

1) Frans Tonnaer

| Subject | Herbert | FAEF Board | FRANS TONNAER |
|--|---------|------------|---------------|
| Right to vote: 25 years | yes | no | NO |
| Right to vote: 18 years | no | yes | YES |
| One and only list | yes | no | NO |
| Representatives=>Delegates | yes | yes | NO |
| Only 300 delegates in both Houses | yes | no | NO |
| Re-election 1x (10 years max) | yes | yes | YES |
| Term 5 years (not 6) | yes | yes | YES |
| Citizens' panels | yes | yes | YES |
| Rephrasing start&end terms Section 2.1 and 3.1 | yes | yes | YES |
| Dynamic sizing | no | yes | YES |

2) Lars Næsbye Christensen

| Subject | Herbert | FAEF Board | LARS CHRISTENSEN |
|--|---------|------------|------------------|
| Right to vote: 25 years | yes | no | NO |
| Right to vote: 18 years | no | yes | YES |
| One and only list | yes | no | NO |
| Representatives=>Delegates | yes | yes | YES |
| Only 300 delegates in both Houses | yes | no | NO |
| Re-election 1x (10 years max) | yes | yes | YES |
| Term 5 years (not 6) | yes | yes | YES |
| Citizens' panels | yes | yes | YES |
| Rephrasing start&end terms Section 2.1 and 3.1 | yes | yes | YES |
| Dynamic sizing | no | yes | YES |

I would also like to comment on the dynamic sizing, which I proposed on the forum.

First, a census every 10 years is good. I fully back this.

My initial suggestion for the sizing was to simply apply the observed 'cube root rule' because it is short and easy to explain and so it looks nice in a text.

However, I do understand the concerns that Herbert Tombeur brought up about the problem of scaling and the combinatorics of potential communication channels, and also the comment about the economical costs of a large house.

I did some more research, and found that the 'optimal size of a parliament' is a little more complicated, which this article sheds light on: <https://aceproject.org/main/english/es/esc03.htm> by adjusting for the politically active part of the population. The short result is that this would make an even larger house because the literacy rate in EU is almost 100%. The cube root of 1,25 times the population is of course larger than of the population. And already my proposal seemed to make the house too large for many. So instead my suggestion is that we reduce my suggested size of the House of Citizens with the size of the House of States, since these are also a form of representation. Such a formula can still be written simple. I have made a little spreadsheet where one can play with adding European states to this

formula: <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1c8DSY4ZPtI0hDEaiOokc3YjQF5OVomVqLOX6Z1MfOrQ/edit?usp=sharing>

3) Fabrice Luijten

| Subject | Herbert | FAEF Board | Fabrice Luijten |
|--|---------|------------|---------------------------|
| Right to vote: 25 years | yes | no | NO |
| Right to vote: 18 years | no | yes | YES |
| One and only list | yes | no | |
| Representatives=>Delegates | yes | yes | YES |
| Only 300 delegates in both Houses | yes | no | YES * |
| Re-election 1x (10 years max) | yes | yes | YES |
| Term 5 years (not 6) | yes | yes | YES |
| Citizens' panels | yes | yes | YES |
| Rephrasing start&end terms Section 2.1 and 3.1 | yes | yes | YES |
| Dynamic sizing | no | yes | No, see explanation above |

*

Even less if you consider the insights of psychological/sociological/anthropological/organizational sciences on the dynamics of effective decision making of the past 50 years. The paradigm of numeric representation as a check/balance for good decision making isn't based on anything other than wishful thinking. There is really no scientific correlation whatsoever between the number of people deciding and the quality of the decision. If any, it is a negative correlation. At least, if you do not do anything proactively to ensure that the quality of the decision is fitting the mandate of the organization/institution.

Aspects that do improve the quality of decisions taken (among others): a large and explicit role for a moderator/facilitator of the decision-making process + guidelines for the process of decision making itself. In general, I think that regardless of the size of both houses this is a crucial notion for a new system that is designed to function better than the previous/current system. The system of voting is quite rigid, binary and inherently 'unwise' if you ask me.

Furthermore, reducing decision making to voting alone makes decision making slow in a world that is moving at high pace. Because if you do not completely agree, the only option you have is to say 'no' or 'against' and then go into a new round of amending (if it comes to that and it doesn't strand there). Really the best way to suck out the very life of leading an administrative body effectively. If your aim is to come to inclusive and high-quality resolutions, this is an aspect that simply cannot be overlooked. Because overlooking it, by a project like this with its aspirations to really improve a broken system, is a question of neglect of criminal proportions.

Consider this notion for a brief moment: imagine the day the constitution is ratified by both the citizens and the countries, and the federation comes into being, and we did nothing to ensure that the qualities of the laws, resolutions and policies are in the spirit of the preamble. And then we allow all the power-obsessed people (for instance: research shows that psychopaths/sociopaths are overly represented within politics, if you look at personality types) to take office and to start playing the game of leading the federation. That would be quite the tragedy and disaster right from the first day, wouldn't it?

Below this table I will refer to some links* that put forward suggestions to make decision/policy making more inclusive, more deliberative, more democratic, more representational. So that common interests will not be governed through a system that implicitly encourages oligarchy. And we finally can transcend the myth of numeric representation as a means for protecting democracy.

**Some of the links will be in Dutch unfortunately.*

Links:

Within the last part of the article you can find some good suggestions to 'bake into' the decision making process (article in Dutch): https://decorrespondent.nl/12830/het-bizarste-idee-dat-de-mens-ooit-bedacht-dat-je-een-stukje-grond-kunt-bezitten/248005773180-34220aa6?pk_campaign=daily

Below you will find a slideshare presentation that quickly introduces laypeople to the principles of deep democracy. One of the great benefits of deep democracy is the ability to include minority-perspective in the majority-decisions thus transcending the 'winner-takes-all-principle' and making policy more inclusive and more sustainable by nature: <https://www.slideshare.net/RichardEnglish/calp-deep-democracy-webinar>

You will see that my area of expertise is not per se the area of constitutional law-making, but more to work with groups to effectively tackle difficult societal issues. So I will refrain from the task of correctly formulating my ideas into 'lawlike-formulations'. However, I will make the line of reasoning more explicit what this could mean for the constitution. I firmly believe that adding a section to ensure the following elements is really vital to compensate for some of humanities inherent flaws and bring about real human flourishing:

- Actively acquire all perspectives within society prior to making decisions
 - By digital questionnaires, forums or regular citizen conventions
- Proactively integrating minority-positions within majority-decisions
 - With minority positions we can think of cultural or regional minorities
 - But also include the voice of future generations for instance to make decisions more sustainable and less oligarchic (look at this Dutch initiative: <https://toekomststoel.nl>)
- Adding elements of direct democracy in all policy areas
 - Working with juries of randomly selected and revolving citizens on the major policy areas (article III of the constitution). The juries have to be consulted and policymakers have to adhere to the comply-or-explain principle.
- Recognizing and giving voice to sub-conscious elements in the decision-making process to make 'what we say we do' more aligned with 'what we actually do' and to make resolutions more realistic and truly beneficial to the common interest
 - Appointing neutral facilitators to observe the decision-making process and give them a very limited set of powers to intervene in case of so called 'edging-behaviour'

Of course, I can see that some of the proposed elements can also be attributed to other elements of the trias politica. Not everything has to come down to the 2nd article of the constitution. Be that as it may, I think that the legislative branch offers some of the best chances to actually integrate some of science best insights of the past century. And not doing so would be a serious omission.

4) Christer Lundquist

| Subject | Herbert | FAEF Board | CHRISTER LUNDQUIST |
|--|---------|------------|--------------------|
| Right to vote: 25 years | yes | no | NO |
| Right to vote: 18 years | no | yes | YES |
| One and only list | yes | no | NO |
| Representatives=>Delegates | yes | yes | YES |
| Only 300 delegates in both Houses | yes | no | NO |
| Re-election 1x (10 years max) | yes | yes | YES |
| Term 5 years (not 6) | yes | yes | YES |
| Citizens' panels | yes | yes | NO |
| Rephrasing start&end terms Section 2.1 and 3.1 | yes | yes | YES |
| Dynamic sizing | no | yes | YES |

PS: I have been away and thus not able to make a proposed amendment to Article II in the discussion forum in due time. Question: Even though the discussion is closed on Article II, I would like an objection re: subject below to be added to the record and thus duly noted, even though it won't change anything since it missed the deadline. May I do so and mark it as such in the Forum Article II section?

It concerns the age limit for candidates to the House of Citizens; I think barring anyone under 25 is a big mistake, one that can and probably will draw criticism for age discrimination. It is an arbitrary age limit incompatible with current age eligibility for parliament in most developed democracies in Europe. It will disenfranchise young voters and bar them from electing peers that might as well as older candidates be both qualified, competent and great talents/future leaders. Prohibiting delegates under 25 for no other reason than principle is another thing from the American const. that a progressive, modern Europe should NOT copy. We will exclude a considerable percentage of Europe's citizens, citizens that one can argue have that highest stakes and interest in best possible long term policies for future custodianship of the planet. I can list many more arguments, but here will just add that for decades now, the broad trend in developed democracies has been to lower the age limit for seats in parliaments; the prevailing requirement is now 18, which is the age at which you become an adult citizen with all rights and responsibilities (including the ultimate sacrifice; being drafted to fight and die in a war to defend our democracies). Last, but not least: The 25 limit is made superfluous by other parts of the Article; namely the requirements stipulated in Section 2.3: The vetting process that will fall upon parties, to ensure that candidates are competent and suitable for office, is quite unique and certainly sufficient.

(A personal note: I find it very offensive to see adult European Citizens in the wide age range 18-25 described in derogatory language, like this in Herbert's mail: ***"teenagers do not live on a (sub-)continental scale, they live on a local scale, if not on a regional scale."*** This is at best arrogant and a detached gaffe, as it demonstrably wrong: This age group is the most borderless and supranationally connected/minded generation of all, as a consequence of the digital globalization. Take a look at who voted heavily against Brexit (and thus FOR deeper European integration). Thanks to the older, short-sighted voters with the least interest in the future, the young people of Britain were dragged into unwanted nationalism/isolationism. Or consider who drives climate change activism. Etc. etc. I would hope that such unscientific, undocumented prejudice like the quote above will not become part of the final texts/records of the making of our Constitution.)