

New rules for a new world

By

Gene Fredericks

Putting the civil in civilization

A very loose framework for a new approach to governing

I may be crazy, but have you looked around lately?

Revised based on Trump

Personal note:

For years, I've heard friends, enemies, politicians, newscasters, and nearly everyone complaining about the government, a law, or another group. Saying "they" did this or "they" did that, if "they" would just, the problem is "they", it is "their" fault!... Basically, each side is complaining or, frankly bitching. I am not saying I have never bitched; however, I realized at one point that I did not want to take sides in many of these bitching sessions and thought, "ok if I don't want to bitch or take a side, what can I say and do?" I wondered, since to me the present governments seem to be failing in so many ways and there appeared to be no hope of truly fixing them, then what could be done? I thought, "Ok, so if this system is broken beyond repair, then what can be done to replace it?" I posed this question: "Will there ever be another form of government? If not, we are stuck with the mess we have and are all doomed to go where the maelstrom takes us. Or, if the answer is yes and there could be another form of government, what could, would, or should it be? Personally, I felt that was a much better way to spend my time than taking on an opposing view and suiting up in my political armor for the combat and fights to defend my side.

We have freedom of speech, but it seems we don't have a willingness to listen. With all the free speakers, and there seems to be more all the time, there needs to be a listener. A listener that is willing to hear what is said before attacking what is said. All speakers and no listeners is untenable.

Over the years, that is what I have been thinking and doing. Whenever talking with people about contentious issues, rather than taking a side, I ask them, "If you feel "they' are the problem and "they" feel you are the problem, then you can't both be right and the problem is you won't see common ground and will only stand your ground. To those who I can speak to, I say "no one has the right to tell another "they" are wrong, yet each side does have the right to convince the other side that their side is correct. This makes for an ongoing dialog with no emphatic, often violent conclusions; it creates an active debate, even if it is heated. At our core, most people feel they are right and want to do the right thing. I believe most individuals are motivated by what they feel is right, even if that belief may seem twisted and abhorrent to others. Feeling you are right does not make it right. Fighting for what you think is right does not mean yours is the only side worth fighting for. If a belief is so strong that nothing can change that position, and if this is true for both sides, then there will never be a resolution, and the fighting will go on and on and.... A passionate belief should not be misconstrued as a moral imperative.

That mode of thinking and of non-communication is in play all around the world in every community and even within families. The unwillingness to entertain or consider another opinion and the validity that each side has as much right to their beliefs as the other is a formula for unending fighting. Accordingly, each side can expect that their "tit" will be responded to by their "tat," and the tit-for-tat tug of war will go on forever.

I prefer not to engage in the tit for tat continuum. Rather, I ask those I speak with to see that the other side has a right to their opinion, and it is more productive to hear that perspective than to ignore or attempt to destroy its right to exist. It is summed up in my statement, "I have no right to tell you that you are wrong, but I do have the right to convince you that I am correct. Let the discussion begin! I am surprised by how many people I mention this new approach to, who actually stop and think about it as a possibility, sadly, not all. Given my passive sideline position and observations, I have decided to put my overall thoughts into a position paper that I hope will lead to open discussions. I am not expecting my thoughts or perspective to take hold anytime soon; radical change rarely does. I merely want the perspective to be expressed and understood. Change is always difficult, and the motivation to keep the status quo is strong, especially for those who have something to lose, such as in power, money, influence, or their well-protected moral core.

I am not advocating a "one world" government. Rather, I am advocating a grassroots movement that has some very basic and far-reaching tenets that could, over time, sway a larger and larger base to adopt a healthier, more equitable creed of conduct to perpetuate it. Perpetuate not by preaching in a missionary way or a forceful way, but by example. If

individuals could speak their mind without reprisal and listen without retaliation, I believe they would feel better about themselves, within themselves, and perhaps see that feeling as a settling reward, versus the current alternative of the venomous, angry, arm-crossed, and foot-stomping not budging attitude many currently live by. “Do unto others as you wish them to do unto you” is the basis of many religions, and most people are taught this principle as children. But over time, that basic teaching seems to either erode or never take hold, and yet it offers the most clear-conscious approach to life, if individuals want to adopt it. To debate is healthy, in my opinion. The unwillingness to engage in it is not! A simple change to be willing to listen, even if in the end there is no change in one's position, is far better than being steadfast and recalcitrant.

As a thought experiment, given the current state of affairs, imagine how the world will be and what it will look like in one hundred, two hundred, or one thousand years from today. Just think to yourself what kind of world it will be. Will the proliferation of nuclear weapons reach the explosive breaking point? Will the avarice of dictatorial authoritarians crush and suffocate the rights of the masses? Or will we find some better way to live more harmoniously with greater autonomy and hope for a better future? We need to put more “civil” in civilization, or devolve into a less civilized society with tribal-like warfare everywhere.

Most who read this will likely feel the ideas are unrealistic pie-in-the-sky thoughts that can never be adopted. Perhaps that is true. I might be called crazy, but I cannot be called naive. I have lived for over seven decades and watched the failed attempts for society to control itself, govern itself, and please itself. All I have seen is more fracturing, dissension, and dysfunction. I have seen new democracies formed and dissolved. Authoritarians take power and are overthrown. All the while, behind the scenes, there was a vacuum of alternatives. That is our reality. That is our current state of affairs. If nothing is proposed, nothing will change.

However, my attempt is worth the flight of fancy and the accusations of craziness that will likely follow, since the alternative seems crazy to me. If each side feels the other is wrong and can't or won't listen to the other side, or reason with them, then to me that is crazy, since it is logically impossible for both sides to be “right” at the same time. Each can only be a polarized one-sided perspective and belief about a contentious issue. This is made worse when laws are created that pit these sides against each other. War and strife are inevitable if we cannot find a way past this “us and them” approach. There must be, or should be, a place where the WE becomes the goal, not the us and them.

I wonder, what percentage of the world's populations are disenchanting with their leadership and government? How many disenfranchised people are there? How many apathetic constituents of nations all over the globe would prefer a change? How many people prefer not to fight for what is right, but just do what is right? Those are the individuals that this manifesto

is meant for, not the ones who want “their” way, nor the ones who see power as the goal and control as the means. Rather, I am addressing the ones in the world who are forced to be part of a governing body with its rules and restrictions because they have no alternative but to choose between the lesser of two evils, or, more politely put, political parties.

What would that world and an alternate way of governance look like? What would be possible if all those individuals who want basic change could come together? The following is my attempt to place some foundational pieces in place. These ideas and thoughts are active and changing; the journey toward improvements remains ongoing.

Gene Fredericks

Dreams of new rules for a new world

A Manifesto

The notion that a globally decentralized government could be created is far-fetched, mostly because it has not been attempted thus far. However, the development in technologies, communication, and the evolution of society have brought us to a place where this idealistic notion is theoretically possible, geopolitically necessary, and should be considered. The strife and gridlock that exists within and among the current governmental systems make it necessary to seek alternative forms of governing that can redefine what a government needs to be in this smaller and smaller yet increasingly diverse and conflicted world. Alternatives need to be considered and should be designed. What is proposed here is a rough framework based on the areas that seem to be in most need of reform. When the basics change, the implications of the existing dogmas do too.

We can now communicate everywhere instantaneously. There are currently people around the globe who feel and think similarly who can and do act in unison, sometimes for the good but often for the bad. Radical groups have found ways to communicate so they can come together virtually and act out locally. The fringes are finding followers and amassing them. More individuals everywhere are coming out to express who they are and what they believe in. The breadth of acceptable norms is widening while governments are becoming more divisive, draconian, and dysfunctional. Dissent is on the rise, and so are punitive controls, contentious rules, and laws. Discord is prevailing over consensus, while more and more individuals are discontented and resigned to sideline silence and apathetic non-involvement.

Yet, there are also individuals around the globe who want peace, harmony, and prosperity without all the political rancor, bitter divides, and land and power grabbing. These individuals are globally distributed, diverse in ethnicity and ideology, and could be aligned for a common purpose. Unlike the radical fringes and the religiously aligned factions that thrive on righteous sanctimony, these individuals want stability, acceptance, tolerance, and a better way that can come together when we unite, even with disagreements.

We have been told human nature cannot change and that we need to accept the way things are. If that is the case then there is no hope and there is no next form of fair and equitable governance and civilized progress. That is like a snake eating its tail and rolling forward, eating itself alive as it moves. Our bitter uncompromising global bickering will lead to annihilation.

Yet, there is another part of humanity that will not accept that status quo. It is the side of human nature where progress, knowledge, mutual understanding exists and attempts to change what is broken in the world and wants to work toward creating something that is better and more encouraging and sustainable. It is the peacemakers, the visionaries, the ombudsman. They exist as a way of controlling the most egregious so it does not become the accepted norm. Their role is not a prominent one, just a necessary one.

The diversity of personal preferences is increasing and so is the repression and opposition. With the religious wars brewing visibly and behind the scenes, in the end which god will win. In the personal preference vs law enforced restrictions war, how far and how many personal and civil liberties can be taken away by laws before we say enough, or have no choice. In the “this side vs that side” geopolitical struggles to control the world, which form of government will win? The struggles that all of those scenarios portends leave our future filled with bitterness, dysfunction and isolation even down to individuals in families. There needs to be a better way even if that might seem unrealistic, idealist, fantasy or lunacy. Because the alternative now on our current course is destruction, and bitter madness, with the emphasis on madness!

The following foundational elements for a new way of governing, locally and globally offers alternatives to what seem to be the greatest obstacles to our current dilemma, and opens a fertile landscape where the notions can take root and flourish.

It sets up the governing tenants as goals to be reached over however long it takes, expecting that change and modification is built into the design with a flexible self directed and self correcting approach. Rigid laws break, flexible laws bend. Inclusion grows while exclusion shrinks, understanding and tolerance teaches and expands, dogma and elitism brainwash and stifles. Acceptance of differences increases dialog, rejection of other opinions silences and divides.

An informed voting public is what is asked for in democracies, yet majority rule democracies leaves as much as 49.999% of the informed public seemingly misinformed, and overruled.

Having strong opinions is a good thing; confusing a strong opinion with the truth or what is right is not. Being proud of who you are can be liberating; denial of that right can be infuriating. We need a better way! The problems we face are with humanity and how we treat each other, and are not unique to any single form of government.

The various forms of governing we have around the world today were mostly started by discontented people wanting a change and formulated new ways to govern. That is needed again.

The foundation for a new form of governing.

1. No Provincial borders
 1. Constituents globally disperse
 2. Virtual governance
2. No divisive laws
 1. Laws that merely cause contention are avoided
 2. Plurality rules, not majority
3. No choosing sides
 1. Opinions are a right, dialogue is defended
 2. Discussion and debate are encouraged
4. No law is absolute.
 1. Moral beliefs supersede civil rules
 2. Strong personal beliefs are honored
5. No secrecy
 1. Vote choices and preferences are open to view
 2. Preference profiles are shared
6. No supreme governors
 1. Leadership is fluid
 2. Common sense for common good is promoted
7. Economic independence, financial, health and welfare support
 1. Financial interdependence social concern, community support
 2. Have not funds give service
8. Recruit by example
 1. Participate in the plan to refine by experience and involvement
 2. Participation is not inherited

No provincial borders.

Problem:

Currently, there are no lands on earth that are not controlled by national interests or individuals.

Most modern land nations beyond the early empires and their colonies were started by groups of discontented members from their former country. For example, American pilgrims wanted to escape the tyranny of monarchies and search for religious freedoms, and eventually migrated to new lands and formed new nations. Similarly, other groups of people decided to break off from their motherland to create a new form of governance and a new generation in their region. They formed small nation-states surrounded by other nations. Warring territories also needed to create defensible areas to fend off unwanted rule. Avaricious leaders annex neighboring lands in the name of unification. The churn of the provincial government is ongoing.

Today, the world does not have any geographic locations that are not under the control of another nation and even if a section of a country decides to secede and form another nation, the need to build the necessary protections and infrastructures to support a new fledgling nation are formidable and fragile.

Yet, the level of internal discontentment and apathetic attitudes toward existing governments everywhere is increasing. Even with voting, the legislative gridlock seems to be pervasive. Most governments have been corrupted by a small minority of wealthy, powerful, and influential people who dictate their will to a large majority. Many of the governing principles and laws are biased and divisive, leading to perpetual conflict due to the desire to impose the will of what may be a slim majority.

When foreigners live and work in a foreign country, they can only stay for a period of time and most often cannot easily become a citizen. More and more people are living and working outside of their passport home country, often attempting to establish dual or multinational citizenship.

Even in homogeneous communities, there are more and more sensitive and contentious issues that are making it difficult to govern with the standard majority rule laws, regardless of where on the globe they are in force.

In this new electronic social media-connected world, we can instantly communicate with like-minded sympathetic people around the globe. This open personal identity portal is here, and it is growing. Yet, the subsequent proliferation of unique individual beliefs and the right to defend them is difficult to achieve alone. The unwillingness to accept others' opinions leads to violence from both sides. An unwillingness to accept another's beliefs and wishes has eroded into denials, twisted fabrications of the truth, and open acceptance of known falsehoods. The desire to believe that only one view is right and vindictively attacking dissenting ones in the sake of righteousness has superseded the societal need for common sense and courtesy.

If an individual or group does not like the way they are being treated or governed, they have few choices. Either stay and try to effect change with a vote, leave and try to find a more compatible nation closer to their beliefs, or be resigned to just accept and ignore. Standing up and fighting for what one believes in seems noble, yet it is still fighting and often futile, leading to bitterness, contempt, and polarization. This only furthers the divides and does not repair the schism.

Leaving one's homeland to search for a better place has been done over the centuries, and although there are nations with governments that offer better alternatives, they may not accept immigrants, and if they do, the society there may have its own set of unwelcome customs and rules. In the end, one is governed based on where they live, not by what they believe. The other alternative is to be resigned to the status quo and passively be taken in the direction it goes.

There are many individuals around the globe who like where they live but not how they are governed and see no hope in changing the prevailing political will, realizing to challenge it will lower their quality of life or put them in jeopardy. It is with and for this type of disconnected individual that we need to contemplate a new way. A way to have one's beliefs honored and represented, even if they are not accepted in their domicile. It is with the passions of a few in many lands that we must create a passionate force that requires no violence, no overthrow, no revolt. It is a movement from within that can change the external status quo over time, by example.

It appears that passive non-involvement is the most common stance taken, and there is an increasing number of discontented, disaffected people around the globe. There are many

other problems surrounding the current provincial, geographical, and border-based ways of governing.

Making it impossible to go to a “place” where the influence and control of existing nations is not in force, and the internal volatile struggles are seemingly unreasonable.

Like the tectonic plates of the earth, they shift, crack, explode, and never return to the same place. And, like those fractured governments are all over the globe and make up all the places we live with violent upheavals on many of the borders. We are learning to live and build on these volatile tectonic edges on Earth. We should think about this as we plan how we are to be governed and do so with a safer, more stable footing in mind, all over the globe.

The idea that all of the individual minds in a given country would be willing to change and agree on a new form of governing is not likely. The divisiveness that exists today is a main obstacle. Yet, to attract like-minded individuals in each country around the globe is feasible. Most religions act this way. The believers live in countries all over the globe and adhere to a common set of principles around a god or a faith.

Also, if the individuals in a physical land were to agree on a new form of governing in that land, the militaries of the world are there to stop them. It is extremely unlikely to form a new government with provincial borders. Yet, it is feasible, albeit difficult, to form a geographically dispersed governance body that can grow by absorbing the discontented, the apathetic, the mindful, non-judgmental people of the world.

Solution:

To form a new global “nation” that does not have geopolitical borders to confirm and conform its people but rather has an open constituent alliance and mindshare that willingly agrees to adhere to a set of self-imposed and self-adjusting rules in an ongoing attempt to relieve societal biased tensions and increase stability, tranquility, and diversity globally. This virtual nation would have members all over the globe with no land that enclosed them and no borders or territory to defend. There would be no civil disobedience. This nation's citizens would take no stance in politics and attempt to have no way to be persecuted or prosecuted.

The new nation's rules would be broad in their scope yet clear in their intent. Since this new “nation” would not have physical boundaries the members of this coalition would need to reside in other lands in all countries. The provincial laws in these respective countries would need to be obeyed yet the voting and the participation in the local customs, rituals, beliefs,

morals, and defense of their local laws would be avoided or where possible altered to reflect the basic tenants of the new nation. As a member of another nation, status in the residing country would be that of a foreigner in a foreign land, the membership of the new nation would be required to pay taxes and health and welfare fees where they reside until such time as there is a plurality of members in the new nation with the requisite support structure to replace the provincial government services. Common good institutions, such as in banking, health care, insurance, etc... would be created and grown over time.

Rather than have borders that define the boundaries of what is right or wrong, what is legal or illegal, this new nation will have individuals who are connected globally by a common set of rules, everywhere. The rules reside within each member, not from an external body. Each individual's skills, talents, vision, economic support, and desire to see a better way will become the unified whole that this new nation strives to perpetuate.

The communication connectivity that exists in the world allows us to create a geographically dispersed nation of like-minded people who are able to come together as needed to make decisions and initiate acts that can change how provincial governments work, while living within them. In effect, this global alliance can effect change globally, one local at a time. Much like a religion or member organization, this nation will have members that may not live in proximity to each other but share a connectedness and a singular purpose.

Because of its distributed global structure, inclusive diversity with no single point of control, this new age nation will have resiliency and defensibility against those who are threatened or disturbed by its creation and growth. By design, this open-minded accepting coalition should be no threat and, in fact, be welcome to debate, challenges, and apathy.

Each member of this new borderless nation willingly accepts the beliefs of others wherever they live and agrees not try to impose their will on any local. A core tenet is to agree to accept and defend others' right to diversity without violence or subjugation. Agreeing to accept another belief does not mean agreeing with the belief, just their right to have it. Without heated rhetoric, each member will be willing to foster ongoing dialogue everywhere to replace local violence and vigilantes. Each individual would want to add local members to this new accepting coalition that is organized to perpetuate the common good and common sense of all, not merely the controlling majority. Leading by basic example in each local and refraining from joining polarizing chics would be the expected conduct.

Encouraging mutual dialogue and compromise would be the methodology to promote the ideas of the new nation. Focusing on doing what is best for all can create admiration, but also jealous negativity, which, when it arises, can be used as a teaching point to highlight that sentiment is part of the problem that this new nation is attempting to solve. Those who see this as a necessary solution will experience the pressure-relieving benefits. Those who cannot will continue to suffer from their slings and arrows that will eventually find them as their target. People tend to say “they” did this or “they” did that, and have a difficult time realizing that at some point, they are someone else “they”, and each and everyone of us is “they” to others. The goal is to focus on the amazing diversity of the collective “US”, which we are ALL also part of.

The promotion of a non-religious, non-political, non-exclusive member union will create an inclusive state designed to incorporate all of those with strong beliefs. In that religious beliefs, all religious beliefs, will be welcome so long as the believers do not act as missionaries, all political persuasions will be welcome so long as they do not act as lobbyists, and all special interest club members will be welcome so long as they don’t become elitist or secretive. The new globally distributed nation encourages diversity, self-expression, and devout passionate members, so long as they respect that other members have the same right to their passionate beliefs. The common bond and allegiance will be to find the greater good of all and the ongoing willingness to determine what that is without bitterness, violence, and ignorance.

Compromise is the beginning of positive collective action. Dissension is the end of constructive progress. The preliminary name for this new form of governing is “Populiocracy” from the Latin word “Populi” - the will of the people. The will of the people globally, even in small numbers everywhere, can have a large impact. If the tenants are sound and the goals noble and just, the number of people who will see that and are willing to join this Populiocracy should increase, and the new borderless nation will grow.

Inclusion in this new nation does not require rejection of local citizenry. It only requires a willingness not perpetuate the common good of all everywhere and not to fight to change others, but rather persuade with example everywhere.

Reason for no borders

Borders need to be defended. Defending them needs a military and weapons. Even the Swiss have the Swiss Army knife, kidding! Without borders there can be no assault and no need to defend. The borderless form of governance is voluntary, members can join or leave at their discretion. With no borders people from any existing nation can join without the need to move or give up citizenship, except in those countries where dual citizenship is illegal.

Optionally, a physical location can be used to establish the government, but no need to have the populace within its perimeter.

Much like those who joined Facebook, Instagram Twitter and the other social media platforms, this new form of governance could be offered as an internet alternative to the existing provincial government regardless of the geographic local the citizen wants to reside within.

NAME????

Civil anarchy benevolent Technocracy meritocracy, democracy, social democracy,
Consociationalism

No Divisive Laws

Problem

Laws create boundaries for acceptable behavior and consequences for rule infractions. Most laws are to protect public safety and in free countries protect civil liberties. Their primary intent

is not to be punitive but to act as a deterrent to unacceptable behavior and deeds that interfere with the social order.

People everywhere have moral and ethical beliefs, opinions, superstitions, fears and fantasies. All are good on a personal level regardless of what they are. They are our core, everywhere, and for everyone. We want to feel we have the right to our core beliefs and our essence, even in oppressed nations. Yet, when making some laws we lose sight that each individual has their own core, each is right in their own way. Many are willing to strongly defend their beliefs rather than succumb to attempts to control them. While others passively succumb to the rule of law that may restrict their rights rather than defend or fight to keep them. Both have negative outcomes.

Each person may have a right to their core beliefs but not all core beliefs can be turned into controlling laws. Some restrictive laws are created with the clear knowledge that not all will agree and the law will never be accepted by all or perhaps only a slim majority. These laws therefore are by design contentious and will never be totally enforceable. Many of these laws motivate those who do not agree and act out to change the laws leading to civil disobedience or worse. The most contentious have such slim margins of acceptance that the dissenters are continually fighting until they prevail and then the other side becomes the dissenter and the process of civil disobedience or worse continues.

Law and order is important but laws that do not create law and order but insight conflict are futile law and have no right to be created in the first place. It seems better for each side or all sides to act the way they feel is correct for them so long as it does not cause obvious harm to others. Imposing a moral stance into a codified law does not add to the public discourse or make the stance correct. It only pits one side against another inciting a contentious fight. Laws that are just few that oppose them. Laws that are unfair will always be contested. Laws surrounding right to life, gender preference, and other highly charged issues should remain open and unrestricted. No law will be able to enforce, restrict or silence those who believe strongly. Forced rules like a right to or a right against abortion makes no sense. Whichever law is in force will alienate the other side and never reach consensus. Yet acceptance that each side has their rights and not attempting to enforce one or the other will lead to dialog. Each side does have a right to their beliefs and may have a strong case for why they feel it is right. The debate is useful to offer perspectives and underlying beliefs, which should be protected. If the debate becomes so heated that it results in violence or sabotage then that act clearly should be stopped by whatever means necessary. No one has the right to tell another they are wrong, only the right to say they disagree. Disagreements are good if listened to. Compromise is best when sought. It seems far more productive for society to

engage in compromising dialog than waste the energy in contentious law making and the inevitable overturning that will flip sides forever.

Changing someone's core beliefs can only happen from within. Persuading through logic and reasons can help to make that transition easier, if it can happen at all. Fighting for what one believes is right will only polarize each side. A look at the current state of affairs should make that clear enough.

Therefore, in this new nation no law that is contentious in its implementation shall be created. Open discussion will continue and each side will respect the rights of the other side, not force their will on them. If that seems unrealistic it is because we have allowed reality to back us into the corner that we fight for and from. If one feels they are right, can they see that the other side may feel the same way. It may not be easy to accept another side, but it is possible to respect that the other side has a right to exist and find a way to have both sides coexist.

The world has seen an increase in the number and diversity of personal preferences. The binary world of male/female has changed forever. Identification in one's core has become a proud personal attribute and identifying as who one feels they wish to be seen as has taken hold, no matter how repugnant it may be to others. Again, this is not a place where society needs a law. It is a place where society needs more tolerance, acceptance and discussion.

However, most good laws are in place to protect, defend and deter actions that harm the common good and protect the public and individuals. Those laws are violated but are clearly enforceable with little or no public outcry, like murder, rape, crimes, and violence. When the laws infringe on civil rights, religious beliefs, personal orientations and freedom of thought they force individuals to take a side, give up their core and fight, surrender or hide. That happens everyday, everywhere all the time. Changing one's core is not easy but not impossible. Individuals change their views over time and circumstances and education can sway individuals to see another way. That happens everywhere, everyday. Holding an opinion firmly while understanding others may have equally firm stances can allow for a discourse that may sway opinions or at the minimum allow for tolerance of other opinions. Unwillingness to understand that one's right to their opinion is a two way street and dismissing that another's opinion is right for the other side leads to bitter polarizing outcomes and perpetuates societal discord. It should seem clear and obvious to any individual that it is impossible for all to be right regardless of how strong one's beliefs are. There is no real right or wrong, just opinions

about what is right or wrong. The area between strong opinions is often a battle ground with no winner ever, unless the other side is willing to agree and change or both sides are willing to accept and live and let live. Most have a very difficult time with this idea. It seems that if one feels strongly, surely I must be right, but only for them. No matter how many of them there are.

Some groups use a guide book that they quote from as proof they are right, never realizing that their guidebook was written by biased believers on all sides and each book and set of believers has the right to their core, regardless of what their book says. The good book is the one that is good for all. And, that book has not been written yet! In fact that good book would be a compilation of all the other guide books with sections of fact and sections of wishful fiction. The facts and fiction change reader by reader.

Although it is common that communities are often very homogeneous and hold to the same views, there is more and more diversity and individuals are increasingly having differing opinions and beliefs even within tight knit communities. Abortion and sexual orientation rights have highlighted this disparity and the number of expressing different opinions has created divisions and legislative tug of wars and stalemates.

The intent of this document is not to say what is right or wrong and take sides, it is specifically to not to take a side and point out that each side has a view point and a reason for it.

Laws that are instituted to stop someone or force someone to do something that is against their moral, ethical or personal beliefs or values, should not be created in the first place and those that are in place should be removed as laws.

One's choices should be respected and honored not dictated, regardless of the reasoning behind the desire to legislate. The reason to have laws is to protect public safety, freedom of speech, not to limit or punish it.

Civil disobedience is not enough. The disobedience is compensating for an inequitable law and the law needs to change or be eliminated everywhere.

It seems that creating a law that is known to be divisive and will never be able to be enforced is senseless and counterproductive when the goal is to provide governance for the masses. If an

issue is so contentious and divisive as to immediately create dissension in the creation of a law surrounding its acceptance is futile and should not be enacted.

Instituting a law does not make it right. We can look at many defeated regimes and see that their laws were not right given most humane standards. Yet if those failed regimes had won those laws would be what was considered right.

Most people are motivated by what they think is right, but just believing you are right is not enough to make it so.

There also seems to be a proliferation of devise laws against freedom of choice in religion, gender orientation, right to life, morality and other personal preferences.

Solution:

The laws governing this new nation need more of a set of ethical codes to live by and, when possible, they can influence the locale where the members reside. Laws that are contentious and divisive will never be instituted and the dismantling of those types of laws in all lands will be attempted through persuasion, and discussion with those that live there.

Law will be created when the members agree on the necessity for the law even if they do not believe in the effects of law. Realizing that it is not possible for all of one's wishes and beliefs to be in the final law will allow for the establishment of laws for the common good, not the biased sole desire of any one group.

If not all can agree on the need for a particular law then it does not become a law. The discussion remains open until a compromise can be reached. On some of the most contentious issues that compromise may never be achieved and therefore no law will ever be created.

Laws that attempt to pick one fact and impose penalties for disobedience should not be created. If a law is for the common good there should be little debate about its content. Laws

This new “nation” is not meant to be some secret society or a conspiratorial movement. It is meant to be an alternative to all the standard governmental structures that enforce laws around the world. Its goal is to offer an alternative in a world where your physical location and address dictates how you are governed.

This unique nation must coexist with other nations and will never attempt to overthrow a nation and its people. Rather it will attempt to persuade them that this is a better plan and offer inclusion to any individual whenever the time is right for them. (I expect over decades, maybe centuries.)

The world of the internet and global instantaneous communication is well established yet there appears to be no form of government that uses these global communication pathways and information systems, except for a few like Estonia, which is a fine example and building block model for this new nation.

Voting on the internet happens all the time. Opinion polls and other forms of voting are part of most social media sites and impromptu survey questions pop up all the time, mostly to gather clicks and revenue from the responders. Yet the technology exists that makes an instant tabulation of a poll possible and can make standard term elections ineffectual. We can change our thoughts and preferences in a leader instantly by a show of clicks. We can know the essence and predisposition of those who are voting. That can, if handled respectfully, allow us to govern based on personal liberties and create a true republic that will defend the rights of individuals, regardless of the majority rule. Allowing each individual to know who the other individuals are via a willingly offered profile of beliefs will provide insight into why they believe and act a certain way, and respecting them as individuals, and each and every member of this new nation being willing and obligated to allow for this individual to

Membership in this nation will most likely take the form of joining an online forum. Over time, that forum will become more separated from the main internet, so the revenue generation will be eliminated from the online presence. Ideally, early members will have the skill set to develop these tools and other tools that will help this new age, no provincial border nation to grow, maintain, and defend its virtual borders.

Challenges:

Will the provincial government attempt to stop this new initiative?

Why would someone want to join? What's in it for them?

Opinions are a right, dialogue is defended

Problem:

There seems to be far too much desire to silence opinion than allow for its true expression. Too often, an open discussion ends with “you are wrong” - period! In extreme instances, it leads to animosity, violence, or death. Opinions are never wrong to those who have them, only to those who don't want to listen to them. Debating, preaching, and proselytizing are not bad in their own right. It's when they become one-way monologues and deadened diatribes that they become unproductive and dangerous.

Freedom of speech is a right in some open countries, and it is defended, but not well. The main reason is that freedom of speech does not seem to come with the strength to defend it while it is happening. When individuals speak to each other, it does not start with the understanding and agreement to disagree if a compromise cannot be found. It is more often started with “here is what I think, and your opinion doesn't matter. In fact, having a strong opinion makes it that much easier to be blinded by the darkness of your unwillingness to be enlightened. Listening to see if there is an idea one may not have thought of or a perspective one may never have glimpsed is a far better way to move society forward than to obstinately drag one's opinion along as they dig their intellectual feet in and ground the conversation to a stop.

Telling someone they are wrong only means you do not agree. It does not mean that the other side is wrong. In fact, the vast majority of non-fact-based discussions are just wishful conjectures. Real facts that can be right or wrong are usually provable by looking the answer up, and that answer will be true whenever and wherever. Even a law that is well established does not mean what it states if right. It only says it is the law, and the offender will be prosecuted. And then, depending on the law, the defendant may be in the “right” or at least not able to be prosecuted.

Defining and defending the rules of conduct in a nation is not easy. Our society, like a tectonic plate, is moving and changing. What was once wrong or illegal may turn into what is

considered right and acceptable. The Irony is that those wrongly accused and punished are rarely made whole, like the plates never returning to their original place.

The need to express opinions without fear of reprisal and the knowledge that being told you are wrong is unacceptable and not defensible is a very important social need as we move forward in this very opinionated, speak your mind world. There are more outlets for personal expression, and more are coming, yet we lack social graces and controls to allow that speech not be attacked and ridiculed or silenced and demonized. It is front and center in these times that we can create more and more degrees of separation of thought and opinion. The pendulum swing of left and right views and norms is swung wider and out of kilter. Instead of a swing from side to side, it seems it can swing from all 360 degrees and degrees of separation, with no one path being right and nearly all being out of whack.

Opinions based on knowledge are better and more defensible than those spun out of lies and twisted fabrications. Deceitful speech to stir up animosity seems to be on the rise. How they can be defended is perplexing, yet they are. And since there is no right or wrong they do have the believers who willingly perpetuate the fabricated fallacies.

Personal beliefs

Solution:

We need to have Freedom of speech, not freedom to silence. Changing another person's opinion is not as important as recognizing they have a right to their opinion. Not all opinions and moral political stances can be charged, and to do so can be dangerous, physically and psychologically. Allowing others to keep their strong position and defending their right to have that opinion without attempting to change it can open a safe area for personal detente.

There is a simple solution that is difficult to achieve. It is courtesy and tolerance, mixed with patience and understanding. These are behaviors we should learn or be taught as children, but for some unknown reason, we are not. Perhaps the parents and schools are happy to foster bullheaded bitterness, one-sided stubborn debates, and discourage open discussions.

If that is a family tradition, it should be looked into since it can only make the next generation more polarized, bitter, and unwilling to compromise.

If parents and schools cannot teach this respectful tolerance, it should be built into a set of laws that can be held up as a code of ethics to achieve. In principle, it is difficult to imagine any individual who does not feel understanding and willingness to listen is a good thing. If they cannot, there is no place for them in the open, inclusive new nation, and they would likely not have any interest in joining. The looseness is on both sides, and hopefully will change in the future.

No law is absolute.

Problem:

Laws are black and white. It is either legal or it is not. It takes a lot of gray mashing to make the black and white laws we have on the books everywhere. Most laws have an enforcement gray scale that dictates the severity of the infraction once a verdict is determined and imposes the requisite penalties for breaking the black and white law. So effectively, we have black and white laws with gray enforcement. However, there is a process of determining what shade of gray to apply as a punishment in many cases. That legal procedure can make the process less fair and often skew it to a biased and unfair outcome. When a crime or tort happens, charges are brought by a plaintiff against the defendant. Those charges may be changed or dropped, but then the process of litigating them begins. In the simplest cases, it can be settled quickly without a jury merely by pleading guilty or paying a fine. In the cases where a jury is required, a jury pool is created. From that pool, lawyers for the plaintiff and the fence have the right to interrogate and choose the jurors who will hear the case. Then the case begins. The jurors are asked if they have any prior knowledge of the case, and are often dismissed if they know the case or have a bias against issues in the case. Then the trial begins. In many cases, the next phase is to discredit or show the merit of the plaintiff or the defendant's case, effectively giving a background and circumstance as to who they are and what their motivations and intentions might have been. Effectively turning the black or white law into a mitigating circumstance, a shade of gray, from black to white.

Much of this information about them is readily available if they have any online profile or social media presence. Yet that is not allowed, and the hand-picked jury is being given a well-crafted picture of who the plaintiff and defendant are.

In many cases, the laws are not really black and white; they are markers of acceptable to unacceptable. If the laws allowed for us to know more about those involved in the disputes before jury selection and the biased weeding out process, perhaps we may have a better, more equitable trial and outcome, not skewed by highly crafted, well-compensated defenders. The facts might speak more loudly for themselves, and the jury might get a better, less biased perspective. In many places, the attorneys use their craft to legally sway the outcome. This in itself is not wrong since it exploits the way the judicial system is structured. It merely shows how flawed the rules of the judicial system are and how they can be manipulated, which does not seem to be the intent of their initial creation.

It seems that the legal system has been co-opted by the loophole defense and the obfuscation of the law. In the United States, which was once a pillar of justice, there now exists a climate of lawlessness. It also seems apparent that the system is broken, leading to a flagrant disregard for the need for law and order and an attitude that flaunts its flaws, even by legislators.

Most people are fair and believe in justice. A decision left to a group of peers is the way it was meant to be, not a decision based on the skillful manipulation of your legal representative.

The way it is is not how it has to be. Changing a particular country's legal system will be difficult, if not impossible. Those in power will not willingly relinquish that power and will use measures to stop its change, even if those very measures violate the law and are offenses against the government.

It seems apparent that this is another basic tenet that needs to be used as a foundational block to build on.

No law is all black or all white, and the laws should be gray, with the enforcement black and white depending on who and what the infraction was, not the crafty slight of legal hand that is applied to the case.

Solution:

Laws are the basis for the safety and protection of individuals everywhere. The need for them is obvious. The taking of a life, the invasion of someone's body, the protection of one's property, and all those other situations that seem to need a priori protections for civilized individuals everywhere. Yet, even with the most well-agreed-upon laws, there is always a circumstance

where it can be justified, even if it is a twisted circumstance. As stated earlier, laws that are divisive and contentious unable to be supported by a near-unanimous majority should never be instituted.

If no law were deemed absolute and black and white, the focus could be on the circumstance from the beginning. If no reasonable circumstance exists, it will be plain and obvious to anyone that the strong punishment for the infraction should be doled out. If not, then without the long and drawn-out process of weeding out jury members and creating mitigating circumstances, those who are judging can look at the evidence and decide the mitigating circumstances at the outset. The problem here is that the discovery time for the jury might be prohibitive, making the need for attorneys necessary. Even then, the jury cherry-picking just needs to be reduced or eliminated.

Moral beliefs supersede civil rules

Problem:

If an individual strongly believes in something, any laws against that belief may seem unfair to them, and the laws are often ignored or deliberately violated. The threat of punishment is often not enough to dissuade an individual from acting out. Conscientious objectors are those whose conscience objects to a law. One's conscience is the strongest controller of will and is the center of our guiding principles. Most individuals' consciences align with the laws or are tolerant of the discrepancies. Yet some adamant die-hard believers will fight to the end to uphold their conscience and core beliefs.

Conversely, some who have opposing moral beliefs will fight each other and incite violence, sabotage the other's cause, and inflame public opinion. None of this adds to the protection of the social fabric or bond. This clash between what are strongly held beliefs versus what is legally mandated creates a separation of church and state, or moral beliefs and state, that potentially pits every individual against some rule of law.

The stalemate between a god and a law cannot be resolved in the court of law or public opinion. It needs to be resolved by the believer or left as an open debate.

It may be impossible for all laws and civil rules to be agreed on by all individuals; it is possible that a way can be established so that those who do not agree with a particular law can be less affected by it or given dispensation from abiding by it. In the same way, conscientious objectors can legally refuse to serve in the military on moral or religious grounds.

As stated earlier, divisive laws have no merit in being created in the first place since they, with their very inception, create a conflict. If there is no law controlling a moral stance, then it is left up to each individual to freely choose. Each side is defended so long as it does not infringe on others' rights, incite violence, or obstruct discourse. Once a law takes a side, either side, then it pits the other side against it. When those sides are drawn, the fight begins with one legal and the other not. When the law has a slim majority, the right/wrong, good/bad, legal/illegal fight goes back and forth. Often, those laws flip when the minority side gets votes and swings the majority their way, and then the other side is in the wrong or right. Only to repeat the process. Moral beliefs are not suppressed by a law that is felt to be unjust.

Solution

Since personal moral beliefs are so strong and often become the one-sided basis for a law, it seems they should take precedence over the law. This creates a new condition of ambiguous law enforcement. Ambiguous in that the law is not the only factor for enforcement and the personal stance and moral beliefs of the individual are taken into account. The enforcement of the letter of the law may be mitigated by the individual's belief from the outset not at a trial or sentencing phase and all the subsequent appeal phases.

Most laws do not have such a strong effect on individuals that they feel the need to protest or violate it. So the need for ambiguous laws would not need to be that pervasive. Yet any law that is contested by an individual should be given attention as to how the enforcement of the law could be mitigated based on the personal beliefs of the individual being charged.

Some of the objections may be outrageous, and if so, they will be dismissed; if they are reasonable, even if it is the widest stretch, then the individual belief and personal stance should be given attention and a resolution determined. This is very similar to what extenuating circumstances are in the current laws. The difference is that the individual is charged, and in the trial phase, those extenuating circumstances are revealed and either defended or refuted. That with ambitious laws could happen at the outset and save all of the time and effort to go through the trial process. No law is absolute, and personal beliefs will and do supersede the law, either by finding a loophole exemption or simply violating the law.

A fair construct for governing is better than a biased and fractured one. Adding personal beliefs to the code of ethics and acceptable behavior will create a less litigious and punitive way to enforce the law and focus on the protection of society and the individual rights of each individual. How that can be done requires a knowledge of who the individual is and what they believe in. That is another area where change based on our current and future technology will come into play.

Personal choices and preferences are open to view

Problem

As much as individuals would like to have privacy, it is apparent in this day and age that that is no longer feasible. With the advent of the internet, personal communication devices, the vast acceptance of social media, and the need to provide personal information at most entry points for institutional and commerce systems, the personal information of nearly all individuals is out in the meta-verse and will never be kept totally private or secret. It is an unfortunate fact. If privacy is important to an individual, but a fact nonetheless. The individuals who were born into this online porous web of information are accustomed to the lack of true privacy and expect their data to be online and they can find out about others and what they think and believe.

Yet, by most laws that information is not supposed to be made accessible and the “right to privacy” is attempted but fails on most fronts. This leaves those who can gain access to an individual's information outside of the law, yet with all of the long legal contracts that are agreed to and signed by individuals when joining online systems, where “right to privacy” is forfeit, and their personal data is fair game for exploitation. That too may be unfortunate but it too is here to stay.

The likelihood that all the data about individuals can be grabbed back and scraped from the collective servers is slim to impossible. Yet technologically it is very easy for an individual to get access to all the places where personal information resides and receive a report of the traffic that has pursued an individual's personal data. In fact, there are countless algorithms that do that every second or maybe even more frequently. Some systems compile the data, analyze it, calculate likely correlation, and then act on the resulting data, mostly to exploit the individual and extract funds or sell their data. Trillions in currencies of all kinds are made on that personal data. Nearly all powerful commercial conglomerates grow and thrive on this legally forfeited, yet illegal in principle, violation of the invasion of privacy.

It is hard to imagine that this is going on, and yet it is. Hacking, spying, falsifying, distorting, and exploiting personal data is the way of the world.

False information is used to win elections, ruin reputations, control behavior, and silence dissent, all because individuals can be seen everywhere all the time by those who have access

to our personal data. And, it is mostly out of our control. If this continues, civil rights, personal voices, and self-determination will be in jeopardy. The fragility and functioning of our world have also become an issue as well. Sabotage, system failure, and malicious action have brought our underlying system to a point where it is fragile and requires constant vigilance and reaction to threats. Our reliance on the world of data in all forms has become one of the most important aspects of how we will live, thrive, or perish in the future.

Policing these systems is also becoming a challenge since many of the infractions are done by very tech-savvy individuals who exploit weaknesses and hold the skills and tools to disrupt and repair the systems. Prisons cannot hold cyber criminals, and the prisoners are those who are held hostage by the tech-savvy pirates.

Most of this is possible because the access to the data is transparent to some, yet opaque for others. Passwords, firewalls, and security precautions have all been foiled. The illegal access to the data may be a crime, but once it is accessed, the damage has been done.

Protection of sensitive data and systems seems prudent. However, the failed attempt to secure privacy is not prudent and is impossible to protect. Making the crime of access unenforceable and the punishment for the misuse of the data a difficult and overwhelming process.

Solution

Protecting an individual's personal data is virtually impossible. Determining who has seen it is not. What if that information were open to view and those who view it are known to the data's owner, based on a legal data audit trail? Those who access the data are either privy to it and can go about their business if they are not and they should be held accountable for how they used and misused the information. The technology exists to see who has accessed an individual's data, and some services look at who accesses personal data and charge individuals for this vigilance and "protection. Effectively making a business out of letting an individual know who got at their data. Why should individuals need to pay for a service to find this information out when it is available? The services are doing nothing that could not be done if the law about "right to privacy" in this case data privacy became more a right to pursue the issue of the privacy and primacy of our data.

If someone wants information on another individual or business, there is a way to find that information, regardless of how many barriers are put into place to protect it. A bigger, better lock just means that a bigger and better lock picker is needed, and it is an obvious clue that there is value to be found. Yet, conversely, with nearly 2 billion individuals in the world, not all data is of value and worth stealing, yet all of it is personal and should be protected, not behind a wall, but behind a law that can protect the misuse of it

On a personal level, some private detectives can pry into intimate details of lives, and on a business government level, there are hackers and bad actors who can spy to divide and topple or control and restrict. It is a whack-a-mole world of data that we live in. It will never stop, only escalate. Better protections, better crackers. The solution is more transparency when feasible and more concentration of the vermin that feed on the rich data stockpiles and the unsuspecting victims.

Given the state of the data world, why not allow access to information legally as an alternative? It does not mean everyone automatically looks at their neighbors' private personal data, or preferences, or that businesses open their trade secrets to the competition. We all know how to avert our eyes and respect a closed-door approach to privacy. Businesses know that their copycat infringement will be found eventually and prosecuted. Most individuals and businesses adhere and abide, but some don't. The Peeping Toms and the prurient interests of others will remain. The guarded access to personal and financial data will still be needed for banking and commerce, and the misuse of the data and the ill-gotten gains that come from it will still be a crime. A crime that will be far easier to detect and prosecute if the data breach is seen by those that matter, not a service paid to alert. In fact, it will become the one thing that can protect the data because a data audit will provide a path back to those who breached the data.

Governments are the only place where data needs to be protected at such a high level that perhaps a separate operating system might be required. Also, governments are the biggest violators of intrusion into personal privacy, and they can do it legally now and in the future, for better or worse. An aware citizenry is essential, and vigilance is prudent. Individuals in each country with their own set of rules seems essential as well when the governments become oppressive, unflinching, and log-jammed. Going about an individual's day-to-day life with a private code of ethics can help avoid many of the swamp-ensnaring areas of public opinion.

It is already imperative that each individual remain aware of who is doing harm to their data or finances or reputation and with all the social media and the porous nature of the world of information it becomes all the more important the one's personal preferences and data become less opaque and as transparent as it can be.

This can also have a positive impact on how laws are created, and ambiguous law enforcement can be achieved.

If there was a profile that an individual could “willingly” fill out and continually monitor and modify that expressed their views or topics of interest and the prevailing laws then it could lead the way to how an individual feels and how they would like to be judged.

“Coming out of the closet” was and is a very liberating and cathartic act for many. Once out, that did not mean that they were accepted by all. But, their preferences are now known for all to see, regardless of how they reacted, either with applause or boos, either with embrace or with stones. Currently, there are many locations where laws that could restrict personal preferences are being contemplated. That is a very dangerous path without a mechanism to show who one is and what they believe.

There is nothing wrong with being who an individual wants to be. There is something wrong with trying to force them into another way or restricting their choices. There seems to be an increase in the number, form, and variety of personal preferences. From sexual and gender orientation, religious belief, body mutilation, to dietary, artistic, and governmental preferences. It does not seem that, as the world becomes more connected and more individuals find like-minded brethren around the globe, the tide will change. It willingly increases with more and more varied preferences with finer and finer distinctions between them and more and more divisions surrounding them.

If extrapolated, this can create an amazing amount of volatile dysfunction with individuals pitted against each other in more and more ways, increasing the vitriolic rhetorical and the I am right, you are wrong narrative. It does not appear to be a pretty picture.

Allowing individuals to be who they want to be and making that choice open to view and opinion can actually show that each needs to accept the differences in others, so others can accept the differences in them. Realistic? I hope so, because the alternative is hellish!

Leadership is fluid

Problem:

In the current representative democracies, governments must have elections with terms and often term limits. Representatives are elected and re-elected when a majority of voters resonate with their stance on issues or their party affiliation. Most politicians are willing to give their constituents their wishes. However, far too often, there is also another agenda for the political representative. It is to become rich or powerful or both. This is the main reason for instituting term limits. If representation is a fleeting thing in all cases, then so long as a good representative job is being done, there is no reason to replace or term-limit a politician.

Conversely, if they are doing an unacceptable job or have lost the confidence of their constituents, then, like in many countries, there can be a call for a vote of confidence, and the term of representation can end abruptly.

In this new nation, when representatives are elected or selected, they can be replaced whenever there is a need to change the voters. Or a representative can stay as long as there is no descent. Yet in the new nation, until it can amass enough voters to matter, representation is an individual matter. Opinion and decisions are handled on a per-case basis, and consensus is required, or an idea doesn't become a law. Agreeing to disagree is one of the strongest tenets of this new nation, and it can only exist if those disagreements are heard, discussed, improved, and agreed upon. Otherwise, the dissent will tear apart any unit and defeat the purpose and cause for this new and inclusive nation of individuals that are geographically dispersed and single-mindedly connected. Much like a religion without the need to believe in a higher being or a punitive post-life experience.

The notion of leadership is also an area that will be markedly different from most forms of governance. The reason for representation is so that an individual who has the best interests of many people can navigate all of the concerns and issues of the day and legislate appropriate resolutions to contemporary challenges. In a world where social media like masses of individuals come together, there does not seem to be a need for representation, just exposure and followers. Each individual can present a position on an issue and see how many followers they get. After a period of time, the one with the most supporting followers has their proposed

solution adopted. The internet has shown us that a viral idea or person can garner millions of likes and supporters without any campaigning or deal-making. Regardless of the platform, each social media group has its “opinion leaders.” If there is a globally dispersed nation with common goals, then a group of leaders in that mass can and will find a way to be noticed and take on the leadership roles required.

This notion is still very new as I put thoughts together and will likely change as this new nation's core foundational requirements gel. I will leave this section for another time.

Economic independence, financial, health, and welfare support

Problem

In order for a new nation to exist in the form expressed here, it will need to have some financial and other support structures in place. Like a religion, club, or any organization, there is a need to support the structure, activities, and operations. How much financial and welfare support is required is open, as of yet! Since this document is a very broad and undefined framework, those details are not known.

Solution

To be explored!

Recruit by example

Most political parties and religions recruit by preaching and promising. This initiative needs to be set by example. Rather than recruit, it would be more I want to join because It makes sense and I agree with the tenants and want to add to the movement.

ISSUE and CHALLENGES

We are living in very divided times. The left and the right, the racist and the religious zealots all have strong opinions and firm stances. Woke and canceled culture. Right to life and a woman's rights.

How would this new form of governance handle some of the issues of today?

Racism:

A racist has a reason why they believe the way they do. Either from their upbringing and/or examples in their community or from personal experience. The racist posture in a perfect world would not even exist since we are supposed to treat each other fairly and see others as equals. Yet, that is not the way things are. So, how would a member of this new way of governing handle a racist? First, by expressing to them their right to feel the way they do, and not confronting or challenging them or their beliefs. Their beliefs are their beliefs, and they have a right to them. Then ask that they be given the same courtesy. Second, attempt to find out why they feel the need to be a racist. What is that position giving them that they need to be who they are? Perhaps after hearing the reasoning, if a dialog can even occur, then the feelings why might be better understood, and there may be a deeper reason why they feel the way they do. Perhaps it was an assault on them by people of the other color that was so awful and uncalled for that the logical reaction is to be hateful and racist. It is difficult to turn the other cheek when the sting is still strong. Acknowledging that assault and injustice can help to turn that face around, even if it does not offer another cheek.

If the answer to why they feel racist comes back as noncommittal or "just because I don't like who they are," then the question can be asked if they acknowledge that the other person may see them the same way. It is not very feasible to get everyone to like everyone. Not all people like chocolate ice cream or strawberry jam. That is why lots of ice cream flavors are offered so as to appeal to the many tastes, since no one taste is the only right taste. In the same way some people may not like another person for good reason. They don't suit their taste and there are some people who are just not likable or want to be hated. Having choices about how to feel about others and not having a one flavor for all seems to be a better way to go. I am fairly certain that even the most racist of people has found someone of the other color to be a friend or a tolerable human.

White supremacists are very narrow thinkers who feel they are the only right way to be. Their vanilla wolf has no room for chocolate. That logically cannot be correct and the one flavor policy will always fail. Yet without tolerance, understanding and acceptance of even the most extreme there will be no alternative. If a supremacist of any persuasion is asked to question their beliefs to their core it will likely fall apart, which is why most have little room for reasoning and a lot of desire for silencing.

Cancel culture

They are you, only different.

You are them, only different

We are part of us

Us are we are

You and I make up everyone

A conducive environment for needed change

If you have read the previous manifesto, you will understand there are several challenges and obstacles to the ideas presented.

In fact, given the reality of the geopolitical environments and the general state of world affairs, most of the notions in the manifesto are unrealistic now. That is not to say that the value and intrinsic intent of those governing positions are forever unrealistic and unattainable. So what would it take for these idealistic notions to take hold and gain societal traction?

Sadly, it will take a society that is in such upheaval that an alternative is being begged for.

When there is no side to cling to, the right you choose is a right you can defend. A time when even your enemies see they are doomed and deflated by the prospect of their futile divisive goals.

Armageddon is the word that is most often given to this time. It is not meant in a bible context.

It is a time when all sides see that the way they have been addressing their destiny and moral compass need to be questioned. Questioned in a very basic core value way. Core in that all personal bias is stripped away and all that is left is what really matters. In the heart of hearts, community, parenting, love, compassion, understanding and empathy are what truly matters, to all sides. Not just for one community be all, not love of your kind but all, parenting for every child not just yours, love for all not hate for them, compassion for others not disdain for the different, understanding of those differences no matter how different, and empathy because at our core we are all the same, just divided.

In that stripped down world, what is important to nearly all will be revealed as so common to all that the notion of why we fought so strongly will seem trivial and although compassion for others will remain challenging it will be imperative.

Perhaps we need an event where the factions on all sides draw their weapons and point at the other side. After the trigger is pulled, there will be no enemies, no loved ones, no one.

Because if we allow our societal dysfunction to go to its nth degree, we do have the ability to wipe out humankind and decimate the surface of the earth many times over. The cumulative destruction force is irrelevant because it will be too late.

If it is unrealistic to attempt to create a world where differences are embraced, disputes are discussed, outcomes are egalitarian, and extremes are wisely isolated or ignored, then we are doomed. We live in a world now that has small pockets of good intention, but vast fields of distrust, hatred, and righteousness.

Each person has the ability to say "I have no right to tell you that you are wrong but I do have the right to convince you that I am correct". That sets up a continual dialog where our various views can be believed individually but not enforced unilaterally. A world where disagreement is expected and understood to be helpful to growth, better ways are always possible; one way is stifling.

So the ideas present in the manifesto are food for thought to help nurture new ideas with the goal of a better way of governing, not a perpetual clash of ideas.

Peace and harmony are not impossible, just difficult. There is all the room in the world to work toward that goal, while we still have a world we can live in.

I'll end with a link to the Teachings of Buddha. He was just one person, gained followers, and continues to be a good moral model. Perhaps what I have been writing about can follow from Buddha's lead!

https://www.bdk.or.jp/pdf/buddhist-scriptures/02_english/TheTeachingofBuddha.pdf

