



**Global
Challenges
Foundation**

Cosmopolitan

Deliberative e-Democracy

Author

Farsan Ghassim

The submission proposes to create a World Citizens' Assembly (WCA) as the centerpiece of CDeD. One thousand people worldwide would be drawn by lot each year to deliberate on solving global issues like climate change. Random selection would ensure a statistically perfect representation of the world population. The creation of a WCA may be possible in the near future, as it is based on established methods of public opinion polling which even present-day authoritarian regimes allow. The WCA would thus be composed of ordinary citizens, rather than elected politicians. To enable widespread, continuous, and effective participation, WCA members would deliberate online and part-time – supported by translators, IT specialists, and subject experts, e.g. on complex issues like geo-engineering. After each debate, the WCA would pass monthly resolutions expressing global popular will.





1. Abstract

Cosmopolitan Deliberative e-Democracy (CDeD) allows us to tackle the greatest challenges of our time such as global environmental degradation and extreme poverty [1], while ensuring legitimate decision-making procedures. The World Citizens' Assembly (WCA) is the cornerstone of CDeD. It would add the authoritative voice of global popular will to debates on the greatest challenges and risks we face, thus influencing global public discourse decisively. As opposed to other reform ideas such as the proposal of a global parliament, which rely on – currently infeasible – free and fair elections worldwide, the WCA could be established in the near future. The WCA's short-term realizability is due to its reliance on already available technologies as well as related practices of deliberative assemblies and opinion polling which are permitted not only in democracies such as Australia [2] and India [3], but also in non-democratic states like China [4] and Iran [5]. Encouragingly, deliberative assemblies in various parts of the world have demonstrated that lay people are quite capable of grasping the intricacies of even the most complex issues, arriving at reasonable policy recommendations [6].

The key ideas behind the WCA are random selection and deliberation. Firstly, representatives are randomly selected from the world population, rather than elected. The resulting WCA is a random sample and thus constitutes a statistically perfect representation of the global population. Secondly, decision-making processes in the WCA are characterized by *deliberation* which refers to exchanges of reasoned arguments under conditions of non-coercion and reflection [7]. Thus, instead of merely asking representatives about their pre-conceived views as in opinion polling, the deliberative processes in the WCA expose representatives to arguments on issues of global relevance and ask them to contribute to debates, before opinions are eventually aggregated in majoritarian decision-making processes. This process culminates in resolutions that can be regarded as authoritative expressions of global popular will.

Each year, 1000 individuals from around the world are selected at random as representatives for the WCA which operates throughout the year. Every month, the WCA votes on one issue. The subjects for the first few sessions may be predetermined by the World Citizens' Foundation (WCF), e.g. climate change and large-scale violence [8]. In general, however, the WCA decides autonomously and flexibly on the global issues that it intends to deliberate on.

In its choice of subjects, the WCA is restricted to issues of global relevance. Several mechanisms are intended to ensure this thematic focus of the WCA and prevent an overstepping of its mandate. First, topics are only adopted for deliberation if they receive a supermajority of two-thirds of the WCA. Such a level of interest by WCA representatives is generally expected to apply only to truly global issues. Second, WCA representatives and national governments can refer to the World Citizens' Court (WCC) if they suspect that certain issues to be taken up by the WCA may infringe upon national sovereignties.

The principal method for ensuring a high deliberative quality is the online WCA platform. As is common practice in contemporary public opinion research, every randomly selected WCA representative is equipped with the software – and, if necessary, the hardware – required to access the WCA intranet. On this



platform, WCA representatives are able to communicate, obtain expert advice, and ultimately vote on the issues at hand.

In order to ensure equal opportunity of participation by all WCA representatives, it is crucial that they are not only provided with the necessary IT infrastructure, but also adequately supported. For instance, IT assistants are required to ensure that less technologically savvy WCA representatives can contribute just as much to debates as their more IT-savvy counterparts. Moreover, interpreters are necessary to guarantee that WCA representatives can follow any debate, understand any draft resolution, and communicate with any other WCA representative.

Anonymity of WCA representatives throughout the course of their mandate, both toward the public and toward other participants, is central for several reasons. First, anonymity is key to shield WCA representatives from the influence of special interest groups. Second, anonymity is crucial for protecting WCA representatives from possible reprisals by their national governments. Third, anonymity between participants is fundamental to ensuring full transparency. That is, if WCA representatives were allowed to agree on another communication platform or even personal meetings, auditors and the wider public would not be able to scrutinize their actions.

WCA representatives are randomly allocated into working groups to dedicate themselves more intensively to particular aspects of an issue, e.g. the questions of aviation or geo-engineering in the context of climate change. To this end, WCA working groups are advised – throughout the deliberation processes – by experts on such diverse aspects of a given issue. However, the deliberative process itself takes place entirely between WCA representatives.

Decisions on resolutions are made by simple majority. Once a resolution is passed, its results are publicized to the global media and public. Given the likely influence of special interest groups on subsequent public debates, a WCA cannot reopen a resolution that it has already passed. A resolution may be reopened with a two-thirds supermajority by a subsequent WCA, however. This procedure is to avoid that any given WCA repeatedly deals with the same issue, while allowing for “natural” updates in global public opinion (e.g. due to medial influences) to be addressed in WCA debates.

In the long-run, the WCA will become further formalized, professionalized, and integrated into the broader CDeD system. The WCA’s funding will not solely be based on donations and voluntary contributions anymore, but include obligatory contributions and taxes. The WCA’s substantive and procedural rules will be replaced with a formal constitution. Finally, the WCA will elect – for one-year terms – ministers and executives of a World Citizens’ Government (WCG). The WCA, WCC, and WCG will take part in global decision-making and implementation processes that also involve other institutions such as national governments and international organizations. This is the vision of a Cosmopolitan Deliberative e-Democracy.



2. Description of the model

INTRODUCTION

Cosmopolitan Deliberative e-Democracy (CDeD) is an innovative model for global governance in the 21st century. CDeD's cornerstone is the World Citizens' Assembly (WCA) – an institutional innovation that can be established with readily available means in the near future. The WCA is a permanent institution composed of 1000 randomly selected global citizens. These 1000 representatives spend a few hours each week for an entire year on their work for the WCA. Through online deliberative processes, they recommend solutions to contemporary global challenges such as climate change and military conflicts. In the short term, the WCA's effectiveness depends on the normative power of its resolutions. Hence, national governments, international organizations, and other global actors are in charge of implementing WCA decisions. In the long term, it is envisioned that the WCA would become the cornerstone in a reformed model of global governance, in which national governments, international organizations, transnational companies, global civil society, as well as a World Citizens' Court (WCC) and a World Citizens' Government (WCG) would all play a role. This is the vision of CDeD.

In the following sections, this vision will be broken down into its key components and elaborated with respect to its short- and long-term aspects. While the short-term vision refers to aspects that may be implemented with readily available means and technologies, the long-term vision also relates to the foreseeable future, but partly depends upon global developments which are not entirely under control of the WCA.

THE KEY IDEAS BEHIND CDED

RANDOM SELECTION

We have become accustomed to thinking of free and fair elections as the cornerstone of democracy. Indeed, in the Western liberal tradition, democracy is essentially *defined* by the presence of such an electoral process [9]. Unfortunately, free and fair elections on the global level are elusive, since some of the most powerful countries of the world, as well as many others, are not democratic in any meaningful sense. This makes global democracy, as proposed by many political theorists, seem like a very distant prospect. However, there may be a way out of this dilemma by moving away from the idea of free and fair elections as the cornerstone of democracy. Instead, we may turn to random selection of representatives.

While the idea of randomly selecting representatives seems quite odd to us today, its connection to democracy indeed goes back to the very beginning of democratic theory and practice. In ancient Athens, representatives were randomly selected from the citizenry to serve as representatives for a limited period. The idea at the time was that the practice of politics is a fundamental citizen duty. It was thought that every citizen who adequately participated in politics would be capable of governing as well [10].

Random selection of representatives boasts significant advantages compared to modern parliamentary democracy. First, contemporary parliamentarians are incentivized to be relatively short-sighted, given that their livelihood depends on their job in parliament and due to regular election cycles in which their constituencies must be satisfied in order to reelect their representatives.



In contrast, randomly selected individuals whose mandate is limited are not restricted by such necessary short-sightedness.

Second, whereas modern parliaments represent their constituencies only indirectly and imperfectly, an assembly composed of randomly selected representatives constitutes – by definition – a direct and statistically perfect representation of the underlying constituency. That is, through the process of random sampling, the demographics of the underlying constituency are all reflected on average. For instance, whereas in a parliament there might be not a single 20-year old, given the track record and financial resources usually required to be elected, an assembly composed by random selection may well contain several 20-year-olds, since their probability of becoming part of the assembly is equal to their frequency in the respective (adult) population.

DELIBERATION

In contrast to contemporary parliamentary democracy, which is based on competitive elections and majoritarian decision-making, deliberation requires the reasoned exchange of arguments. Insulated from the influence of special interests and shielded from the corruption through comprises, such a deliberative process leads to higher-quality decisions than ordinary majoritarian processes otherwise would.

As some scholars have noted, random selection and deliberation are mutually reinforcing, since most randomly selected representatives are not strongly partisan at the outset and thus more amenable to reflection which, in turn, is central to deliberation [11].

NORMATIVE POWER

Given this combination of random selection of representatives and a deliberative decision-making process, the resulting resolutions gain significant normative power, even in the absence of a formally binding nature. That is, since representatives are randomly selected from the global population, they truly represent world public opinion on issues of global relevance. Moreover, through the process of deliberation, resolutions of the WCA are not merely a reflection of global public opinion, but rather represent global popular will after extensive exchanges of arguments from various perspectives. As such, it can be said that the WCA's resolutions carry significant normative weight and thus constitute a position on global issues that cannot be simply ignored by other actors in the international system such as national governments, international organizations, and multinational firms.

ASPECTS OF CDED IN THE SHORT- AND LONG-TERM SELECTION PROCESS

In the near future, the selection of representatives for the WCA will be based on clustered random sampling, but still proportional to population sizes. That is, to ensure both adequate regional distribution, but also follow the principle of equal worth of all humans, the selection process is conducted in two steps: First, countries and territories are divided up into clusters of equal population size, i.e. patches of around 7.5 million inhabitants (given an estimated global population of 7.5 billion people divided by the intended size of 1000 representatives in the WCA). Second, one representative is selected at random from each of these clusters, thus constituting a WCA of 1000 representatives in total.



One alternative to this process would be to select at least one representative per country – taking, for instance, UN membership as the applicable benchmark of defining what qualifies as a “country”. This approach might have some advantages like greater interest on the part of people worldwide, if any of their compatriots were selected to serve in the WCA. However, such an approach would also suffer from serious problems. First, the fundamental principle of the equal worth of all humans would not be observed anymore, given that the probability of being selected to serve as a WCA representative would rise significantly for people in micro-states below the threshold of 7.5 million inhabitants. Second, it is not clear why nations such as Palestine or Kosovo, which are not universally recognized as sovereign states, should not also obtain the privilege of having at least one representative in the WCA. Finally, it should be noted that the nationality of WCA representatives, in fact, does not need to be publicized. In fact, such an approach would better fulfill the WCA’s expressed goal of acting in the interest of all of humanity, while also avoiding the problem of reduced public interest in certain countries simply due to the fact that no compatriot features among the representatives in the WCA.

Referring to the discussion above on comparing contemporary parliamentary democracy to random selection and deliberative processes, further points are worth noting with regard to the envisioned WCA selection process and alternative proposals for global reforms based on the electoral model of democracy. First and foremost, it should be noted that autocracies would not allow for free elections of representatives (as required by other proposals for global institutional reforms); but even non-democratic states such as China and Iran do and, in fact, have already allowed for opinion polling and deliberative assemblies at the national level. The WCA is thus an extension of what is already permitted and practiced in countries all over the world – be they democratic or not.

In its early stages, especially in light of limited resources and expertise, a charitable World Citizens’ Foundation (WCF) – acting as the umbrella organization for the WCA – may outsource the selection process to national experts and/or polling organizations with expertise on random sampling in their respective countries. Given their professional focus on the particular characteristics of different countries and the difficulties of obtaining nationally representative samples, such individuals and organizations are ideally placed to draw a certain number of people at random in a given territory. Indeed, clustered random sampling is a standard procedure practiced by many polling organizations worldwide.

As with other aspects of the GDeD idea and the WCA proposal, in particular, great emphasis is placed on transparency and accountability. Hence, every step of the sampling process should be recorded, monitored, and publicized to allow for public scrutiny. While monitoring of the sampling process by external auditors should occur in real-time to ensure the validity of the selection process, publication of details on the sampling process should only occur after the end of each full-year WCA session in order to protect the anonymity of WCA representatives.

IT INFRASTRUCTURE

In contrast to other deliberative assemblies hitherto, which were largely based on *physical* gatherings of people on a full-time basis for relatively short periods of time, it is proposed that the WCA be based on *online* deliberation on a part-



time basis, but throughout continuous cycles of one year each. Consequently, as opposed to standard deliberative assemblies, the WCA requires a reliable IT infrastructure.

In the very near future, the WCA could operate cost-efficiently and effectively using established and free online services such as Google+ and Facebook. Moreover, those randomly selected WCA representatives who do not possess a computer and internet access themselves would have to be provided with the necessary hardware equipment. Later on, given more resources and expertise, a tailor-made WCA online platform will be developed to allow for secure communication between WCA representatives. Moreover, all WCA representatives – without exception – would receive the same IT equipment in order to ensure complete equality in that regard.

ANONYMITY

Anonymity of WCA representatives throughout the period of their mandate, both toward the public and among each other, is key for several reasons. First, anonymity is key to protect WCA representatives from the influence of special interest groups. That is, if lobbyists were aware of the identities of WCA representatives, they might contact them and offer rewards for favorable engagement on the part of a WCA representative. Besides prohibiting such behavior by WCA representatives in principle, the IT infrastructure will also make any breaches of the fundamental rule of anonymity more difficult.

Second, anonymity is crucial for protecting WCA representatives from reprisals by their national governments. That is, it might be that WCA representatives – in the course of their work – have to make statements on global issues that also bear on national affairs. In such cases, WCA representatives must be ensured that their nationality and identity is not publicly accessible, such that they do not have to fear reprisals by their national governments.

Third, anonymity is fundamental to ensuring full transparency. That is, in order to ensure complete transparency and – later – public scrutiny of WCA representatives, it is essential that all their interactions are recorded. If WCA representatives were allowed or able to agree on another communication platform or even personal meetings, auditors and the wider public would not be able to scrutinize their actions.

Fourth, continuous anonymity is essential for the quality of the deliberative process. Whereas in ordinary human interactions, people use heuristics and develop blind trust in the views and actions of certain other individuals, such shortcuts are not in line with the ideal of deliberation where views should form merely based on the quality of the arguments made. At the same time, a certain extent of such heuristic shortcuts is amenable to efficiency and progress on any given decision. Thus, it is proposed that WCA representatives are allocated a new randomly generated number for each voting period, such that they can reliably communicate with one another throughout one period, but cannot rely on such established connections in subsequent periods.

SUPPORT STAFF

Various groups of support staff are intended to ensure the observance of regulations, the facilitation of deliberation, and equal opportunity in participation.



First, English is expected to be the focal language of the WCA. However, given that not all WCA representatives speak a similarly high-level of – or even any – English, translation services and interpreters are key to ensure equality of opportunity in participation. In the short-term, the WCA can rely on services from activist platforms such as Babels [12] which provide free simultaneous interpretation. In the longer term, it would be essential to have a well-trained body of professional interpreters such that any WCA representative can access any document and conversation at any time.

Second, given that participation in the WCA occurs online, WCA representatives require certain technological skills in order to be able to contribute to debates. If WCA representatives do not possess those skills themselves, it is essential that IT-savvy assistants support WCA representatives, e.g. by typing up comments of WCA representatives on circulated draft resolutions. In the short term, such IT assistants may be recruited from local universities, for instance. In the longer term, a large and reliable team of professional IT assistants is necessary to facilitate equitable participation in deliberation by all WCA representatives.

Thirdly, auditors are necessary to ensure the observation of WCA regulations at all times. That is, if WCA representatives breach the WCA rules, they can only be excluded if their actions are monitored in real-time. However, given the principle of anonymity, public scrutiny can only take place after the publishing of recordings following voting sessions. Thus, full-time auditors are necessary to observe the actions of WCA representatives in real-time. Finally, legal aides are necessary to facilitate the work of the World Citizens' Court (WCC) by checking the factual veracity and plausibility of complaints and passing them on to the WCC judges to decide. Again, while these auditors and aides may be volunteers in the short run, in the longer term the WCA should rely on professionals.

REGULATIONS

In order to facilitate the initial stages of its existence, the WCA's provisional regulations are at first pre-determined by the WCF based on the guidelines of the present document. In its inaugural session, the WCA confirms or amends these provisional guidelines, thereby transforming them into the WCA Constitution. Subsequently, the WCA decides on its regulations and structures entirely autonomously. Any changes to the Constitution of the WCA require a 90% supermajority. This high threshold is designed to ensure that minorities within the WCA are not discriminated by adapting the WCA's components or regulations. In addition to this demanding supermajority requirement, any changes to fundamental structures and processes in the WCA can be referred to the World Citizens' Court (WCC) by any WCA member in order to confirm their legality.

AGENDA-SETTING

For the purpose of facilitating the initial stages of the WCA's existence, the WCF recommends topics to be deliberated by the WCA, e.g. climate change, global environmental degradation, large-scale violence, population growth, or extreme poverty [13]. These subjects may be adopted or amended by the WCA in its inaugural session. Subsequently, the WCA decides on its topics in a fully autonomous fashion. Topics are adopted for deliberation by a two-thirds supermajority in the WCA.



EXPERTS

In the early stages of the WCA, the WCF suggests experts on the topics it recommends for the WCA's initial agenda. Depending on, but separately from, the WCA's adoption of these suggested topics, the WCA also decides on the appointment of these recommended experts. In addition and subsequently, the WCA may appoint subject experts itself by a plurality vote. This relatively low threshold is intended to facilitate the hearing of outsider opinions alongside mainstream opinions on subject matters. For instance, if 20% of the WCA want to appoint a climate change denier, whereas only 10% categorically reject this, and 70% abstain, then such a vote would lead to the appointment of a climate change denier as an "expert" to advise the WCA throughout its deliberations on climate change.

Experts are required to present global viewpoints, rather than national interests. For instance, in presentations on climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies, experts must focus on *general* patterns concerning the distribution of costs between developed and developing countries, rather than implications for *specific* nations.

While experts are invited for presentations on particular issues and consultations with WCA members, deliberations themselves take place only between WCA representatives themselves. In various randomly composed working groups, WCA members deliberate on and amend various draft resolutions which can be supplied by experts. Draft resolutions shall then be submitted by simple majority to the plenary for a final decision.

DECISION-MAKING

After deliberation in working groups and consultations with experts, the plenary serves to deliberate on the different draft resolutions submitted by the various working groups. On any given topic, only one resolution may be accepted as final. In order to be accepted as final, a resolution must receive a simple majority of the votes in the WCA plenary. If several resolutions are passed with a simple majority, the resolution with the greatest number of approving votes is considered the WCA's official resolution on the issue at hand. It may, of course, be possible that no resolution receives a majority in the WCA.

MEDIA INTERACTION

The WCA's official resolution (if any) is the focal point of monthly presentations to the global media and public. However, the deliberative process in general, as well as potentially outvoted resolutions and paragraphs, are also presented to the global public by the WCF (not by members of WCA who remain unknown to the public until the end of their one-year mandate).

IMPLEMENTATION

In the short run, the WCA's effectiveness and the implementation of its resolutions largely depends on the normative power of its pronouncements. That is, given that the initial WCA is essentially a global civil society initiative, powerful institutions in the international system, e.g. national governments and multinational companies, must decide whether to implement the decisions of the WCA. Given that the WCA's random composition and deliberative processes render its pronouncements effective expressions of global popular will, it is likely that the WCA's resolutions would be an authoritative voice in the global public sphere which could not be ignored – even by powerful actors.



In the long run, when the international community is convinced of the WCA and increasingly observes its resolutions, the WCA's decisions might become formally binding. The WCA would then become the cornerstone of a full-fledged CDeD system based on the rule of law. In such a CDeD system, decisions are implemented by a World Citizens' Government (WCG) and checked by a World Citizens' Court (WCC) in collaboration with other institutions in the global governance system such as national governments and international organizations.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

The WCC is the principal organ intended to avoid that the WCA oversteps the boundaries of its mandate to address global challenges. For instance, if the WCA takes on a subject which possibly infringes unduly upon the sovereignty of any nation-state, then any WCA member is able to refer the matter to the WCC in order to clarify whether the subject at hand was indeed within the realm of the WCA's mandate. Similarly, after each passing and publication of resolutions, national governments may appeal to the WCC if they consider the specific resolution at hand to infringe upon their national sovereignty.

Besides this formal appeals process, the WCA's procedures inherently tend toward the discussion of only truly global issues, given that a two-thirds supermajority is required to adopt an issue for deliberation. Such a high-level of interest by representatives from around the world generally indicates that a subject is of global relevance.

Deliberation within the WCA is protected from corrupting real-time influence by special interest groups through the global media. That is, by not publicizing the agenda at the time that it is set, but rather together with a potential final resolution after deliberations have taken place, the WCA procedures ensure that deliberations take place without a live media echo and thus are spared any corrupting influences from lobby groups, which may be exerted in this way.

Finally, the WCA is shielded from the corrupting influence of special interest groups primarily through the principle of anonymity and the restrictions placed on representatives. Firstly, the identities of WCA representatives are not revealed throughout the entire year of their mandate. As a consequence, special interest groups are unable to initiate contact with WCA representatives. Secondly, WCA representatives are prohibited from revealing their identity and position as WCA members to anyone, including potential lobbyists and the wider public. This is to ensure that – just like special interest groups shall not be able to initiate contact with WCA members – representatives are also prevented from initiating such contact themselves.

In case WCA members fail to abide by the regulations against undue lobby influences (e.g. publicly revealing their position on the WCA), as well as restrictions upon their communication with other WCA members (e.g. revealing their identity or other contact methods), representatives will lose their mandate and possibly face further legal penalties, if the WCC finds them in violation of WCA regulations. To this end, dedicated external auditors monitor interactions on the WCA platform constantly and refer suspected violations to the WCC, once observed. Moreover, once records of past sessions are published after the final votes have taken place, the global public can scrutinize WCA members' actions and refer them to the WCC.



FUNDING

In the short run, the WCA would be financed by philanthropic funds, crowdsourcing, and voluntary contributions from sympathetic governments. Moreover, as indicated above, in order to minimize costs, the WCA may rely on readily available technologies such as Google+ and Facebook, as well as freely available services such as the simultaneous interpreters in the activist network Babels [14], which has been used in related contexts such as the European Social Forum [15].

In the long run, as the WCA becomes more established in the global governance system and as it demonstrates its value to global society, the WCA may draw not only on donations and voluntary contributions from like-minded countries, but also obligatory taxes and compulsory contributions from national governments in order to fund its activities.

3. Motivation

CORE VALUES

The core values of cosmopolitanism, i.e. respect for the equal value of all human beings and the good of all humankind, lie at the very heart of the proposed model of Cosmopolitan Deliberative e-Democracy (CDeD) and the World Citizens' Assembly (WCA), in particular. The random selection of representatives and the process of deliberation in the WCA observe the principle of the equal worth of all human beings by design and ensure procedures in which diverse viewpoints from around the world are heard and included in decisions concerning the greatest challenges of our time.

Respect for the equal value of all humans is arguably the key principle behind the (clustered) random sampling method of selecting representatives. This method ensures that the probability of each (adult) human being to be invited to participate in the WCA is approximately equal, thus conforming to the equal worth of all humans.

Moreover, through the process of deliberation and the restriction to matters of global relevance, WCA representatives are strongly encouraged to think and act as citizens of the world and for the good of all humankind, rather than as narrow-minded national representatives. WCA members are advised by experts through presentations and consultations on the intricate specifics of each of the issues that the WCA takes on. These experts are required to express their views in global terms, rather than with reference to specific national interests. Moreover, WCA representatives are exposed to the diverse opinions of their fellow representatives, thus broadening and deepening their own views and turning them into truly global perspectives.

DECISION-MAKING CAPACITY

In contrast to other deliberative assemblies in the past, the WCA is intended to be a permanent institution. Adding topics for discussion is possible at multiple points throughout the year. Thus, the WCA would be capable of flexibly taking on current and emerging issues, ensuring relatively prompt – yet well-deliberated – resolutions regarding the greatest global challenges of our time, ranging from climate change to population growth [16].



Given the deliberative process and majoritarian decision-making procedures, as well as comprehensive protections against undue influences from special interest groups (e.g. the anonymity of WCA representatives, as described below), no WCA representative or other party can systematically exercise a disproportionate influence over the decision-making process.

EFFECTIVENESS

In the short run, the effectiveness of the WCA and the implementation of its resolutions will largely depend on the normative power of its pronouncements. That is, given that the WCA is at first essentially a global civil society initiative, it is up to powerful institutions in the international system, e.g. national governments and multinational companies, to implement the decisions of the WCA. Since the WCA's random composition and deliberative processes make its pronouncements effective expressions of global popular will, it seems probable that the WCA's resolutions would constitute an authoritative voice in the global public sphere which could not be ignored – even by powerful actors.

In the long run, when the international community is convinced of the value of the WCA and increasingly observes its resolutions, the WCA's decisions might become formally binding. Then the WCA would become the cornerstone of a full-fledged CDeD system, in which decisions are implemented by a World Citizens' Government (WCG) and checked by a World Citizens' Court (WCC) in collaboration with other institutions in the global governance system such as national governments and international organizations.

RESOURCES AND FINANCING

In the short-term, the WCA would be financed by philanthropic funds, crowdsourcing, and voluntary contributions from sympathetic governments. Moreover, in order to minimize costs, the WCA may rely on readily available technologies such as Google+ and Facebook, as well as freely available services such as the simultaneous interpreters in the activist network Babels [17], which has been used in related contexts such as the European Social Forum [18].

In the long run, as the WCA becomes more established in the global governance system and as it demonstrates its value to the international community, the WCA may draw not only on donations and voluntary contributions from like-minded countries, but also obligatory taxes and compulsory contributions from national governments in order to fund its activities.

TRUST AND INSIGHT

CDeD and the WCA, in particular, are designed to be maximally transparent. Given that all interactions between WCA representatives, experts, and other participants in the WCA framework are supposed to take place on the WCA's online platform, they can be recorded and later publicized to allow for public scrutiny. Moreover, in order to ensure the continuous observance of WCA regulations, all activities are constantly monitored by dedicated WCA auditors. Besides monitoring and auditing of the WCA's internal procedures, its substantive outputs are also exposed to public scrutiny through monthly presentations of resolutions to the global public and media. Thus, people worldwide will benefit from maximal insight into the WCA's processes and will thus likely develop substantial trust in the WCA as an institution.



FLEXIBILITY

The WCA is capable of adapting its structures autonomously through 90% supermajorities of all WCA representatives. This high threshold is intended to ensure that minorities within the WCA are not excluded or disadvantaged by simply adapting the WCA's components or regulations. In addition to this high supermajority hurdle, any changes to the fundamental structures and processes in the WCA can be referred to the World Citizens' Court (WCC) by any WCA member in order to confirm their legality.

PROTECTION AGAINST THE ABUSE OF POWER

The WCC is also the principal organ intended to avoid that the WCA oversteps the boundaries of its mandate to address global challenges. For instance, if the WCA were to intend taking on a subject which possibly infringes unduly upon the sovereignty of any nation-state, then any WCA member would be able to refer the matter to the WCC in order to clarify whether the subject at hand was indeed within the realm of the WCA's mandate. Similarly, after each passing and publication of resolutions, national governments may appeal to the WCC if they consider the specific resolution at hand to infringe upon their national sovereignty.

Besides this formal appeals process, the WCA's procedures inherently lean toward the discussion of only truly global issues, given that a two-thirds supermajority is required to adopt an issue for deliberation. Such a high-level of interest by representatives from around the world generally indicates that a subject is of global relevance.

Deliberation within the WCA is protected from corrupting real-time influence by special interest groups through the global media. That is, by not publicizing the agenda at the time that it is set, but rather together with a potential final resolution after deliberations have taken place, the WCA procedures ensure that deliberations take place without a live media echo and thus are spared any corrupting influences from lobby groups, which may be exerted in this way.

Finally, the WCA is shielded from undue influence by special interest groups primarily through the principle of anonymity and the restrictions placed on representatives. Firstly, the identities of WCA representatives are not revealed throughout the entire year of their mandate. As a consequence, special interest groups are unable to initiate contact with WCA representatives. Secondly, WCA representatives are prohibited from revealing their identity and position as WCA members to anyone, including potential lobbyists and the wider public. This is to ensure that – just like special interest groups shall not be able to initiate contact with WCA members – representatives are also prevented from initiating such contact themselves.

ACCOUNTABILITY

In case WCA members fail to abide by the regulations against undue lobby influences (e.g. publicly revealing their position on the WCA), as well as restrictions upon their communication with other WCA members (e.g. revealing their identity or other contact methods), representatives will lose their mandate and possibly face further legal penalties, if the WCC finds them in violation of WCA regulations. To this end, dedicated external auditors monitor interactions on the WCA platform constantly and refer suspected violations to the WCC, once observed. Moreover, once records of past sessions are published after the final votes have taken place, the global public can scrutinize WCA members' actions and refer them to the WCC.



References

- Szombatfalvy, László. *The Greatest Challenges of Our Time*. Ekerlids, 2010.
- Dryzek, John. “The Australian Citizens’ Parliament: A World First.” *Journal of Public Deliberation* 5, no. 1 (2009).
- Rao, Vijayendra, and Paromita Sanyal. “Dignity through Discourse: Poverty and the Culture of Deliberation in Indian Village Democracies.” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 629, no. 1 (2010): 146–172.
- Fishkin, James S., Baogang He, Robert C. Luskin, and Alice Siu. “Deliberative Democracy in an Unlikely Place: Deliberative Polling in China.” *British Journal of Political Science* 40, no. 2 (2010): 435–448.
- Council on Foreign Relations. “Chapter 2: World Opinion on International Institutions.” In *Public Opinion on Global Issues*, 2012. http://www.cfr.org/public_opinion: 2.
- Pimbert, Michel P., and Tom Wakeford. “Prajateerpu: A Citizens Jury.” In *Scenario Workshop on Food and Farming Futures for Andhra Pradesh, India, 2002*. <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/9135IIED.pdf>.
- Dryzek, John S., André Bächtiger, and Karolina Milewicz. “Toward a Deliberative Global Citizens’ Assembly.” *Global Policy* 2, no. 1 (2011): 36.
- Szombatfalvy, László. *The Greatest Challenges of Our Time*. Ekerlids, 2010: ch. 2.
- Robert A. Dahl, *Democracy and Its Critics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989),
- Reybrouck, David Van. *Against Elections: The Case for Democracy*. Random House, 2016.
- John S. Dryzek, André Bächtiger, and Karolina Milewicz, “Toward a Deliberative Global Citizens’ Assembly,” *Global Policy* 2, no. 1 (2011): 37.
- Babels.org. “[Babels.Org],” 2017. <http://www.babels.org/>.
- Szombatfalvy, László. *The Greatest Challenges of Our Time*. Ekerlids, 2010: ch. 2.
- Babels.org. “[Babels.Org],” 2017. <http://www.babels.org/>.
- Dryzek, John S., André Bächtiger, and Karolina Milewicz. “Toward a Deliberative Global Citizens’ Assembly.” *Global Policy* 2, no. 1 (2011): 37.
- Szombatfalvy, László. *The Greatest Challenges of Our Time*. Ekerlids, 2010: ch. 2.
- Babels.org. “[Babels.Org],” 2017. <http://www.babels.org/>.
- Dryzek, John S., André Bächtiger, and Karolina Milewicz. “Toward a Deliberative Global Citizens’ Assembly.” *Global Policy* 2, no. 1 (2011): 37.