*Sabahudin Hadžialić, Bosnia and Herzegovina*

***World as Global Sin:* Deliberative democracy as the only way out**

Public discussion within the form of deliberative democracy has a central position within the process of justifying the laws and principles upon which community relies.

Let us make a point that everything lies on interest, from individual up to common, general one. So, that interest, within democracy, unlike in non-democratic societies, should be met for the purposes to satisfy common good. Why than we have almost similar outcomes in democratic and non-democratic society? On both sides we have rulers and the ruled ones. On both sides we have rich minority and poor majority and as *contradictio in adiecto*, all have been conducted by the will of the people. Difference between “the will” on both sides is just which kind of the means we are using to get there.

Why there is a problem, than, of using deliberative democracy at least in democratic society? A huge issue will arise than. Namely, in democratic way somebody has been elected. In democratic way, the laws has been adopted and passed. In democratic way we are suffering all around the World, for the sake of democracy.

As mentioned, the huge issues arises: The question of integrity of the chosen ones - The question of majority in power.-The question of questioning decisions of democratically elected ones. Regardless that they are conduction their jobs and mission within the democracy as the procedure. Of course, I cannot agree more on that, but what if that kind of democracy does not work and just goes down to the execution of the will of few for the good of few. Would it be much better to have execution of the will of all for the good of all?

Utopia? No, if we just put on pedestal basic ethics codes of conduct: respect, balance, accuracy, honesty and truth.

Utopia? No, if we just allow, as democracy should do, by all means, to discuss, in much broader sense (we have a God given social media for that, aren’t we) all important current and future acts of the government.

Utopia? No, if we openly discuss, for example, given promises within election period and execution of the given promises within first nine months of the ruling. If they failed to comply with at least 40 % of give promises, let us choose another ones. Elections are expensive? No, if we compare with the loss during the period of having them on power.

Utopia? No, if we make consensual point of view, i.e. compromise, on the main standing point of the future of our state – good for all no matter what. To have independent bodies (led by volunteers) who will control every nine months all executed activities and recommend to the public future activities to improve the status of planned actions.

Utopia? No, if we choose that somebody cannot be elected on power more than ones, if he fail to accomplish at least 40 % of given promises from the last elections. In that case, 95 % of elected officials will not be able to run for the office again.

Utopia? No, if discussion within deliberative democracy will provide different point of view on similar issues, and as outcome we have compromise that will not satisfy fully all, but will satisfy jointly establish compromise of all.

Utopia? No, if we use deliberative democracy as helping mean to get to the point of making proper social decisions.

Utopia? No, if we establish the meaning “of another one” as somebody who conduct a pressure on elected ones, and focus on trying to imagine imagination of others for the sense of understanding of common good.

Utopia? No, if we have presence of the motivation (through the satisfaction that we are doing general good for the sake of good of the individual) to assume how somebody who think differently would felt within my point of view. And from it to find a proper, joint way out.

Utopia? No, if we try to establish starting point of conversation, based on mutual interest for the benefit of all.

Somebody will blame me that this is communism, socialism and whatever….No, communism never existed, socialism in a sense of eastern point of view failed, and this is more humanism – to define it properly.

We just need to find a way out. Deliberative democracy might be. If we, at least, are going to follow basic human ethics, as mentioned above.

How we will do it? Very difficult, of course, but, what else can we lose, at least us, 99 % of the population in every country in the World.