UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE   www.usip.org

SPECIAL REPORT

About the Report

Constitution making has become increasingly open and participatory. Yet the core tools of participation are just beginning to evolve. New technologies can help drafters increase participation and provide conduits for civil society, vulnerable groups, and the population at large to mobilize and express their views. These tools can improve public education on the constitution and the drafting process, inject meaningful expert guidance into the national dialogue, and may help societies craft more inclusive, useful, and durable compacts. This report explains how.

About the Authors

Jason Gluck is a senior program officer with USIP's Rule of Law Center. He focuses on the design and implementation of constitution-making processes in postconflict and transitional states. Gluck is currently on leave to the United Nations Department of Political Affairs, where he serves as Constitutional Focal Point. Brendan Ballou is a former associate at Google Ideas and is currently studying law at Stanford University.

Contents

Jason Gluck and Brendan Ballou

New Technologies in Constitution Making

Summary

- Public participation has become an integral part of constitution making, particularly since the end of the Cold War. It has strengthened national unity, built trust between governments and citizens, promoted reconciliation, and helped produce national consensus.

- Constitution drafters in the past were mostly limited to using official statements and press releases, workshops, meetings, radio and television programs, and printed materials to engage with citizens. These methods were often costly and time-consuming, and failed to reach significant segments of the public.

- New technologies can increase participation in and the perceived legitimacy of constitutional processes.

- Constitution drafters have recently begun using the web and mobile phones to educate citizens on the constitution-writing process and engage them on issues of concern. Increasingly constitution writers are also using the web to consult international experts on specific technical issues.

- Given the rapid growth of the Internet and mobile phone penetration in the developing world, the increased use of new technologies in constitution writing is nearly inevitable.

- People and organizations considering using these tools should bear four things in mind. New technologies will affect different groups differently. The people who use these tools should respect social and cultural norms. They should keep control of the process in the hands of national actors. Last, they should fit their work within the larger context of the conflict or postconflict environment in which they work.

- Constitution making is a difficult field, however, and new technologies are tools, not panaceas.

Introduction

Constitution making has become increasingly open and participatory. Whereas once constitutional reform processes were dictated by a coterie of elite politicians, today such processes are likely to include national dialogues, public engagement efforts, and expert consultations. These new platforms seek to allow all members of a nation to collectively make new social and political compacts on such issues as the identity, organization, and nature of their nation, the relationship between citizen and state, and the peaceful coexistence of citizens and groups.

From Nicaragua in the 1980s to South Africa in the 1990s and from East Timor in the 2000s to Iceland in the early 2010s, constitution makers have reached out to millions of citizens in an effort to draft national charters that enjoy maximum legitimacy and national ownership and that genuinely reflect the needs and aspirations of the people.

Yet, while this trend toward greater inclusiveness has evolved over the past several decades, the core tools of constitution making, particularly participatory constitution making, have barely changed. Citizens are still educated about constitutional matters mainly through community meetings, brochures, and announcements in the press and on television and radio. Their views and preferences are solicited—if and when they are—through public forums, focus group meetings, and questionnaires. International assistance, when provided, arrives via flown-in expert consultants or costly study tours.

These traditional tools are often cumbersome, costly, and logistically difficult to use. Of greater concern, they can be exclusionary, particularly in cultures that discourage public political participation by women and minority groups. They can also be underinclusive if time and money are limited, the operating environment is insecure, or geography or weather makes portions of countries inaccessible.

New technologies can augment traditional approaches. Tools such as the web and mobile phones can help drafters increase participation and provide conduits for civil society, vulnerable groups, and the population at large to mobilize and express their views. They can improve public education on both the constitution and the drafting process. And they can inject meaningful expert guidance into the national dialogue. Collectively, these tools can boost the integrity and legitimacy of the constitution-making process as a whole.

This said, new technologies will not radically transform the fundamental nature of constitution making. That has always been and will continue to be a political exercise. But as the politics of constitutional reform widen to include more and more people, new tools may help societies craft more inclusive, useful, and durable compacts. This report explains how.

Participation

Public participation has become an integral part of constitution making, particularly since the end of the Cold War. In nations as diverse as Afghanistan, Albania, Kenya, Nicaragua, and South Africa, governments have conducted civic education programs and solicited public opinion to turn constitution-making processes into national dialogues. In the best of these processes, public participation has strengthened national unity, built trust between governments and citizens, promoted reconciliation within divided societies, helped produce consensus on divisive constitutional matters, and educated citizens on the principles and practices of a democratic society.[1]

Countries that have engaged their citizenries in constitution making have traditionally done so through a variety of public forums and written submissions.[2] For example, in the mid-1990s, Eritrea's government engaged the public through debates in each of the country's four regions and in diaspora communities. Over a two-year period, members of the country's constitutional commission teamed with more than four hundred specially trained instructors to conduct public seminars. South Africa's government between 1994 and 1996 received more than two million comments on its constitution, mostly through public forums organized according to geography, theme, and target group (such as women, human rights groups, and business and tribal leaders). In 1995, Ugandan constitutional commission members toured the country, soliciting more than twenty-five thousand comments from individuals and groups through local councils, essay competitions, seminars, and op-eds.[3]

Social media and web technology offer new modalities to augment these traditional tools. If embraced, these technologies can help constitution makers engage with the public and civil society and help the population at large mobilize, network, and advocate for specific constitutional issues. In Iceland in 2011, for example, constitutional committee members posted draft provisions for comment online. After a period of public debate, the committee posted revised versions of the articles. The engagement reportedly resulted in several changes to the proposed constitution.[4] Even more important, the effort "nationalized" the debate and the process, increasing the public ownership and legitimacy of the proposed amendments.[5] A post on the Facebook page of the Iceland Drafting Committee sums up the spirit that animated the process: "Never again can the world be told by the custodians of the old that the people cannot be relied upon to write the contract between citizens and government, and write it well."[6]

Constitution drafters in other countries have similarly used the web to solicit public opinion. In Ghana in 2010 and 2011, the Constitutional Review Committee received public submissions via e-mail, Facebook, and Twitter.[7] In Kenya in 2010, the Committee of Experts set up a Facebook page and chat rooms to generate public discourse and elicit feedback.[8] And in Libya in 2012, the prime minister-elect used Facebook to poll citizens on whether they preferred the constitution-making body to be appointed by the parliament or directly elected by the people.[9]

Web-based technologies are not the only new tools available to participants in constitution-making processes. Mobile technologies also offer opportunities to connect citizens more directly with drafters—and, unlike the web, mobile phones are already ubiquitous in the developing world. Projects using mobile technology therefore can in theory overcome the logistical, political, climatic, and geographical difficulties frequently encountered when using traditional outreach methods. In Somalia, for example, where a lack of security impeded access to citizens, Google Ideas and Voice of America (VOA) used mobile phones to organize a national public opinion poll on the proposed constitution. The results of the survey were broadcast on VOA radio into Somalia and shared via printed handouts with constitution drafters. Al-Jazeera and a regional NGO led a similar polling effort through the SMS and web program Somalia Speaks. Their program, unlike VOA's, was opt-in, allowing people to text their opinion on the draft constitution free of charge. The results were displayed on an interactive map published on the Al-Jazeera website. In Ghana, after receiving more than sixty thousand public submissions (many through e-mail, Facebook, and Twitter), the Constitutional Review Commission identified twenty-five issues that merited additional consultation and scrutiny. It then launched a mobile phone project that sent text messages with questions about those issues. To answer the questions, mobile phone users texted their responses to a designated number at a nominal cost.[10]

In Iceland in 2011, constitutional committee members posted draft provisions for comment online....the effort "nationalized" the debate and the process, increasing the public ownership and legitimacy of the proposed amendments.

Civil society groups and individual citizens are also using social media to insert themselves into the constitutional debate. In Egypt, commentators and activists published leaked copies of the draft constitution on Twitter, literally photographing and sharing individual pages as they were released, prompting a lively exchange of views.[11] In Libya, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) such as Lawyers for Justice in Libya (LFJL), the Voice of Libyan Women (VLW), and H2OLY have used Facebook and their own websites to advocate for a fair and inclusive consultative process.[12] An Egyptian civil society group prepared a "parallel constitution" to the one written by the Egyptian Committee of Fifty, the official body charged with drafting the 2013 constitution, using social media and the Internet to create an open-sourced constitutional text accessible and editable by the general public.[13]

In addition to providing a conduit for expression of popular views, these tools are playing a critical role in grassroots mobilization. Facebook and Twitter have in many places replaced meeting rooms and coffee shops as the preferred platforms for NGOs and individuals to identify and mobilize like-minded supporters, build networks, and force multiple education and advocacy efforts. As one Tunisian civil society activist put it, "Facebook has become the new café for women who cannot easily meet in public spaces" due to societal norms against female activism.[14] Activists are also using videoconferencing tools such as Google Hangouts and WebEx, because they "mak[e] networking more personal, leading to stronger alliances."[15]

Education

Education on a constitutional reform process has—or should have—two goals. The first is to educate the public on the process and specific constitutional issues. Doing so prepares and empowers citizens to participate knowledgeably during the consultation phase. The second goal is to increase the transparency, and by extension the legitimacy, of the constitution-making process as a whole by giving the public access to the rules governing the process and the actors managing it, as well as by providing updates as the process unfolds. This transparency encourages leaders and drafters to obey the rules of the constitution-making process and enables the public to hold them accountable when they do not. At the same time, such transparency helps constitution-making officials manage the expectations of the public, protect the legitimacy of the process, and defend officials against unjustified accusations of behaving in a biased or self-serving fashion.

Before the advent of the Internet, constitution drafters were mostly limited to educating the public through official statements and press releases, as well as through workshops, meetings, and a host of media ranging from radio and television programs to pamphlets, books, comic books, posters, and newsletters. In doing so, the drafters were limited by the same logistical, political, and geographic factors that made public consultation so difficult.

The web and social media give officials new outlets to educate citizens and increase transparency. Interpeace reported in late 2011 that countries as diverse as Bolivia, Ecuador, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Nepal, Somalia, and Zambia had all established websites for their constitution-drafting committees.[16] Since then, Tunisia, Egypt, Fiji, and Yemen, among others, have followed suit.[17] These platforms introduce constitution-making officials to the world, describe the constitution-making process, enumerate opportunities for input, and broadcast drafts and deliberations along the way. The Tunisian National Constituent Assembly's website (in Arabic, French, and English) was updated daily during particularly busy periods of drafting, with reports from all of the six working committees, and allowed the public to comment on drafts.[18] In Egypt in 2012, the Constituent Assembly and, sepa-

Interpeace reported in late 2011 that countries as diverse as Bolivia, Ecuador, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Nepal, Somalia, and Zambia had all established websites for their constitution-drafting committees.

rately, individual members of parliament communicated via Twitter accounts, allowing them to share constitutional drafts, weigh in on constitutional matters, and engage directly with constituents.[19] Mobile technology is also being used in less web-connected countries; in Kenya, for example, the Committee of Experts used SMS texting to reach the people, often to correct rumors and misinformation about the constitution-making process.[20]

In some countries, social media is replacing print, radio, and television as the authoritative source of news on constitutional processes. In Tunisia, for example, Facebook has been described as "the main source of information in [the country],"[21] in no small part because more than 30 percent of citizens have accounts on the social network.[22] Given a legacy of government-controlled television, radio, and newspapers, Tunisians may trust what they read on Facebook more than what they find on traditional forms of media. These trends are almost certainly being replicated in other countries with less reliable traditional media.

Social media and technology are also increasing the transparency of constitution making by recording and archiving key constitutional documents and events in virtual libraries. The historical legacy of these events, once confined to dusty storage rooms, is now widely available. This access is important not only for symbolic and educational reasons but also for later generations, who will be able to draw upon the constitutional record when interpreting the constitutional text.

Given a legacy of government-controlled television, radio, and newspapers, Tunisians may trust what they read on Facebook more than what they find on traditional forms of media.

Expert Guidance

International constitutional experts can offer invaluable advice to national counterparts on a diverse range of issues and questions. Organizations such as the United Nations have traditionally augmented their in-house assistance capacity by engaging academics and practitioners on short-term consultancies. Workshops, in-country or abroad, have often been used to bring experts and national counterparts together, as have "study tours" to foreign countries for constitution drafters. Workshops and study tours have their merits, but they also have significant drawbacks, including the cost of organizing conferences and covering travel expenses, and the demands placed on the already hectic schedules of experts and constitution-making officials. The latter especially can ill afford to spend days or even weeks on study tours while the constitution-making process unfolds (or unravels) at home.

Web technology offers alternatives to these expensive and time-consuming approaches. In an effort to assist Iraqis with their 2005 constitution-making process, the United States Institute of Peace (USIP) and the International Network to Promote the Rule of Law created a discussion forum to help constitutional experts from around the world address specific issues arising in Iraq's constitutional debates. For very little cost, USIP was able to collect the advice and opinions of numerous international experts and convey those views to the UN Assistance Mission in Iraq as well as to Iraqi counterparts.[23] More recently, several projects have demonstrated the potential of the web to connect experts to constitution drafters. AGORA, a global knowledge platform on parliamentary development, provides reports and other constitution-related resources on its portal, and has organized an e-discussion, "The Role of Representative Assemblies in Constitution-Building," for the Tunisian National Constituent Assembly.[24] The LEND Network, organized by the Community of Democracies, is attempting something similar by setting up a regular video chat service between drafters of the Tunisian constitution and international experts and constitution drafters who might not be able to consult in the country personally.[25] The United Nations has also begun to use video teleconferencing to connect constitutional experts with their national counterparts. Although no substitute for long-term,

sustained assistance, these videoconferences provide an outlet for immediate consultation on time-sensitive issues or when an expert simply cannot be on the ground.

Web technology is also starting to be used to assist in constitution drafting itself. Constitute, a new online resource developed by the Comparative Constitutions Project and Google Ideas, is a repository of the world's constitutions, searchable by country, year, and topic.[26] Such a tool, along with resources produced by organizations such as Interpeace, International IDEA, and USIP, can be invaluable to both practitioners and drafters in identifying key constitutional matters and deriving constitutional formulations and text. At the same time, the easy accessibility of these resources puts cutting-edge tools directly in the hands of national actors, increasing national ownership and control over the constitution-making process.

What's Next?

The increased use of technology in constitution writing seems to have been inevitable. In the regions in which new constitutions are most likely to be written, Internet access is exploding: Between 2000 and 2012, Internet penetration grew 3,600 percent in the Middle East and 2,400 percent in Africa.[27] Looking forward, four areas—in addition to participation, education, and expert guidance—are especially promising for leaders to take advantage of these trends to improve how constitutions are drafted and discussed: processing feedback, engaging voters, negotiating key constitutional provisions, and sharing citizen "snapshots" with constitution drafters.

First, new technologies may soon assist with one of the core challenges: processing and analyzing public feedback. This problem is hardly unique to constitution drafters. Private companies work to process massive amounts of unstructured consumer feedback to improve their products. These companies use "sentiment analysis" software such as Clarabridge to "scrape" public comments from the web and evaluate their attitudes toward the companies' products. Interestingly, companies need not solicit consumers' feedback to perform this analysis: As long as the information is online in a public format, chances are good that sentiment analysis software can find it. Such software therefore offers constitution makers a valuable opportunity to watch public sentiment on the constitution-drafting process evolve in real time and to respond to it appropriately.

Second, new technologies also offer an opportunity to improve public voting in constitutional referenda. In some parts of the United States, polling places now offer disabled citizens an option to "vote by phone."[28] In Estonia, a leading country in e-governance programs, citizens can now cast their votes online.[29] (The program is aided by the country's national ID system, an advantage that many less technically developed countries do not currently enjoy.) These advances may soon be applied to constitutional referenda, enabling disabled or distant citizens to participate in constitutional processes in ways they otherwise could not.

Video chat programs such as Skype and Google Hangouts can enable intercommunal exchanges in environments in which in-person meetings might be politically or logistically difficult to arrange.

Third, to the extent constitutional dialogue is used to promote intercommunal trust building and reconciliation (as it has in several contexts and countries, South Africa included), videoconferencing technologies may soon broaden the dialogue and facilitate conversations between divided or previously hostile communities. Video chat programs such as Skype and Google Hangouts can enable intercommunal exchanges in environments in which in-person meetings might be politically or logistically difficult to arrange. This is already occurring with participants in entrenched political conflicts.[30] The same tools may be applied in constitutional processes where geographic division is significant.

Fourth, mobile phones are being used to share information in ways that may have direct applications for constitution making. A project sponsored by the UN Population Fund and the UN Environment Programme allows people from around the world to use mobile phones to send text messages that offer "a snapshot of their daily life and highlight the development issues that matter to them."[31] A similar campaign in the context of constitutional reform could let citizens tell constitution drafters about the challenges they face in daily life and their aspirations for change.

Finally, in addition to these wholly new applications, countries may continue to experiment with new technologies and find increasingly innovative modalities for consultation, education, and expert guidance as well. Outside the constitution-making context, governments are already experimenting with new tools for consultation, with projects such as the U.S. White House's "We the People" program. There, for any online petition that receives more than a threshold number of signatures, a White House expert must offer a public comment.[32] On a smaller scale, cities such as Chicago and Calgary are setting up websites for people to offer suggestions on their municipal budgets. At times through these programs, officials can comment on the public's proposals.[33] These tools help bring government and people together to jointly set goals through semistructured online conversations, simultaneously allowing people to hold government officials more accountable. Something like this could soon happen for constitution writers, because online polls and discussion forums will help them understand citizens' priorities and preferences.

A Tool, Not a Panacea

New technologies can help constitution makers and assistance providers make constitutional reform more inclusive, participatory, and transparent even as they ensure that negotiators and drafters can get the resources and assistance they need. Constitution making, however, is a difficult business, involving formidable challenges and often ending in failure. Even success tends to be short-lived: The average life span of a constitution is just seventeen years.[34] New technologies do not and cannot provide an easy fix to most of the social and political challenges confronting constitutional negotiators. New technologies are tools, not panaceas.

Practitioners who want to use these tools should bear this in mind, together with four other key considerations. First, these technologies will affect different groups in different ways and to different degrees. Some may privilege urban over rural populations; some may be more advantageous to the rich than the poor; some may benefit the literate but not the illiterate. Practitioners who want to use technology to broaden the constitutional dialogue should select their tools with great care and be careful not to needlessly discard traditional mechanisms; the goal is to reach more people, not simply different ones. Second, the use of new technology should respect social and cultural norms. A project that employs robocalling (calls from recorded messages), for example, may be entirely appropriate in some countries, where such calls are familiar if not welcome, but wholly alien in others. Third, each project that uses new technologies should keep control of the constitution-making process in the hands of national actors; they, not international actors, should decide the content, tone, and platform of every effort. Finally, each project should fit within the larger context of the conflict or postconflict environment in which it is organized. The primary principle with any intervention must be to do no harm.

These considerations, however, are again not unique to the use of technology for constitutional reform. Any intervention using any mechanism or tool will suffer if the considerations described are not respected and applied. No one approach will reach everyone. That

Each project that uses new technologies should keep control of the constitution-making process in the hands of national actors; they, not international actors, should decide the content, tone, and platform of every effort.

is why the constitution makers most committed to public participation and transparency have used multiple different tools and approaches. New technologies are simply another tool to reach a wider audience, potentially at lower cost and in less time than other traditional methods.

Security is an inherent risk with new technologies. Governments and malicious actors can surveil or censor users and break or ban sites. For some constitutional projects, these risks are small: In online public engagement projects, for example, where the aim is to foster national discussion or users are expected to use their own identities, privacy is of little importance. For other projects, however, privacy is essential. When projects purport to let citizens submit their feedback anonymously, or when activists need to coordinate under cover, censorship or surveillance can be both destructive and dangerous. Governments and nonprofits that manage such projects should be clear about what privacy their users need, and what privacy they can reliably offer.

Another problem posed by the Internet is that monitoring the accuracy of information on the web can be more difficult than in more traditional media, which in turn makes it more difficult to hold individuals accountable for spreading misinformation. Social media also open the door to new forms of fraud, harassment, and intimidation that may be more difficult to monitor and police. In Tunisia, for example, women running for the country's National Constitutional Assembly were targeted and harassed on Facebook. Some women found offensive pictures of them posted online. Others had their accounts hacked.[35] These risks demand serious consideration and planning, as well as a strategy to mitigate them, to maximize the benefits of the technologies themselves.

Another challenge is how to interpret and weigh social media data. Does an opinion from someone with a thousand "likes" on Facebook count for more than the opinion of a person who provides a single written submission? How about the view of someone with thousands of Twitter followers? The issue of quantity versus quality arises in traditional forms of public participation, but it may become more acute in the context of social media and related technologies. Here again, constitution drafters would be wise to remember that these technologies are tools and not answers. Any public input must be weighed against considerations of minority rights, international norms, and good governance, among other factors. Constitution making has never been and cannot be a public opinion poll—a reality that could be easily forgotten when technology creates the illusion that an intensely political dialogue in a deeply divided society is actually an exercise in direct democracy.

A final challenge is that technology for constitutional support is just that: support. It cannot make a dysfunctional process functional or an unfair process fair. Many of the examples cited in this report are from Egypt. That country's constitutional processes—three in as many years—were troubled by exclusion and insider power plays, however. Civil society and the general public used a myriad of traditional and online tools to increase the transparency and discourse, but to a very limited extent in an environment where political leaders were resistant to the opportunities and benefits a more open process might have afforded.

All of that said, these new technologies will almost certainly become both more common and more important in constitutional processes. The reason is simple and straightforward: Constitutional projects on the web and mobile phones are less cumbersome, less costly, and less logistically difficult to implement than many of their offline alternatives. For programs that rely on platforms such as Twitter or Facebook, the only cost involved may be time, making it both quicker and less expensive than organizing and conducting a public meeting. For programs that rely on simple websites, the cost may be in design and hosting the site. Though perhaps less personally effective than in-person outreach, online outreach methods' low cost, relative ease, and ability to reach different actors (until the day comes when they

Any public input must be weighed against considerations of minority rights, international norms, and good governance, among other factors. Constitution making has never been and cannot be a public opinion poll.

can reach more actors) should be a significant draw to governments and nonprofits considering how best to engage populations on constitutions.

Opportunities for Engagement

These new technologies present opportunities for governments and INGOs involved in constitutional processes. Some of these opportunities are just now developing, and some carry risks. But more than a few are "easy wins" that organizations could prioritize.

First, governments leading constitutional process might consider the systematic strategic use of new technologies, including official websites, Facebook pages, and Twitter accounts. These platforms are low cost to organize and maintain, and they have significant (and growing) reach around the world. Governments might also consider creating Facebook or Twitter profiles for officials involved in these processes. Doing so humanizes the constitution-making process for citizens and gives them access to more candid opinions than might be available through traditional official channels.

NGOs involved in constitutional processes can seize on the web and mobile platforms to mobilize supporters, build networks, and educate and solicit input from citizens, thereby empowering citizens and nonstate groups. The calculated and strategic use of these platforms can also assist civil society to engage directly with constitutional drafters—all of which can improve civil society advocacy efforts. The use of new technologies might include video conferencing to provide expert guidance to constitution drafters, or setting up websites where citizens could share with government officials writing, video and photo "snapshots" of their lives, illustrating the need for specific constitutional reforms.

International assistance providers can also make better use of technology in their support to national counterparts. In cases where the international community plays a larger assistance role, web technologies can connect a larger and more diverse set of experts to national 7counterparts. Also, using sentiment analysis software to classify citizen input into more readily analyzable categories could vastly improve the way constitution drafters use and benefit from public participation. Some of these technologies are still proving themselves. In addition, they are expensive and require substantial technical expertise, but they could provide significant benefit.

Conclusion

Until the 2000s, the tools with which constitutions were shared, negotiated, and written had barely changed for a generation or more. With the advent of the Internet and the intensifying of the communications revolution, however, the range of tools available to officials and activists began to broaden significantly. As this report has made clear, governments, civil society, and international actors are beginning to use new technologies for constitutional reform. Given the large reach and low cost of these technologies, they should be used more. Undoubtedly, risks are involved, but if national and international actors are aware of the dangers, the dangers are likely to be outweighed by the advantages. The Internet, social media, mobile phones, and related technologies will not transform the nature of constitution writing, which is a quintessentially political activity. They are only tools, but they are potentially very powerful tools.

Appendix: Related Projects

More information about the projects discussed in this report is available online.

- Budget Ideas. City of Chicago. www.cityofchicago.org
- Clarabridge Intelligence Platform. Clarabridge. www.clarabridge.com
- Constitute. Google Ideas. www.google.com/ideas
- The Constitutional Council. Constitutional Assembly at Stjórnlagará. www.stjornlagarad.is/english
- Dostour. Egyptian Commission to Amend the Constitution. www.dostour.eg
- Hanging out for Peace. Peres Center for Peace. www.peres-center.org
- International Network to Promote the Rule of Law. United Nations Assistance Mission in Iraq. www.inprol.org
- Internet Voting in Estonia. Government of Estonia. www.vvk.ee/voting-methods-in-estonia/engindex
- LEND Network. Community of Democracies. www.community-democracies.org
- National Dialogue Conference. Government of Yemen. www.ndc.ye
- Our Future. City of Calgary. www.calgary.ca/ourfuture
- Portal for Parliamentary Development. AGORA. www.agora-parl.org
- Reboot Somalia. Voice of America, Google Ideas. www.voanews.com, www.google.com/ideas
- Somalia Speaks. Souktel. www.souktel.org
- Vermont's Vote by Phone Voting System. Vermont Secretary of State. www.vermont-elections.org
- We the People. The White House. https://petitions.whitehouse.gov

Notes

1. "Guidance Note of the Secretary-General: United Nations Assistance to Constitution-Making Processes," 2009, www.unrol.org/doc.aspx?n=Guidance_Note_United_Nations_Assistance_to_Constitution-making_Processes_FINAL.pdf. "A genuinely inclusive and participatory constitution-making process can be a transformational exercise. It can provide a means for the population to experience the basics of democratic governance and learn about relevant international principles and standards, thus raising expectations for future popular engagement and transparency in governance. Inclusive and participatory processes are more likely to engender consensus around a constitutional framework agreeable to all" (4).

2. For numerous examples of public engagement through these media, see, generally, Michele Brandt et al., *Constitution-Making and Reform: Options for the Process* (Geneva: Interpeace, 2011), 80–149.

3. Laurel Miller, ed., with Louis Aucoin, *Framing the State in Times of Transition: Case Studies in Constitution Making* (Washington, DC: USIP Press, 2010).

4. Finnur Magnusson, interview by Iveta Kazoka, "Crowdsourcing Icelandic Constitution: A Myth or Reality?," Re:Imagining Democracy, March 11, 2013, www.democracyoneday.com/2013/03/11/crowdsourcing-icelandic-constitution-a-myth-or-reality.

5. "The World's First Facebook Constitution," United Nations Regional Information Centre, www.unric.org/en/right-to-participation/28101-the-worldas-first-facebook-constitution.

6. Richard Bater, "Hope from Below: Composing the Commons of Iceland," Open Democracy, December 11, 2011, www.opendemocracy.net/richard-bater/hope-from-below-composing-commons-in-iceland.

7. "Constitution Review Commission Receives over 60,000 Submissions," Ghanaweb, November 12, 2010, www.ghanaweb.com/GhanaHomePage/NewsArchive/artikel.php?ID=197312.

8. C. Murray, interview by author, December 10, 2013.

9. Of almost nine thousand people who responded, 80 percent favored a direct election. The Libyan parliament in 2013 amended the interim constitution to allow for a direct election. George Grant, "Four-Fifths of Libyans Support Electing Constitution-Drafting Committee: Poll," *Libya Herald*, November 24, 2012, www.libyaherald.com/2012/11/24/four-fifths-of-libyans-support-electing-constitution-drafting-committee-poll/#axzz2yD2T500N

10. "CRC Enlists Opinions via Text on Constitution Ammendments [sic]," *Modern Ghana*, December 24, 2010, www.modernghana.com/news/309880/1/crc-enlists-opinions-via-text-on-constitution-amme.html.

11. Zaid al-Ali, interview by author, October 24, 2013.

12. Among the many other NGOs in Libya assisting the constitution-drafting process are the International Libyan Women's NGO, the Tripoli Women's Union, the Together We Build It Movement, The Committee to Support Women, and the Forum for Democracy Libya. See Sami Zaptia, "Magarief Strongly Supports Women's Inclusion in the Constitution Drafting Committee," *Libya Herald*, December 27, 2012, www.libyaherald.com/2012/12/27/magarief-strongly-supports-womens-inclusion-in-the-constitution-drafting-committee/#axzz2iJV8iyqZ; Michael Cousins, "Don't Repeat the Egyptian Constitution 'Disaster' Says Libyan NGO," *Libya Herald*, January 24, 2013, www.libyaherald.com/2013/01/24/dont-repeat-the-egyptian-constitution-disaster-says-libyan-ngo/#axzz2iJV8iyqZ.

13. See, for example, "Launch: Final Egypt Parallel Constitution Draft," Egypt Parallel Constitution, October 5, 2013, www.facebook.com/events/528922027185995.

14 Besma Soudani Belhadj, interview by author, October 29, 2013.

15. Sawsan Gad (cofounder and coordinator of the Egypt Parallel Constitution Project), interview by author, August 22, 2013.

16. Brandt et al., *Constitution-Making and Reform*, 99.

17. The Tunisian website has been shut down, though a description and screen shot are available at the Espace blog: www.espace.com.eg/blog/179-tunisia-s-mejlis-exporting-governmental-internet-sources. For Dostour and the National Dialogue Conference, see the appendix.

18. Radwan Masmoudi, president of the Center of the Study of Islam & Democracy, interview by author, November 22, 2013.

19. See, for example, Amr Darrag, "Amr Darrag," November 3, 2013, https://twitter.com/amr_darrag; Amr Hamzawy, "Amr Hamzawy," November 4, 2013, https://twitter.com/HamzawyAmr. Darrag was secretary general of the constitutional assembly. Hamzawy was a member of parliament.

20. Christina Murray, interview by author, December 10, 2013.

21. Radwan Masmoudi (president of the Center of the Study of Islam and Democracy), interview by author, November 22, 2013.

22. "Internet Usage Statistics for Africa," Internet World Stats, www.internetworldstats.com/stats1.htm.

23 See International Network to Promote the Rule of Law website, www.agora-parl.org.

24. See "Portal for Parliamentary Development," Agora, www.agora-parl.org.

25. Kristine Luoma-Overstreet, interview by author, December 3, 2013.

26. See the Constitute Project website, www.constituteproject.org.

27. Sheldon Himelfarb, "The Real eHarmony," *Foreign Policy*, January 2, 2014, www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2014/01/02/real_eharmony_virtual_exchanges_peace

28. "Vermont's Vote-By-Phone Voting System," Vermont Secretary of State, www.vermont-elections.org/elections1/VoteByPhone.html.

29. "Internet Voting in Estonia," Estonian National Electoral Committee, www.vvk.ee/public/dok/Internet_Voting_in_Estonia.pdf.

30. Doron Avni, "Hanging Out for Jewish-Arab Dialogue in Israel," Google Official Blog, September 21, 2012, www.googleblog.blogspot.com/2012/09/hanging-out-for-jewish-arab-dialogue-in.html.

31. For this and other applications of mobile technology, see UN Development Programme, "Mobile Technologies and Empowerment: Enhancing Human Development through Participation and Innovation," 2012, www.undpegov.org/sites/undpegov.org/files/undp_mobile_technology_primer.pdf.

32. Tanja Aitamurto, "Crowdsourcing for Democracy: A New Era in Policy-Making." Parliament of Finland, January 2012, 27.

33. Ibid., 23–24.

34. Thomas Ginsburg, Zachary Elkins, and James Melton, "The Lifespan of Written Constitutions," *The Record Online* (Spring 2009), www.law.uchicago.edu/alumni/magazine/lifespan.

35. Besma Soudani Belhadj, interview by authors, October 29, 2013.

Of Related Interest

- *Social Media Reporting and the Syrian Civil War* by Anand Varghese (Peace Brief, June 2013)

- *Blogs and Bullets III: Syria's Socially Mediated Civil War* by Marc Lynch, Deen Freelon, and Sean Aday (Peaceworks, January 2014)

- *Blogs and Bullets II: New Media and Conflict after the Arab Spring* by Sean Aday, Henry Farrell, Marc Lynch, John Sides, and Deen Freelon (Peaceworks, July 2012)

- *Evaluating Media Interventions in Conflict Countries* by Amelia Arsenault, Sheldon Himelfarb, and Susan Abbott (Peaceworks, October 2011)

- *Media in Fragile Environments* by Andrew Robertson, Eran Fraenkel, Emrys Schoemaker, and Sheldon Himelfarb (USIP Press, 2011)

- *Can You Help Me Now?* by Sheldon Himelfarb with contributions from Cecilia Paradi-Guilford (Special Report, November 2010)

- *Advancing New Media Research* by Sean Aday, Henry Farrell, Marc Lynch, and John Sides (Special Report, September 2010)

- *Blogs and Bullets: New Media in Contentious Politics* by Sean Aday, Henry Farrell, Marc Lynch, John Sides, John Kelly, and Ethan Zuckerman (Peaceworks, September 2010)