

One Human(e) Society

by Martin MacIntyre, martin.macintyre@juno.com, 10/4/19

Background and Introduction

I conceived this modest - though potentially monumental - proposal in 1965 when the postcard was the only low-cost global method of communication that could allow individuals to join in a common cause. It was inspired by an experience I had in 1957 (age 20) at a summer program called the *Encampment for Citizenship* at Fieldston, New York, sponsored by the Ethical Society.¹ I wrote this note to my parents:

"We have campers from Vienna, Italy, India, Japan, Hawaii, China, Indians [American], Negros [American], Nigerians, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Mexicans, etc. It truly makes you want to cry when you see those things you have talked about, dreamed about, and which have been considered by others merely as highfalutin talk being lived and acted out by real live people, maybe not perfectly but well enough to be optimistic about the future and then know your dreams aren't in vain. Love Marty"

The germ of my idea was for every individual, for the first time in their lives, to have an unfettered opportunity to proactively join the society of humans. In 1965 they would simply send a postcard to me saying, "I want to join the Human Race."

Sixty years later, in 2017, this idea was rekindled when the Global Challenges Foundation offered a US \$5 million prize (minimum \$1 million guaranteed first prize) for a "new shape" of governance that could resolve global problems. The competition details are at www.globalchallenges.org but here is a brief post-competition description from the web site.²

*"Entrants to the New Shape Prize were asked to focus on designing **a decision-making structure or framework that could galvanise effective international action to tackle global catastrophic risks**. Global governance needs to be reshaped to fit the 21st century. We need to further stimulate debate about the challenges we collectively face and the solutions that have been proposed to tackle them."*

Ultimately, there were three prize awards of \$600,000 each (not the minimum \$1 million 1st prize promised), because none of the finalists came close to meeting the minimum competition requirements. This was not the fault of the competitors but rather ordained by the competition criteria, which had internal contradictions making the task impossible.

The main criteria for the new governance model were:

- feasible and sustainable in the foreseeable future.
- universal acceptance without using violence.
- enforceable decisions on global issues.

I thought my proposal, *One Human(e) Society* (OHS) had an excellent chance to win because I correctly assumed that the other proposals would either try to fulfill **all** the criteria (which was impossible) or ignore the second and third criteria (which they did). Consequently, my proposal was perhaps the only one to fulfill two of the three criteria

and also dared to point out the internal contradictions while still fulfilling the stated goal: “a decision-making structure or framework that could galvanise international action to tackle global catastrophic risks.”

To my dismay, OHS did not even make the first cut, let alone the short-list of finalists. I concluded that the selection committee didn't like hearing my critique of the criteria and could argue that OHS isn't a “governance model” because it can't produce “enforceable decisions.”

Nonetheless, I feel the competition's goal is commendable and that OHS comes as close as possible, despite lacking the impossible “enforceable decision” criterion. It only needs acceptance by super-majority of individuals (possible). OHS adds an essential criterion that was omitted from the competition – time-framed, long-term, measurable objectives. After all, what good is any governance model if its success can't be measured?

I'm confident that OHS can be peacefully and globally implemented within a few years at a reasonable cost and sustained without significant opposition from individuals or governments. Without using or threatening coercion (the criteria contradiction), it is impossible to achieve universal acceptance by existing governments of a model that can produce enforceable global decisions.

After the competition ended, my wife gave me Yuval Noah Harari's book, *Sapiens*. My idea is consistent with his thesis of the historical trend toward global singularity. So I am offering OHS for everyone's serious consideration as a way to measurably lower global risks: **without mandatory enforcement** (physical enforcement), **without changing existing national models of governance** (regime change) and **without expecting *homo sapiens* to significantly change our basic nature in the next 50 years** (e.g., a planned quantum DNA mutation equivalent to SOMA in Huxley's *Brave New World*).

At a minimum, OHS could reduce the number of humans imprisoned or killed for protesting against their governments. So, see what you think. Note that OHS is both a human and humane society.

By Martin MacIntyre
martin.macintyre@juno.com
10/4/19

Abstract

Problem

Existing models of governance have not, and cannot, resolve global risks.

Required Criteria for the “New Shape” Model of Governance Competition

- Nations will individually or collectively change their models of governance to give up some sovereignty to allow enforceable decisions on global risks.
- The solution must be implemented in the foreseeable future and be sustainable.
- Physical force must not be used to create or maintain the new governance model.

Models of Governance

All secular governments are tribal in character with leaders (authority/belief imperative) and nation-states (territorial imperative). Religious governance has no territorial boundaries but doesn't countenance competing authority/beliefs.

There have been many models of governance including: patriarchy/matriarchy, the clan, village/town meeting (democracy), aristocracy, theocracy, oligarchy, representative democracy (republic), autocracy (monarchy, military rule, dictatorship), government of governments (league, confederation) and combinations (e.g., Puerto Rico – domestic self-rule with USA for foreign policy).

Methods of Change

Methods used to change the type of governance range from assassination/genocide to referendum/plebiscite (vote to create a new government).

Until recently, there has been no global method for *individuals* to independently and voluntarily subscribe to: a governance model; basic human principles, rights and values (moral imperative); or a way to voice their views on global issues.

Failures of Governance Models and Methods of Change

All models of governance and methods of change have failed to prevent war, which now has the potential of annihilating life, as we know it. The failures are most likely due to human nature, which embodies a natural territorial imperative (ownership of land/water/air) and often a sole source of authority (one true belief or a supreme leader). With few exceptions, if any, governments aren't based on acceptance by a super-majority of citizens or representatives (e.g. 66+%).

Conundrum

How can humanity control the territorial/ownership and authority/belief imperatives that are the current foundations of governance and human nature, while at the same time they are the sources of governance failure?

Proposed Solution

One Human(e) Society (OHS) adds a moral imperative (pure moral suasion) to counterbalance the territorial/ownership and authority/belief imperatives.

Individuals will voluntarily join OHS, a free Web organization based on shared principles, rights and values, and each member will agree to minimal - but mandatory - participation.

OHS will provide the existing governments with real, timely, transparent and continuing knowledge of the global views held by its members. Although OHS votes can't force compliance by the decision-makers of countries or religions, it would be hard for them to ignore the wishes of a representative super-majority of humankind.

Formation of *One Human(e) Society*

The trustees will be drawn from a pool of individuals who answer a worldwide call to fulfill this important, but short-term, task (about one year). Organizations, like the Nobel Prize Committee and the United Nations, will select the twenty-one founding OHS trustees ensuring that they represent the various geographic regions, religions, ethnicities, generations, socio-economic and genetic groups. The founding Board of Trustees will select and then oversee the technical personnel who will create the OHS website and pretest it on populations representing diverse countries, cultures and governance models.

Functioning of *One Human(e) Society*

Communication with the membership and to the public will be in all recognized languages, both written and spoken. The OHS website will maintain the membership rolls. Data will be displayed to demonstrate the level of diversity and representation in comparison with the global population. When the enrollment reaches a critical mass in size and diversity, the members will be asked to vote on a list of human principles, rights and values (PRV). The PRVs shared by a super-majority of members will be published and re-voted bi-annually.

Annually, members will have the opportunity to vote on at least three issues of global significance and be obligated to vote on two of them. The results will be widely publicized to guide the policies and actions of governments. Individuals will be able to compare their government's PRV against OHS's PRV list.

The OHS system will be simple, transparent and secure to maximize participation and engender trust in the voting results. Ruling "powers that be" should find it difficult to reject the views of a super-majority of their country's citizens and global citizens (pure moral suasion). To be successful, OHS must have high participation, a guaranteed secret ballot and no fake memberships/votes.

Ten-Year Measurable Objectives (examples)

- 30% of the world's population with web access will be OHS members.
- 10% fewer individuals in war zones.
- 10% fewer political refugees.
- 10% fewer economic migrants.
- 25% reduction in human trafficking and slavery.

- 90% reduction in arrest/death of government opponents.
- Deceleration of the gap between rich and poor.

Funding

An endowment will be created by crowd-funding. The major capital costs will be the web server(s) and maintenance cost the computer security and translation services. A sample estimated initial six-year budget and maintenance budget are at the end of this document.

Assessment Criteria

- High probability of acceptance by individuals in the global community
- Low-cost (both initial and maintenance)
- Easily tested
- Universal participation
- Free participation except web access is required
- Feasible (immediate implementation)
- Existing technology
- Flexible
- Simple
- Transparent
- Meaningful
- Trustworthy
- Practical
- Scalable
- Sustainable
- Objective measurements of success
- Accountable
- Non-commercial (no advertisements or listing of donors)
- Secure
- Effective *not proven until tested against objectives
- No veto with minimal delay and possibly a more efficient decision process
- Moral suasion replaces coercive enforcement of decisions
- No approval required from existing governments or organizations
- No structural change in existing governments or organizations

Arguments

The "New Shape" Global Challenge competition required virtually all countries to accept a common improved model of governance based on rational/moral arguments with enforceable laws in common and diminished sovereignty. Ala Brexit, it is beyond reason and contrary to human experience to expect this to occur in the foreseeable future without human kind facing a common risk that is far greater and more imminent

than the monumental risks we already face OR there are fundamental changes in the nature of humankind.

Therefore, rather than expecting the impossible and/or changing the existing models of governance, OHS cloaks them in an extra-national, uniting and balancing force - moral persuasion (moral suasion). Moral suasion was a major force in eliminating atmospheric nuclear testing, in ending South Africa's apartheid and in resolving other national issues e.g., women's suffrage. The World-Wide-Web can now be used to allow individuals to voice their views on significant current global issues based on shared principles, rights and values – **One Human(e) Society** (OHS).

Summary

1. Current governance models are based primarily on territorial/ownership and belief/authority imperatives that have not resolved global problems and have even exacerbated them.
2. It is highly unlikely that the existing nation-states will cede a significant amount of their sovereignty to the United Nations or another global authority.
3. A moral imperative is needed to balance the territorial/ownership and authority/belief imperatives that are the present foundations of governance but also the source of their failure to resolve global problems.
4. Global citizens should have an opportunity and obligation to express their views.
5. OHS fulfills the need for a countervailing foundational imperative – moral suasion – against which the “powers that be” can be held accountable.
6. OHS fulfills the following criteria.
 - a. **Core Values:**
 - 1) upholds the common good of humankind.
 - 2) is non-violent and non-coercive.
 - b. **Decision-making capacity:** adds timely global moral suasion.
 - c. **Feasible:** pilot implementation possible within one year.
 - d. **Resource:** existing technology.
 - e. **Financing:** low-cost, crowd-funding, anonymous donors.
 - f. **Trust and Insight:** transparent, participatory, considers existing realities.
 - g. **Flexibility:** trial run, regular revision.
 - h. **Prevents Abuse:** constant vigilance and multiple back-up systems.
 - i. **Accountability:** independent, rotating management, nonpartisan.
7. Doesn't require a change in current governments or sovereignty.
8. Measurable objectives.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF ONE HUMAN(E) SOCIETY - OHS

BACKGROUND

Before detailing the problem and proposed solution, it is necessary to briefly review how our species, *homo sapiens* (humans), has reached the current status in our quest for a successful and sustainable model of governance (peaceful coexistence).

The minimal goals for a governance model are survival of the citizens and stability. All models are rooted in a natural, evolutionary tribal system, ranging from a family/extended family/clan/ village related by blood with a patriarch or matriarch/chief to a country/nation with a hereditary, appointed or elected leader or a representative decision-making body with an independent judiciary. The members (citizens) of each group owe their allegiance to that group or sovereign regardless of whether they support that model of governance or specific actions taken on their behalf or in their name.³

Citizenship is usually determined by one's birth location or a parent's citizenship rather than by an overt declaration of consent and unrestricted loyalty. Citizenship includes the unstated obligation to fight and die if ordered by the government. Any overt opposition to the government's existence or system of governance can be deemed a high offense (treason), punishable by exclusion/exile, imprisonment, torture, or death (e.g., Socrates in Athens, the Rosenbergs in the United States, and Middle-East Awakenings). Even being unwilling to fight and die for one's country based on a religious or philosophical belief (conscientious objection) can result in imprisonment (Mohammed Ali).

There are territorial governments in which the rulers think they derive their authority from beyond earthly boundaries (the divine right of kings) or even declare themselves to be a god or god-like or anointed/selected by a god. Examples are the Egyptian pharaohs, Alexander the Great, Roman emperors, Iranian shahs and ayatollahs, the Roman Catholic popes, the Dalai Lamas, and the supreme leaders (North Korea).

Laws

There have been written secular laws as early as c.2050 BCE (Code of Ur-Nammu) and later Hammurabi (c.1700 BCE). There were also religious laws e.g., Halakhah (Jewish), Sharia (Islam). These laws provide peaceful co-existence and stability within the group by regulating the daily intercourse among individuals. This requires the ability of individual citizens to know and understand the laws, even if they don't overtly accept them. Development of written languages has allowed laws to be more specific and literacy has made them more meaningful.

As the size of nation-states expanded, the need for detailed written legal secular law expanded e.g., Babylon (Hammurabi), Athens (Draco and Solon), Rome (Twelve Tables and Justinian code).

Establishment of Governments

One must distinguish between laws governing human conduct (thou shalt not steal) and laws that set forth a system of governance (democracy, republic, monarchy, voting). While there have been many written codes of interpersonal conduct, it has only been in the last three or four centuries that there have been written constitutions establishing a specific form of governance. This is probably because until then, governments were dependent upon the desires of the single ruler or ruling class rather than upon the will and desire of those being governed.

Disestablishment of Governments

Common methods of changing the method of governance have been, and often still are, by brute force (assassination of the ruler, popular uprisings, military coup or civil wars). It should be noted that it wasn't until after the 1776 American Revolutionary War of Independence that the detailed United States Constitution was written and approved in 1789, closely followed by ten amendments (Bill of Rights) in 1791.

Individual Representation (e.g., United States)

Long before the Constitution of the United States of America was approved, the leaders of ancient Athens, Gaelic clans and the American Iroquois Confederation of Six Tribes had specific individuals elect their leaders and decide issues. However, only the Iroquois had women make significant decisions. The meaning of "all men are created equal" in the 1789 U.S. Constitution applied only to white males who owned property. In 1828, the property requirement was removed but it wasn't until 1868, after the American Civil War, that black men gained citizenship and could vote. Starting in 1890, many poor, mostly black voters were disenfranchised via a voting "poll" tax and other rules disenfranchised other groups of voters. U.S. Women couldn't vote until 1920 and Native Americans weren't citizens (voters) until 1924. There wasn't a US federal voting-rights law until 1965 and it wasn't until 1971 that the voting age was lowered to 18, the age that males could be forced to join the military - to kill or be killed. A recent ruling of the US Supreme Court has allowed states to reestablish disenfranchisement of certain population groups under the guise of preventing illegal voting.

The right to vote varies greatly from country to country and there are still countries where there is no universal suffrage (e.g., Saudi Arabia and The Vatican).

World Language

There have always been international languages based on conquest and territorial occupation e.g., Latin, Arabic, Spanish, French, Mandarin, English and Portuguese, among others. At one time, French was the Lingua Franca of diplomacy and now English has become the default language of diplomacy, commerce and science.

However, in the 19th century, a few European intellectuals thought that a shared "world" language was essential for achieving global peaceful coexistence. Toward that end, several new languages were constructed trying to avoid being associated with a particular country, region or culture (although limited to European languages). The longest lasting and most widely used of these languages has been Esperanto (meaning "one who hopes") but it hasn't accomplished its purpose of being a popular or unifying world language.⁴

World Governance

There have been numerous attempts to devise a universal government for large land portions of the world. There were empires (Egyptian, Persian, Macedonian, Roman, Muslim, Mongol, Inca, Mughal, Ottoman, Spanish, British); ideologies (Democracy, Communism, Fascism); and organizations (Delian League, League of Nations, United Nations).

Secular Governance

Starting in the 20th century, attempts have been made to have a unified, secular, "world" government. After World War I, the League of Nations (1920 –1946) was formed but it failed because the United States and Russia didn't join and every member had a veto.

The United Nations (1946 – present) was formed after World War II and has had partial success but the veto power of the five "permanent" members on the Security Council has greatly limited enforcement powers. Its basic model hasn't kept up with changes in global issues.

Before and after WWII, there were attempts by non-governmental organizations to plan a world government. There was a "World Constitution" and the United World Federalists, a confederation of organizations seeking to form a world government. These efforts were outside of the nation-state framework and haven't received widespread support, partly because they were seen as counter to the interests of individual nations (e.g. un-American).

Following WWII, there was a "Cold War" between governments based on democratic republics versus "Soviet-style" communism. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was formed by "western democracies" to counterbalance the military might of the eastern Soviet Bloc. When the Soviet Union disbanded in 1991, NATO was enlarged to include many of the countries formerly part of the Soviet Bloc. NATO still remains in opposition to Russia and groups, like Al-Qaeda, the Taliban and ISIS, that are opposed to western-style democracies. This has resulted in NATO taking military action as far away from the North Atlantic as Afghanistan, even when there are no territorial boundary disputes or likelihood of invasion from Afghanistan. The new threat is terrorism (smaller-scale deadly actions without warning often against defenseless civilian or economic targets (e.g., oil tankers and refineries) by individuals willing to commit suicide in the name of their cause and by drones). The latest measures are cyber war, including stealing information and disrupting elections.

The European unity efforts began after WWII with the first organization in 1950. The European Union (EU) was formed in 1993 as an economic and then as a political counterbalance to the United States, Soviet Union, China and Japan. Formation of the EU required some loss of sovereignty by the member countries in return for greater cooperation. By agreement, new countries could be added if they met the basic economic and political requirements. Some Eastern European countries were added. A common currency (euro) was added, except for the UK. Members could have a peaceful exit (Article 50). This happened for the first time in 2016 when the United Kingdom voted to leave the EU (BREXIT). BREXIT was decided by a simple majority of those voting with 37% of eligible voters approving the exit. A major argument for leaving was the real and perceived loss of both sovereignty and cultural identity i.e., the natural tribal and authority/belief imperatives that both unite and divide groups. BREXIT is still not finalized.

Religious Governance

There are belief groups that don't necessarily control territory yet still hold sway over most aspects of how human beings live and interact with each other. These "religions" are generally based on beliefs about how life began on earth and what happens after death. They also prescribe and proscribe how to live/eat including social interactions. They affect large portions of humankind who live in many different countries under different systems of governance. These codes of conduct are often described in "holy" texts that the followers believe have supernatural origins (Decalogue, Koran, Book of Mormon). The holy texts are considered the one and only supreme authority/truth (the belief/authority imperative). There is usually an individual or individuals who make final decisions on the rules of conduct. To be an adult member/adherent of a religion almost

always requires the individual to publicly affirm their belief in the religion's central tenants. If you are unwilling to make a public affirmation or you don't conduct your life according to the tenants of the religion, or you profess disbelief, or you marry outside your religion, or you convert to another religion, then you are shunned, shamed, excommunicated, exiled, tortured or killed. Even a single element of the belief can separate one form of a religion from another, which historically has resulted in war, even when both religions profess non-violence and "almost" identical tenants.

A religion's primary influence over a secular leader still exists in many countries. Historically, there have been a few cases where the "official" religion of an entire country changed when the leader changed his religion or established a new one, e.g., Roman Emperor Theodosius and King Henry VIII of England. Over 50 countries still have official religions e.g., Israel, Saudi Arabia, The Vatican, Myanmar and the United Kingdom. Past examples are: Tibet, the Roman Empire, and Aztec Empire. The supreme religious leader in Iran is also the supreme governmental leader.

Summary

Regardless of whether the governing organization is a territory (village/country), a religion (true belief/authority) or a combination, the decisions that affect the individual, including war, are made by hereditary, anointed, appointed or elected leaders.

If global citizens have no binding agreement on basic principles of co-existence, then individuals and groups will try to impose their secular or religious government on each other. This is a manifestation of the territorial and authority/belief imperatives and has frequently been used to justify war.⁵

The existing systems of governance have not resolved the significant global problems and in some instances have exacerbated them. This is the problem that the 2017 "New Shape" Global Challenges Governance Model competition sought to address.

PREVIOUS SOLUTIONS

Attempts to achieve or impose a single form of government have included:

Extermination of the non-believers or unwilling citizens, known as ethnic cleansing/crimes against humanity/genocide (e.g. Hitler's Third Reich/Holocaust; Pol Pot's Cambodia, Rwanda massacre, Bosnian ethnic cleansing, Sudan Darfur genocide, ISIS Caliphate beheadings etc.).

Forced Submission and/or agreement via war or threat of war/death (slavery).

Forced Exile: Citizens of Judea were taken to Babylon; Native Americans were moved from Georgia to Oklahoma; Armenians were removed from Turkey, Rohingya have been forced out of Myanmar.

Voluntary agreements to not harm each others (peace treaty) or to settle disputes and cooperate on world problems:

- League of Nations
- United Nation
- United World Federalists - individual memberships, not representing countries
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
- World Health Organization
- International Court
- International Atomic Energy Agency
- Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty / Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
- International Monetary Fund / World Bank / World Trade Organization
- Sustainable Development Goals
- Paris Climate Accord

None of these solutions have fully or permanently prevented armed conflicts. The United Nations has not prevented all nations from resorting to war. In one instance, the UN sided with South Korea against North Korea based on approval of four of the five permanent members of the Security Council with the Soviet Union not voting and therefore not vetoing. The “Korean Conflict” is still unresolved.

Membership in the United Nations is by countries, not individuals (global citizens). For many years, the government of Taiwan represented the entire population of China.

The United Nations has a statement of principles and has sub-organizations with more detailed lists of principles (e.g. UNESCO and WHO). However, individual members of the global civil society have not voted on these principles.

The human species' quest for permanent, safe and secure peaceful coexistence has resulted in many forms of governance including village patriarch, town meeting, monarchy, aristocracy, republic, oligarchy, theocracy, military rule, dictatorship, representative democracy and government of governments. All forms of governance have fallen short of preventing all wars, which have consequences far beyond the adversaries and now with the potential of annihilating all living things.

WHY HAVE PREVIOUS SOLUTIONS FAILED?

First: There are natural human territorial/ownership and authority/belief imperatives that both unite and divide individuals/groups on the basis of common and differing characteristics and beliefs. There are many legends and historical facts concerning disputes over ownership of territory (Falkland Islands, Palestine) and over “true beliefs” (Muslim conquests and The Crusades). Nonetheless, these two imperatives have been the foundation of governance and have both united people under one government and pitted countries/blocs of countries against each other as enemies. History and the study of human interactions strongly suggest that there is no way to eliminate or significantly change these two natural imperatives. Novels have been written about ideas for trying this: Wells' *Men Like Gods* (1923), Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) and Orwell's *Animal Farm* (1945), as well as works by Plato (427 BCE), Aristotle (384 BCE), Tao Yuanming (421), More (1516), Bacon (1627), Marx (1818). Bellamy (1888), among many others.

Second: All prior attempts to solve this problem have been based on agreements among rulers of countries representing their citizens rather than directly among individuals, representing themselves a global citizens. When a country goes to war, it doesn't require a majority of its citizens to approve it. What would happen if war required approval of a super-majority of all citizens of each country, including the obligation to bear arms and risk being killed? Suppose all the elected officials were required to take the highest risk of being killed, e.g., lead the charge?

Third: Until c. 2010, it was technically impossible for a super-majority of humans to anonymously and instantaneously register their views on values or issues. Within the last few years, the Internet/Web with the relatively universal access to wireless mobile communication devices has made this feasible. As of March 2017, half the world's population (over 3.7 billion) has access to the Internet.⁶

REQUIREMENTS OF THE 2017 GLOBAL CHALLENGES COMPETITION

- In the foreseeable future, it will be possible to have a sustainable and widely accepted model of governance that can make decisions on global issues.
- The new model's decisions must be enforceable.

THE CONUNDRUM

These requirements are not attainable by any conceivable model of governance without a significant change in human nature, which has an imbedded territorial imperative (ownership of land, water and air) and an authority/belief imperative (one absolute true belief/authority).

How can humanity control these two natural imperatives that are the current foundations of governance but are also the reasons for humanity's failure to peacefully coexist?

One might conclude from the preceding discussion that it is impossible to have a new, improved and universally accepted model for global governance in the foreseeable future. However, I'm reminded of a statement by G. B. Shaw:

"You see things; and you say 'Why?' But I dream of things that never were; and I say, 'Why not?'"

This is the underlying spirit of the 2017 Global Challenges Foundation competition and it is in this spirit that I propose the following solution.

PROPOSED SOLUTION

Instead of trying to improve all the patently inadequate and diverse systems of governance; or to have all nations accept a single world government; or to expect a significant change in the DNA of *homo sapiens*; there is a fourth alternative that is technically ruled out by the 2017 Global Challenges Foundation competition's "enforcement" criterion, which by logic must ultimately threaten or use violence.

However, we can delete the “enforceable” criterion and add an innate countervailing foundational force - moral suasion. Moral suasion has always existed and has been used to control interactions among individuals but it has not been used effectively on an international or global scale. That is because countries or nations don't possess morality, individuals do.

Moral Suasion is our species' natural moral imperative. There are two types:

1. Pure Moral Suasion - an appeal to an individual's sense of morality (moral imperative) in order to guide everyone's behavior without threat of harm during life or afterlife. This was the primary method used to end apartheid in South Africa.
2. Impure Moral Suasion - Threatening or using non-violent actions to force someone to take a desired action or to prevent/stop an undesirable action. Individuals also used this to end apartheid via boycotts of South Africa's commerce. It was used by individuals who boycotted table grapes that forced farmers to allow farm workers to unionize (Cesar Chavez). The use of Impure Moral Suasion can also be used for impure immoral suasion by countries.

In this proposal, Moral Suasion refers only to the pure form. It is manifested by creating the One Human(e) Society (OHS) - a free voluntary web membership organization of global citizens based on shared moral principles, rights and values (PRV) with minimal but mandatory, participation. OHS is an all-encompassing, non-national, non-religious and non-violent organization of independent individuals who voluntarily express their moral and political conscience as global citizens.

OHS adds the all-important uniting force (moral imperative) as a third foundational force of governance to the already existing territorial/ownership and authority/belief imperatives. Only with this addition can the decisions of the existing systems of governance be more closely aligned with the moral will and desires of the global citizenry.

The only technical requirement for OHS membership is access to the Web at no additional cost to the individual member. While there is no way to prevent the members of OHS from individually using, or exhorting others to use, the impure form of moral suasion, this approach will not be advanced by OHS. This restriction is necessary because there may be agreement on the end (desired outcome) but not agreement on the means to achieve the end, e.g., pure moral suasion vs. impure moral suasion (sanctions, boycotts, blockades and border walls) vs. the threat of physical force and, all too often, physical/lethal force (assassination/war).

The initial OHS goal is simply to have a super-majority of humans become members of One Human(e) Society. This free, voluntary global citizenship will be separate and distinct from the individual's national citizenship, birthplace, residence, DNA (ethnic and biologic characteristics), socio-economic status or religious affiliation. Membership will be anonymous. There will be periodic votes on basic principals, rights and values (PRV) and regular informed votes on important global issues. The purpose will be to give timely direction to the existing governments as they make life and death decisions on behalf of their citizens that have global consequences.

OHS has similarities to opinion polls, elections and even social media, but with significant differences.

Opinion Polls & Surveys are minuscule statistical samples, with participants often self-selected based on the decision of each individual to answer or not answer the question being posed. Also, the way the question is asked can influence the response and the predicted results don't accurately represent the actual results.

In sharp and significant contrast, OHS is not a sample but rather a super-majority of a large representative body of humans who are obligated to vote in order to retain their OHS membership.

Plebiscites/Referenda/Elections are population votes with the following significant contrasts with OHS. They are limited to people with the same citizenship (i.e., not international or global). They often don't represent a majority of the eligible population, because voting isn't a requirement of citizenship in most countries. This means that elections are frequently won by a minority (plurality) of eligible voters. In the 2016 US Presidential election, only 55% of eligible citizens voted and only 22% of eligible voters voted for the winning candidate. This means that many individuals, who were eligible to vote, either didn't register or were prevented/discouraged from registering; that many of those who were registered, didn't vote or were prevented/discouraged from voting; and a significant number of those who voted didn't vote for one of the two major presidential candidates. The accuracy or legitimacy of the vote count can be questioned because voting is conducted by a partisan government. Also, voters may have been swayed by false information provided by a foreign government that they obtained from their social media platform.

The votes are primarily for individuals as representatives (elections) rather than on specific issues (referenda). Plebiscite usually refers to a referendum that changes the basic form of government or sovereignty. For example, citizens of Puerto Rico voted in a plebiscite that they wanted to be a new State in the United States rather than to continue as a territory or become an independent country.

Again, in sharp contrast, voting on OHS principles, rights and values will be 100% participation of the membership requiring a super-majority for approval and voting on specific issues will be a minimum 66% participation. The votes will be free of interference from any government or individual. Each vote will be on one specific global issue i.e., not a plebiscite, since OHS is not intended to change the form of government or vote on which form is best or preferred.

Social Media has exploded around the globe and has shown that billions of individuals can participate although often about non-serious subjects. Social media platforms have groups with rules and memberships, but the platform isn't controlled by the group and money is the driving force (either to make money or money that buys the ability to manipulate, as the Russians have been accused of doing in the 2016 US election cycle). Anyone can say anything without documentation and the level of education of the majority of humankind is no match for undocumented theories (often of conspiracies) or being able to separate fact from fiction leading to the term "gone viral." The same person or organization can gain access in multiple forms (e.g., bots).

OHS attempts to use the positive aspects of the Web while avoiding the negative aspects of social media. OHS is a bottom-up source of power, via a transparent, but secret, ballot that provides a moral/ethical compass to inform and guide the governmental decision-makers who have the power to improve or destroy the world. This additional representative and moral source of power can be easily achieved because it does not require a change in, or approval from, the existing diverse governments, who at best are slow to act, often recalcitrant and unlikely to reduce their sovereignty. We won't know if the votes on OHS will quickly sway back and fourth like opinion polls often do, but we can't know that unless we try, which shouldn't be too difficult or expensive.

OHS doesn't try to remove the territorial/ownership and authority/belief imperatives because they can't be removed from the human DNA (yet). Instead, it provides a way for each global citizen to voluntarily and independently become an avowed (but anonymous) member of One Human(e) Society and to directly participate in the politics of global moral suasion regardless of their national citizenship, religious affiliation, biologic characteristics or socio-economic status.

CAN MORAL SUASION WORK?

YES. In the last 100 years, on rare but significant occasions, moral suasion has succeeded on a national level with the non-violent efforts of Mahatma Gandhi in India against colonialism; Susan B. Anthony, Martin Luther King and Cesar Chavez in the United States for civil rights; and while in detention, Nelson Mandela was still able to use it against apartheid in South Africa. On the international stage, moral suasion was a force in stopping atmospheric nuclear bomb testing. Moral suasion hasn't always worked, e.g., the Dalai Lama for Tibetan independence and, most notably, for nuclear disarmament. There are still forms of slavery (vulnerable women and children) despite an almost universal moral opposition to it. However, moral suasion has never been tried to improve decision-making on global issues on the scale proposed in OHS.

OHS is an up-to-date international version of prior non-violent efforts e.g., the 15 March 2019 Students' Strike for Climate when 1.4 million people took to the streets. Unfortunately, when the protest is directed against the government's legitimacy, street demonstration can result in their leaders being identified by the authorities thus threatening their livelihoods, freedom and existence. If OHS could have been used by individuals protesting against the Syrian government, they might have averted the displacement, destruction and carnage that started with non-violent street demonstrations. It could be used in averting disasters for Algerians, Sudanese, Venezuelans and Hong Kong. Joining and participating in OHS will be safer than demonstrating in the street and easier than mailing in a ballot, standing in line to vote or buying something online.

FORMATION OF ONE HUMAN(E) SOCIETY (OHS)

One Human(e) Society will be established by twenty-one full-time but short-term (one year) members of a founding Board of Trustees. The trustees will be selected by international organizations like representatives of UNESCO, the Nobel Prize Committee and large NGOs. Five will be Nobel Prize laureates/nominees or persons of a similarly recognized stature; five will be from permanent members of the UN Security Council and the rest from other countries in the UN General Assembly, with no more than two

from any country. The Board of Trustees will represent all continents and human diversity (biological, geographical, urban/rural, generational, gender, educational, sociological, religious affiliation/non-affiliation and technical skill). If needed to meet these criteria, the number of trustees can be increased but will always be an odd number to avoid tie votes.

The permanent OHS organization may be no more than 200 - 500 individuals.

One Human(e) Society Organization

Board of Trustees

Three Chairpersons -> Oversees general manager of staff.

Committees of Board of Trustees

- Web Design
- Language/Translation
- Security/Data
- PRV List/Votes
- Personnel
- Public Relations/Communication/Outreach/Endorsements
- Finances/Endowment/Budget
- Membership

Technical Staff

General Manager

- Web Design
- Translation
- Computer Security/Data
- PRV List/Votes
- HR/Personnel/Job Description/Recruiting/Vetting/Hiring
- Outreach/Social Media/Press/Government Relations/NGOs/UN
- Controller
- Membership

The full Board will select the technical staff and vote on important issues. Each member of the Board will serve on at least three committees. The committees will make recommendations and oversee the staff in the areas of their committee's interest. The staff will be drawn from experienced individuals responding to a Web invitation to create the One Human(e) Society organization. The Board will decide the physical location of the Board and technical staff. If at all possible, most daily activities will be via the Internet to allow participation by trustees and staff without being separated from their families and cultures.

Communication among the staff and the Board will be in spoken and written English but communications to/with the public will be in all recognized languages in both written and spoken formats. This will allow the inclusion of those individuals who can't read or see or hear or whose language has no written form. Unfortunately, but by necessity, participants will need to have access to a web device but access is increasing exponentially, separately driven by social and commercial necessity.

From the date of the first OHS board meeting, it may take 12 months to complete an OHS website that can safely and securely start accepting millions of members. The

OHS system will have a trial run in geographic locations that represent a wide variety of potential problems. The first run might include locations like: China, South Africa, United States, Nigeria, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Israel, Palestine, Iran, India, Pakistan, New Zealand, Brazil, Venezuela, Spain, Ukraine, Russia, Korean peninsula, Tahiti and the United Kingdom. The trial run will be initiated via press releases and social media. Initiation of OHS will not need permission from the existing governments or the United Nations, but their advice and positive support will be actively sought and welcomed.

The initial technical staff will also create a system for selecting the permanent technical staff and Board of Trustees. There will be a mandated staggered turnover in positions to avoid stagnation, entitlement or appearance of bias, while still maintaining continuity and trust in the OHS system.

A list of human(e) principles, rights and values will be developed that might be acceptable to a majority of global citizens, regardless of their national origin, biologic or physical characteristics, social, economic or educational status, beliefs, ethnic origin, sexual identification or age (with a minimum limit). The founding Board of Trustees and staff will mold this list into one that is easily understood and ready for a vote by the OHS membership.

After bugs in the OHS web system are corrected and intentional efforts to hack the system have failed, the final operating plan will be approved by the Board of Trustees giving due consideration to the guidance found in this proposal. Then, and only then, will OHS be activated worldwide and the initial OHS Board of Trustees will be replaced with the new Board.⁷ OHS operations will be turned over to the maintenance staff. For continuity, a minimum of one-quarter and a maximum of one-third of the original Trustees will be held over for a two-year period. Hopefully, the OHS board positions will become highly prized and respected as perhaps the only truly global organization with membership open to all humans at no charge. **Although not an actual government with enforceable laws, OHS will be as close as possible to an effective, sustainable and non-violent global governing force that one could hope to establish in the foreseeable future.**

FUNCTIONING OF ONE HUMAN(E) SOCIETY

Every human being who meets the age requirements will be invited to join OHS. Communications will be in all recognized languages: both written and spoken forms. The only membership requirements will be access to the web and active participation. To ensure that each registrant is an unique individual (not a robot), applicants will be asked to identify their age-range, self-identified gender, multiple physical characteristics, general birth GPS location, general current GPS residence, national citizenship(s), self-described socio-economic status within their group, ethnic origin(s), language(s) - primary and secondary, religious affiliation or lack thereof, and a unique password (with a secure system to prevent multiple memberships). There will be no names, telephone numbers, postal addresses, e-mail addresses, personal I.D.s and, if possible, no device I.D.s. To the extent possible, state of the art anti-hacking algorithms will be used to avoid fake memberships or votes.

In the foreseeable future, it may be possible to have identification of individuals that is too difficult, cumbersome or expensive for hackers to penetrate yet simple enough for all individuals to access easily, safely and securely.

The extensive information on personal characteristic will also ensure that OHS membership is representative of the world's population. The ultimate goal is to be able to distinguish memberships between identical twins who live together. Avoiding fake memberships (computer security) will be the most difficult barrier to overcome and a top budget expense along with language translation. Despite the fact that OHS membership doesn't offer identity theft for hackers, there will be individuals or groups who would like to defeat the purpose of OHS or gain notoriety by showing they can "beat the system" or more likely, ask for ransom.

When the OHS membership has reached a critical mass for both enrollment percentage and diversity, the members will be asked to select items from the initial PRV list that they can accept and think a majority of their fellow global citizens should be able to understand and accept.

From this revised list, members of OHS will vote on each principle/right/value (PRV) creating the official OHS-PRV list that is supported by two-thirds of those voting and a majority of each major subgroup (gender, continent, age range etc.).

The PRV list will be revisited bi-annually for possible additions, deletions or revisions. PRV items that are supported by a majority (but not super-majority) of the OHS members will be offered for a revote in two years.

At least three times a year, there will be votes on issues of global importance selected by the OHS membership. The results will be published to inform governmental decision-makers. Prior to these votes, there will be referenced position papers arguing opposing views to help the OHS members make an informed vote. This will be relatively expensive because it will be in multiple languages and in audio for those who are sight-impaired or cannot read. Examples of issues might be climate change and management of economic migrants. In September 2017, to weigh in on the heated discussion between President Trump and Supreme Leader Kim Jung Un, OHS members might have wanted to vote on the question, "Should there be universal disarmament of nuclear weapons?"

In order to retain their OHS membership, members must vote on the PVR list and then, starting with the activation of their membership, vote on global issues at least twice during a 12-month period. Failure to meet these minimum-voting requirements will cause their membership to lapse. Membership can be regained by voting on all prior issues that were missed. Members will always be free to cancel their membership, but they will have no basis for complaining about the state of humankind and planet earth.

If the results of a vote by a super-majority of members on a specific issue appears to be in conflict with an item on the PRV list, then that PRV item and issue will be resubmitted for a mandatory vote of the membership with essays supporting and opposing the alleged inconsistency.

ENROLLMENT GOALS

Within 5 years, 15% of the world's eligible population will be members of OHS and in ten years, 30% will be members (approximately 2 billion humans). It is important that as many humans as possible - as early in their lives as possible - have the opportunity to

join OHS and participate as unique individuals, independent of their siblings, parents, children, family, village, country, ethnicity, culture, socio-economic group or religious affiliation. Therefore, I propose an associate membership for individuals age 10-15. Their votes will be counted and publicized but not used in determining a super-majority of members age 16 and over. Enrollment and participation in OHS will be within the ability of a person age 10.

MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES

On the tenth anniversary of the activation of OHS there will be:

- 30% of the world's population with web access will be OHS members.
- 10% reduction in individuals living in war zones,
- 10% reduction in political refugees,
- 10% reduction in economic migrants,
- 25% reduction in human trafficking and slavery,
- 90% reduction in arrest/death of government opponents,
- Deceleration in global warming,
- Deceleration of the gap between rich and poor.

On the twentieth anniversary of OHS there will be a:

- 70% of the world's population with web access will be OHS members.
- 10% reduction in poverty,
- 10% increase in literacy,
- 10% reduction in perinatal mortality,
- 50% increase in girls attending school,
- 90% global suffrage,
- Deceleration in birth rate where the birth rate is in the upper 50%.

FUNDING

Crowd-funding will create a long-term irrevocable endowment to sustain the relatively low-cost OHS organization. The annual budget of OHS might be so low that a single individual or foundation could endow it, as was the original funding of the Nobel Prize.

LIST OF HUMAN PRINCIPLES, RIGHTS AND VALUES (PRV)

Sources and inspiration for the initial list of principles, rights and values of humanity can be the Rig Veda; Decalogue; Confucius sayings; New Testament; Buddha sayings; writings of Plato and Aristotle; Koran; Magna Carta; Scottish Declaration of Arbroath; U.S. Declaration of Independence, Constitution and Bill of Rights; Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen; English Bill of Rights; United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights; European Union Charter; charters of international organizations; and other writings on this subject.

As a start we could use a slightly revised version of the *Articles of Faith*, authored by my father, L. D. MacIntyre, in the early 1940s, as guidance and motivation for International Red Cross volunteers.

Principles, Rights, and Values of Humanity - Articles of Faith

Might can never be the measure of the right.

The end cannot be used to justify the means.

Strength was given us to succor and shield the weak; to lighten the burden of the sick at heart; to teach all who wish to learn the simple skills with which to aid themselves and others.

That all children of this earth are brothers/sisters and we shall not recognize any barriers of physical characteristics, class, creed, economic or social status, national origin or citizenship to set them apart, one from the other.

That equal opportunity must be afforded for each to share in the fruitfulness of this world and each, according to his ability, to share in its burdens.

That kindness and mercy and understanding will grow – must grow – that this planet may be a place for children and their children's children to live in peace and security.

That each must have a chance to contribute what he wills to this new world, this fitter measure to his dream.

That as each one of us has a share in the world we know and hope to shape, so each of us now must strive to save those simple human values which give dignity to man and life its meaning.

For these principles and to the just means to achieve these ends, I pledge my time and efforts.

How would global citizens vote on the following issues?

Climate Change and Global Warming?

Nuclear Weapons Control? Disarmament?

Political Refugees?

Economic Migrants?

Mal-Distribution of Wealth?

Population Control?

Conflicts:

Israel/Palestine?

Korean Peninsula?

Syria?

Yemen?

Lybia?

Afghanistan?

ISIS?

Myanmar – Rohingya?

Sudan

Hong Kong

Wouldn't you want to know the results of a vote on these issues?

What affect, if any, do you think the results of these votes (moral suasion) would have on decision-makers?

3. Arguments demonstrating how OHS meets the assessment criteria.

GENERAL ARGUMENT

It is highly unlikely that the current wide variety of governments will accept a common model of governance based on rational/moral arguments with enforceable laws that diminish their sovereignty, even if limited to global issues. Therefore, instead of trying to change the existing models of governance or impose a single government over the existing ones, this proposal adds moral suasion – an extra-governmental uniting and balancing force. Moral suasion was effective in ending apartheid in South Africa without a civil war and in resolving national issues in other countries. It could be argued that it was used to stop atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons. Now it can be used on a global scale because the Internet can allow individuals to voice their views on significant current global issues based on shared human principles, rights and values without risking the livelihood, liberty or lives. One Human(e) Society (OHS) allows this to be done in an orderly, transparent, secure, trustworthy, non-commercial and anonymous manner that the present social media platforms can't provide.

OHS meets, and in some respects exceeds, the Global Challenges competition assessment criteria. However, in two respects it doesn't fulfill the criteria. Here are my comments on these unmet criteria.

First, no matter how rational and practical a new and improved governance model might be, it is too optimistic to expect existing governments to voluntarily change their models of governance in the foreseeable future (the 10 - 20 years needed to solve current catastrophic problems such as, climate change and proliferation of nuclear weapons). With a few notable exceptions, governmental changes have been the direct or indirect result of lethal violence.

Also, to expect all countries to accept the same model of governance, albeit an "improved" one, or to join into a single world government, will entail a common motivation more dire than the already existing threats of global annihilation via nuclear war or climate change. As fanciful as the following example might sound, it would require a force from outer space that threatens the lives of everyone on earth, regardless of their citizenship, social order, religious/moral persuasion or species (e.g., the thesis of the film, *The Day the Earth Stood Still*) or a 80% chance of a direct hit by an asteroid. Only then, and only with sufficient lead-time and virtually unchallenged evidence, would there be a strong enough "survival imperative" to unite global citizens under a single earthly mandate that could overcome the territorial/ownership and authority/belief imperatives and fulfill the criteria previously stated.

Second, the model shouldn't be delimited by necessitating physical enforcement of decisions, i.e., ultimately war. Alternatively, there have been rare, but monumental, changes in the world of politics (governance) that weren't immediately preceded by violence or a threat of force as the change agent (even when violence was used in trying to prevent the change). Thus, it is possible to have an unenforceable, yet forceful and effective "middle way" to improve governance and this possibility shouldn't be preemptively ruled out by requiring an enforcement criterion.^{8,9}

Therefore, I'm arguing that it is possible to significantly improve decisions made by all types of governance, even one-person, authoritarian, repressive dictatorships, without using force or requiring loss of their sovereignty, cultural identity, beliefs or authority. While this may seem to be impossible, it has already happened in human history and is far more feasible and sustainable in the foreseeable future than persuading all the governments with various models of governance to accept one "improved" model or one world government.

After all, the purpose of the 2017 Global Challenges competition was to make the competitors "think outside the box" and "... to dream of things that never were and say, 'Why not?' " Only in this way can we develop a solution that meets the stated goal, even if it does not meet all the stated criteria. As the announcer said at the beginning of the Star Trek TV series, we will need to go "Where no man [person] has gone before."

This proposal has very few references because the proposal is not a new form of governance but rather an implementation of a naturally existing and well-known human moral imperative that is exponentially expanded via the WEB.

OHS VIS A VIS THE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

1. Improves the natural imperatives that are the foundations of governance
2. High probability of acceptance by the world community
3. Low-cost
4. Easily tested
5. No veto, minimal delay and possibly a more efficient decision process
6. Universal participation
7. No membership fees
8. Immediate feasibility
9. Existing technology
10. Flexible.
11. Simple
12. Transparent
13. Meaningful
14. Trustworthy
15. Practical
16. Scalable
17. Sustainable
18. Objective measurements of success
19. Accountable
20. Non-commercial (no advertisement)
21. Secure
22. Effective
23. Replaces physical enforcement of decisions with moral suasion
24. Doesn't change governments or require their approval/acceptance

SPECIFIC ARGUMENTS

1. Core Values.

Decisions within the governance model must be guided by the good of all humankind and by respect for the equal value of all human beings.

OHS fulfills the core values because all human beings can join and equally participate in selecting the shared principles, rights and values of humankind.

2. Decision-Making Capacity

Decision-making within the governance model must generally be possible without crippling delays that prevent the challenges from being adequately addressed (e.g. due to parties exercising powers of veto).

At present, it has been impossible to achieve global action (binding and enforceable agreements within the UN Security Council) to oppose on-going crimes against humanity, like those taking place in Syria, Yemen, Somalia, Congo and Myanmar (despite being led by a Nobel Prize honoree).¹⁰

For this reason, OHS leaves intact the existing systems of governance and depends on the enormous power of moral persuasion (moral suasion) expressed in concert by billions of diverse individuals to be the non-violent force do the work that can't be accomplished by physical enforcement, no matter how strong. The consensus views of humanity must be the force to guide the decision-making process of each and every proposed governance model, no matter how they are structured.

OHS would create minimal delays and more likely would accelerate the otherwise slow decision-making process of governments with functioning deliberative bodies. A recent example of a similar device was critically important in the decision to not change the Affordable Care Act (Obamacare) in the United States. The U.S. Congress has an independent, non-partisan research organization (Congressional Budget Office - CBO) that estimates the effect of proposed legislation. CBO determined that millions of individuals (voters) would lose their medical insurance. That fact alone may have swayed at least one decision-maker and the final vote was determined by one vote.

There is no perfect system of governance and certainly none that will be acceptable to all countries or peoples or even to most individuals. The only "veto-like" power of the proposed solution would be the clear lack of support by OHS membership for a specific item being decided by existing governments and the desire of those governments to retain power. This would be a good "veto", equivalent to immediate and overwhelming public street protests but without the potential of having the protesters become targets of violence or abuse. In the OHS model of governance, it will be impossible for existing governments or a vocal minority to physically or violently prevent, intimidate or oppose the expression of opinion (approval/protest). They could try but it would require shutting down or destroying the means of communication (the Web), which would risk shutting down or destroying the nation's economy - an action no government would be willing to take simply to prevent the expression of opposition. Hackers might attempt this, which is the major concern of this model, but this same concern exists for all models of governance.

3. Effectiveness

The governance model must be capable of handling the global challenges and risks and include means to ensure implementation of decisions. NO and YES

NO - No governance model can "ensure" implementation of its decisions without using or threatening physical force. That is why, despite international agreements to prevent it, many countries have developed nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them

(India, Pakistan, Israel, North Korea) and others have attempted it (Libya and Iran). In this regard, physical enforcement has not been effective while impure moral suasion has been effective in Libya and Iran (against developing nuclear weapons) but ineffective in North Korea, India, Pakistan and Israel. Using equal force (nuclear weapons for all countries) to enforce nuclear weapon disarmament (of all countries) is unthinkable and there is no reason to believe that the five permanent members of the UN Security Council will give them up. However, there has never been a vote of global citizens to eliminate all nuclear weapons and this could be what is needed to balance the equation. It certainly is worth trying and there is no downside. Regardless, there will still be great benefits from having individuals participate in global politics.

YES, because moral suasion by a well-represented super-majority of the world's human beings is the only way left to achieve changes in the decisions made by governments, although it can't ensure enforcement.^{11,12,13}

There will be two major criticisms of non-enforceable moral suasion:

A. The addition of moral suasion might still be inadequate to avoid war or global actions that can destroy the environment and make the world uninhabitable. That is an invalid reason for not trying it. The United Nations hasn't been 100% effective but it certainly has been worth trying. If necessary, one can always add impure moral suasion to the equation with voluntary enforcement of boycotts by individuals and sanctions by governments.

B. There is a significant percentage of the world's population who are illiterate, uneducated, uninformed, ill-informed (fake news) or have more important personal survival issues that might keep them from joining and participating in OHS. However, illiteracy and ignorance or peer pressure won't prevent participation in OHS, since there will be spoken languages and easy/anonymous access. The bottom line is that we have to start somewhere by including as many people as possible in the political process in the hope that they can be informed and, if given a chance, that they will be guided by a common moral imperative (PRV). Only then will their voices potentially lead to alleviating some of their survival issues.

These criticisms apply equally to any proposed changes in the model of governance. For example, it will take more than an 85% agreement on an international survey (of 10,000 individuals) to get the five permanent members of the UN Security Council to give up their veto power or nuclear weapons. However, an 80% vote of two billion members of OHS might get the permanent members of the Security Council to require two members to agree on a veto and/or to override a Security Council veto by a vote of 80% of the General Assembly. Any major change in the United Nations is unlikely without the support of a super-majority of the global population expressed in a way similar to One Human(e) Society.

4. Resources and Financing

The governance model must have sufficient human and material resources at its disposal, and these resources must be financed in an equitable manner.

The required human and technical resources to create OHS already exist. Financing will be relatively minimal and can be initially achieved in the same way that Wikipedia was funded, e.g., crowd-funding and anonymous "no strings" donations from

individuals, foundations, companies, and governments. The cost is so minimal that it could be sustained by an irrevocable endowment from a single wealthy individual, like the Nobel prizes have been. In this way it would be free from leverage by the funding source and any withdrawal of funding, or threat of withdrawal, would easily find "no-strings" alternative funding. If there were 300 full-time employees and 200 part-time employees, the annual budget could be \$50 million or less.

5. Trust and Insight

The trust enjoyed by a successful governance model and its institutions relies on transparency and considerable insight into power structures and decision-making.

The stated goal of the 2017 Global Challenges competition was to have a significant improvement in the governance model to allow enforcement of global decisions. Requiring "enforcement" makes it highly unlikely that a change in a physical governance model could be achieved in the foreseeable future. It is this "insight into power structures and decision-making" that caused me to propose adding a foundational force at the bottom rather than change the "authority structure" at the top. In place of a new physical system of enforcement, OHS adds a purposeful global psychological system of enforcement (moral suasion). This method hasn't been possible until now. The OHS website is a non-violent, transparent and timely means to exert moral suasion (the moral imperative) on existing governing institutions by expressing the view of a diverse supermajority of global citizens i.e., the voice of the voluntary and independent members of One Human(e) Society.

6. Flexibility

In order to be able to fulfill its objectives effectively, a successful governance model must contain mechanisms that allow for revisions and improvements to be made to its structure and components.

One Human(e) Society has a bi-annual membership vote to correct any problems. The Board of Trustees and technical staff will be available to correct immediate Web problems or to request an emergency vote on an urgent global issue or a vote that appears to have been hacked.

If and when a problem in the One Human(e) Society website is detected, it can be presented to the membership (via a backup system, if necessary) where solutions can be proposed, discussed and voted on by the membership. If needed, this can be accomplished on a short notice.

7. Protection against the Abuse of Power

A control system must be in place to take action if the organization should overstep its mandate, e.g. by unduly interfering with the internal affairs of nation-states or favoring the special interests of individuals, groups, organizations, states or groups of states.

As described above, it is difficult to imagine how One Human(e) Society can be abused beyond multiple votes by a single individual, fake identities or a malicious shutdown. To avoid this will require constant vigilance by the staff and membership and could happen even though there will be no monetary reward or power gained from a successful hacking. However, it will be relatively easy to know when it happens due to input from the (anticipated) billions of members. If vote tampering is suspected (as in the 2017

Kenyan presidential election), an immediate re-vote could be accomplished to offset and discourage any voting abuse. Detection of unsuccessful attempts at hacking or vote tampering could be considered a measure of success in the OHS system of security.

In the foreseeable future (<10 yrs.) there may be a technology to identify members in a manner that can't be usurped by hackers, e.g., retinal scan, body odor or a combination of natural human products of individuals and improved computer security.

Avoiding abuse by the individuals managing OHS can be accomplished by rotating management and independent oversight.

8. Accountability

It is a fundamental requirement of a successful governance model that it performs the tasks it has been charged with, and the governance model must include the power to hold the decision-makers accountable for their actions.

The power to hold the decision-makers accountable requires immediate, transparent and sustained advice and feedback based on moral suasion from billions of OHS members. This accountability will also apply to those managing OHS.

It is hoped that decision-maker(s) (whether legislators, executives, judges or a supreme authority who has all three powers) who consistently ignore(s) the "will of the people" will lose the citizens' trust, even the trust of any military support they may have at their disposal. If so, they will be deposed via election or by whatever means are appropriate for changing their form of governance, but hopefully OHS can help to accomplish this without violence.

Thus, decision-maker(s) who ignore moral suasion will have a greater risk of losing power. In authoritarian models of governance, it will swiftly and clearly demonstrate lack of support by the people and hopefully result in a change in decisions that would otherwise be prevented by the government's control of the media. The authoritarian ruler will risk forceful removal from power by members of the ruling group and, at the very least, will know that the citizens of their country and/or the world, strongly disapprove of their actions/inactions (e.g., Sudan 2019).

9. Likely Criticism

The destructive side of human nature will always be present and must be taken into account. Only constant vigilance can keep it in check.^{14,15,16} Creation of the One Human(e) Society, or something like it, appears to be the only feasible way to advance the goals of achieving rational governance and global peaceful coexistence. While the best foundation for a rational improvement in governance is a literate, educated and informed population, we have to start somewhere.

There is no time to lose. We can do it and there is no obstacle or reason to not do it. Pure global moral suasion in the form of the One Human(e) Society seems to be a viable, feasible, sustainable, meaningful, transparent, and potentially effective step in the right direction toward significantly improving *homo sapiens*' and the earth's chances of reaching the next millennium.

REFERENCES

1. <https://api.globalchallenges.org/static/files/GG%20models%20in%20history%20EN.pdf>
2. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Encampment_for_Citizenship
3. "Australia Wants to Drain the Swamp -- of Canadians. Lawmakers felled by obscure citizenship rule: 'Resigned as , bro' " by Rachel Pannett, Wall Street Journal Page A1 Monday, August 7, 2017
4. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Esperanto>
5. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Territorial_Imperative Robert Audrey
6. <http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats.htm> Potential worldwide access by individuals (e.g., Facebook and Twitter and mobile devices)
7. Herodotus, The Persian Wars, The Modern Library 1942 Random House, P.16 According to Herodotus, Solon designed the Athenian constitution, which only he could change and then went on a 10-year self-imposed exile.
8. Middle Way - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Middle_Way
9. Global Citizenship - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_citizenship
10. "U.N. Backs Inquiry on Syria After Departure" by Associated Press, Wall Street Journal, Page A16 Tuesday, August 8, 2017. The Director resigned due to lack of enforcement.
11. Stuart Little, The School Room pp. 91-96, Pub. HarperCollins 1945.

The Chairman of the World (a mouse names Stuart Little) is the substitute teacher for a class of human students who he helps develop and test "laws of the world."

"... . Absolutely no being mean." Suggested Milfred Hoffenstein.

"Very fine law." said Stuart. "When I am Chairman, anybody who is mean to anybody is going to catch it."

"That won't work." Remarked Herbert Peengast. "Some people are just naturally mean. Albert Fernstrom is always being mean to me."

"I'm not saying it'll work." said Stuart. "It's a good law and we'll give it a try. We'll give it a try here and now. Somebody do something mean to somebody. Harry Jamieson, you be mean to Katharine Stableford.

... Harry ran over to where Katharine sat, grabbed the little pillow from her hand and ran back to his seat while Katharine screamed.

"Now then." said Stuart in a fierce voice, "hold on, my good people, while your Chairman consults the book of rules." [Stuart pretends to look in a book of rules]...

Harry has broken two laws - the law against being mean and the law against swiping. Let's get Harry and set him back before he becomes so mean people will hardly recognize him any more! ...

He ran toward Harry and the other children jumped up from their seats and raced up and down the aisles and crowded around Harry while Stuart

demanded that he give up the little pillow.

Harry looked frightened, although he knew it was just a test. He gave Katharine the pillow.

“There, it worked pretty well.” said Stuart. ...”

Without knowing it or giving it a name, they had successfully used peer pressure, something between pure and impure moral suasion to enforce the law.

12. Twitter #MeToo Movement. An example of moral suasion using the Web's social media.
13. Towers and Squares, Niall Fergusson. A history of networks. The title refers to the tower in Siena that looms over the piazza/square. The tower represents the secular hierarchical power structure of governance (along with the cathedral of exactly the same height for religious governance/power) and the piazza/square below them represents the powerful but unpredictable alternative market place of ideas. Comment: The web is the new “market place of ideas” but it needs to be organized to become a countervailing governing force via moral suasion via OHS.
14. "Humanity Violated" Podcast of www.philosophytalk.org, Aug. 22, 2017
15. On Tyranny, Twenty Lessons From The Twentieth Century, by Timothy Snyder, 2017, Tim Duncan Books
16. The Future of Democracy, Lessons from the Past and Present to Guide us on our Path Forward by Steve Zolno, 2016, Regent Press, Berkeley, CA. Mr. Zolno is a graduate of my *alma mater*, Shimer College and the Great Books curriculum of the University of Chicago that was developed during the tenure of Robert Maynard Hutchins. The Shimer Great Books curriculum has been added to North Central College, Illinois.

| Sample Six-Year Start-Up Budget for OHS Proposal | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| Budget | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Total |
| Items | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|--------------------|
| Personnel (total) | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | 2,500,000 | 2,500,000 | 3,500,000 | 3,500,000 | 15,000,000 |
| Fringe Benefits | 100,000 | 100,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 1,200,000 |
| Travel | 50,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 100,000 |
| Equipment | 53,000,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 0 | 53,400,000 |
| Materials & Supplies | 500,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 1,000,000 |
| Contracted Services | 3,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 24,000,000 |
| Other Direct Costs | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 300,000 | 450,000 | 200,000 | 1,700,000 |
| Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning | 100,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 300,000 | 400,000 | 400,000 | 1,600,000 |
| Indirect Costs | 400,000 | 600,000 | 600,000 | 700,000 | 800,000 | 900,000 | 4,000,000 |
| TOTAL yearly | 57,500,000 | 6,860,000 | 8,960,000 | 10,210,000 | 9,660,000 | 7,410,000 | 102,000,000 |
| TOTAL cumulative | 57,500,000 | 64,360,000 | 73,320,000 | 83,530,000 | 95,190,000 | 102,000,000 | 102,000,000 |

Major areas of expenditure:

- 1) Cost of servers
- 2) Bandwidth
- 3) System administration
- 4) Staff

Breakdown of Budget by Major Accounting Areas for 6 Years

- \$ 54,400,000** - Servers, equipment, materials & supplies
- \$ 39,000,000** - Fulltime OHS personnel & contracted services
- \$ 1,600,000** - Monitoring*, evaluation and learning;
- \$ 7,000,000** - Travel, Direct Costs, Indirect Costs, Fringe Benefits _____
- \$102,000,000** - **Total budget for 6 years**
- \$ 17,000,000** - **Per Annum budget for first 6 years**
- \$ 7,500,000** - **Per Annum budget for 7th + years (see below)**

Estimated Annual Maintenance Budget for Yr. 7+

- Salaries and wages \$3.5 Mn
- Contractors \$2.0 Mn
- Internet hosting \$1.0 Mn
- Capital expenditures \$0.5 Mn
- Travel \$0.1 Mn
- Facilities and operations \$0.1 Mn
- Staff development \$0.1 Mn
- Legal and Audit Fees \$0.1 Mn
- Fundraising \$0.1 Mn
- TOTAL \$7.5 Mn Per Annum**