

The Ultimate Approach

By Anthony P. Brasher

The strangest thing about working to create a better system, is that despite the fact everyone knows our current one is so broken it is literally destroying Earth, once you tell them you're working to create a better one, they seem to automatically think the idea is 'too out there', and walk away.

So if telling people 'this is the new system' scares them away, then what if instead we could tell them 'this can make you money, help you find friends, and the best available solutions to your problems'?

In the age of information it's not hard to see that underneath all the political affiliations and ideologies, that people mostly want the same things. -They mostly just have incredibly different strategies for how to get there. The problem has not been that we as a species lack vision, or detailed plans on how to solve our problems. What we lack, is a system capable of making the right choices once they are not the most profitable.

Which is catastrophic, because what is best for life, is almost never the most profitable option. The bleak truth of our system is that it is more profitable to ruin lives. -Because in the eyes of a capitalist, the fact we don't have to *pay* anyone just to *breathe*, represents 'a lost "income opportunity"'. Meaning our system isn't only ready to poison our air and water to generate a profit, it will double down and eviscerate environmental regulations so they can sell us air and water sooner. Their system has become a fatal tumor within the tree of life, and we must do something.

But as I have said, telling people you are working on a new system, usually scares them off. -Creating a terrible catch 22 wherein we need a sizable following to be taken seriously, but we need to be taken seriously to develop a sizable following.

Therefore I am about to propose a kind of 'Trojan horse' strategy, to bypass people's initial confusion. Our plan is to make implementation of the next system *inevitable*, by designing it to be *invaluable*, from day one.

It starts as a ‘Wikipedia for all problems and potential solutions. Where the best ideas for problems can all be found, and refined. With important, never-before-seen tools that let people communicate with groups in ways that weren’t even possible before. (As well as make money, friends, and network)

It is also a place to make decisions as groups. We don’t see it as ‘trying to build a website to solve everything’, as the occasional critic says, but instead as a way to accomplish two things:

1) Amplify the effectiveness of the real energy and work we see, all around us. In one sense we are making a tool for direct action, giving activists and citizens tools to accomplish more with their efforts.

2) But even more importantly, we are here to show people that an alternative *-frankly superior-* system for making decisions as groups is possible. To not just to put the power in the hands of ‘the people’, but to create a place where all fallacies, myths and misinformation can be publicly exposed. -While the best ideas, be them from scientists or children, can spread like wildfire and become law.

We’ve created systems to facilitate all of this but it does require a website. Building the next system boils down to connecting the masses so to us it would appear, incorporating the net is *critical*.

And why wouldn’t we? In the digital realm we may alter the very fabric of space. We can enable people to drop entire documentaries or public debates into the middle of what other people said without anyone actually being interrupted at all. We can offer people ‘tokens’ they can drop into pages that each do different things. -Like the ‘note tokens’, which free people to go off on tangents without complicating pages any more than the addition of a little icon, which others can click on or ignore as they please. Because while language tends to be linear, the problems we are trying to solve clearly are not. On a fundamental level, we really could be communicating better.

For instance our design for the debate token is of special interest because it’s built to pop the public’s filter bubbles. The media’s kept the masses in ideological echo chambers that have woefully diminished their ability to process conflicting information. Which leaves them unable to actually accomplish anything. Filter bubbles have become a serious problem.

Fortunately the moment entire communities start sharing their ideas, they naturally expose one another to a diversity of perspectives. However the debate tokens drastically accelerate this process. Before the site lets a user drop debate tokens, it requires them to state their 'main argument' so everyone can be on the same page. Once dropped, debate tokens display their 'main argument' and offer everyone 3 columns where they can place their arguments: 'for', 'against', or 'otherwise'. This way each community can gather all relevant information.

Meanwhile each *individual* argument, gets rated up or down in the column, making it possible for people to see exactly what matters the most to everyone. This functions like a kind of real-life mass telepathy, letting everyone see what other people want, or even what mistakes they're still caught up on. In a place where you get to directly speak to them.

This way we can all craft better ideas, ones everyone likes, or at least can respect, and live by. Sometimes simply knowing the decision was made in a non authoritarian fashion can go a long way, as well as knowing nothing is written in stone. -That if anything's working out bad for you, you can literally just go propose an edit or amendment, and the others will genuinely care and support you as long as it's actually being a problem. So instead of fighting like hell to get your way and preventing change, which would just lead to an endless argument in our proposed system, the incentive is to find an agreement that's 'stable' because it's the most mutually respected. Because its every detail has been experimented with and refined, creating something completely unlike today's "bills" which just kind of ram their way into society. I guess you could say we're striving to create a 'Darwinism for ideas'. -Perhaps we had better stick to calling it a 'meritocracy'?

What we will likely be continuously reminding people about the debates is that "winning" is 'a good idea becoming law', not 'destroying people in debates'. There's no points or trophies for 'winning the debate' because treating others poorly only makes reaching a consensus harder. In returning to 'the local' we are reminded that respect usually has its benefits.

Our primary goal is to show people what a real democracy would look like, however the secondary systems like the time bank do also facilitate the kind of change we're striving for. People having their own space to list everything they want or have, including their skills and services, will build community spontaneously, and more meaningfully. Because the opposite of superficial is listening to people and supplying them with what they need. The time bank works by connecting

people by their strengths, which cultivates mutual respect. Some of the most beautiful aspects of this project will be seeing people truly helping each other through the time bank. Time banks are also inherently revolutionary because they create a sphere of commerce wherein an hour of anyone's time is valued equally as that of anyone else, regardless of race or gender.

Having a land of never-ending garage sales also means more consumer goods can be reused or re-purposed. As well as making it so babysitters and others don't have to gamble with their very *lives* meeting new clients through anonymous sources. They can not only see an employers history and friends, but also their world views. Meaning they can walk into situations better prepared, as well as locate the situations that work best for them.

Which also applies to activism, meaning people can see what groups are like before they go there. So they can find the right place for them without suffering through a bunch of 'trial and error' that might turn them off to organizing. Eliminating these headaches would spell larger, more united movements.

Having a library for all strategies also means everyone gets a kind of phone-book for the kinds of efforts and thus people, that resonate with them. -so they don't have to be so isolated. They can not only find potential friends, but have a way to 'break the ice' with them. We can help them bypass the awkwardness of trying to make new friends by giving them ways to make friends naturally, by working on cool stuff together.

And because there's larger scales, groups from one city can easily learn from those of others. In a place where all their good conversations don't have to be lost. They can be collected, and refined. Even linked into other conversations using a 'portal token'.

The difference in an individuals ability to speak to an entire group, to create meaningful change, will be so radically improved, that even should our site somehow *fail*, the publics very concept of what government could be, will be changed forever. The truth is 'representative' democracy is just a primitive information technology, one invented before the age of toilette paper. -or pencils. Our species could be doing infinitely better now, and it's time to make that known.

Additionally we imagine this project is not likely to fail because not only does it mimic

successful models like Wikipedia and others, unlike even the most successful of them, it is loaded with tools that can be applied itself too. The governance site governs itself, and seeks to employ the creative talents and insights of literally billions. There is no telling how they may adapt it, or of what it may become, within even the first 10 years. As new technological interfaces appear we may find the ‘nucleus’ of the best sites growing into new forms. There may come to be an entire 3D virtual realm in which people list all their ideas, skills, needs, and problems. Or where researchers pool data from our site and others to master crafting good law, and building better consensus.

In the meantime, after we’re established online, we will be preparing for the next phase: the transition to full implementation. First we show people how easy it is to make decisions as groups of any size without voting for anyone. After people see it not only works for real groups around them, but *wildly outperforms* the old methods, there will be no way to stop it. It would be like trying to stop science, because it is not actually a position, *but a process*. Once established, a few scenarios are possible.

The most likely being that first politicians will run on ‘open platforms’ wherein they promise to do what their constituency votes in favor of online. Once the ‘Open party’ has enough members elected they can either start dismantling the old system bill by bill. People hate the establishment, they’ve been feigning for an alternative.

Another potential scenario is that activists and grassroots organizers will adopt the technologies far more voraciously; and in an atmosphere of local victories, this technology could sprout into more of a populist movement. From there communities could start running their own areas, and helping other areas to do the same. It’s even possible there will be government resistance and we have to move the servers and adopt more extreme strategies. Now that the government is calling water protectors “environmental terrorists” and proposing it be a felony offense to protect your own water and air¹, it’s become clear anything is possible.

In any case we will probably eventually succeed because we are a movement based on listing all potential solutions to all problems. If something becomes a barrier, we will simply brainstorm ways to get past it. -the way corporations are with us, and environmental regulations. Again, once online, fighting us would be like trying to fight science itself. *We are a movement based on a process.* -On the

idea that decisions should be made with all available information.

This early in the game there is no telling how this will play out, or how long it will take, but I do find it worth noting that once it is online, there's really no stopping it. People hate the present system so tremendously we could see a full scale revolution happen in a matter of weeks or months. But most importantly, whenever the revolution does come we know it will be extremely well thought out, because it is built on effectively addressing problems. We also know it will be non-violent, because all activity is transparent. This isn't some kind of angry mob making decisions on whim, we are creating a place to have the most comprehensive talks of all time, then use that space to start seriously dealing with things like pollution, poverty, and war.

Our system works on various scales. Once you log in the site asks you what scale you want to work on, then what area in specific. So if for 'scale' you enter in 'city' then for 'area' you would enter in the name of a city. But this isn't limited to geography at all. Or even politics.

If for 'scale' you enter in 'niche', then for 'area' you can type in *literally anything* you want. This way you can work on things people have never even thought possible before. It could be a problem with the English language, holidays, shared households, or even with the human knee. People have problems with everything, so why not create a place for solutions to anything? -Even if it's not 'political' it *is* helping people, and getting them acquainted with direct-representation technologies.

After a user tells the site *where* they want to work, it shows them a list of all the problems there, with the highest rated ones on top. They can do keyword searches and other things to find exactly what matters the most to them. And of course if they don't see it, they can add it themselves.

Once they find a problem they care about, the site shows them a list of all possible solutions to that problem, also with the highest rated on top.

For direct action that would be enough, these tools would do wonders for activists. But we want to see this go beyond activism, we want to create a world where groups can govern without electing rulers. Because problems in our society are not accidents, they are the predictable outcome of bad decisions. So if we can make decisions based on all the *best options*, we're not going to need stuff like charities anymore. Because even the evils people don't associate at all with government, really are

connected to it.

As the famous quote goes, ‘government is what we do together that we cannot do alone’². So even for the traditionally ‘non-political’ issues like depression, or misogyny, if our government actually worked, people would be continuously working with them to get results. The fact we’ve even come to see our real-world problems as being ‘unrelated’ to our government, in the first place, is itself an indictment of our governments. Who were supposed to be here for us.

If an alien or something came to Earth and financially enslaved us or abused women like people do today we’d be up in arms, at red alert, but once it’s due to corporations or a norm of toxic masculinity, current governments can’t do anything. So instead of continuing to plea with politicians for real change, let’s have every city in the world talking about the best ideas on Earth.

In fact let’s launch the most well-coordinated assault on oppression human kind has ever seen. Where activists can not only speak to giant groups, but can refine their tactics for actually ‘getting through to them’. A lot of activists don’t realize how much they’re expecting other people to conform to their own values, or that change comes through understanding, not coercion or judgment; so part of the answer is establishing a dialog. Activists and data analysts are going to compare strategies for ‘reaching people’, so even the tactics anti-oppression workers employ are going to start evolving.

We’ve even found a way to teach users de-escalatory psychology, in specific: NonViolent Communication. NVC addresses the underlying logic all languages are build upon. For humans ‘stimuli’ become ‘stories’ in one of two ways:

When a person starts trying to solve their problems by thinking in terms of who did ‘right or wrong’, and therefore “is a [insert label here]”, they are thinking in what Rosenberg calls “Jackal logic”. Interestingly enough, all insults boil down to some form of this logic, as an insult cannot exist without implying inferiority, and one cannot even imply inferiority without somehow establishing someone “is” more or less of something. In fact without such ‘logic’ entire forms of mental illness might not be possible, such as anxiety, and rage.

“Giraffe” is the logic of needs. It was named after giraffes because they not only posses the

largest heart of all land mammals, but secrete a special enzyme which allows them to eat thorns. -forming a splendid metaphor for what NVC does. Once you learn to think in terms of needs, someone could literally insult you and instead of letting anger ruin your day, or your connection to them, you just ask yourself what un-met needs led to this situation, and how best to meet them. From there you work with them to figure out what can be done.

To the NVC practitioner, problems are merely what comes before a solution, there's no reason to label, judge, or punish anyone, including oneself. Which make it the most ideal mode of communication possible for groups to work on controversial issues. It's all about bypassing drama by focusing on direct observations and unmet needs. And it is said that once both sides in a conflict can, (to the satisfaction of the other), explain the other sides needs, that peace is usually not more than 20 minutes away.³

So of course we wanted to incorporate this, and we came up with the perfect way to, using our project's 'layer' system. At first we just thought it'd be cool if pages could have different layers so projects could have many different kinds of specialists working on them, without making the main page impossible to understand. So each page can have 'layers' or 'sides' for each kind of specialist working on them, and a 'plain English' side to tie all the other layers together.

This turns out to offer a lot for communities. Imagine being able to learn from biologists, engineers or other professionals by seeing them working on problems in the real world. This makes it easier for communities to connect with scientists, and could do wonders for scientific literacy, funding, and for education as a whole. But the most powerful effect, may very well stem from what this can do to teach people how to reason and communicate better, through "NVC".

The moment someone creates a page for a problem or idea, the page starts off with two layers. The 'main page', which by default appears first. -And the second 'auto-generated' layer, the 'NVC side', which is kind of like the backup main page. It's where users go if the discussion in the main page gets unproductive, or if they just want to avoid drama in general. In fact NVC's 'no drama' appeal might inspire a lot of people to strictly roam the site on its NVC layers. -because it's not just effective, it makes conflict resolution far more *enjoyable*. After all, at the heart of almost every problem is a solution, and solutions should feel good.

To further help the spread of NVC the home page will offer tutorials on how to use it, as well as recommendations to apply it *everywhere*.

And we'll be providing a clear incentive to do so, because if you want to create a rule you need to gather a 90% consensus for it, which is why need literacy is invaluable. 90% agreement might seem too high but we're giving users a collection of advanced tools to understand exactly what aspects of their propositions, are bothersome to others. It's not like voting on referendums, it's interactive and rapidly self-evolving.

However because we've made it possible for people to literally work on anything, there's going to be a few places where making a rule, itself, wouldn't make any sense as a law. Such as with non-spacial 'areas' such as the 'human imagination' or 'sunlight'. We can definitely have good talks about these things, and even jokingly 'make decisions' or 'laws' for them, but it's not like sunlight's going to abide by them. Which is fine because all that really matters, is that when it comes to the places we do care about rule making, the people and related specialists are well organized and in control.

As long as our options are pre-selected for us the ruling class will always be in control, but once the options we vote between are all crafted and selected by us, that all changes. Because despite monolithic complexity, this entire system hinges on a single detail: "who makes the decisions?" -with the key hidden detail being that if your decision start with me deciding what your options, even *are*, then in reality I made the decision and you chose between details. Clearly that is only the illusion of freedom, and it's time we do better.

Give the people actual sovereignty and inconceivable things begin to happen. Once the laws police enforce, legitimately reflect what their communities *actually want*, people will eventually stop hating them. If police were honestly just there to protect and serve us, we might even *like* them. Other strange things become possible as well. Our idea of what cities can realistically be, and do, will be changed forever, because finally the importance of 'purpose' will outweigh the value of 'profits'. Finally, the human species can remember that money was created for life, not the other way around!

So to recap on how the technology works: we break everything down into 'scales', then 'areas',

with lists of ‘problems’ and ‘ideas’. -In a space with tools that allow people to communicate in new ways, such as with the ‘token’ and ‘layer’ systems.

From there they can work on direct action, or on governance. If they’re trying to work on laws they hop over to that areas decision making section where they can add, debate, or propose edits to legislation. As well as vote.

There’s even another section where all decisions made in that area are on display, in plain English. Because it should never take a lawyer to know what is legally expected of you. And if we’re ever going to have a world of sovereign localities, or a pluralist commonwealth⁴, having expectations listed openly are going to be vital.

In conclusion I hope you can see that this project deserves support because it not only offers a clear alternative system for making laws, but a realistic means of implementation as well. We don’t need the government’s cooperation, a mass uprising, collapse, or social movement to get this started, just 5 or so thousand dollars to fund the programming of a uniquely sophisticated, and promising website. A ‘Wikipedia’ for all good ideas, and doorway to a new world.

--Questions for Authors of Works on New Models and Systems---

Core Goals:

We believe all major systemic problems, be them economic, social, political, or environmental, could be addressed by our governments, but presently are not, because mass social exploitation is just too much more profitable. Even if a politician really did care, the cost of assassinating their character or worse, is utterly dwarfed by the potential cost of them voting ‘the wrong way’ on a budget. The bottom line is this system doesn’t work, but if we can make one that does, all the brilliant ideas people keep

been having will be proliferated, and even refined. Suddenly we can have a society that makes its decisions based on what most benefits 'the people' instead of Wall Street.

A key aspect of our movement is that we're not inventing 'the way other people will live' for them, we're inventing a way for them to get to decide that for themselves.

To make sure a bunch of racists can't just move somewhere and re-instate slavery or something, the basic agreements like 'no genocide, slavery...etc' will be made on the global scale long before full implementation, (because we can officially make decisions from day one, they just don't have the power of law, until full implementation). Generally speaking global pacts will be for the most basic and universal agreements, while localities like cities will get far more specific. Right down to parking ordinance.

Principal Changes:

The principle difference will be that when people have good ideas, scientists or anyone else, they can actually become law, possibly within weeks or months. That alone would change everything, but the communication tools and time bank strive for even more.

Principle Means:

We will utilize all ethical means possible. The principle of which will be citizen's proclivities for particular internet behaviors. -including but not limited to: making money, making friends, winning arguments, bartering for goods, exploring curiosity, fighting oppression, and seeking solutions for their own problems.

There is a chance our main support will come from activist organizations instead as the public might not as readily adopt a more complex social networking technology. -At least not until it's clear they're not 'early adopters', once they can see other people are using it.

Geographic Scope:

This project is global.

Temporal Scope:

We have programmers ready to generate this in a matter of months once we secure the funding. Once online we will personally contact every large activist organization we can to get the technology out there, and have the first pages of the site generated by more knowledgeable people. Those already studying and writing about the world's problems. By summer of 2017 we could be starting to plan out what full scale implementation would entail. Of course actually transitioning to the new system requires enough time for the general public to find themselves in support of this.

In my own experiments with trying to convince 'regular people', time and again I find they actually love it. Regardless of their politics, everyone respects the idea of a better democracy. And they all hate politicians. My experience suggests once this is actually online, it's going to spread very quickly. We've designed it to serve their interests from day one, so given the current need for a new system, if a single celebrity like Russel Brand endorsed it, we could see mass adoption and discussion of full scale implementation buzzing in the scope of couple seasons. But obviously this is all speculation.

Theory of Change:

Necessity is the mother of innovation, people literally detest politicians, and who doesn't want access to a vault for all good ideas? We believe many things will drive people to our movement, and from there they won't be creating *our* change, we will be helping to facilitate *theirs*. Our theory is basically that people already want peace and happiness, we're just here to remove obstacles.

In a sense, crises have been important to our work. Obviously if there was no problem we would have no reason to change things, but when Trump actually *won*, for once the extent of people's fear started matching the severity of our problem. -Which was there long before him, but could only now be so widely seen as the life-threatening cancer it truly is.

Our biggest impediment to adoption so far has been the fact that we're not actually online.

Everyone's been interested in checking it out, but until we're online, we're some concept they don't know how to be a part of. Once online we are 'a really fascinating idea *just one click away*'.

--Economy --

-How are productive assets and businesses owned?

-Does ownership differ at different scales (community, nation, etc.)?

-Do forms of ownership vary by economic sector (banking, manufacturing, health care, etc.)?

Different regions, given their own sovereignty, will make their own policies about economics. There will probably be a number of agreements made on the global scale regarding economics but for the most part one has to ask themselves 'what do most people want, throughout the world?'. -Then 'what about after experts break down the important details for them in a place where any myths or fallacies can be publicly dispelled?'... My guess is healthcare will be universal and most people will support small business and more strongly tax and regulate big business. Although policies may vary considerably from one region to another, there seem to be a number of fairly universal trends.

And their differences will not be random. If one region chooses to not use a system employed by another, it will be due to an argument that communities and analysts found more compelling in some way. Meaning each one will probably either have its benefits or eventually be replaced with something that does.

-How are public and private investment decisions made?

Private investment decisions will be made in many of the same ways they are now, because in a sense we're just helping people vote on ideas directly, instead of voting on people who vote on ideas. It's not like we're going to burn everything down and build a new system from the ashes, we're just

making a way to craft better decisions. That said, the economy will change considerably, because people generally favor smaller businesses, and perhaps nationalized or decentralized banks. Meaning the subsidies and sizes of sectors in the market will change over time.

-What is the role of private profit and the profit motive?

-Who owns and controls economic surplus?

There will still be a role for the profit motive. People like knowing the basic necessities of life are being provided for, but most are not interested in getting taxed harder so ‘freeloaders can live extravagantly’. Perhaps after the era of wage slavery ends we can create a world of such abundance that everyone has access to really nice things, but for now it would be enough to avert the impending ecological apocalypse, and we can use the profit motive to do it.

What is the role of the market for goods and services? For employment? Other?

We need a green revolution, and people want nice things, so people will continue working for money. But they won’t have to worry about dying if they can’t continue to do so, even if they’re just feeling depressed and need to travel for awhile. Smarter automation will handle the jobs no one wants and people will be free to work on themselves.

-What is the role of planning in your model?

-How is it structured? & how, if at all, made democratic?

At least for the foreseeable future, there will still be big business, they just won’t be able to bribe or threaten politicians anymore. Meaning they will have to stop cutting corners, and the 1% will lose some money for once. Although ironically I believe their quality of life will increase, as not only will the entire world become a kind of vacation resort, where there’s always healthy food and clean shelter, and the public’s hate for them fades. -so them and their families can walk around safely, and mingle with a far wider array of interesting people. People actually like the idea they could be rich someday, so technically “inequality” isn’t their problem. The problem’s been that poverty is still fatal. If everyone can have what they need, and we start installing nice things to boot, people won’t hate the rich. To end class war we elevate those on the bottom, and can destigmatize the service by forming ‘vacation networks’ wherein everyday people are invited to roam the world for free. And as Mark

Twain famously said, “*Travel is fatal* to prejudice, *bigotry*, and narrow-mindedness, and many of our people need it sorely on these accounts.”⁵

Another interesting point is that not only will the markets stay open, and employment continues working the way it always has, our plan is to not have a single day of interruption of services. We are basically aspiring for the least climactic victory of all time because we don’t want to see anyone get hurt. We don’t want an armed revolution, we want to help others to orchestrate the most effective non-violent resistance, and democracy, of all time. *2 Pak would be amused.*

If one asked ‘what is your central method of planning’, the short answer would be “there is no center”. In a more traditional sense of ‘central planning’, the answer would be closer to ‘members from all sectors’. Legislation can be proposed by anyone, but for something like a city or larger would fall under the scrutiny -but also possible support- of anyone else. Even the criticisms themselves will be subject to criticism and people will debate, sometimes vigorously. -Which is why we’re integrated the NVC layers.

Often when debates get heated, the public wants to hear from experts. The layer system makes it possible to see the scientists and other professionals discussions, and the main page makes it easy to see the highlights from all the other ones. Meaning there is a strong potential for integration of insights from members of all sectors. Eventually everyone will have access to the internet and no one will be left out. Machine learning programs⁶ are already beginning to truly decode human languages and the site will even have auto-translation, enabling people from all over the world to talk, and share insights. Because the goal is mutually assured peace.

-How are the international economy and economic integration handled?

The international *economy* won’t even have to be “integrated”. Once the major economic entities can finally be regulated, people don’t need to create new institutions. We just need the ones that are here, to work.

And any changes that do come, do so only after an extremely comprehensive international

5

6

discussion has played out to a satisfactory conclusion. That could take years, and by that time there's no telling if the international consensus will be closer to agreeing upon managing their own countries economics, or something closer to creating one united currency.

-How do you address economic localization, globalization, decentralization, 'glocalization,' and similar issues? Where is the primary locus of economic life?

In any case the primary locus of economic activity will shift from the financial sector, into a plurality of scientific, ecological, and social efforts. Every aspect and policy in the transition will be discussed in great detail and localities will each individually determine what their policies are.

-How do economic competition and cooperation play out?

I am pleased however, to say the way economic competition and cooperation plays out will be very different. When things stop being done purely for their profitability, arguments for various forms of cooperation tend to gain a lot more traction. Because, as game theory shows, cooperation results in a greater net gain than can be had by competition. Competition sounds great until you realize rapidly ideas and resources can spread when everyone's not trying to keep everything to compete and build walls.

-Do commodification, commercialization, and the commons surface in your analysis?

In a sense we're building a commons, one in which all other spaces can get their own microcosms. Which will make it easy for commercialization and commodification to be regulated on various scales, and in various ways.

-How is private property handled in your analysis?

Private property will continue as it always has. Taxes might go up or down but owning things will basically work the same.

-What mix of business enterprise sizes do you envision?

The mix of business enterprises will however change. People in all countries like buying from small businesses, but people also love high-tech goods which rely on big business, so it's not like those

are going away. But some might get nationalized or replaced by government operated versions. At the very least, pollution standards are going to get more expensive. Corporations will likely claim the new regulations would put them out of business. To which citizens will start asking themselves if people in their country or somewhere else could pull it off instead. -Which is to say that if corporations aren't up to the challenge, then they might start becoming less prevalent.

-How do you envision the future of the large corporation and what specific measures do you envision for corporate governance and control, internal and external?

If the 'profitability' of corporations drops low enough we might start seeing their internal politics start changing radically. Because once investors and executives can no longer team up and use politicians or think tanks to make more money, then the investors will have to finally start asking why CEO's get such ridiculous paychecks, and that's going to leave executives with nothing left to do but find a way to make profits through better efficiency or marketing, which can only go so far. Therefore many will seek to corrupt the new system. So we anticipate well paid hackers, and pre-emptively employ transparency.

-What role do you see for innovative corporate forms, coops, public enterprise, social enterprise, and public-private hybrids?

The masses won't have sympathy for the CEOs because it's not like they'll be living in poverty, but if a business can prove they need a little help affording new environmental regulations, then the new system *would* be sympathetic to them. Because even for industry, the new system is based on the purpose motive.

Which also means we will probably see all kinds of new cooperatives, social enterprises, and hybrids. An interesting thing about our process is that it also doubles as a kind of 'formula for innovation' because if you think about it, innovation involves identifying exactly what elements matter, then what can be thrown out or modified. Which is precisely what our process is, we drop everything and focus directly on the unmet needs. (and strategies)

-What is the evolution of the workweek (hours worked, say, per year)?

As people start realizing how much of the remaining work really can be done by modern robotics, the demand for human labor will drop. We could even potentially see a world where most people don't "work" *anywhere*, while others only do so for as little as 5 hours a week. But people will also build and want more, so the number of people working, volunteering, and maintaining the machines could be considerable. But that is all a long ways off, for now we're just focused on helping people discover 'direct representation'.

-What is the envisioned future of organized labor?

The future of labor movements may also be on the verge of transforming. If the coming revolution in machine intelligence really is going to automate most jobs, then the labor parties, like all other groups, will need to adjust. Most likely implementation of something like a Guaranteed Minimum Income will be central to preventing socio-economic catastrophes.

-What are the roles of economic growth and GDP as a measure of growth in your system?

What is the priority of growth at the national and company levels?

Obsession with GDP and growth have brought about such incomprehensibly vast poverty, that according to UNICEF over 20 thousand children die from it, every single day.⁷ No matter what it takes, we must unite and put this system in check. The fate of humanity is literally depending on it. Once we succeed, GDP will no longer be the central method of determining a countries worth. Many will instead refer to a countries "Gross National Happiness".⁸ -Or something else sane like its infant mortality rates, average life span, or scientific literacy. Trying to measure how well we can maintain infinite growth on a finite planet is truly delusional. Companies have depended on promising growth to get investors, truly depended upon it; therefore without their narrative of infinite growth, we might see cooperatives and other forms of business begin to dominate the environment.

-How is money created and allocated?

Without a ruling class, people will most likely find that money is in fact a useful tool and *not* 'the root of all evil'. Like the nuclear physics that made it possible to build atomic bombs, it is merely a technology, itself possessing no intentions or 'nature'. Once in the right hands these all become

7

8

beautiful things. Knowing that in our system any misinformation or fallacies being employed to fool the public can get openly exposed and neutralized, we are confident whatever systems win out in the new political environment, will be at the very least, fairly decent. -But also possibly amazing.

It's possible that in a meritocracy people wouldn't have so much distrust for their governments that models like Bitcoin would actually win-out or even have managed to grow to their present size. Meaning the existence of a trustworthy and just government might actually be bad for things like alternative currencies, but only in the best possible way. Obviously it's completely unacceptable to have the worlds currencies controlled by elites, but once that part gets remedied, people might start feeling a lot better about banks and paper currency.

-How do you envision the future course of income and wealth inequality? What factors affect these results?

-How do you envision the future course of economic poverty? What factors affect these results?

In any case governments are going to be taking poverty far more seriously. Most people don't try to organize or make a difference because they feel like they can't do much. -and (unbeknownst to them), that they had no idea how bad things have actually become because the media's doesn't cover it. Once we have a government that openly faces its problems, media and other content will begin to pour in and people will finally start to really see the consequences of bad policies.

Once conditions are improved for the common person and no one has to die from a lack of money, and the rich can no longer prey upon the poor, the publics view of inequality will change. There is a whole system of exploitation which not even the wealthiest of people could actually stop or change. Income inequality is going to become a far less serious issue, not because people, once given the power, are going to just tax all businesses out of existence or something. -People are going to be choosing between propositions that must endure a newfound level of criticism, and they know bad things happen if they tax the private sector into oblivion. People mostly want reasonable things like clean air and with the coming automation of entire sectors, they're going to want GMIs.

Meaning those on the bottom will be elevated, and those on the very top will 'make less'. But once the struggle of poverty is ameliorated, the animosity and danger them and their families have had

to live with, will begin to fade. This basically means there will be more cohesion and freedom to mingle and travel. They and everyone else will be able to breathe easier, and at the end of the day, isn't that what money *is for*? "Making less" in our system will be anything but making, less.

Once we have a functional government, ending world poverty will actually be a breeze. The U.S. could have done it last year on it's own, for less than 1/4th the cost of their new F-35 jets⁹¹⁰. For the cost of one stupid jet we could have become the country that ended poverty *for everyone*, which would have made us so much safer than these weapons ever will. But of course, once you eliminate poverty, who will need trillion dollar fighter jets? And for as horrible as complicity with this is, what politician, or 'rich' person, could have possibly stopped a multi-trillion dollar military industrial complex? (They have families too). Electing mere politicians to stop this is completely absurd. *Only billions of people united can change this*. We won't have a single banner, but instead a shared stake in survival, and network through which to collectively solve our problems.

-Are special measures envisioned to protect and enhance children and families? To advance the underprivileged? To promote care-giving and mutual responsibility?

There already exist an ocean of measures envisioned to protect and enhance the lives of children and families, but despite being good ideas, they often don't get funding. Instead our governments fund war and maintain scarcity. Once our governments becomes a universe of comprehensive lists of all problems and solutions, we are going to see every great idea, start getting the respect and funding they deserve. And what ideas prove themselves the most effective, through the site and other means, will be spread to every corner of the world. Again, creating a Darwinism for solutions.

-How do racial, ethnic, and religious justice figure in your work?

With great pleasure, I can say a government truly 'of the people, by the people', working on all communities highest rated problems, will effectively amount to the most well-coordinated assault on oppression the world has ever seen. Anti-oppression workers of all creeds will be equipped to propose and critique legislation where all else may see and input. If an activist is completely alone in a whole town of oppressive people they can do anything from seek a safer place to call home, to collect other communities ideas for how they can have the most effect there. They could even create secret niche

spaces in the site where they could meet and work on things with other oppressed people in their city. And if they need help with anything they can contact sympathetic groups near or far.

-What role do gender and gender issues play in your work?

Most cities are going to have a mix of people and perspectives, so in their discussions of problems and potential solutions, these differences are going to surface. People will espouse their beliefs in various social myths, thereby making them into sitting ducks in our system. Any myth or fallacy can be tagged with tokens offering things like links to videos and other informational resources. As well as letting everything get debated out in the open where everyone's names are attached to what they say so they know they'll be held accountable. -But also in a space where they don't have to speak in front of a crowd, and where they get to edit or even research what they say before hitting 'enter'. Aside from giving activists an apparatus for making law, the primary gift to anti-oppression workers will be the tools to openly call out and obliterate oppressive myths and ideology in government and everywhere else. Theoretically an entire multi-million-dollar, think-tank, propaganda piece could be ruined by a single activist taking a 5 minute smoke break at work somewhere. Because trying to win arguments using lies should be an uphill battle, not telling the truth. Changing how media works will be invaluable, and starts happening the moment our technology's online.

-What, specifically, is the role of community in your model?

-What measures and factors affect community health, wealth ('social capital'), and solidarity, and how central are local life, neighborhoods, towns and cities?

In the new model communities will be central, in fact mapping features can be added to the existing framework to enable users to see how state and national boundaries really should be drawn. We can start to see regions more defined by their people than today's legalistic lines in the ground. Each community will be utilizing countless ideas for their own problems and referring to larger scale conversations as ideal sources for world-class ideas, with countless cities learning from posts on the global scale. We can't wait to see what this does for activists.

-Do you envision a change of values, culture and consciousness as important to the evolution of a new system? If so, how do these changes occur?

Even better than 'serving activists', it blurs the very line between 'citizen' and activist. -Because

there won't be labels on people, be them 'activist', 'democrat' or 'republican', there will just be 'problems', and 'ideas'. Meaning it will just be *normal* to organize. And if someone's working on the same solution you really like, there's a good chance you're about to find friends. This will actually be fun. This movement thrives through the best elements of human society, be it curiosity, play, or preservation. Many powerful forces in society will fuel it once it's up and running, we just have to get it there.

-What are the roles of the consumer, consumerism, and advertising in the system you envision? Self-provisioning? Sharing, renting, and bartering?

Advertising on the site will be uniquely democratic. At least for as long as people don't vote to stop relying on advertising. At least for the beginning there will be ads but only ones that pass the site's 'ad counsel', on the home page. Everyone's welcome to join the counsel and vote between different groups proposed ads. This way all demeaning or oppressive ads can be eliminated, whilst creating demand for better ads. And for every paid ad we can feature a 'community service ad' which are selected in a similar system, also on the homepage, except these submissions come from activists and aren't for profit. They can create media with positive messages, generating ads for 'purpose' instead.

-How do "leisure" activities—including volunteering, care-giving, continuing learning—figure in your work?

And volunteering, once people don't have to worry about running out of money, will probably become *ubiquitous*. People will seek to fill their time with nature, art and each other.

-If your system addresses environmental concerns, how do you conceptualize "the environment"? Do you envision the economy as nested in and dependent on the world of nature and its systems of life?

The 'environment' is conceptualized in many ways, and for nature's sake we hope humanity will utilize all of them. It will also be great seeing a place where each body of nature can have all its problems listed publicly for any and all to work on. Almost like some kind of techno-Lorax, it can speak for the trees. (and oceans and stuff too)

-Do you address a rights-based environmentalism (e.g. right to clean water) and the idea that nature has legal rights? Do we have duties to other species and living systems? Are any of your goals non-anthropocentric?

And when it comes to a government 'of the people, by the people', the question of whether we should pay more to stop poisoning our own air and water, will be a no-brainer. Everyday people understand that not just our economy, but our very family's lives, dependent upon nature. You can tell because the fight for environmentalism has always been citizens against corporations and governments. Once government is on their people's side, nature will be protected.

-Do you envision addressing environmental issues outside the current framework of environmental approaches and policies (e.g. by challenging consumerism, GDP growth, etc.)?

In this way even the rights of non-humans can be protected. Scientists, conservationists, and activists in our system will have every advantage in communicating the importance of making particular decisions. Meaning we can as world citizens not only secure things like their own water rights, but with never before seen ease, secure rights for other creatures as well.

-How do you handle environment-economy interactions, trade-offs, and interdependencies?

Perhaps the most interesting thing about the transition will be seeing what environmental strategies will prove most effective. People don't realize that in our present system recycling could never be enough because by the time a consumer produces one barrel of recycling, industry's produced 70 barrels of trash. So instead of trying to convince everyone to stop enjoying showers longer than 5 minutes, and all these other ineffective strategies, we can be discussing root level questions like why that energy wasn't coming from sustainable sources to begin with!

Before full implementation the various interdependencies between different groups of people will be thoroughly discussed. All previously existing systems, businesses, exports and currencies continue as they are until particular improvements are thought of and publicly approved.

-How do you address transnational and global-scale environmental challenges?

When it comes to transnational environmental challenges, there will be global scale conversations and agreements. The new system of government scales in such a way that any expert or other citizen can think of possible international agreements, and if there's demand, then accrue the support of people like activists and scientists. And instead of seeing pacts get trashed because they didn't gain enough support in their first try, these will happen in a place where they stay on the table, and can be refined. And again, if there's a real need for them, they will have support.

-Does your work explore the links between large-scale environmental challenges (like climate change) and other economic and political issues?

So for climate change, there's numerous possible strategies. Some however are not strong enough, and because of that each needs to be well scrutinized. Therefore at this stage is it impossible to know if people will prefer an international strategy like 'cap and trade', or to instead focus on immediately switching to renewables. But we can be certain there will be intense deliberation. Most likely we will even create an entirely new constitution. Possibly as an entire species or planet. But it is also possible people will look back on what an absurdly complicated process it was trying to 'amend' a 'constitution' and decide the newer version is simply better.

-To what degree would your proposed model require Constitutional change? What specifically might be required or recommended?

Up until, and possibly beyond full scale implementation, we won't need any government cooperation or permission to move forward. Eventually however, we will want to start 'voting open party' until they can peacefully dismantle the old and transition to the new. Or whatever else is effective.

-Does your model have anything to say about liberty and how it may or may not relate to the design of your model? And how, specifically, is liberty nurtured and protected?

Liberty will thrive in our model because it's based on granting sovereignty, but also on making it more possible to begin actually neutralizing the tyranny of the majority. Instead of trying to rely politicians, we make it so minorities can speak for themselves, with advanced new communication tools to make it clearer than ever how messed up some popular ideas really are. Fascism can only exist through censorship, so creating a ballot where everyone's voice can be heard means we can do all kinds of things about any potential 'tyranny of the majority'.

And due to the global pacts, if anyone tries to form communities where they agree to make it legal to use slavery or something else awful, other communities near and far could respond with anything from lawsuits, to embargos or otherwise. It's always been the case that 'if some armed men ban together and do awful things' that some kind of response would be necessary. But that force doesn't have to be deadly. No matter how well armed they may be, they still need things like imports and exports. So theoretically enough direct action alone could force them to reconsider the profitability of their inhumane decisions. Direct democracy means there is no limit to what strategies people could employ.

-How does your model address questions of political and institutional power?

What we're offering is a way to begin relieving the underlying tensions and economic forces creating fueling fascism. The better organized we become, and the better equipped to work out compromises with any given group, the more violence will become unnecessary.

-How does your model deal with problems of scale? How much decentralization does it include for large systems? How would decentralization be structured?

So in a way the global scales are just as essential as the local ones, even if people find themselves interacting with the local government far more often. And the intermediary scales will be useful because it takes a lot of energy to make a global pact, and often all a solution needs is the cooperation of people in a particular region.

There is also the question of language at the world scale. So far the site's all in one language and while it won't be hard to create templates in other ones, having a world scale conversation that converts all activity into any users language is going to be difficult. But not impossible, researchers are already developing specialized artificial intelligence for breaking language down the way humans do. From there translation can be automated, there's just a lot of details for the researchers to perfect. Worst case scenario, the new system of government needs translators. In any case it represents a far lower barrier to making real progress than trying to get politicians to do anything important does.

-Does your work address issues of foreign policy, international relations, regional integration, military policy and spending, war and peace, i.e. the international context of the new system? If so, how?

We're going to see a rich diversity of international relations and foreign policy. Most interesting will be seeing governments truly 'of the people' interacting. It's even possible terrorists organizations will have a harder time recruiting because this form of government humanizes "nations". The nations face goes from being politicians, to just a bunch of citizens talking about their problems and ideas. Furthermore people can be surprisingly generous and if they can just start dropping aid instead of bombs, *or even just stop dropping bombs*, then we might see war gradually become a thing of the past. Especially if the people vote to eliminate the profitability of war.

-At different political levels, what polity and what political conditions are implicit or explicit in getting to success?

Success will come in many forms but perhaps the most explicit, will be seeing the world's people voting between ideas instead of people who make their decisions for them. Another major success would be achieving sustainability ecologically, which include ending poverty and war. These have all been possible technologically, long ago, except there's been one technology missing, one for actually selecting them. Technology that unites billions.

The most significant implicit success will be seeing things really start change for people who today are struggling. It will be in seeing trans and black people feel safe, and in every child who's parents could say with ease that *they should follow their dreams*; because for once, it's perfectly safe to. Because they'll know they will always be provided for. Because *everyone* is provided for.

-There is an ongoing critique of representative government and exploration of direct, "strong," and deliberative democracy. Does any of this figure in your framework? If so, how?

But that will require humanities decisions be made based on needs instead of profits, which is only made possible by the creation of a direct democracy. Any form of government involving a concentration of decision making powers, will lead to corruptive forces targeting those concentrations. Therefore as daunting as the effort might be, *our only hope* is to ban together and create a network for direct representation. A pluralist commonwealth. (cite)

-Milton Friedman, among others, believed that only a crisis produced real change. Another old expression is that "good government is just the same old government in a helluva fright." Do you examine crisis-driven political change and crisis preparedness?

And of course making any such effort requires motivation. And our present system is built on *creating* crises, so we haven't even needed to wait for one to occur. They happen so many times a year at this point all we need to do is say 'want a way out of this deadly rat race?', then show them one. So in a convoluted sense, someone could try arguing our movement 'uses disaster for its own advantages' but in the bigger picture they might as well blame medics for war.

And as much as we are here to disrupt, we're not here to put the government 'in a helluva fright', we want to democratically replace it with communities who will rule based on love instead of fear, to see society's decisions be made by the people who will actually be *impacted* by them.

-How central is government in the future you envision, both in getting there and staying there?

Today's governments will not be interested in helping us dismantle them, however, politicians can run on promises to abide by and support net democracy. And once elected can they accrue government support for it, so there is a real chance we *could* see the old system help create the new one. But at first we are relying on everyday people to realize it's time to stop picking between rulers and their pre-selected garbage. -To realize a truly viable alternative does exist, and from there, (equipped with the new technology), create a movement that is unstoppable.

-In the system you write about, what are the appropriate levels of government expenditure or government as a share of the economy and how are these levels achieved?

Given their own sovereignty, the exact levels of government expenditure will vary from one area to the next, and it's hard to say if there even is an 'ideal' amount because what works for one group wouldn't for another. There needs to be more flexibility. Which will ideally be determined based on the individual needs and desires of each community. More than anything we seek to give communities the freedom to choose for themselves.

-Do you envision social movements as important in driving political change and action? If so, can you elaborate on how this happens?

Looking back on history it appears that social movements haven't only been important in driving political change and action, they are the *primary sources* of it. When a system unfairly burdens certain people, the group of people willing to do anything about it, tends to be people it adversely

effects. Which makes sense because members from other groups didn't have anything bad happen to them. In their eyes, 'nothing is there'. -evidenced by the fact that even after they're told about other group's problems, they often just think it's all made up.

Which inspires some organizers to be willing to use violence. To which, often, people respond by mounting their high horses and decrying violence without ever even noticing that what they're talking about is in fact a *response* to violence. -Violence which is just continuing on, and would for all *eternity* if left to them or the oppressors.

When people protest in government approved ways, it tends to be extremely ineffective. But when people disrupt in the name of civil disobedience, they can make ignoring them too expensive to continue. Therefore it is said, and observed, that direct action gets results.

Back in the civil rights movement, African Americans found themselves supporting both nonviolence, and a believe in 'any means necessary' [to end the violence]. Malcolm X and his following saw people beating and shooting members of their community and decided it was time to patrol their own streets. -Armed.

Something great from that era people in ours would do well to remember, was the wisdom Martin Luther King Jr demonstrated in not siding with his opposition and distance his nonviolent following from that of Malcolm X, but to instead tell the opposition 'a riot is the language of the unheard'¹¹, meaning 'you can either work with us, or deal with them. *Those are your options*'.

Which wasn't some kind of gimmick, it was and remains *fact*. Again we can see the truth of how society works is out there, it's been out there for forever now. What we've always needed was a "government" or 'decision making system' that can actually respond to the truth instead of always trying to twist or bury it. If our government *had listened*, then the drug wars would have never happened. The US government basically responded to the Black Liberation Movement by just making things far worse using state sponsored violence.

Imagine how differently the civil rights movement would have all occurred if the government wasn't made of politicians, but instead the whole city talking about its problems and ideas for solutions.

-Are there specific real-world examples or experiments you can point to that embody your model or system or exemplify important elements of your approach?

Because this technology is still so new, real world examples of it are few and far between. There *are* a few distant relatives however. The Open Source Software movement, for instance, has accomplished things no one thought possible. Hackers with a dream that ‘everyone could have access to free software, and even the code to modify it’. They stood up to big business, and won. And to this day, most of the world’s servers run on Linux. -Plus their free software is still online and better than ever. In a way theirs was also a project for delivering mass sovereignty. The freedom to direct your own movies or other media. We salute their legacy and expand Open Source Software into the realm of Open Source Government. In fact our site will likely employ licensing developed by them, called “GPLv3” which frees everyone to work with our code but not copyright it for themselves to then sue us for using it. When it comes to software it’s important to legally protect yourself.

-Are there other models that you see yourself aligned with or close to yours?

There is also a number of other projects seeking to facilitate net democracy, but with all due respect none so far have seen nearly as appealing as our own project. They appear to come in all forms. Some still rely on voting between politicians, others are more like ours and let groups list and rate their problems, (and proposed solutions). But none have offered immediate benefits to the everyday people they’re depending on to adopt it, meaning when regular people ask ‘what’s this for?’, the next thing they think is ‘government stuff’ and suddenly you’ve lost ‘em.

Sadly most people aren’t driven by principles or character, they want pizza and netflix. If you want them to take time doing something, there is no other choice but to find a way to first become invaluable to them. -And in a world full of people racing to provide new internet services, finding something doable that isn’t already out there can be a serious challenge. Fortunately we believe we have designed something truly ready to meet that challenge, now we need your support.

---Citations---

- 1: Protecting water as environmental terrorism — <http://www.commondreams.org>
- 2: “Gov is what we do together that we cannot do alone” — Jennifer Pahlka, www.aspenideas.org/speaker/jennifer-pahlka
- 3: “...peace is not more than 20 minutes away” — Marshal Rosenberg, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YwXH4hNfgPg>
- 4: Pluralist Commonwealth — <http://www.pluralistcommonwealth.org/>
- 5: “Travel is fatal to ignorance...” — Mark Twain, www.twainquotes.com/Travel.html
- 6: Machine Learning applied to language translation — <https://techcrunch.com/>
- 7: ‘20,000 children killed by poverty, *per day*’ — <https://www.unicef.org/>
- 8: Gross National Happiness — <http://www.grossnationalhappiness.com/>
- 9: F 35 budget over 1.4 Trillion dollars — <http://time.com/money/>
- 10: Cost to end global poverty --- <http://www.nytimes.com>
- 11: “A riot is the language of the unheard” --- Martin Luther King Jr., wagingnonviolence.org

---About the author---

Anthony Brasher is a graduate of the Evergreen State College. Originally intending to major in science, he eventually discovered the world was in fact not lacking in technology. It was lacking *democracy*. -A government capable of serving the world, instead of just serving itself.

From there he had 2 distinct inspirations:

- NonViolent Communication, which revealed to him that problems are ultimately just un-met needs (profoundly solvable).
- and an online video called “Coalition of the Willing”, which was essentially a response to the Copenhagen Convention’s failure to even so much as *stall* climate change. The video illustrated a new way to build a government, one made from the best ideas on Earth. But upon being contacted, they said no-one they knew, had thought of a way to actually build it. *The movement was just that one video.*

From there a whirlwind of inspiration would come to Anthony, leading to him brainstorming design concepts, and eventually, an intuitive way to organize them.

He now lives in Washington, working to create better media to promote direct democracy.