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Abstract :

For 20 years, the democratic innovations have been multiplied, and with them, specific literature. In this paper, I argue that a way to understand the democratic innovations at the local level is to trivialize the novelty of participatory democracy ; it is what I have done in my PHD realized on the case of Poitou-Charentes, the region led by the former socialist candidate at the presidential election, Ségolène Royal, which displayed “participatory democracy” as a discriminating choice of public action methods. By crossing an ethnographic study, a long term study of the policy making process and an analysis of the political work of the local authorities, on one hand I show the traditional use of innovation in the policy making and in the political competition (the organization needs of ideology and innovation) and on the other hand the multiple uses of the participatory method. By comparing three participatory devices ("high schools’ participatory budgets", "citizens' jury evaluating the ‘Transport and Mobility’ regional policy", and "participatory forum" on water issues), this work analyses how the objectives of the devices are renegotiated during implementation : both the representatives of the organization and the spokespersons of the regional territory use the devices to their own interest. So, the participatory process can be analyzed as a negotiation process of the identity, the resources and the value of the spokespersons of the regional territory, and by there as a negotiation on the objectives and the tools of local policies.

For 20 years, the democratic innovations have grown considerably, and with them specific researches. There have been substantial contributions from both a normative perspective as well as in empirical research. Specific literature has been devoted to evaluate the development of these
processes and to assess their deliberative qualities or their democratic consequences\(^1\). These researches have provided empirical evidence on what participation can deliver and what it cannot. But, on the one hand, there's still a gap between participation researches, based on the study of the most innovative case (Participatory Budget in Porto Alegre, citizens' polls) and « ordinary » local government studies: participatory democracy specialists are often criticized for overinvesting some micro democratic experimentations. On the other hand, we still know few things about how these democratic innovations are articulated with the wide representation systems and the ordinary political work.

That is why I argue that another way to understand the democratic innovations at the local level is to trivialize the novelty of participatory democracy. It is what I have done in my PHD thesis on the case of one the most innovative institution in France: the Poitou-Charentes region, led by the former socialist candidate at the presidential election, Ségolène Royal\(^2\). In my attempt to integrate the study of participatory democracy in the ordinary “toolbox” of political research, re-reading Philip Selznick's book, TVA and the grass roots, was very useful. As C. Stivers said, TVA “has been more admired than read closely” (Stivers, 2009). In this paper, I try to highlight what Selznick's work tells us, and what we can learn from it to study participatory democracy. The central message is that the important thing is not to measure how much an organization can be democratic but what do the uses of democratic ideology and methods teach us about the needs of the organization, and from there, about the way the political leaders can act on the social world. I will first quickly sum up Selznick’s case study (TVA) and his methodological approach and present my case study. Then, I will expose two main contributions of Selznick's work: the uses of innovation and ideology in the policy making, and the dilemmas of interaction between the organization and its environment.

**A first-rate case study.**

TVA and the Grass Roots: A Study of Politics and Organization is a famous and influential study of politics in action at all levels in the creation and expansion of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Selznick’ study is a first-rate case study which analyses in depth the implementation of an agricultural program, which sought to work with farmers and farm organizations to encourage greater use of improved fertilizers. During the 30’s, the TVA promoted an ideology “the grass-roots doctrine” which has been presented as a democratic method. This approach had two functions: it

---

1 For example, we can think about the evaluation grids of the effects or of the quality of the processes (Arnstein, 1969; Guston, 1999; Rowe, Fewer 2000, 2004; Callon, Laszoumes, Barthe, 2001).

2 Alice Mazeaud, La fabrique de l’alternance. La démocratie participative dans la recomposition du territoire régional (Poitou-Charentes 2004-2010), Thèse de doctorat en science politique, Université de La Rochelle, 2010.
was supposed to be more efficient to strengthen “grassroots” institutions instead of working at cross-purposes with them and it also promised to strengthen the TVA’s self-image as a regional organization and to preserve its autonomy from the federal government.

In other words, The TVA coopted local officials into the TVA to gain local support. This cooptation had unintended consequences by allowing the local officials to keep out the New Deal agricultural programs. In terms of the functional need to adjust operations to the local environment, the bargain was rational; even if it had bad consequences in terms of democracy, because turning authority over to the landgrant colleges and extension services did not mean only giving up direct access to farmers but going along with Southern traditions, including pervasive institutional and individual racism. The central message of Selznick’s study is that policy implementation is not a one-way street: the agency acts on the environment and the environment acts back on it. Another message, it that the strategy was functional because the ideology was vague, accommodating different meanings for different people and groups: the grassroots ideology put a “halo” (Selznick, 1949 p 220) over measures considered necessary to adjust the organization to its environment. In conclusion, TVA shared responsibility but not power: voluntary organizations were used as coopted tools to strengthen TVA authority.

As P. Selnick, my work is a case study, chosen not for its representativeness but for its exemplarity. Whereas several French regions have invested the participatory thematic, the case of Poitou-Charentes can't be viewed as a representative case. It may be viewed as an extra-ordinary case because of the “quality” of the innovations implemented (Sintomer, Talpin 2011), this isn’t my perspective. I don't analyze this case because it's acknowledged as “innovative” but how this case had been “named” and acknowledged as innovative. In 2004, Poitou-Charentes, led by the same political team since the first election in 1986, had known its first political alternation. Ségolène Royal and her political team drove a participatory campaign, organising participatory forum on all the regional issue. In a few years, “participatory democracy” became the key of the political identity of the former socialist candidate at the presidential election. As they acceded at the head of the regional council, they began to try out participatory devices (high school’s participatory budget, citizens jury, and participatory forum) and made “participatory democracy” the regional method of governing. In this perspective, we analysed both the political alternation as a using circumstance of participatory democracy and the participatory democracy as a tool of the making of the political alternation. By this, we don’t oppose the real effects of the participatory devices and the strategical uses of the innovations but we analyse how these two dimensions are linked.

---

4 Ségolène Royal deputy and minister (primary school, environment) in the 80’s. She’s president of the regional council since 2004. In 2007, she was the socialist candidate at the presidential election.
Participatory democracy as ideology: the need for distinction and consistency.

Usually, participatory democracy is analyzed with regard to the objectives claimed by local elites. But, the important thing is not that the regional elites believe (or not) in participatory democracy. “The systems of values, or ideologies, must be seen as resources to build a balanced system, means for actors to legitimize their practices rather than what inevitably determines their perceptions of reality and their actions” (Mériaux 1995). As Selznick taught us, the ideology shaped in a democratic manner, doesn't tell us anything about the aims of the actors, nor even on the practices of actors, but can lead us to the needs of the organization in its relationships with the representatives of the environment and towards its own members. « No democratic program can be unconcerned about objectives of a course of action, especially as they affect popular welfare. But the crucial question for democracy is not what to strive for, but by what means to strive [...] the most pervasive obstacles to the understanding and even the inspection of this technology is ideology or official doctrine [...] But what is less well understood, or at least less generally applied to objects of public esteem, is the tendency for ideas to reflect something more than enthusiasm or more or less pardonable pride. The functions of a doctrine may be more subtle and more significant, related to the urgent needs of leadership and to the security of the organization itself » (Selznick 1949 p 7-8). In the case of Poitou-Charentes, we have studied participatory democracy as an ideology, “understood as a whole, more or less coherent, of beliefs, values and practices presented as discriminative”. Like the TVA, both the regional council and its president shaped their entire approach and public image around their democratic, “participatory” nature.

The need for distinction

To understand the choice of Ségolène Royal for participatory democracy, the main point is not her ideological preference but her position in the political field. If at the regional level, she appears like a national leader, at the national level and in the competition inside the socialist party, she’s an outsider. By using participatory democracy, she tries to reconvert the weakness of the political capitals and legitimacy which are acknowledged to her. In other words, what we study is the work

---

5 Three main objectives are usually pointed out: social, politic, and responsiveness (Bacqué and al. 2005).
6 About the impact of ideology in public policy (Arnaud and al., 2007).
of the new political team to be acknowledged as “innovative” and “apart from the establishment”. Her use of participatory democracy must be analysed in relation to the others political offers, especially to the “nearness democracy” promoted by the former prime minister and president Poitou-Charentes, Jean-Pierre Raffarin. The difference between “participatory democracy” and “nearness democracy” is generally made by academic specialists, it is based on the quality of the procedures and the decisional power of the citizens; what explains why the figurehead of participatory democracy in Poitou-Charentes is the high schools participatory budget: the star of participatory device, inspired from Porto Alegre, which main quality is the decisional power of citizens (10M€, about 10% of the regional investment budgeting in high school), and also the large number of participants involved (20000 in 2010).

This difference between “participatory democracy” and “nearness democracy” must be difficult to understand outside the academic field. Nevertheless, by trying out innovations, Ségolène Royal’s team can find supports with some specialists involved in the promotion of participatory democracy. This special relation between Ségolène Royal, her personal adviser, Sophie Bouchet-Petersen a reader of social science who has yet worked with academics when she was working with Ségolène Royal at the educative ministry, and some academic specialists of participatory democracy is a key point to understand how this new political team succeeded in being acknowledged as “innovative”. The collusif work of the personal adviser of Ségolène Royal, of some academic specialists and of some of regional civil agents involved in the promotion and implementation of the participatory devices, contributes both to the invention of the “innovation”, the statement and stylization of the regional public policy and to the spread of the innovations outside the regional space.

On one hand, by multiplying the “innovations”, Ségolène Royal tends to consolidate her innovative capital and her academic supports. The innovations are invented at the cross-section between scientific, politic and administrative knowledges. The profil of the people engaged in this work show it very well: the manager for participatory democracy is a former phd student of Yves Sintomer (french academics specialist of participatory democracy), she gives up the thesis to work in the regional council; the educative policy regional manager is both a specialist of education and politically engaged; Sophie Bouchet-Petersen is used to work with academics. Altogether, they have imagined some “innovations”, as the BPL (High school’s Participatory budget) now known as the most important french participatory experience, which is in practice the product of the adjustment between the Porto Alegre model, the political ambition of Ségolène Royal and her support and the reality of the regional configuration. They have adapted the model of municipal Participatory budget, implemented at the local level, to the regional level.
Participatory budget in the high schools, citizen jury of evaluating the regional policy. Ideal-Eu (the electronic and European deliberative assembly) a “world premiere”, the innovations project the change on the whole of the regional, national and international society, and give weight to a “different” style of leadership and policy making. Or, “the appearance of innovation is almost as necessary as compliance with the ideas in vogue and structural possibilities, because only the spectacle of leaders boldly engaged in new ways of leading can acknowledge them talents and strengthen their right to govern; this phenomenon of “innovative” leader is built primarily by a set of both stylistic and gestural language, and by the publicity given to the techniques described as synonymous with progress” (Edelman, 1991). Furthermore, embodied in innovations able to be spread and transferred, in techniques, in tools of government “participatory democracy” becomes not only an ideal to pursue but a credible way of making politics: “participatory democracy” promotes an image of a political team that acts differently but rationally and above all, in a progressive way.

But, these “innovations” do not exist by their own qualities. There is an organizational work to be acknowledged as an “example” to follow on democratic domains; “to be a leader on the market of participatory democracy” said in the words of the manager for participatory democracy in the regional council. The regional council organizes each year a colloquium on participatory democracy which gathers some international specialists; the manager for participatory democracy attends at national or international conference to present the innovations of Poitou-Charentes; the academic specialists publish on these innovations. With this work, we can observe some transfer processes of BPL to other French regions. The circulation of the Poitou-Charentes experimentations in academical, political and administrative fields leads to accredit the difference claimed on the way of governing, and the innovative capital. And that is a key point. The new political team needs to be acknowledged as different but also as efficient. Making the innovations evaluate by academics, refering to overseas experiments contributes to legitimate, and rationalize the use of participatory democracy. Ségolène Royal said: “Participatory democracy which is laughed when it’s me who speak about it, works almost everywhere”. Futhermore, thanks to the cooperation with academics, the discourse is inspired by social sciences. It fulfills two antagonistics functions. On one hand, we saw that it contributes to the political labelling of public policy, ie the politicization in a subjective meaning, by highlighting the “difference” in the way of governing. On other hand, it contributes to rationalize, and by there, depoliticizes, ie removing the electoral dimension, the use of participatory democracy. More, the discourse underlines how much these innovations make the public policy more democratic, more reactive, and more efficient; as in the words of Ségolène Royal:

7 My work is based on interviews, ethnographic observations and documentary analysis.

6
“Sometimes, I’m asked about the usefulness of participatory democracy we implemented in Poitou-Charentes. It simply serves to make some better decisions in association with all of those who are concerned by regional policies. This other lightening enforces the efficiency of regional policies, allows to correct them at real time or to enrich them by taking in account the citizens and the users’ recommendation about what works, what doesn’t work and what would better work8. The discourse on the BPL is a great example. The internet website, the communication documents, the public agents often stressed on how much the BPL has fed the regional policies: policies about “highschoo1s’ life”, “nutrition” or culture are born with the social demand the students expressed in the participatory assembly. These new policies are given as piece of evidence that participatory democracy works. “In only four years, the BPL, has proved its pertinence beyond our expectations: associate all the members of the educative community to the decisions that concern them, this is the good method. A best listening, it’s also an administration more reactive and public expenditure more efficient9.”

That reminds us that the common opposition between democratization and instrumentalization lacks of pertinence. Furthermore, we cannot pull down the use of participatory democracy on the routine game of innovation and the need of distinction. If on one side, we can study participatory democracy as an ideology and analyze its production and legitimation, on the other side, the participatory procedures can be studied as normal “tools” of public policy; ie, “a device both political, technical and social which reflects the representation of the problem” (Le-gales, Lascoumes, 2004), whom first effect is to introduce a rupture in the policy making. In this way, we have to analyze the other needs which these devices aims to satisfy, and before this the conditions in which this game of innovation can be implemented. If the change in official discourses, regional images and the implementation of “innovative” procedures are primarily intended to project the change, producing and creating new policies requires converting the institution, and therefore the actors who give life to it, to the new directions.

The need for consistency

Thus it comes to analyze the functions of “participatory democracy” in "the process of [...] institutional conversion by which the actors or institutions restructure their strategies within institutions to adapt to new objectives, in other words to serve new functions "(Thelen 2003). We analyse how the newly-elected team mobilizes “participatory democracy” to seize the organization and to lead the change of practices. The ideology is not only a set of symbols and discourses

8 L’Essentiel, Poitou-Charentes regional letter
9 L’essentiel, Poitou-Charentes regional letter.
intended to project change and to make the region existing inside and outside the regional society\textsuperscript{10}. The ideology also answers to a need of the organization in its relationship with its environment and towards its own members.

In the Poitou-Charentes case, the ideology had a significant role in the conversion of the institution. The participatory democracy has ideological functions. The ideology must not be seen as “a posteriori justification of conduct and practices” but “the use of ideology may allow human beings to ennable - and first in their own eyes - practices morally reprehensible: it is a work of justification and legitimization.” (Lagroye et al. 2006, p.490). Thanks to the collaboration between the public managers, the politicians and the academics, the regional discourse is scientifically shaped: the partisan and personal aspects are hidden by the rhetoric of democratization and administrative modernization. On the one hand, this ideology gives a motivation for the public agents who are involved in the implementation of the procedures, especially of the participatory budget which requires an activist investment. “Here, all of these guys shared the same values, are ready to invest. Something like that can only be made with passionate persons, whose take some risks and don’t count their time\textsuperscript{11}. Besides, they defined themselves as militants; “yes, it’s called activism. But, if we don’t believe, if we stay in the administrative frame, the high school participatory budget can’t exist. One must agree with the political project carried on by the president… that’s what makes sense when you carry a message. And it’s clear that we have to carry a message in high school BPL, it’s the consistency\textsuperscript{12}”. We see that the civil servants whose implement the BPL is far from the weberian ideal-typical bureaucrats\textsuperscript{13}. With the words, the public agents represent the organization towards their environment and in the case of BPL it’s important because the device is organized in each high school of the region; they need to learn the discourse and to adjust it to their practices. « What I found difficult was the regional discourse… Learning to speak with the region’s words without that it’s false. It was the first time I spoke in in institution

\textsuperscript{10}All the researches on territorial identity underline the importance of this need, especially in the case of young institutions as region or metropolis.
\textsuperscript{11}Interview, the regional education manager.
\textsuperscript{12}Interview, the BPL director
\textsuperscript{13}It’s not specifically to the case of Poitou-Charentes administration. It’s noteworthy that, even they oppose in an ideological perspective, participatory democracy and New Public Management are comparable on the quality and the work of public agents (enthusiasm, reactivity, sympathetic) » (Vigoda 2002; Du Gay 2008). Paul du Gay describes the transformation of the identity and the ethos of public servants: « Contemporary demands for responsive public management contain two emotional injunctions to public bureaucrats. The first, derived from populist doctrines of political right, requires bureaucrats to be responsive to the needs of their ‘clients’. In the name of ‘recognition’ and the ‘politics of care’, for example, it is thought vital to inculcate in bureaucratic conduct a sense of ‘compassion’ or close identification with others’ feelings. Secondly, in the name of responsiveness to political superiors and the delivery of their policy objectives, bureaucrats are expected to exhibit ‘ownership’ of and identification with particular policies. They are required to be committed champions for and enthusiastic advocates of those policies. Both of these injunctions are deemed to be more in tune with democratic principles and the currents of contemporary ethical culture (‘diversity’ or ‘human rights’, for example) than what is represented as the unalmented Weberian world of rule-bound hierarchy ». 8
where there is a discourse, a political ligne. It’s not easy to have the words, the political words. I had to train myself (…). What it seemed to be difficult, was to have the same disours, to have to represent the institution with words…. Indeed speaking in one voice is, in fact, what was not easy. Nevertheless, I agreed with what was said… But the words wich have listened during all the presidential campaign bothered me, all of this seemed to be false so much it had been repeted14*. Nevertheless the unease of the civil agents with the political labelling of some words, this process, analyzed as the constitution of an “activist ethos”, shows that the discourse of the organization progressively takes consistency and, in return, creates unity in the organization. It reminds us the words of Selznick. « In addition, ideas arise from the need for internal communication as a means of developing organizational unity and homogeneity. This functions both to present a consistent interpretation to the world, especially when subject to attack, and to establish a foundation for the smooth flow of directives, the ready acceptance of executive decision. This unity, when based on the cultivation of an appropriate set of attitudes, provides a framework for the development of special policies which will be attuned to the basic view of the leadership. » (Selznick, 1949 : 50).

Although we can observe the construction of a group of supports in the organization, the belief in the participatory democracy is shared not by all the politicians of the regional majority nor by all of the public agents. The politicians attitude to participatory democracy shows that, as in the TVA case, the ideology was enough consistent to promote the distinction and gain supports, and enough plastic to accommodate different meanings and practices. Some politicians have developed on their own some participatory devices, which can’t be named as innovation, but are used to get around the established representatives of the environment and legitimize their supports. The former public agents, especially technical agents, mainly perceived the participatory democracy as a politicization of the public service: with the presidential campaign, the participatory democracy method is embodied by Ségolène Royal, the personal and partisan uses of the participatory rhetoric have been highlighted and implementing the participatory device can be viewed as supporting the career of the regional president. For example, some public agents were afraid of having to face some criticism about the politicization of the regional policy in the high schools. In response to these fears, the BPL director has argued about the democratic dimension of the BPL. Indeed, as the participatory democracy is defined as a democratic process, it’s difficult to criticize it, and with the scientific shape, the ideology becomes acceptable by the public agents who have to transform their practices. To sum up, the scientifically shaping of the ideology is decisive in the endeavor of the new political team to regain control on administration, and hence of its work to seek some spokespersons of the

14 Interview, an agent of the BPL organization.
environment. Indeed, controlling the administration is an important issue of a political alternation because the administration is the mediator of the organization to the environment.

**Participatory democracy as governance method. The need of coming to terms with the environment.**

The main problem of an organization is to adjust itself to its environment. With the participatory democracy method, the regional council seeks to meet, indeed to produce, some “new” spokespersons of the environment. It must be understood in the specific context of a political alternation. As Friedberg said, the environment is never a “data”, it's produced by the spokespersons which at a moment are considered both legitimate and representative (Friedberg 1997). In Poitou-Charentes, with the stability of the former political team (during 20 years), these relational systems have been stabilized and with them the representations of the territory and the goals and the tools of regional policies. So, when Ségolène Royal and her team came to power, they have to face an “environment” shaped around the former political team and its supports; ie the patterns of negotiation between regional civil agents and the spokespersons of the “environment” are routinized and the “characteristics” of the environment seem to be “natural”. Furthermore, the new team had a limited knowledge about sectorial and territorial configuration.

Beyond their different properties, the function of the three participatory devices I have studied is to mobilize new spokespersons of the environment. Sometimes, as in the case of water, there is a strategic dimension: opening the decision-making to all the inhabitants is a strategy to get around the institutionalized political network. The participatory forum on water policy is more an ordinary public participation process than a participatory innovation. More, all the participants were yet mobilized on the water thematic and none of them were fooled about the strategic use of participatory process: during the campaign, the regional new political team had promised to change the water policy in a more ecological way. However, despite, or perhaps thanks to, these strategic dimension, we can observe that the public debate has contributed to form a new political network: actors (fishermen, environmental NGO, consumers, sustainable farmers) were used to be marginalized compared to prefered partners (irrigator farmers) of the former political “governants” of the regional council have pooled their resources. The regional council has helped them to empower, and furthermore have contributed to make them acknowledged as experts in the negotiation arena of the regional water policy. Now, this new political network has enough resources to propose new public options in the water management meetings, and to go to court to
make cancelled the decisions taken in favor of irrigator farmers. What is very interesting here is that, whereas the water was an important issue in the electoral competition, the regional council has not competence to manage the water policy. In other words, this example shows that empowering some new representatives of the territory was the only way to act on the water “issue”.

Even if there is not always a strategic dimension, we mustn’t believe that it is a specifical case. Cooperating with the local forces is a condition to implement any public policy. That is what Selnick said and that is what has been reminded recently, for example by P. Duran: “It is not only the participation of the stakeholders which is required but their inclusion in the public decision and management system” (Duran 2009, p.24-25). So, participatory innovations do not aim to respond to a new need but aim to respond on another way to an old and classical need. However, the procedures can produce some proper effects, partially unexpected, on the definition of the public engaged in public policy. This is the case of the citizen jury which, first aims to demonstrate the pertinence of organizing citizens’ jury to evaluate public policy; proposition made by Ségolène Royal during the presidential campaign which had been very criticized. The citizen jury is bound to involve some ordinary citizens, drawn by chance, in the policy process. At the beginning of the procedure, which aims to evaluate the effects of transport regional policy, it appears that the jurors where in fact also non-users of the public transports; a “category” with which it is very difficult to come to term. So, we could think that the citizens’ recomandation have been very usefull to implement new policies. The observation of deliberation shows that the citizens contribute to move the borders of public problems, and, by there, debate about the administrative organization. These words of a juror well recap what the deliberation makes: “as a traveler, knowing whose public administration is competent is not my problem. As a traveler, my problem is to go from a point A to a point B”15. They also proposed some ideas to organize collective transport in rural area. More, they proposed to think about “how not to move”, that’s means a work on territorial planning, instead of thinking about “how better move”, which was the question the regional council asked them.

But, the problem is that the public agents do not have the skills to make functional the citizens’ recommendations, or the administrative organization is an obstacle of integrating such trans-sectoral options. And that is a paradox of the mini-public: the more the recommendations innovate, the more it is difficult for the policy makers to incorporate it in the policy. Hence, we can make another hypothesis to understand the little effects the participatory devices often have on the policies: the problem is neither the “good will” of the deciders nor the “quality” of the deliberation made during the participatory process but the effectiveness of the alliances and option systems produced by the

15 Observation, 2nd day of the jury.
deliberation in the decision-making. Participatory devices like “citizen jury” which are named “innovative” and “democratic” perhaps produce a true opinion but not an “effective” opinion, ie the opinion of powerful representatives who can engage the behavior of the environment which they are supposed to represent.

The gap, the tension between the innovation and the ordinary need of coming to term with “representatives” of the environment can also produce some, positive and negative, unsuspected effects. The case of the BPL shows it. For the new regional team, the BPL is a tool to produce some new spokespersons of the high schools and change on their name the regional educative policy. But, once the rules have been defined, the political elites no longer control the implementation of a process, whose main rule is the autonomy and the power of the citizens. And the local use of the BPL has produced unexpected and adverse effects from the claimed objectives of the regional. The BPL objectives were shaped around the articulation of democratization and social justice: it’s said, in reference of the Porto Alegre experience, that democratizing the policy process is way to implement public policies more reactive. But, in practice, the constraints of the procedure born from the opposition of high school executive team and the strategical uses of the BPL by these teams have produced some un-redistributive effects on the distribution of public resources between the high schools, and constraint Ségolène Royal and her supports to redefine the objectives of the procedure to adjust it to the effects produced: the objective of administrative modernization has been substitute to the objective of social justice.

To conclude, by studying both the discourses and the practices, we can understand the uses and the functions of ideology and the problem of coming to terms with the representatives of the environment. By crossing an old lecture of local democracy and a new one, focused on the procedures, my work shows that it is quite useless to try to distinguish what is produced by and what is legitimate by the participatory procedures. First, trivializing the novelty and analyzing the practices moves the eyes from the innovations towards how the procedures are acknowledged as “innovative”. The history of participatory democracy is made of returns and re-discovery, whose success depends of the amnesia of former experiences (Lefebvre 2011). We must be vigilant about “the trap of speeding” (Passeron 1987), to understand both the uses and the effects of the participatory procedures. That's a second learning from Selznick’s work: we have a lot to understand by analyzing the participatory procedures as an interaction framework between the organization and its environment. By implementing these procedures, the organization seeks to adjust itself to its environment and negotiate the support of spokespersons of the environment, condition of producing new policies. This is not a new need of the organization. But the way of coming to terms with the environment is, in a part, reshaped to adjust to new characteristics of the
environment. By there, we see that participatory democracy is not only an ideology but also a
governent method wich aims to produce new public policies. It shows us that the game of
innovation is part of the politicization work, understood in a subjective way\textsuperscript{16}: the work to mark
politically the public policy and allow a political lecture of public policy which is a classical
dimension of representative democracy. It also invite us to think to the problem of politicization
work, understood in an objective way, which is the classical problem of changing in public policy:
there’s always a tension between the ambition of changing and the need to come to terms with
people to execute it. Here, and perhaps it is due to the specificity of the case, we can say that the
participatory democracy is not only the symbol but also a vector of the political alternation.
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\textsuperscript{16} I use the distinction between politicization in objective and subjective way made by J-M Eymeri (Eymeri 2004).


