, political and administrative culture, institutional and systemic conditions as well as to specific situational conditions. In a variety of contemporary polyarchies, centralization and decentralization are two complementary and interacting organizational poles. They stay in synergy when properly balanced, and when they are not, they seem to be clashing. However, they are not actually antagonistic to each other. Centralization and decentralization create a dual system. It is impossible to reasonably consider them separately from each other – both in the ideological and theoretical-model dimensions, as well as in the political and public dimension in practice. Disruptions of the dual system understood in this way, in the form of a disproportionate advantage of one of the poles, sooner or later bring counterproductive results in social life, economy and politics – and as a result lead to system destabilization and disruptions of the so-called social space.

In this study, we are interested in democratic incarnations of public policies and for this reason we will not deal with authoritarian forms of controlling the public apparatus in which decentralization, even if it actually occurs, is subordinated to paradigms of a hierarchizing or excluding hierarchy. Examples of this kind are provided by ethnic, caste, class,

Introduction

sectarian, and territorial criteria used in tyranny. Centralization – along with stricter control, uniformisation and the lack of possibility for a democratic change of power (alternation) – is a typical tool of dictatorship. On the other hand, we are interested in those issues which contradict tyranny and correspond to the implementation of systemic principles of democracy in public policy – such as: equality of political rights, participation, and deliberation. Their implementation requires a multi-lane combination of centralized and decentralized processes, appropriately adapted to the conditions. We will look for examples of similar conditions in the theory and practice of civic budgeting.

Participatory budgeting, as one of possible variants of deliberation, is one of those phenomena of public life, the quality of which depends on the relations of the parties involved. The shape of these relationships only to a limited extent depends on the ways of their current practice, because these methods are causally conditioned, and the causes lie in cultural constructions. That is why these relations are not easy to study; it is difficult to reach that deep, because it is difficult to both model the conceptualization of the problem and the methodological approach to such research. These are one of the most difficult and, at the same time, the most promising research areas of public policy. We hope that this book will contribute to their partial exploration.

The main objective of the article written by Jacek Sroka and Joanna Podgórska-Rykała is the indication of the direction of the evolution of a significant tool in contemporary democracies – the participatory budgeting. In the current national law the budget of Poland was defined and normalized as “citizens’ budget”. In accordance with the main hypothesis of the paper, which is reflected by the title of the article – the formal Polish solutions subject the role of this self-government budget to one of the standard tools of plebiscitary character, which are in fact not so deliberative, as they are more and more commonly practiced in consolidated democracies. Thus, key systemic innovations become restrained – which on one hand should aim at extending and deepening co-determination, and contributing to the verification of the impact of local communities and

consolidation of democracy in Poland. On the other hand, they constitute the essential component of a modern public policy and public management within the developmental paradigm associated with the so-called cognitive economy. The authors note that the later the real practices of deliberative codetermination occur in Poland, the later the complex systemic modernization will be possible (as long as it is possible at all). It concerns modernization, creating authentic and long-term developmental chances and generating social, economic and political-public resources as well as solutions vital for dynamic, but also stable development in the conditions of globalization.

Monika Augustyniak in her article *Participatory Budget in France – Selected Issues* makes an interesting description of the civic budget in France. In the French local and regional government, participatory budget allows residents of local communities to freely submit projects and provides a way for expressing their expectations and needs in terms of quality of life, immediate surroundings, future of their districts and municipalities. Thanks to participatory budgets, the residents of local communities are able to shape their own public space by submitting ideas and selecting, by way of a vote, projects to be implemented in their local communities. The tasks financed under the participatory budget are aimed at improving the living conditions of the residents, thus providing an example of pro-citizen co-management of the municipal space. The French participatory budget is an effective instrument for the participation of residents in the co-management of the local community, and not an illusory substitute for power exercised by residents.

The paper of Agnieszka Sobol entitled *Deliberation as a Path towards the Development of Participatory Budgeting (a Case Study of the City of Antwerp)* delivers an overview and arguments for deliberation in practices of participatory budgeting at the municipal level. It can be observed that in deliberative participatory budgeting, compared to the standard framework, the quality of work and the general outcomes demonstrate improved standards. The paper analyses the participatory budgeting process (burgerbegroting) in the city of Antwerp (Belgium). It provides an

Introduction

ample amount of empirical examples which address both the research itself and the ensuing problems that arise in the process of implementation. It should be stated that the paper depicts an institutional perspective of the process. The presented information and data were collected from open sources, i.e. articles and documents as well as direct information from the Participation Office in the Antwerp City Hall. The analysed practices and experiences provide useful recommendations for Polish cities and towns in which deliberative practices are a rare case.

Liliana Podwika in the article entitled *The Characteristics of Participatory Budget Process Based on Brazil and Poland Examples* touches the topic of participatory budgeting in Brazil and in Poland. She begins her comparative analysis by explaining the concept of civic budget and providing criteria that mark out this process. There is also an introduction to the issue at hand from a historical perspective. Next, she discusses the example of the city of Porto Alegre and the solutions adopted in Brazil to reduce the marginalization of less a fluent social groups. Analysing the roots of the success of participatory budgeting, the author presents the elements that characterize European models of participatory budgeting with some focus on the Polish case. The paper draws attention to the features of participatory budgeting and its benefits to the communities in a democratic state.

Marcin Rachwał in his article titled *Participatory Budgeting as a Form of Conventional Political Participation* presents participatory budgeting in the context of conventional political participation. The purpose of the considerations was to identify criteria that would allow a given procedure to be classified as a political institution specified in the title. The research problem focuses on the factors that cause rapid implementation of participatory budgeting in subsequent local communities. According to the thesis formulated as a result of the Author's research, the studied form of conventional political participation is responding to the demand increasingly articulated by citizens to reform democracy in such a way that wider participation of the sovereign in decision-making processes is possible. The demand for reform is the outcome of dissatisfaction with the way liberal

democracy functions, which essentially limits the role of the sovereign to participation in free, cyclical and competitive elections as well as the occasional institutions of direct democracy.

The article of Paweł Ostachowski, *Benefits and Threats Related to the Participation Budget Using the Example of the Biggest Cities in Poland*, presents the issues of participatory budget as a rapidly developing contemporary tool for the participation of urban residents in managing local space. The work consists of two parts. The first one focuses on the benefits of introducing a participatory budget that are shared by the authorities and the local community. It also presents threats to this tool of social participation. The second part of the article focuses on the functioning of the participatory budget in the largest Polish cities in the years 2014–2018. It indicates in particular the problem of the declining interest of urban residents in this form of impact on local space, which local authorities have to face. In the summary of the research and the results analysis, the article emphasizes that participatory budget in large Polish cities still remains a tool neither fully established nor effective. It will also require additional years of work by local authorities and the society itself to become a civic tool in the full sense of the word.

The paper of Kamil Brzeziński is entitled *Some Comments on the Appearances of Participatory Budgeting in Poland*. In the opinion of the author, participatory budgeting has gained enormous popularity in Poland since 2011, i.e. its first implementation in a seaside resort. This tool has been utilized by an increasing number of towns. Poland is the current leader in Europe in terms of the number of implementations of participatory budgets. Although this growing popularity was accompanied by social enthusiasm and hope for a positive change in decisions about urban life at first, Polish participatory budgeting has lately faced a noticeable wave of criticism. These mechanisms have been criticized for their façade character and false appearances of participation. This article aims at presenting several arguments confirming the above accusations. For the purpose of this analysis, Jan Lutyński's concept of pretended actions has been used and considerations have been exclusively restricted to Polish conditions.

Introduction

Marcin Kępa in his article *Participatory Budget versus Participation of a Social Factor in Dispute Resolving Methods within Public Procurement in Selected EU Countries*, argues that the idea of participatory budget as well as the idea of a social factor in administration of justice in EU member countries are the phenomena which fall into the broader phenomenon of “citizenship” of administrative service and some spheres of socio-economic life of these countries. Increasingly larger participation of the society in conducting public tasks inclines to enhanced analysis of this phenomenon. This phenomenon on borders on public policies, law, administration, and economy. In particular, it seems to have a progressive tendency, of a clearly dynamic character. It is particularly visible in the local government. Local government authorities as regulatory bodies are the best example to display these mechanisms.

The citizenship of public mechanisms (state and local government) is well visible based on two examples: direct participation of society in the financial policy of local government authorities and direct participation of society in the public procurement system.

The purpose of the article is the analysis of mechanisms determining the functioning of these two phenomena in theory and practice, especially based on mutual influence. There is no doubt that the influence of a social factor on the allocation of finance via participatory budget is considerable (at least it is known that such an institution functions in a legal system). But how is this issue (influence) reflected within public procurement?

The common denominator of the situations analysed is their orientation to provide public goods. The first notion is related to announcing ideas and securing financial means to provide public goods, the second one determines the selection of their provider. The legal-dogmatic method and the observation method are the predominant ones applied in this research.

The article of Magdalena Wiśniewska, entitled *Integration of Immigrants through Participation – Determinants and Good Practices* focuses on an emerging issue which is social integration of immigrants. Migration is a contemporary world phenomenon and affects communities around the world. Poland faces immigration as well and should be prepared to

integrate newcomers with the existing communities. Long-term immigrants should be able to take part in the public sphere also through social participation. There are countries and communities which already have some experience in this field and have managed to overcome the barriers of participation or create effective approaches. The article first presents international migration as an existing phenomenon on the basis of statistical data. Then, the Author presents social integration of immigrants on chosen examples, including participatory budgeting. The paper ends with concluding remarks.

We hope that our collection of articles will show that governance practices, including citizens' assemblies, can contribute to strengthening proactive public activities located in the area of the so-called civil democracy. The modern beginnings of the idea of democratic participation understood in this way are in the words spoken by Abraham Lincoln in 1863, at Gettysburg: Government – of the people, – by the people, – for the people. In this vision, a forward-looking (proactive) approach dominates the more conservative (reactive) variants known from the democratic-parliamentary classics. The conservative variant (government for the people) exercising the public power 'for citizens', or 'for the benefit of citizens' – through the elite, composed of its elected representatives. In the proactive approach ('government by the people'), power is exercised in a direct, close and networked – in the social and technological sense – contact with its addressees. The proactive approach incorporates into public policy a variety of phenomena related to co-deciding, agreeing between different interests, as well as a joint evaluation of collective and particular results and benefits, living in a given (sub) culture. The proactive approach, if only because of its network paradigm, escapes strict formal conceptualization. By the way, this also reveals one of the main recommendations given in various ranks of EU documents which recommend (directly or indirectly) 'networking' and 'governance' in public policy. However, the real effects are very different. It is also demonstrated by the example of citizens' assemblies and shows that the effective use of citizens' assemblies has strong local and situational context.

Introduction

Citizens' panels are one of the methods of public governance. The results of its application do not differ much from those resulting from the classic government. The key difference is in the processes: (a) single-lane and hierarchically oriented (in classic government); (b) multi-band and network-oriented (in governance). The 'mechanics' of hierarchically ordered processes, although (formally) more precise, is not a masterpiece and contains numerous contradictions and inconsistencies. Network solutions are also not free from them. However, in their case, more flexible and adequate system reactions are possible. They work better in the conditions of the presence of an increased level of generalized social trust, and they are favoured by culturally embedded, consensual patterns of individual and group behaviour, dominant in various dimensions of life. In such conditions, the so-called mini-publics mentioned in the text function almost spontaneously and free from more serious deformations. That makes it much easier to establish their formalized forms, e.g. citizens' assemblies. It is also easier then to establish the relationship between citizens' assemblies and classic elected bodies, taking into account such key issues as: responsibility, self-selection, or the need to skilfully balance the focus on processes and decisions.