"It doesn't matter what country you are from; in the end we find each other as one people, one family." -- Indigenous Grandmothers

"Isolated independence is not the goal of the world state. It is voluntary interdependence." -- Gandhi

Humanity is at a crossroads, inviting us to go beyond attempting to address specific acute threats to accept the Foundation's call to design a global governance model to creatively address *any* challenge.

The current institutions and power structures are, at worst, exacerbating existing threats to our survival, and, at best, unable to decisively address them.

Accordingly, we propose a model that reclaims our evolutionary gifts: love and collaboration in small groups, scaling them to a large, highly interconnected civilization by weaving the local and the global. The resulting system offers decision-making pathways agile enough to attend to global conditions while valuing each human being.

The Problem

Our conviction is that the root of humanity's enormous challenges is a fundamental departure from our evolutionary heritage. Starting around 5,000 BCE and accelerating dramatically in the past 100 years, ever-larger groups of humans have organized around separation, scarcity, and domination. All along, our systems have aimed to control inner and outer nature; to divide us from one another and life; and to allow a subset of humanity to amass wealth and rule over the rest. The sources of our evolutionary indigenous wisdom have been progressively relegated to smaller and smaller pockets in the world.

Only in the past few decades, as we approach the limits of planet earth, has the unsustainability of extractive, growth-based economics, and mutual-deterrence politics become widely recognized. Only in the past decade has a global conversation about our very survival emerged.

In response, we propose a system based on global collaboration in support of all life, trust in the possibility of human connection, and faith in the existence of natural abundance and sufficiency.

Our model embeds transformative principles into institutions. No *individuals* need become saints. Smaller experiments demonstrate that, over time, consciousness changes through practice and people increase their collaborative capacity along with their trust in the system to restore our sense of embeddedness within life and with each other.

Our Inspiration

For many millennia, humans lived in collaborative societies, sharing resources with care for all life. Even after empires subjugated masses of people, most still managed resources as a commons until land expropriation interfered. Today, billions still depend on collaboratively managed commons for their daily living, as documented in myth-dispelling research by Nobel Laureate Elinor Ostrom. [Ref#3] The Acequias in the US Southwest, e.g., have managed desert water as a commons in unbroken continuity for several hundred years, without interference from government or corporate entities. [Ref#4]

We recognize the circle and forms of governance developed by indigenous peoples, especially the Iroquois. Their matrilineal system has operated consensually at multiple layers for hundreds of years. For example, Mohawk village councils are platforms for universal deliberation of issues then brought to the Council of Chiefs representing each of three clans. The first clan deliberates and proposes a resolution. The second and third clans either support the resolution or ask for a reconsideration. The process is repeated until all clans reach an agreement. [Ref#5&6] We remain clear that it's only because we lost this legacy that we need a new and complex system to re-integrate with these ways of being and governing.

We honor and derive sustenance from Mary Parker Follett, who laid out a comprehensive blueprint of local-to-global governance in 1918 in her book *The New State* [Ref#7], consisting of neighborhood associations coming together to form a global unit. In her book *Creative Experience*, Follett also articulated the shift from domination or compromise to integration as a way to collaborate in decision-making. [Ref#8]

We appreciate the pioneering work of Frederic Laloux, who described existing self-managing organizations in his book *Reinventing Organizations,* [Ref#9] demonstrating that humans can manage complex problems without people in some distant "top" telling them what to do.

We know of the remarkable story of Frome (England), where the town council is made up of ordinary citizens, sidestepping party politics and recognizing the need for trained facilitators for solutions that work for all stakeholders. [Ref#10]

We know that during the Spanish Civil War, many communities in Catalunya and beyond self-governed, both in production and in military operations, with impressive results. [Ref#11-14] Similarly, in the Rojava region (Syria), a fully participatory self-governance system has been operating since 2012, naming itself feminist and anarchist. It appears to be the only entity successfully fighting back ISIS. [Ref#15&16]

We are aware of participatory processes in Ecuador, Bolivia and elsewhere, where indigenous communities make local decisions and weave larger regional movements seeking greater ecological sustainability as well as more participatory democracy. [Ref#17&18] (Note that the degree to which these self-governing sustainability-oriented movements can co-exist with current extractive economies remains open.)

We know of dozens, likely hundreds, of randomly selected councils making wise decisions that are then embraced by official political bodies. [Ref#19]

We follow with interest developments in several parts of the world where top-down and bottom-up collaborations, including extensive citizen deliberation, have resulted in significant gains for all. Some notable examples are Taiwan, where citizen deliberation on controversial legislative topics is integrated into the parliamentary process; [Ref#20-22] Porto Alegre (Brazil), where participatory budgeting has resulted in increased participation (50,000 in 2011), improved infrastructure, and reduced income inequality in a city of 1.5m; [Ref#23-25] and Belo Horizonte (Brazil), where a city-council-led collaborative effort eliminated hunger in the city within a few years. [Ref#26-27]

We are aware of significant scholarship on nonviolent social movements, documenting ordinary people compelling high-level changes via public support and moral authority. [Ref#28]

We know of the extraordinary results of a months-long effort to restore New Orleans (US), involving several thousand residents using "breakthrough innovation" processes. [Ref#29]

We are aware that COP21 in Paris mobilized the power of collaboration in two ways. One was before the meeting: the deliberation of people in dozens of countries on the issues being discussed. [Ref#30] The other was *Indaba*, a Global South collaborative process from South Africa leading to a unanimous agreement that included all countries present. [Ref#31&32]

Our conclusion is simple: When we create conditions for collective human wisdom to emerge, it does. When people get together to solve problems that affect them and where they have autonomous authority to implement decisions, they do. The examples above are supported by growing research that challenges our assumptions about human nature. [Ref#33&34]

The Path Forward

We envision a transition to a comprehensive global governance system based on small circles seeking unanimous decisions with support from trained facilitators, with this architecture:

- Making decisions as close to those affected as possible
- Involving the entire global population in Local-to-Global Coordinating Circles for routine decisions, supplemented by ad hoc circles for more challenging decisions
- Voluntary implementation of decisions, motivated by the inclusiveness, wisdom, and moral authority of the circles
- Full transparency about everything in the system without compromising immediate safety

The entire global population is linked in a web of decision-making circles. These Local-to-Global Coordinating Circles make routine decisions at the most local node possible. More challenging decisions are handled by special ad hoc circles, formed either a) through random sampling or b) as multi-stakeholder circles. Decisions are implemented by the circles themselves or by existing political and private bodies when material resources not available to the circles are needed. We impose no legal requirement that such bodies act, relying instead on the public support we expect the circles to have. Given that either all citizens, a representative random sample, or a diverse multi-stakeholder group are making the decisions, circles carry tremendous moral weight. This is especially true because facilitated deliberation converges on decisions that work for all in the circle, thereby surfacing and attending to all variables. Although it is not yet proven that such moral force is powerful enough to drive global governance, it is the only viable alternative to armies and coercion, which can only perpetuate how the world now operates.

This design is ambitious enough that immediate implementation is not realistic within the world as it exists. A complex transition is necessary, aiming to replace the engine of a metaphorical plane while also continuing to fly, so as to support innovation within the current system even while it is being transformed.

Our approach includes:

- Beginning globally and locally simultaneously.
- Collaborating as possible with the UN, nation-states, corporations, and global leaders
- Gradual trust-building through global Ad Hoc Multi-Stakeholder Circles for complex and controversial issues.
- Gradual strengthening of the Local-To-Global Coordinating Circles as they coalesce and expand into Regional Coordinating Circles, eventually leading to a Global Coordinating Circle
- Gradual building of systems and infrastructure.
- Massive worldwide training in facilitation, conflict resolution, and nonviolent peacekeeping.

We estimate 15-30 years, with noticeable results beginning within the first few years.

(Note: this transition is cross-referenced using the notation [Diagram#n] to point to elements in the accompanying two diagrams.)

Initiation of the Transition (years 1-2)

Purpose: Work out everything needed to begin implementation. [Diagram#A]

Responsible Bodies: A Design and Implementation Circle (DIC) with full authority to solicit input and to make decisions (in collaboration with the UN where possible, or in parallel otherwise).

How Chosen: Randomly selected from among valid applicants for the prize competition, supplemented by Nobel Peace Laureates to ensure geographic representation of the global population.

Tasks:

1. Flesh out the design of the system (e.g. protecting circles from being bogged down by unstable individuals and methodologies for creating robust ad-hoc circles).
2. Identify financing to jumpstart the system until solidifying ongoing, voluntary funding sources through existing bodies (e.g. UN, corporations, nation states, philanthropists, and crowdfunding).
3. Conceptualize and design large-scale training in facilitation, conflict resolution, and nonviolent peacekeeping building on existing traditional cultural methods.
4. Plan how circles select representatives to establish regional, sub-continental, continental, and eventually a Global Coordinating Circle selected from and accountable to Local Coordinating Circles, including sophisticated rotation and recall mechanisms.
5. Create toolkits for Coordinating Circles, providing guidelines e.g. about functional principles, drawing on local cultures and wisdom, and selection of representatives to wider circles.
6. Design tools for information flow globally, regionally, and locally.
7. Identify criteria and select individuals to participate in the Global Initiating Circle (GIC) to generate the highest possible trust and authority in that body.
8. Design a random selection of 5,000 people to represent all countries, occupied entities, and regions, including pockets of indigenous cultural wisdom.
9. Design how this group will identify and prioritize the global issues to be attended to.
10. Design the permanent infrastructure to be lean, efficient, self-managed, without concentration of power, and able to compensate for global patterns of power distribution.

11. Solicit input from marginalized communities, especially from the global South and indigenous peoples, to increase the likelihood that the ultimate design will be globally appealing and implementable.
12. Issue formal invitations to the GIC. (Diagram#13)
13. Transfer responsibility to the GIC and disband.

Immediate Steps (years 3-6)

Purpose: Identify and address the most pressing global issues while beginning local coordination. [Diagram#B]

Responsible Bodies: The Global Initiating Circle (GIC), with the authority to initiate ad hoc circles. (Diagram#14)

How Chosen: Invited by the DIC.

Tasks:

1. Initiate the ad hoc 5,000-person random sample to identify and prioritize the most pressing issues with global input. [Diagram#15]
2. Initiate Ad Hoc Multi-Stakeholder Circles (AHMSCs) for the identified issues. [Diagram#16]
3. Invite the world's citizenry to begin organizing Local Coordinating Circles using the DIC's toolkits. [Diagram#17]
4. Initiate massive global training in facilitation. [Diagram#18]
5. Initiate an AHMSC to fund the permanent infrastructure. [Diagram#19]

Next Steps (years 6-12)

Purpose: Solidify global ad hoc circles; begin operating continentally; support local circles in coalescing into wider geographic scope. [Diagram#C]

Responsible Bodies: The Global Initiating Circle (GIC); Continental Initiating Circles (CIC) with the authority to initiate ad hoc circles; Coordinating Circles with the authority to make local and regional routine decisions.

How Chosen: CICs are invited by the GIC; LCCs self-organize and select representatives to regional circles and beyond.

Tasks:

1. GIC: Form Continental Initiating Circles on each continent (selected similarly to the GIC) to begin identifying and addressing continental issues. [Diagram#20]
2. GIC and CICs: Initiate annual Ad Hoc Randomly Selected Circles (AHRSC) to identify global and continental priorities. [Diagram#21]
3. GIC and CICs: Initiate AHMSCs to address the above issues. [Diagram#22]
4. GIC and CICs: Initiate AHRSC instead whenever sufficient trust exists and the issues call for broad diversity of views. [Diagram#22]
5. LCCs: Deepen capacity to take on more decisions. [Diagram#23]

6. LCCs: Coalesce into regional circles and beyond and convene ad hoc circle. [Diagram#24]
7. GIC: Initiate massive global training in conflict resolution and restorative practices. [Diagram#25]
8. All: Begin to populate elements of the permanent infrastructure. [Diagram#26]

Medium-Term Steps (years 10-20)

Purpose: Continue weaving the global and the local. [Diagram#D]

Responsible Bodies: The Global Initiating Circle (GIC); Continental Initiating Circles (CIC); Sub-Continental Initiating Circles (SCIC); Local Coordinating Circles (LSC) and beyond.

How Chosen: SCICs are invited by the CICs; LCCs self-organize and select representatives to regional circles and beyond.

Tasks:

1. Initiating Circles: Continue operations as above globally and within continents and subcontinents. [Diagram#27]
2. Coordinating Circles: Continue solidifying operations, improving selection criteria for representatives to wider circles, enhancing conflict resolution mechanisms, increasing accountability. [Diagram#27]
3. Coordinating Circles: Take on the functions of Initiating Circles whenever a Sub-continental or Continental Coordinating Circle forms. [Diagram#28&29]
4. GIC: Initiate massive training in nonviolent, unarmed peacekeeping methods. [Diagram#30]
5. GIC: Begin deploying nonviolent, unarmed peace forces in regional conflicts.
6. All: Continue to populate the permanent infrastructure. [Diagram#27]

Final Implementation (years 15-30)

Purpose: Complete weaving the system to full implementation. [Diagram#E]

Responsible Bodies: Same as above.

Tasks:

1. Initiating Circles: Continue operations as above until Coordinating Circles are ready to take on their functions. [Diagram#33]
2. Coordinating Circles: Continue solidifying operations and resolving kinks using feedback mechanisms. [Diagram#32]
3. Coordinating Circles: Complete taking on the functions of Initiating Circles. [Diagram#32]
4. All: Complete the task of populating the permanent infrastructure. [Diagram#32]
5. GIC: Pass responsibility to the Global Coordinating Circle (GCC) when it forms. [Diagram#34]
6. GIC: Celebrate completion and disband. [Diagram#34]

At this point, people everywhere participate in their LCCs, work out local decisions and select representatives for wider Coordinating Circles that attend to all routine coordination decisions. AHRSCs name, prioritize, and attend to complex issues. AHMSCs are used less and less often as the

level of trust within the world increases. Nonviolent peace forces are a robust, viable, and frequently sought alternative to UN armed peacekeeping forces and to war.

Structural Details

Post-transition, the institutions and functions of the system stabilize as below. Humanity is already actively engaged with many of the most immense challenges we are currently facing, some of which have already been addressed through the intensive transition processes. Mechanisms for catching new ones operate indefinitely at deeper and deeper layers as the system continually evolves and adapts.

Local to Global Coordinating Circles (LTGCC) [Diagram#1-7]
Function: Attending to routine decisions.

Details: The Local Coordinating Circles, usually up to 100 people, decide on resource sharing within their circle, resolving conflicts between neighbors, and more. Anything that has effects on or requires input from outside their circles, is transferred to a wider circle that is composed of unanimously selected representatives from the Local Circles: maybe a neighborhood or village. These also make decisions within their range of influence such as: foods to grow within their area; drop-off locations for food from outside the area; and childcare arrangements. Such decisions are made in consultation with local circles as needed. This process continues with wider and wider circles making decisions in consultation with circles within them and with existing political entities whenever they are affected or when the Coordinating Circles seek resources from them.

To minimize the risk of power concentration, anyone selected for any circle continues to attend meetings of their Local Coordinating Circle and every other circle in between, as well as the widest scope circle to which they have been selected. All selections are rotating, with tighter rotations the closer to global a circle is.

For as long as nation states continue to exist, Coordinating Circles match nation states (e.g. block-neighborhood-town-county-region-country), and representation in Continental and Global Coordinating Circles is proportional to population size. As trust evolves over decades, cultural and geographic delineations may slowly replace nation states.

Ad Hoc Randomly Selected Circles (AHRSC) [Diagram#8]
Function: Attending to complex decisions requiring research and digestion of data; feedback from large populations; interviews of experts; or in-depth deliberations.

Details: AHRSCs are always facilitated to unanimity. People enter the circle as themselves: citizens of the globe, or nation, or region that is convening the circle, absent any specific role. The emerging wisdom is based on converging the diversity of needs, perspectives, and social locations that a random sample generates.

One of the tasks for which AHRSCs are regularly summoned by Coordinating Circles is an annual process of researching the most pressing issues and handing them over to the Coordinating Circle to initiate ad hoc circles to address them.

Ad Hoc Multi-Stakeholder Circles (AHMSC) [Diagram#9]

Function: Attending to decisions with the following characteristics:

- There is known controversy surrounding the decision or topic.
- It appears necessary to include people at the very top of current political or economic institutions, who are quite unlikely to be picked up in a random selection.
- It appears necessary to invoke wisdom that is role-dependent rather than just randomly distributed in a population.
- The topic appears in an arena of low-trust.

Details: AHMSCs are invited by Coordinating Circles for a specific issue or decision, and have full authority about conducting their business. People are invited into an AHMSC based on their role or position.

In most ways, these circles operate in the same manner as AHRSCs. However, given that often there are likely to be extreme power differences within these circles, systemic mechanisms are put in place for all voices to be heard and to have the capacity to shape the outcome.

We anticipate that for some time, many or most global issues and challenges will be addressed by AHMSCs, and the introduction of AHRSCs will be gradual as trust and familiarity with collaboration develop.

Case Study from the Future: *It's Water Again*

The year is 2045. It's morning, and Jasmine, one of the most sought after facilitators in difficult inter-regional conflicts around the world, is waking up in Owens Valley, California, the site of water wars in the 1930s. She is about to mediate a conflict between local representatives and those from Los Angeles, randomly selected from the two populations. The topic: LA residents have continued to consume more water than stipulated in energy-descent plan agreements about water diversion from the Owens Valley reservoir. The key question remained: What would make conservation attractive enough -- without coercive measures that everyone knew would backfire -- to people used to some of the highest standards of living in the world? For the locals, the issues were grave. They wanted access to their own resources; the capacity to live in dignity within their means. It was hard for them to agree, voluntarily, to continue to make sacrifices for "a bunch of high-consumption LA residents who still won't budge on their swimming pools." When she talked with people from both sides, she was amazed how much resentment simmered.

She set her intention for the day: to trust the people who would come together to address the conflict. Especially when people were angry and didn't trust each other, she knew how important it was that she trust them completely.

She entered the room, and intermixed the fourteen people who were there to support convergence, starting with reaching shared ownership of all the needs. She knew shared ownership would be a challenge only for those who grew up under scarcity mentality; not for the youth.

After hearing everyone's hopes, she invited everyone to speak about what was most essential for them that the other side would hear. Then she asked for a volunteer from the other group to summarize what was important to the previous speaker. When passion and agitation flared up, she

stepped in to do the reflection herself. So often choice of words created polarization when the underlying intention could produce connection. The most dramatic shift happened when a woman from LA, who was previously defensive and ready to "but…" everything said by the Owens Valley people, said: "I can see how difficult it is for you. It would be for me, too, if I were living here in this… desert … that we … created … for you."

Whenever they got to the bottom of what someone was expressing, and could capture their underlying needs in a few simple words, she wrote the phrase on the board. She was constructing the needs list that would later serve as the basis for finding a solution: one list, undifferentiated, for shared ownership. A solution could only arise from everyone holding all the needs together.

By late afternoon, the list was ready. They all knew that the only solution that would work would be one that addressed all these needs, in a way that would support the LA people to engage with the discomfort of facing the effects of their actions without the risk of future resentment so they could remain openhearted when crafting an agreement.

She divided them into groups of four, two from each region, to brainstorm solutions without losing track of all the needs. From time to time, anger resurfaced in one of the groups, which meant something was still not fully heard. New needs were added and disseminated among the groups. Their mandate was to stay together until they came up with a solution. She reconnected to her intention from the morning. Someone in the room would find the solution.

Just as she was ready to call it a day, one group broke out in a loud cheer. The youngest member in the room had come up with a solution. It often happened, because they were the least burdened with past habits. The young man changed the terms. Since it wasn't really about water, he said, and since the most important needs were about care, he suggested that the LA region support the Owens Valley region by sending people every summer to support local production of food, as well as scientists who would research more innovative approaches to regional sufficiency. This would not be instead of reducing consumption. The commitment was clear as day; it was just a matter of maintaining the overarching integrity with the non-coercive principles. They simply couldn't reduce consumption enough without coercion, and he wanted to have another way to care for the locals. As a rep from LA, he was confident in his ability to mobilize hundreds of youth. The locals were moved by his passion and the commitment to find a way to care for their needs. The LA folks were inspired to see a way out of the either-or. Everyone agreed, wholeheartedly. No one had to give up anything. It was partnership, for the first time. Now, the implementers would hammer out the details.

Systems and Mechanisms

What's left to describe is how the proposed global governance system actually operates.

Decision-Making Process

A core element for this model is that all decisions are unanimous. Based on our experience and research, a group of people focused on solving a practical problem together and committed to finding a solution that works for all unleashes extraordinary creativity and wisdom, transforming even cynical participants in the process. Because of the complexity of reaching unanimous decisions, this proposal calls for massive training of facilitators to serve everywhere. Such facilitators will be trained in multiple known processes that reliably yield collaborative decisions while avoiding the pitfalls of

traditional consensus meetings, such as Convergent Facilitation, Dynamic Facilitation, Systemic Consensing, and Indaba, [Ref#35-37,31&32].

We are aware that in many instances there is an illusion of immediate efficiency in relaxing the constraint of unanimity. Yet we are also aware of all too many examples of decisions made quickly that, in the longer run, resulted in more strife, conflict, and resource depletion. A painful example is the US Civil War, where a swift decision to impose terms on the Southern States still reverberates with separation and violence 150 years later.

Resource Generation, Allocation, and Management
We are aware that the Global Challenges Foundation is a civil society organization, without the specific power and resources necessary to implement whatever entry is selected. Therefore, we have designed the system to be self-funded.

Even beyond the transition, given our commitment to everything being voluntary and inclusive, we still envision a system that creatively funds itself through a variety of mechanisms.

- **Coordinating Circles**. Each circle uses a variety of funding structures, from crowdfunding within its sphere to voluntary transfers from other regions and entities (e.g. US and European countries and/or corporations extracting from the global South can fund global South operations for a while) while preserving full autonomy of local circles.
- **Ad Hoc Circles**. Because ad hoc circles are self-contained, we consider them, financially, as a "project" that starts when the circle is initiated and ends with a final decision. The initiating body provides seed money for a project manager who, in particular, creates a budget, fundraises, and recruits support staff. We envision careful attention to global power differences when hiring, especially when decisions affect people in the global South.
- **Permanent infrastructure.** [Diagram#11] Our design aims for self-management, yet we see a permanent infrastructure as necessary to maintain institutional knowledge and to provide services and coordination. Here are its initial components:
  - General infrastructure: e.g. technological support and innovation; administrative coordination; interface with the public; internal coherence and system maintenance, including review and upgrade of all systems and design.
  - Decision making: e.g. budgeting and funding for training (e.g. facilitation, project management, leadership capacity); coordination of projects (e.g. ad hoc circles, training); support and coaching for Coordinating Circles; live translation.
  - Resource allocation: e.g. budgeting for initiation of projects and functions; fundraising.
  - Information flow: e.g. tracking of information; review of platforms to enhance accessibility; document translation.
  - Feedback: e.g. ongoing review and dissemination of feedback within the system; translation of feedback; receiving and digesting input from the public.
  - Conflict resolution: e.g. training of nonviolent peacekeeping units; permanent coordination of autonomous, self-managing peacekeeping forces.

We anticipate sufficient rotation to prevent concentration of power, and sufficient stability to create coherence and institutional memory.

Information Flow

The core principle of transparency runs through the system, limited only by imminent threats to life. The system operates with sensitivity to issues of accessibility across cultural differences and local conditions, as well as ease in information exchange between regions, languages, and parts of the system to support learning and emergence of global awareness.

The intention is for all agendas, notes, and other documents generated anywhere in the system to be available to anyone, and most specifically to those who are affected by deliberations. This information can be shared in creative ways that access all types of intelligences, including through theater or participatory video in addition to text-based approaches. This also includes using the Coordinating Circles to quickly reach everyone in the world in concentric circles.

For Ad Hoc Circles, information can be shared at key milestones including announcing issues, soliciting input, and disseminating final decisions and debrief notes to support learning.

In addition, the permanent infrastructure can disseminate information widely e.g. about its functions, results of feedback, decisions made about its operations, upcoming training opportunities, positions within the system, and budgets.

Feedback Loops

To support learning, evolution, and accountability, our design establishes opportunities for participants and stakeholders to give and receive feedback on what is working and what isn't, everywhere within the system. The design includes criteria used for evaluation, methods for giving and receiving feedback, methods for analyzing it, and methods for incorporating learning and change.

Feedback plays a critical role regarding individuals selected to represent a Coordinating Circle in the next wider circle. This is a particularly sensitive area. Millennia of power-over functioning have been internalized within all of us. This can easily lead to those with the most privilege being selected, and/or silencing negative feedback regarding those selected, especially if they are selected beyond the next wider circle. Thus, by design, individuals who operate in multiple circles receive feedback regularly, and can always be recalled and replaced by any circle that selected them.

Any project, ad hoc circle, training, team, and functionary with specific, time-delimited roles also receives feedback, including in particular facilitators, individuals working in conflict resolution, nonviolence peacekeeping units, and anyone in an administrative position.

At periodic intervals, say, every 2 years, the Global Coordinating Circle can initiate an AHRSC to evaluate the entire system and propose changes.

Finally, in addition to planned feedback, the system is designed to incorporate and learn from any feedback offered, directly by individuals and groups, or implicitly through e.g. media reporting.

Conflict Resolution

We understand conflict to be an integral, necessary aspect of human life. Our design includes a restorative approach to conflict anywhere. Information about resolved conflicts can then be disseminated for feedback and inspiration.

As restorative approaches grow in robustness, from neighborhood disputes to geopolitical challenges, we anticipate that authority might shift to this system from the current adversarial and retributive legal systems.

To make use of every possible resource, our approach allows conflict to be addressed locally or beyond where it occurs, and calls on youth, women, and elders to step into conflict-resolution authority using approaches that exist across cultures.

Within Coordinating Circles, most conflicts can be resolved with local resources or the support of those trained in conflict resolution. As needed, an AHMSC can be summoned to attend to the conflict. (See the water story above.)

For intense conflicts, the design calls for actions to prevent the conflict from devolving into war. When such efforts are not successful, nonviolent peacekeeping forces can be used for de-escalation. So far, small-scale, nonviolent, third-party intervention has had remarkable results. [Ref#38] [Diagram#10]

Every such intense conflict, once resolved, is investigated, so as to learn to avert other calamities and incorporate possible system changes.

Is This Possible?

Imagine the time is thirteenth-century feudal Europe. You are a traveler from the nineteenth century, meeting with people of different social locations, introducing the absolutely revolutionary idea that the world could be organized on the principle of competition and merit.

The locals know only a world in which the station in life into which they were born determines their life. The idea that a farmer's son could choose to be a tailor, for example, is unimaginable.

In response to your proposal, they tell you that you are naïve, dangerous, or both. They tell you that no one would ever do anything if they weren't compelled to do it based on the strong coercive structures that existed at that time. They would say it was against human nature, and against God, who had specifically endorsed the existing order. Chaos would ensue, and expertise would get lost when not transferred carefully from father to son.

And yet something like that transformation has happened, however imperfectly. The industrial revolution and the political revolutions that arose in tandem created a social order that would have been impossible for our ancestors to fathom.

The idea of a collaborative order based on need satisfaction and willingness finds a similar resistance. People consider it as going against human nature. Many claim that no one would do anything without external incentives; that competition is what drives excellence; and that generosity, kindness, and willingness are not sufficient to run things. A fully collaborative society is just as unthinkable in a world based on competition as competition was for an authority-based society.

If competition as the foundation of a social order emerged from medieval times, is it, perhaps, possible to create a collaborative future from our competitive present?