COMMONS

WORLD

THE HIDDEN WORLD

The Evidence Behind the Twelve Challenges

Twelve crises. Twelve hidden architectures.
Twelve plausible repairs.

✦ ✦ ✦

Mohan Lal Mahtani

FOUNDER, COMMONS WORLD

The free evidence companion to Commons Community. Developed in collaboration with artificial-intelligence systems, which contributed research assistance, drafting support, and editorial review throughout. All final decisions, interpretations, and conclusions remain the responsibility of the author.

Copyright & Licence

The Hidden World — the free evidence companion to Commons Community. First published 2026.

COMMONS SHARING LICENCE

A NOTE ON HOW TO READ THIS

Commons World is a framework in development. The institutions, currencies, devices, and systems described in this book do not yet exist in operational form; they are described as they are designed to function when built. Nothing here constitutes financial, legal, or investment advice. The Commons Unit of Exchange is not a currently tradeable asset. The verified data cited throughout reflects the best available evidence at the time of writing and is sourced, chapter by chapter, in the references at each chapter's end.

Important Notice

Applies to all Commons World publications: Commons Community (CC), The Hidden World (HW), and The Visible World (VW).

NATURE OF THE WORK

The Commons World publications describe a governance, financial, and social architecture that is currently in development. The institutions, instruments, currencies, networks, devices, and systems described — including but not limited to the Commons Registry, the Alliance for Transparent Enterprise, the Global Accountability Rating, the Commons Bank, the Commons Unit of Exchange, AURA, Commons Education, the Open Story Network, and the Evolutionary League — do not yet exist in operational form. They are described as they are designed to function when built. Nothing in these publications should be read as a description of currently operational systems, services, or institutions.

NO FINANCIAL OR INVESTMENT ADVICE

Nothing in these publications constitutes financial advice, investment advice, or a solicitation to invest in any asset, instrument, currency, or enterprise. The Commons Unit of Exchange (CUE) is not a currently tradeable, purchasable, or investable asset of any kind. No offering of any security, financial product, or investment opportunity is made or implied anywhere in these publications. Readers should not make any financial decision on the basis of anything contained in these publications without seeking independent qualified financial advice.

NO LEGAL OR PROFESSIONAL ADVICE

Nothing in these publications constitutes legal advice, regulatory advice, medical advice, or advice of any other professional nature. The legal analysis contained in these publications is provided for informational and educational purposes only. Readers should not act on any legal, regulatory, or policy matter described in these publications without seeking independent qualified professional advice appropriate to their jurisdiction.

ACCURACY OF INFORMATION

Every factual claim in these publications is sourced and believed to be accurate at the time of writing. Laws are amended, repealed, and replaced. Data is revised. Institutions change. The author and publisher accept no liability for

any loss, damage, or consequence arising from reliance on information that has become inaccurate, incomplete, or superseded since publication. Where figures are contested or regulations have been amended, this is stated within the text.

FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS

These publications contain descriptions of proposed reforms, potential futures, and designed systems that do not yet exist. These are the author's considered analysis and design, not predictions, guarantees, or promises. No representation is made that any described outcome will be achieved, that any described institution will be built, or that any described reform will be enacted.

AUTHORSHIP

These publications were directed by Mohan Lal Mahtani and written with the assistance of Claude by Anthropic and ChatGPT by OpenAI, which are artificial intelligence systems. The author takes full responsibility for all editorial decisions, factual claims, and positions expressed. The use of AI writing assistance does not diminish the author's ownership of, and responsibility for, the work.

LIABILITY

To the fullest extent permitted by applicable law, the author and publisher exclude all liability for any direct, indirect, incidental, consequential, or special loss or damage of any nature arising from or in connection with the use of or reliance on these publications or their contents.

TO NIGERIA

my home for more than thirty-six years, and to the extraordinary people with whom I have shared those years — whose resilience, warmth, and ingenuity have been the clearest possible demonstration that a different world is not only possible — it is already present

Contents

BEFORE WE BEGIN

Introduction

The world runs on hidden architecture. Not the official architecture — the legislation, the treaties, the regulatory frameworks whose existence most people are broadly aware of even if they cannot name them. The hidden architecture is the layer beneath: the specific clauses, the individual court decisions, the industry-authored amendments inserted into omnibus legislation at the last moment, the regulatory gaps created not by accident but by the sustained effort of the people who benefit from them. This book is about that layer.

Twelve challenges. Twelve domains in which the gap between what is publicly claimed and what is actually happening is not a matter of disputed interpretation but of documented, verifiable fact. In each case, the challenge is real, the evidence is available, and the people who would need to act to address it have received that evidence and chosen not to act — or have been structurally prevented from acting by the same architecture that produced the problem.

This is not a book about inevitable decline. The working examples in each chapter — the Montreal Protocol, the Amazon Soy Moratorium, the Loess Plateau restoration, the Welsh Well-being of Future Generations Act, the Aral Sea partial recovery — demonstrate that the same pattern that produces failure can produce repair when the structural conditions are different. The structural conditions that make repair possible, rather than merely necessary, are what this book is ultimately about.

What this book is

The Hidden World is the evidence companion to Commons Community. Commons Community introduces Commons World — a governance architecture built around nine Pillars designed to address the root causes of the failures this book documents. The Hidden World does not repeat that architecture in full. It demonstrates, case by case, why that architecture is necessary.

Each of the twelve chapters that follow examines one of the twelve Thematic Priority Challenges (TPCs) that Commons World was designed to address. Each chapter opens with a specific, named case — a law, a company, a decision, a date — that makes the systemic failure concrete and human. Each chapter closes with a brief account of what changes when the relevant Pillars of Commons World are in place. The changes are not speculative. They follow directly from the architecture.

The Nine Pillars — in brief here, in full in the Appendix

The nine Pillars of Commons World are described in full in Commons Community and in The Visible World. This book does not repeat those descriptions. A brief overview of all nine Pillars, with cross-references to the full Appendix at the back of this volume, follows this Introduction. Readers encountering Commons World for the first time are encouraged to read that overview before the twelve chapters; readers already familiar with the architecture may proceed directly to Chapter One.

The Nine Pillars overview that follows this Introduction is a purposely condensed account — each Pillar in a few paragraphs, enough to understand its function and its relationship to the others. The Appendix to this volume carries the full forensic detail of each Pillar: its governance architecture, its investigative instruments, its

founding cases, and its sources. Readers who want the full picture of any single Pillar should turn to the Appendix after reading its summary here.

How to read this book

Each chapter stands alone. A reader whose primary concern is water can begin with Chapter Three. A reader following the pharmaceutical supply chain can begin with Chapter Five. The twelve chapters are organised in the same sequence as the twelve Thematic Priority Challenges of Commons World, but the connections between them are more important than their order: the same structural conditions — insulation of decision from consequence, capture of regulatory architecture by regulated interests, absence of permanent independent evidence — recur across every domain.

The closing chapter, Chapter Thirteen, addresses that recurrence directly. It describes the governance architecture that addresses the root cause rather than the symptoms: not a better regulator in each domain, but a structural change in the conditions under which all institutions operate. Chapter Thirteen is the point of the book. The twelve chapters before it are the evidence for why that point needs to be made.

Following Chapter Thirteen, a Closing Spotlight — From Extraction to Abundance — names, in precise and sourced detail, the three sectors that most clearly illustrate the architecture of extraction this book documents throughout: carbon, plastics, and land. It traces each failure to the specific laws and decisions that entrenched it, and maps each of the nine Pillars directly onto the gap it was designed to close. The Spotlight is the bridge between what this book has documented and what Commons World is designed to build.

A note on sources

Every specific factual claim in this book carries a superscript reference. The references are gathered at the end of each chapter. Where a source has been used across multiple chapters, it is cited in full at first use and abbreviated thereafter with a cross-reference to the chapter where the full citation appears.

The evidence standard applied throughout is the same standard Commons World's own verification architecture would apply: independently verified, permanently available, and traceable to a specific document, dataset, or official record. No claim in this book rests on anonymous assertion, disputed interpretation, or projection. Where the evidence is genuinely contested, the contestation is noted.

The pattern

In 1926, the United States Congress passed a percentage depletion allowance for oil producers: the right to deduct 27.5 percent of gross well income from taxable earnings, regardless of the original investment.

In 1973, internal documents circulated among plastics industry executives described recycling plastic as 'costly' and 'infeasible.' The same industry spent tens of millions of dollars in the following decades telling the public the opposite.

In 2023, the European Union passed a binding deforestation law requiring proof that imported commodities had not been grown on recently cleared land. It has been delayed twice. It has not been repealed. It has simply not been allowed to take effect.

The pattern is the same in every case: a benefit, or the absence of a cost, written into law or practice at a moment when the political conditions permitted it, maintained indefinitely because no mechanism exists to make its true cost visible to the public that ultimately pays it, and because the institutions through which it could

be changed are occupied by the people who benefit from its continuation.

That pattern is what this book documents. Commons World is what it points toward. The rest is construction.

THE ARCHITECTURE IN BRIEF

The Nine Pillars of Commons World

What they are, what they do, and what changes when they are in place.

Pillar 1 — Planetary Coherence & Health (PCH)

Planetary Coherence & Health (PCH) is the first Pillar and the foundation on which every other Pillar rests. It establishes the Prime Directive as the non-negotiable constraint of the entire CW architecture, defines the Nine Principles governing the conduct of every CW institution, and creates the Six Baseline Domains and Six Governing Bodies through which civilisational health is measured, maintained, and protected across time.

PCH does not govern behaviour through coercion. It measures whether human activity is moving toward or away from coherence with the conditions life depends on — and makes that measurement permanently visible. Where other Pillars address specific domains of activity, PCH defines the conditions of wellbeing against which all activity is ultimately evaluated.

PCH is also the valuation standard for the Commons Unit of Exchange (CUE). Without verified PCH baselines, none of the five asset bases that give CUE its monetary credibility can be confirmed.

Full detail — Nine Principles, Six Baseline Domains, Six Governing Bodies — Appendix, Pillar 1.

Pillar 2 — Commons Registry (CR)

The Commons Registry (CR) is the permanent, tamper-proof public ledger of the commons. Built on distributed ledger architecture and maintained through a global network of CommonNodes, CR records who owns what, where resources flow, what has been verified, what has been rated, and what has been established as true. What enters CR stays. No government can delete it. No corporation can alter it. No individual can suppress it.

CR is the institutional memory of the entire CW architecture. Every Alliance for Transparent Enterprise (ATE) finding, every Global Accountability Rating (GAR) rating, every PCH baseline decision, every verified citizen submission, and every public commitment made by institutions and officials is deposited here permanently. Where new evidence or a correction emerges, it is linked to the original entry under the Correction & Restoration Protocol — the full arc of what happened is always the record.

CR does not interpret. It does not judge. It remembers — permanently, publicly, and beyond the reach of those who would prefer otherwise.

Full detail — CommonNodes, deposit pathways, Correction & Restoration Protocol — Appendix, Pillar 2.

Pillar 3 — Alliance for Transparent Enterprise (ATE)

The Alliance for Transparent Enterprise (ATE) is the consequence verification infrastructure of Commons World. It does not ask whether an organisation has complied with regulations. It asks what the actual consequences of that organisation's activities are on people, communities, ecosystems, and the systems upon which life depends.

ATE investigates enterprises whether they choose to participate or not. Investigations are unannounced, conducted across six audit domains, and findings are deposited directly into CR before the enterprise is notified. There is no period for communications planning, legal negotiation, or reputation management. The sphere of influence — not the legal boundary — defines the scope of every investigation.

ATE deploys a forensic toolkit that goes far beyond conventional auditing — combining satellite remote sensing, laboratory chemical analysis, financial flow investigation, AI-assisted entity resolution, and authenticated citizen evidence to find what has been deliberately hidden. Where adverse findings are confirmed, ATE may recommend an Upgrade Pathway — a structured, publicly visible programme of corrective action.

Full detail — Six Audit Domains, forensic methods and equipment, Upgrade Pathway — Appendix, Pillar 3.

Pillar 4 — Global Accountability Rating (GAR)

The Global Accountability Rating (GAR) is the translation layer of Commons World. Where ATE investigates and CR preserves, GAR translates — converting the forensic depth of ATE investigations and the permanent records of CR into a single, globally consistent seven-colour signal readable at the moment decisions are made.

GAR operates identically across every jurisdiction, industry, and scale of enterprise. The signal works at three depths: the colour, visible instantly by scanning a barcode through Commons Verify (CVe) on AURA; a domain breakdown on request; and the full CR record for those who wish to examine the underlying evidence. The Ceiling Rule prevents any product rating from exceeding the overall enterprise rating by more than one level, closing the greenwashing loophole.

The seven colours run from Red (active verified harm) through Orange, Yellow, Green, Blue, and Violet to White (Exemplary —

awarded rarely through public deliberation, cannot be applied for). The same architecture applies to senior public officials and executives through Individual Accountability Ratings.

Full detail — seven colours, three-depth signal, Ceiling Rule, Individual Accountability Ratings — Appendix, Pillar 4.

Pillar 5 — Commons Bank & Commons Unit of Exchange (CB & CUE)

Commons Bank (CB) is the sovereign financial institution of the commons, governed under CW principles and answerable to no shareholders. It provides current and savings accounts, lending, low-cost remittances, microfinance, Commons Bonds, and a Commons Treasury — all outside political interference. Commons Pay (CP), CB's payment layer, supports both fiat currency and CUE.

The Commons Unit of Exchange (CUE) is CB's primary instrument — a sovereign currency issued exclusively upon independent verification of a measurable contribution to human or ecological wellbeing, recorded permanently in CR. CUE cannot be speculated upon, mined, or created through debt. Contribution precedes recognition. Always. CUE's credibility derives from five verified asset bases whose combined value significantly exceeds global GDP.

Full detail — five asset bases, CUE issuance, Commons Bonds, Commons Treasury — Appendix, Pillar 5.

Pillar 6 — Autonomous Unified Rights Architecture (AURA)

The Autonomous Unified Rights Architecture (AURA) is a sovereign digital device and environment — far more than a phone — built around a purpose-built Commons Device running Commons OS. Its network operates on a peer-to-peer mesh with no telecom operator in

the chain, offline-capable by default, with a Commons satellite constellation as Phase Two providing global sovereign connectivity.

AURA was designed to make data harvesting impossible by architecture, not by policy. No advertising, no behavioural profiling, no data sold to third parties. User-Controlled Memory Permissions (UMEMs) govern what AURA remembers and who can access it. Data is owned by the individual. Always.

At the centre of AURA is Commons ID (CI) — a single sovereign identity replacing every login, account, and password across every institution and jurisdiction, held entirely by the individual. AURA's 24 features span identity and security, communication and navigation, learning and participation, and economic and wellbeing — including Commons Wallet (CWa), sovereign asset holding linked directly to CR.

Full detail — Commons ID, 24 features numbered, data harvesting architecture — Appendix, Pillar 6.

Pillar 7 — Commons Education (CE)

Commons Education (CE) comprises two distinct institutions. Commons Learning (CL) is a free, universal, lifelong learning platform built around sixteen subjects and open to anyone, anywhere, at any age, regardless of prior qualification or income. Its curriculum is built around the Commons Method of Inquiry — six questions that develop discernment rather than compliance.

Commons Academy (CA) is the professional education and certification body, providing nine specialist practitioner pathways across all CW Pillars. Each pathway requires a Foundation Course covering the Prime Directive, the Nine Principles, and the standards of evidence that apply across the entire CW architecture. All qualifications are held permanently in AURA's Commons Learning Record (CLR), belonging to the individual, not to any institution.

Full detail — sixteen subjects, nine CA pathways, Commons Method of Inquiry — Appendix, Pillar 7.

Pillar 8 — Open Story Network (OSN)

The Open Story Network (OSN) is the verified information commons, comprising two channels. Commons News (CN) is a distributed network of professional journalism governed by one non-negotiable standard: verification before amplification. Every piece of content carries a permanent, visible status marker — Verified, Partially Verified, Unresolved, Disputed, Evolving, or Insufficiently Substantiated — so the evidential status of what a reader is seeing is always visible.

Peoples News (PN) is the citizen evidence channel. Through Commons Contribute (CCo) within AURA, authenticated individuals submit observations, recordings, and testimony. The canonical verification chain is unbreakable: CCo submits — ATE verifies — CR records — OSN publishes. OSN publishes only what ATE has verified and CR has recorded. Manipulation has nowhere to hide.

Full detail — CN and PN, verification chain, six status markers — Appendix, Pillar 8.

Pillar 9 — Evolutionary League (EL)

The Evolutionary League (EL) is simultaneously the founding agreement that gives every other Pillar its legitimacy, and the most demanding internal critic that ensures every Pillar remains worthy of it. Without the collective agreement of EL's founding cohort — the initial nations, cities, cooperatives, institutions, and communities whose participation makes the Commons World economy real — the currency has no economy and the baseline framework has no binding authority. The agreement precedes the currency. Always.

EL performs four functions: Forward Detection, monitoring emerging developments and producing an annual report deposited in CR; Institutional Adaptation Review, examining any Pillar no longer working as intended; Constitutional Review, examining whether the Nine Principles remain fit for purpose on a maximum ten-year cycle;

and the Founding Agreement itself. EL does not govern CW — it reviews it. All findings are deposited in CR and cannot be suppressed by the institutions they examine.

Full detail — four functions, Founding Agreement, Constitutional Review — Appendix, Pillar 9.

✦ ✦ ✦

Together these nine Pillars form a system in which sovereignty is restored across every domain of human life, and coherence between human systems and the conditions life depends on becomes not an aspiration but an architecture — in service of the one purpose that unites them all: Do No Harm.

CHAPTER ONE · CHALLENGE 1

Planetary systems exceeding safe operating limits

Seven of nine planetary boundaries have been breached.

Ecological Overshoot

In 1960 the Aral Sea was the fourth-largest lake on Earth: roughly 68,000 square kilometres of water held between Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, reaching 69 metres at its deepest point. [1] By 1990 it had already lost 40 percent of its surface area and 60 percent of its volume; the Supreme Soviet declared the region a disaster zone the following year. By 2007 the sea had shrunk to roughly a tenth of its original size, splitting into separate, shallower lakes as its shoreline retreated as much as 100 kilometres from towns built as fishing ports. [2] Aralsk, once a thriving harbour, now sits stranded on dry land, its rusting trawlers visible from satellite photographs taken decades apart. The collapse of the fishing industry destroyed tens of thousands of livelihoods, and the exposed seabed began lifting salt and agricultural chemical residue into the air, found as far away as the Ferghana Valley, Georgia, and the Arctic coast. [3] When the UN Secretary-General visited in 2011, he called it 'one of the planet's worst

environmental disasters.' [4] UNESCO has since added the historical record of the sea's destruction to its Memory of the World Register. Contemporary accounts of the decision-making note a detail worth keeping in mind for every chapter that follows: the central planners who set Uzbekistan's cotton targets did not have independent access to the environmental data documenting what their decisions were doing to the sea, while the Karakalpak population closest to the damage had no channel to the central government capable of changing course before the deterioration became irreversible. [5]

This is what ecological overshoot looks like at the scale of a single body of water: a system from which more is withdrawn, year after year, than nature can replace, for long enough that the deficit becomes irreversible. Of the nine planetary boundaries scientists use to track this kind of overshoot system by system, freshwater use and land-system change are both now classed as transgressed, alongside five others. The Aral Sea is what one of those transgressions looks like once it has been allowed to run, uninterrupted, in one place for sixty years: not an aggregate statistic, but a sea that a living population once depended on and no longer can.

The Enabling Law

The sea did not vanish by accident. From the early 1960s, Soviet economic planners diverted the two rivers that fed it, the Amu Darya and the Syr Darya, into a vast irrigation network built to convert the surrounding desert into cotton fields. Cotton was prized as 'white gold,' a hard-currency export the Soviet Union could sell on world markets, and each Five-Year Plan fixed Uzbekistan's output as a target to be met regardless of the water actually available. Soviet scientists and officials were not unaware of the likely outcome: internal assessments concluded the withdrawals would cause the sea's level to collapse, but planners believed a hard crust of salt would form over the exposed seabed and limit the damage. [5] It did not. The exposed

bed instead became a new desert, the Aralkum, roughly the size of the Netherlands.

The Soviet Union dissolved in 1991. The economic logic that drained the Aral Sea did not, and it survives today through two separate legal mechanisms, one governing what farmers grow, the other governing how much water reaches the sea at all. On the water side, every withdrawal from the Amu Darya and Syr Darya is still allocated under the 1992 Almaty Agreement, signed by the five newly independent Central Asian states in the chaos following the Soviet collapse. Rather than build a new framework, the agreement preserved the Soviet-era quota system essentially unchanged, a formula designed to balance internal regions of a single centrally planned state, now governing five sovereign countries with directly competing interests and no guaranteed share reserved for the sea itself. [6] On the cropping side, independent Uzbekistan inherited the cotton quota system intact and ran it for another twenty-six years substantially unchanged, enforced through an annual mobilisation that at its peak conscripted more than a million children and adults into the fields each autumn under threat of fines, expulsion, or loss of employment. [7] More than 330 international brands, including Gap, C&A, and Tesco, joined a boycott of Uzbek cotton sustained for more than a decade. [8] Reform began only in 2017; the quota system was formally abolished by decree in 2020; by 2021 independent monitors verified the harvest essentially free of systemic forced labour, and the boycott was lifted in 2022. [9]

The forced labour is gone. The mandate to grow cotton on water-intensive, state-designated land is not, and a February 2026 investigation by Human Rights Watch and the Uzbek Forum for Human Rights identifies precisely who benefits from its survival. [10] Farmers hold their land on long leases but are directed which crop to grow, are barred from switching to anything more profitable, and face the threat of having the land seized if they fall short of quota. Every kilogram they produce must be sold to one designated buyer: the 'cotton cluster' operating their district, a vertically integrated private

company combining farming, ginning, and textile production, created by a 2017 reform that replaced the old state monopoly with what the World Bank's own review of the policy called, in its own words, new private regional monopolies built with state support. [11] Those clusters do not simply benefit passively. They receive direct government subsidy on the commercial credit they use to buy the crop the state compels farmers to grow and bars them from selling elsewhere, an interest-rate subsidy funded by the state budget and by loans from international financial institutions. [11]

None of This Happened Without Buyers

For most of the decades the forced-labour system ran, the single largest processor of Uzbek cotton was Daewoo International, a South Korean trading company now part of the steel conglomerate POSCO, which operated the country's two largest cotton-processing plants, in Fergana and Bukhara, generating US$151 million in revenue in 2013 alone. [12] In 2014, a Daewoo spokesperson confirmed to journalists that the company was aware its Uzbek cotton was harvested using forced and child labour, and stated plainly that it had no plans to stop sourcing it. [12] H&M, Michael Kors, C&A, and The Limited all cut ties with Daewoo in response. [13] The other major processor, Singapore-based Indorama Corporation, took a different kind of institutional cover. In December 2015, the World Bank's own private-lending arm, the International Finance Corporation, approved a $40 million loan to expand Indorama's Kokand textile plant despite independent monitors having already submitted documented evidence of forced and child labour in the company's supply chain that same harvest. [14] A forced-labour victim and three Uzbek human rights defenders subsequently filed a formal complaint against the IFC with its own independent ombudsman. [14] Indorama's Uzbek operations did not end with the forced-labour era: Indorama Kokand Textile and Indorama Agro now operate within the same cluster system this chapter has just described, the same captive, state-mandated supply

chain, under different legal cover. The proceeds Uzbekistan itself earned from cotton sales during the forced-labour years did not pass through the state budget at all: they were paid into the Selkhozfond, an off-budget Finance Ministry account accessible only to the most senior officials, with no public accounting of how the money was used. [14] In 2013, the International Labor Rights Forum filed a formal complaint asking U.S. Customs to block all cotton imports manufactured by Daewoo and Indorama under the Tariff Act of 1930, which prohibits the import of goods made with forced labour. [15]

Not an Isolated Case

The Aral Sea is not a unique case. Lake Urmia in north-western Iran, once the largest lake in the Middle East, has lost roughly 86 percent of its surface area since the late 1980s, a decline researchers trace to a mix of drought and a state policy of food self-sufficiency that pushed dam construction and irrigated agriculture across the rivers feeding it; more than forty dams now sit on those rivers, and agriculture consumes over 80 percent of Iran's water while contributing a fraction of its GDP. [16] A ten-year, multi-billion-dollar restoration programme launched in 2013 has produced only partial, contested recovery, slowed by the same funding shortfalls and bureaucratic deadlock that have stalled the Aral Sea's own second restoration phase. The mechanism differs in its particulars from one basin to the next. The underlying pattern, an agricultural mandate prioritised over the water body that makes agriculture possible in the first place, does not.

The Possible Solution

Restoration is not hypothetical here either. In August 2005, Kazakhstan, working with World Bank financing under an $86 million first-phase project, completed the thirteen-kilometre Kok-Aral Dam, trapping what remained of the Syr Darya's flow in the smaller

northern remnant of the sea instead of letting it continue south to evaporate. [17] Water levels rose roughly four metres, salinity fell by about half, and fish, absent since the early 1980s, returned; by 2025 the North Aral's annual catch had reached 8,000 tonnes. [18] A more ambitious second and third phase, costing roughly $300 million and intended to raise the dam a further six metres between 2015 and 2021, was agreed in principle and then simply never built; reporting from the region attributes the delay to a mix of Kazakh bureaucracy and Uzbekistan, which has never endorsed restoration work on the Northern Aral and controls much of the water further upstream. [19] Kazakhstan can dam its own thirteen kilometres of strait. It cannot compel water to keep arriving from a river crossing five countries, each governed by the 1992 quota formula and free to draw on it first.

There is now a real, dated vehicle for fixing that, not merely a hope for one. On 22 to 24 April 2026, heads of state from all five Central Asian republics met in Astana for the first Regional Ecological Summit and signed a joint declaration titled 'Ecological Solidarity of Central Asia,' explicitly committing to treat the region's water crisis as shared rather than separately managed, and to finalise a Regional Action Programme covering 2026 to 2030. [20] Proposals already on the table include formally strengthening the International Fund for Saving the Aral Sea and building shared digital monitoring of both rivers. [21] That these states can finance and build binding joint infrastructure when they choose to is no longer in question: in September 2025, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Uzbekistan signed a package of protocols for joint water and energy management, and have since advanced the $4.2 billion Kambarata HPP-1 hydropower project on Kyrgyzstan's Naryn River, financed jointly by Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, and Kazakhstan, designed specifically to improve cross-border water management alongside power generation. [22]

None of this, so far, touches the 1992 Almaty Agreement itself. The Regional Action Programme, the IFAS reform proposals, and the Kambarata financing model are all real and dated, but they are new machinery layered on top of an allocation formula that has never been

renegotiated since the single state it was built for ceased to exist. The fix this chapter is arguing for is specific: the Regional Action Programme already being drafted for 2026 to 2030 should be the binding instrument that formally supersedes the Almaty formula, replacing it with a fixed, legally enforceable ecological flow to the Amu Darya and Syr Darya before any volume is allocated to agriculture, financed and enforced with the same seriousness already shown for Kambarata.

Why Commons World

Commons World's Planetary Coherence & Health pillar exists for precisely this gap: an independently set and independently defended minimum ecological flow for the Amu Darya and Syr Darya, applied before any agricultural withdrawal is allocated, immune to revision by whichever ministry currently benefits from ignoring it. PCH's baselines are not targets. They are the pre-political conditions that make everything else possible — the minimum a river, a lake, or a water table needs simply to remain alive.

REFERENCES

1 Britannica, "Aral Sea"; Wikipedia, "Aral Sea."

2 EBSCO Research Starters, "Supreme Soviet Declares the Aral Sea a Disaster Area"; The Diplomat, "How the Soviet Union Created Central Asia's Worst Environmental Disaster."

3 United Nations, "Dry Tears of the Aral," UN Chronicle, citing Philip P. Micklin, "Desiccation of the Aral Sea: A Water Management Disaster in the Soviet Union," 1988; Wikipedia, "Aral Sea."

4 Wikipedia, "Aral Sea," citing UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon's 2011 visit.

5 United Nations, "Dry Tears of the Aral," UN Chronicle; Foreign Policy Association, "The Aral Sea Disaster, Part 2: Soviet Irrigation"; National Geographic, "A Soviet Sea, Killed by an Obsession with 'White Gold.'"

6 The Times of Central Asia, "Megaprojects Instead of Quotas: How Central Asia's Water Diplomacy Is Changing," 2026.

7 Anti-Slavery International, "The Historic Elimination of State-Imposed Forced Labour in Uzbekistan," 2022; United Nations University, "Cotton," UNU-CPR, 2024.

8 Corpwatch, "H&M Targeted for Uzbek Cotton Allegedly Grown with Forced Labor."

9 Human Rights Watch, "Uzbekistan Ends Systemic Forced Labor, Civil Society Says," March 2022; International Labour Organization, "Uzbek Cotton Is Free From Systemic Child Labour and Forced Labour," 2022.

10 Human Rights Watch / Uzbek Forum for Human Rights, "Farmers Have No Freedom: Abuse and Exploitation of Cotton and Wheat Farmers in Uzbekistan," February 2026.

11 World Bank, "Cotton-Textile Clusters in Uzbekistan: Status and Outlook," Policy Dialogue on Agriculture Modernization in Uzbekistan, 2020; Human Rights Watch / Uzbek Forum for Human Rights, "Farmers Have No Freedom," February 2026.

12 TriplePundit, "Daewoo International Admits Using Cotton From Forced Labour," 2014.

13 Corpwatch, "H&M Targeted for Uzbek Cotton Allegedly Grown with Forced Labor."

14 Human Rights Watch, "Uzbekistan: Forced Labor Linked to World Bank Corporate Loan," July 2016; Human Rights Watch, "'We Can't Refuse to Pick Cotton': Forced and Child Labor Linked to World Bank Group Investments in Uzbekistan," June 2017.

15 SGB Media Online, "Daewoo and Indorama Cited in Complaint Seeking to Block Uzbeki Cotton Imports."

16 Shadkam et al., "Impacts of Climate Change and Water Resources Development on the Declining Inflow into Iran's Urmia Lake," Journal of Great Lakes Research, 2016; Caspian News, "Lake Urmia Dries Up Amid Water Shortage Crisis," September 2025; Iran International, "Expert Calls Iran's Dried Lake Urmia an 'Ecological Disaster.'"

17 World Bank, "Saving a Corner of the Aral Sea," 2005.

18 Global Voices, "How Kazakhstan Resurrected the North Aral Sea," May 2026.

19 Eurasianet, "Northern Aral's Promise Stunted by Dam Height, International Disputes," 2022.

20 Euronews, "Central Asia Bets on 'Ecological Solidarity' as Water Crisis Deepens," April 2026.

21 The Diplomat, "Can Central Asia Finally Coordinate on Climate and Water?" April 2026.

22 The Water Diplomat, "One Region, One Vision: A New Era of Transboundary Water Diplomacy in Central Asia," May 2026.

CHAPTER TWO · CHALLENGE 2

Supply chain concentration, soil degradation, water stress

Four crops provide close to half of all global calories.

Food System Fragility

In October 2025, Human Rights Watch published an 86-page investigation into the Brazilian state of Pará, the same region that would host the United Nations climate summit, COP30, the following month. [1] Investigators found cattle raised illegally inside protected rainforest zones and on small farmers' and Indigenous peoples' territory, moved through a system that concealed their true origin before they reached the country's largest meatpacker, JBS, which may have exported the resulting beef and hides directly into the European Union. [1] The practice has a name among the ranchers who use it: cattle laundering. An animal is born and raised on illegally deforested or grabbed land, then sold partway through its life to a second, compliant ranch before final sale to the slaughterhouse, erasing the trail back to where it actually grew. [2] JBS's own regulatory filings concede the structural reason this works: the company states that most of the cattle it processes are bred and raised by third parties, and

that it monitors direct suppliers for illegal deforestation but is still, in its own words, 'in the process of extending this due diligence to indirect suppliers.' [3] Indirect suppliers are precisely where the investigators found the laundering happening.

The Enabling Law

Brazil's cattle transit document, the GTA, traces back to a 1934 decree and has run on its current legal basis, Decree No. 5,741 of 30 March 2006, for two decades; moving an animal without one is a federal environmental crime under Law No. 9,605 of 1998. [4] The decree's structural limit is precisely what the laundering technique exploits: the GTA records only a single movement from one property to the next, with no requirement to carry an animal's full history forward through each subsequent sale. [4] A stricter alternative already exists in Brazilian law: SISBOV, the Brazilian System of Identification and Certification of Bovine and Buffalo Origin, created by the Ministry of Agriculture specifically to provide lifetime, farm-to-farm traceability. It has remained voluntary since its creation, used mainly by exporters targeting markets that already demand it. [4]

Voluntary corporate pledges have filled the gap a mandatory SISBOV would otherwise close. JBS signed its first such pledge, the G4 Cattle Agreement, with Greenpeace in 2009, promising to identify all of its indirect suppliers by 2011. It missed that deadline. It has since promised again, committing that from 1 January 2026 its direct suppliers must declare their own suppliers in turn; Human Rights Watch says it remains unclear how that information will be verified or enforced once submitted. [5] The federal government's own response, the National Plan for Individual Identification of Cattle and Buffalo, was only announced in December 2024 and does not require full mandatory traceability until 2032, a full seven years after the plan was first unveiled and twenty-three years after JBS's first missed pledge. [6]

The gap has a beneficiary, even if a diffuse one: every actor in the chain between an illegal ranch and the slaughterhouse door, the

middlemen ranches that exist specifically to receive and resell laundered cattle, and the meatpacker that buys the resulting animal at a lower price than fully verified, traceable cattle would command, while retaining the ability to say its direct suppliers are clean. [2] The consequences now extend well beyond Brazil. Human Rights Watch traced trade data from 2020 to 2025 and found Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Spain, and Sweden had imported beef from the very municipalities hosting the JBS facilities named in its report, with Italy a major destination for the resulting leather. [1] The European Union's own Deforestation-Free Products Regulation was scheduled to start enforcement in January 2026; as this book's introduction notes, that enforcement has already been delayed once, and EU lawmakers were still discussing a further delay as this chapter was being written. [1] Accountability has begun to arrive by other routes. In March 2024 the Science Based Targets Initiative struck JBS from its registry over its emissions claims, and within weeks New York's Attorney General filed suit against JBS's U.S. arm alleging its environmental marketing deceived consumers. [7]

Not an Isolated Case

JBS is not unique in this. In December 2024, the environmental group Mighty Earth published a Soy and Cattle Deforestation Tracker scoring ten of the world's largest soy traders and meatpackers on their links to land clearance across the Amazon, the Cerrado, and the Pantanal, naming Bunge, Cargill, and JBS the 'Terrible Trio,' the three worst performers. [8] On a 100-point scorecard measuring responsiveness, transparency, and action against deforestation alerts, JBS scored 10, Cargill scored 11, and Bunge scored 31, against a leading score of 42 among the ten companies assessed. [9] The underlying tracker linked the ten companies to 330,296 hectares of deforestation and land degradation between February 2022 and July 2024 alone, an area roughly twice the size of London. Bunge was individually linked to 224,181 hectares, a quarter of it inside legally

protected areas. JBS was linked to 118,310 hectares, three-quarters of it in the Amazon biome, a third in protected areas where the clearance is potentially illegal under Brazilian law, and 66,129 hectares bordering Indigenous territories. [9]

The Possible Solution

On the soy side, a fix already exists and has worked for almost twenty years. The Amazon Soy Moratorium, agreed in 2006 between Brazil's grain exporters' and vegetable oil industries' associations, government, and civil society, excludes soy grown on Amazon land cleared after a 2008 cut-off date, verified through independent satellite monitoring rather than self-reporting. [10] Annual Amazon forest loss fell by more than 80 percent after it began, with roughly a quarter of that decline directly attributable to the moratorium, an estimated 3.2 million hectares of forest preserved between 2008 and 2025. [11] That success is being dismantled in real time by exactly the mechanism this book keeps finding: a law. Late in 2024 the state of Mato Grosso, Brazil's largest soy producer, passed legislation stripping tax incentives from any company honouring such sourcing restrictions, effective 1 January 2026; by January 2026, ABIOVE, representing the six traders controlling over half of Brazil's soy exports, announced its members were leaving the moratorium regardless of an August 2025 Supreme Court ruling that had upheld it. [12]

On the cattle side, a comparable working model already exists at smaller scale. Pará launched its own programme at COP28 in Dubai in December 2023: the Integrity and Development Program of the Pará Bovine Productive Chain, creating the state's official individual traceability system, SRBIPA. Each animal receives an electronic ear tag scanned at every property it moves through, building a lifetime record rather than the GTA's single-hop snapshot. [13] Pará's programme is the only one in Brazil to explicitly cross-reference that movement data against each property's environmental record in the

Rural Environmental Registry and its obligations under the Forest Code, tying an animal's traceability directly to whether the land it grazed was ever legally cleared. [4] The programme is not hypothetical. Maria Gorete Rios, a small rancher in the municipality of Novo Repartimento, became the first producer in Pará to tag her herd under the scheme, proof that deforestation-free, individually verified beef is achievable even on a 78-hectare farm, not only at industrial scale. [13] The state aims for full coverage by the end of 2030, two years before the federal plan even requires it nationally. [6]

The fix this chapter is arguing for is therefore specific on both fronts: make SISBOV mandatory nationwide rather than voluntary, built to Pará's own standard of cross-referencing every animal's movement against Rural Environmental Registry and Forest Code data, on Pará's 2030 timeline rather than the federal plan's 2032 date, and pair it with the European Union enforcing its deforestation regulation on schedule rather than delaying it again, so the market pressure already proven to work on soy is applied to cattle as well. Both halves of the fix already exist in working form, the soy moratorium's verification model and Pará's tagging programme; what is missing is binding national law that makes either one the rule rather than the exception.

Why Commons World

Commons World's Alliance for Transparent Enterprise exists for precisely this gap: independently verifying what a company's supply chain actually contains against what satellite and ground evidence show, regardless of whether the company involved remains a voluntary signatory this quarter or what state its herd happens to be standing in. ATE's verification is not self-certification. It is assessment against evidence by an institution with no financial interest in the outcome — the condition the Pará model proves works, extended to every supply chain that claims to be clean.

REFERENCES

1 Human Rights Watch, "Brazil: Illegal Ranches Devastate Rainforest, Livelihoods," 15 October 2025.

2 Human Rights Watch, "Brazil: Illegal Ranches Devastate Rainforest, Livelihoods," 15 October 2025; Inkl/The Guardian, "Revealed: World's Largest Meat Company May Break Amazon Deforestation Pledges Again," 17 April 2025.

3 JBS N.V., Form 20-F, FY2025, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission filing.

4 Human Rights Watch, "Brazil: Illegal Ranches Devastate Rainforest, Livelihoods," 15 October 2025.

5 Human Rights Watch, "Brazil: Illegal Ranches Devastate Rainforest, Livelihoods," 15 October 2025; Al Jazeera, "Is Your Beef Linked to Amazon Deforestation? A Report Highlights Loopholes," 15 October 2025.

6 Tridge, "Brazil Will Also Have Mandatory Individual Traceability of Its Cattle," December 2024; Datamars Livestock, "Connecting With Customers for Brazil Traceability," 2025.

7 Just Food, "JBS Backs Away From Sustainability Officer's Comments on Emissions Goals," 17 January 2025, citing SBTi delisting and New York Attorney General Letitia James's lawsuit.

8 Mighty Earth, "'Terrible Trio': Bunge, Cargill & JBS Ranked Worst for Deforestation," December 2024.

9 Just Food, "Bunge, Cargill, JBS Rank 'Worst' for Deforestation in Brazil, NGO Mighty Earth Says," 6 December 2024.

10 Global Canopy, "Amazon Soy Moratorium: Almost 20 Years of Success Tackling Deforestation Under Threat," December 2025.

11 Wikipedia, "Amazon Soy Moratorium," citing peer-reviewed deforestation-rate analyses, 2025/2026.

12 Green Queen, "Brazilian Soy Giants Exit Amazon Protection Pact, Raising Deforestation Fears," January 2026; Global Canopy, "Amazon Soy Moratorium: Almost 20 Years of Success Tackling Deforestation Under Threat," December 2025.

13 The Nature Conservancy, "Tag the Herd, Protect the Amazon," October 2025.

CHAPTER THREE · CHALLENGE 3

Freshwater availability, access equity, contamination

Some aquifers took thousands of years to fill and cannot be refilled in a human lifetime.

Water security

At the top of Strawberry Canyon in California's San Bernardino National Forest, eight springs feed a creek whose water would otherwise flow down through the mountain, recharge the aquifer below, and eventually supply communities in the San Bernardino Valley. For more than a century, that water has instead been captured at source, redirected through a company's tunnels and boreholes before it can reach the surface, and bottled under the Arrowhead label for sale across the western United States. [1] The company doing the capturing has changed names several times: it was Nestlé Waters North America, then BlueTriton Brands from 2021, and it has operated in the canyon under the claim that it holds a pre-1914 water right, the strongest category of entitlement in California water law, going back to diversions first made when the forest was still private land. [2] In April 2021, California's State Water Resources Control Board

issued its finding: BlueTriton had failed to prove a valid right for the vast majority of the water it was removing. The company may hold a right to extract up to 7.26 acre-feet annually; in 2020, it removed 180 acre-feet, roughly 58 million gallons, more than twenty-four times the amount the Board concluded it could legitimately claim. [1] On 19 September 2023, the full State Water Board unanimously adopted a Cease and Desist Order requiring BlueTriton to stop. As of mid-2026, BlueTriton has appealed the order to a Fresno Superior Court and the diversions continue, twenty-four hours a day, while the legal process runs. [3]

The Strawberry Creek case is not primarily about one company in one canyon. It is about the legal structure that allowed a commercial extraction operation to run for over a hundred years on a water right it has now been found it cannot prove it ever validly held, and that continues to run, by appeal, even after that finding. The question this chapter is asking is not whether BlueTriton acted unlawfully — the State Water Board's unanimous order answers that. The question is what made the arrangement legally possible for so long, and what makes it legally defensible to continue even now.

The Enabling Law

California's water rights system, like most western US states', rests on the doctrine of prior appropriation, codified in the California Civil Code of 1872 and subsequently embedded in the California Water Code: the principle that whoever diverts water first and puts it to 'beneficial use' acquires a property right to that volume, in perpetuity, senior to all later users. [4] That right carries no expiry date. It requires no periodic public interest test, no review of whether local communities have been harmed, and no mechanism for revoking the right if the original diversion turns out to have been made without valid legal basis, unless a formal complaint triggers an investigation, which in BlueTriton's case took from the 1890s until citizen activists began filing written complaints with the State Board between 2015

and 2017. [3] The system was designed in the mid-nineteenth century to allocate water among miners and farmers in a territory with no prior framework; it was never built to govern the bulk extraction of water for commercial bottling and long-distance sale. [4]

In Michigan, a different but structurally identical problem operates under a different statute. Under Section 17 of Michigan's Safe Drinking Water Act of 1976, a bottler extracting more than 200,000 gallons per day from a new or increased withdrawal must apply for a permit. [5] The permit triggers a public comment process. But the fee attached to that permit is $2,000 as a one-time application cost and $200 per year in annual administration, regardless of volume extracted. Primo Brands, the company that now holds the former Nestlé and BlueTriton Michigan operations after a further ownership change, extracts water at a rate that in 2022 ran to 138 gallons per minute from a single facility, representing 72.5 million gallons annually, at an annual cost to the company of $200. [6] Michigan households pay an average of $864 per year for roughly 45,600 gallons, approximately $0.019 per gallon. Primo Brands pays $0.000003 per gallon from the same public groundwater system: households pay more than six thousand times the per-gallon rate charged to the commercial bottler. [6] Nine bills proposing changes to Michigan groundwater law have been introduced since 2018 and left to languish; a state legislator who introduced one of them described four Nestlé lobbyists visiting his office after the bill was filed. [5]

Not an Isolated Case

The same company, under its successive names, has replicated this arrangement wherever permissive extraction law created the opportunity. Near Elora and Aberfoyle in Ontario, Canada, Nestlé extracted 3.6 million litres of water daily from aquifers lying beneath the traditional territory of the Six Nations of the Grand River, doing so on permits that the Ontario government allowed to run on an expired basis because the Ontario Water Resources Act contains no

automatic revocation mechanism when a permit lapses. [7] During the period of extraction, 11,000 Six Nations residents, 85 percent of the community, had no access to clean tap water. [8] In June 2018, all 133 First Nations chiefs in Ontario passed their own moratorium on all for-profit water takings across traditional and treaty lands; the Haudenosaunee Confederacy Chiefs Council delivered a cease-and-desist letter to the Nestlé Aberfoyle facility in June 2019. [7] Makasa Looking Horse Henry, a Six Nations water advocate who spent eight years fighting the extraction, described a community that had no idea the extraction was happening: 'Nobody knew in my community that water extraction was occurring. And with the lack of consultation, not even the governments knew.' [9] BlueTriton exited the Canadian bottled water market in 2024, attributing the decision in part to the cumulative pressure of Indigenous advocacy. The Ontario government, rather than responding with stronger groundwater protections, proposed regulations in 2025 that would allow water-taking permits to be transferred between company owners without triggering a new environmental assessment or any obligation to consult Indigenous communities. [9]

The pattern across California, Michigan, and Ontario is the same: extraction law written for an era that did not anticipate commercial bulk bottling treats groundwater as an ownable property right rather than a shared public resource, sets fees that bear no relationship to the commercial value of what is being removed, and provides no standing to the communities downstream, or above, or living on the land from which the water is taken. The company in each case is not breaking the law. It is using the law precisely as the law permits.

The Possible Solution

California's September 2023 Cease and Desist Order is itself the most important proof that the fix is achievable: a state regulator conducted a sixteen-day evidentiary hearing, found a company had diverted water without a valid right for over a century, and issued a binding

order to stop. [3] The mechanism worked. What it could not do, because no California law requires it, is act without a complaint, act proactively before the harm accumulated, act on behalf of Strawberry Creek itself, or prevent the company from continuing to divert while appealing the order in civil court. [3]

France settled the underlying question by statute decades ago. The Loi sur l'eau of 3 January 1992 declared water part of the 'common heritage of the nation,' removing it from the category of ownable private property and placing all significant withdrawals under state authorisation. [10] The Loi sur l'eau et les milieux aquatiques of 30 December 2006 went further: it replaced individual, indefinite extraction rights with collective volumetric caps managed by Water Users' Associations at the catchment level, with those caps set by the state based on what the aquifer can sustainably yield, not on the historical timing of whoever first sank a borehole. [11] France's law is not perfect and its implementation has been uneven, but the underlying principle, that water is a national commons and extraction rights are time-limited, revocable authorisations rather than perpetual property, is precisely the standard that the Strawberry Creek case and the Six Nations case both show California and Ontario law to lack. [10]

The fix this chapter is arguing for is specific: repeal the prior appropriation doctrine as it applies to bulk commercial extraction for non-local sale, replacing it with the French model of common-heritage declaration, state-issued volumetric authorisations reviewed on a fixed cycle, and community consent as a legal prerequisite rather than a public comment option that a regulator can override. California already has the enforcement body and the evidentiary process to implement this; what it lacks is the statutory mandate to act without a complaint and to halt operations during an appeal rather than after one has run to completion. [3] Michigan already has the permit framework; what it lacks is a fee structure that bears any relationship to the commercial value of what is extracted and a legal standing for communities to challenge extractions that a regulator has approved. [6]

Why Commons World

Commons World's Planetary Coherence & Health pillar exists for precisely this gap: an independently set minimum recharge rate for the aquifer beneath Six Nations, a minimum flow for Strawberry Creek, applied before any commercial extraction permit can be issued, renewed, or appealed, immune to revision by whichever state agency currently lacks the statutory mandate to enforce it. Water is not a property right. PCH treats it as what it is: a shared inheritance whose depletion is a debt owed to every community downstream.

REFERENCES

1 California State Water Resources Control Board, Report of Investigation and Draft Cease and Desist Order, April 2021; Maven's Notebook, "State Water Board requires BlueTriton to immediately cease unlawful diversions in San Bernardino Mountains," September 2023.

2 California State Water Resources Control Board, BlueTriton Brands Water Rights Investigation page, waterboards.ca.gov; FoodNavigator-USA, "Nestlé Waters / BlueTriton Brands ups ante in California spring water spat," April 2021.

3 California State Water Resources Control Board press release, "State Water Board orders BlueTriton to stop unauthorized diversions in San Bernardino Mountains," September 19, 2023; Save Our Forest Association v. U.S. Forest Service, complaint filed June 25, 2024; SBC Sentinel, "State Water Board Orders Arrowhead Bottler BlueTriton to Cease Unauthorized Water Diversions," September 2023.

4 California Civil Code of 1872, water appropriation provisions; California Water Code; Rouillard et al., "Transitioning out of Open Access: A Closer Look at Institutions for Management of Groundwater Rights in France, California, and Spain," Water Resources Research, 2021.

5 Michigan Safe Drinking Water Act, 1976 PA 399, Section 17; ProPublica / Bridge Michigan, "Michigan bottlers still get free water, despite governor's tough talk," June 2024.

6 Flow Water Advocates, "Bottled water companies get a (nearly) free ride in Michigan," February 2026.

7 Sierra Club, "The People Versus Nestlé's Profiteering of Community Water," June 2020; IBFAN, "COP 30: Climate Crisis intensifies water scarcity – Nestlé's water scandals."

8 Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, "While Nestlé extracts millions of litres from their land, residents have no drinking water," 2018.

9 CBC News, "She's fought for clean water for years and fears proposed Ontario permit changes will hurt First Nations," July 21, 2025.

10 Loi no 92-3 du 3 janvier 1992 sur l'eau (France); Rouillard et al., Water Resources Research, 2021.

11 Loi no 2006-1772 du 30 décembre 2006 sur l'eau et les milieux aquatiques (France); Rinaudo et al., "Groundwater Policy in France: From Private to Collective Management," 2020.

CHAPTER FOUR · CHALLENGE 4

Decarbonisation pace, energy access, grid resilience

Fossil fuels receive approximately $7 trillion in annual subsidies — $13 million every minute.

Energy Transition

In August 2023, the United Kingdom's Conservative government granted development consent for the Rosebank oilfield, a project owned 80 percent by the Norwegian state energy company Equinor and 20 percent by Aberdeen-based Ithaca Energy, located 130 kilometres northwest of Shetland in the North Atlantic. [1] Rosebank is the largest undeveloped oilfield in UK waters. It is estimated to contain between 300 and 500 million barrels of oil and gas. Burning those reserves would produce more carbon dioxide than the combined annual emissions of the world's 28 lowest-income countries. [2] The consent was granted. The environmental impact assessment was completed. The process followed the law as it stood. And the law as it stood did not require any assessment of what would happen when the extracted oil was actually burned.

In June 2024, the UK Supreme Court ruled, in a case brought by a local resident named Sarah Finch on behalf of the Weald Action Group against Surrey County Council, that an Environmental Impact Assessment for a fossil fuel project must assess the downstream greenhouse gas emissions from the eventual combustion of the fuel produced, not only the emissions from the extraction process itself. [3] In January 2025, Scotland's Court of Session applied that ruling to Rosebank and to Shell's Jackdaw field in the same hearing, declared both consents unlawful, and ordered the developers to seek fresh approval that accounted for the full climate cost of the project. [4] Equinor said it was pleased with the outcome and would continue developing the project while awaiting the new consents. The company said Rosebank is critical for the UK's economic growth and that an estimated 77 percent of total direct investment would benefit UK businesses. [4]

The Enabling Law

The Rosebank approval was not a regulatory failure. It was a regulatory system functioning exactly as designed. UK offshore oil and gas projects are consented under the Petroleum Act 1998, as amended by the Energy Act 2016, with environmental assessment governed by the Offshore Petroleum Production and Pipelines (Assessment of Environmental Effects) Regulations 1999. [5] Those regulations required developers to identify and assess the significant environmental effects of extraction. For more than two decades, both regulators and developers interpreted 'significant effects' to mean only Scope 1 and 2 emissions: the direct emissions from drilling, processing, and operating the field. Scope 3 emissions, the emissions produced when the extracted oil was refined and burned by end users, were treated as outside the project boundary. [5] This interpretation was not unusual or eccentric; it was the standard reading applied to fossil fuel consenting in the United Kingdom, across Europe under the EU EIA Directive, and in most major oil-

producing jurisdictions. A developer applying for consent in 2023 was doing exactly what every previous developer had done since the regulations came into force.

The financial architecture surrounding that legal gap makes it durable. The IMF calculated that fossil fuels received $7 trillion in global subsidies in 2022, equivalent to 7.1 percent of world GDP. [6] The figure requires precision, because it is often misread. Of the $7 trillion, $1.3 trillion consists of explicit subsidies: direct government payments and regulated underpricing of supply costs, including fuel price controls, below-market royalties, and tax preferences such as the depletion allowance first described in this book's introduction. [6] The remaining $5.7 trillion is implicit: the unpriced environmental cost of burning fossil fuels, principally the damage from climate change and local air pollution, which governments do not charge producers or consumers but which communities and health systems pay for in other ways. Eighty percent of global coal consumption was priced at below half of its efficient level in 2022. The Scope 3 assessment gap in the EIA regime and the implicit subsidy gap in energy pricing are two expressions of the same structural omission: the cost of burning the fuel is not borne by whoever decides to extract it. [6]

Not an Isolated Case

The Rosebank case is not unique within the UK, let alone globally. In September 2024, England's High Court quashed consent for the Whitehaven coal mine in Cumbria, the first proposed deep coal mine in the UK in thirty years, ruling on identical grounds: the consenting authority had failed to assess the Scope 3 emissions from burning the extracted coal when approving the project. [7] In March 2025, the marine conservation group Oceana UK initiated a further judicial review challenging 28 offshore oil and gas exploration licences issued by the UK government in June 2024, arguing the same Scope 3 omission applied at the earlier licensing stage, not only at the development consent stage. [8]

Outside the UK, the same regulatory blind spot remains entrenched. In Australia, Woodside Energy's Scarborough liquefied natural gas project, approved by the federal government and the Western Australian Environmental Protection Authority, proceeded under an assessment framework that did not require evaluation of the Scope 3 emissions from burning the gas once exported and consumed by customers in Asia. [9] In Canada, the Trans Mountain Pipeline Expansion Project, which tripled the capacity of an existing crude oil pipeline from Alberta to British Columbia and was approved by the National Energy Board in 2019, similarly underwent an environmental review that evaluated spill risk and local impacts but not the full lifecycle climate cost of the additional oil it would carry to export markets. [10] In both cases the projects were legal, the assessments were compliant with national law, and in both cases that law simply did not require developers to account for the single largest environmental impact of their projects: the emissions from burning the product they intended to produce.

The Possible Solution

The Finch ruling of 20 June 2024 is the working counter-example this chapter argues from: a court determined, for the first time in UK legal history, that the climate cost of burning extracted fossil fuel is an environmental effect of extracting it, and must be assessed before a consent can lawfully be granted. [3] On 19 June 2025, the UK government published new guidance for offshore oil and gas developers implementing that requirement: any application for development consent must now include an assessment of Scope 3 emissions, providing a methodology for how those emissions should be quantified and weighed. [11] The guidance is a real, dated, operative instrument, not a proposal. It is already in force. Equinor cannot reapply for Rosebank consent without complying with it. The UK is now the first major oil-producing jurisdiction in the world to require

Scope 3 assessment as a legal condition of development consent for offshore extraction.

The fix this chapter is arguing for is the extension of that requirement to every major oil-producing jurisdiction, as a binding standard in international fossil fuel licensing rather than a precedent confined to one country's case law, paired with the systematic elimination of the $1.3 trillion in explicit subsidies the IMF identifies as direct government transfers to the industry. On the implicit subsidy, the position is different and more precise: the $5.7 trillion is not, strictly, a payment that can simply be stopped. It is the gap between what fossil fuel consumption costs and what it is priced at. Closing that gap means pricing carbon at a level that reflects the actual damage. [6]

The Finch ruling took thirty years of North Sea oil development, eight years of citizen complaints, and a six-year Supreme Court process to produce a single requirement that any competent regulator could have written into law in 1999. The UK's June 2025 guidance shows it can be written into law, clearly, in a document of fourteen pages. The question for every other oil-producing jurisdiction is whether it waits for its own Finch, or borrows the answer already available.

Why Commons World

Commons World's Commons Bank and Commons Unit of Exchange are built for precisely this repricing gap: instruments designed to ensure the cost of burning a barrel of oil is borne by whoever decides to extract it, not passed forward in time to whoever is alive when the consequences arrive. The Finch ruling took thirty years to establish that Scope 3 emissions are an extraction cost. CUE makes that calculation automatic, continuous, and borne at the point of decision — not discovered by the generation that inherits the bill.

REFERENCES

1 Beale & Co, "Court puts stop to unlawful development green lights! Rosebank & Jackdaw oilfields ruling," February 2025; Energy Digital, "What Does Court Ruling Mean for Shell and Prized Oilfields?" January 2025.

2 ELAW, "UK Oil Field Approvals Reversed in Major Climate Victory," February 2025; ClientEarth, press release, January 30, 2025.

3 R (Finch on behalf of the Weald Action Group) v Surrey County Council and others [2024] UKSC 20, judgment 20 June 2024; Vinson & Elkins, "UK Supreme Court Hands Down a Groundbreaking Decision Requiring The Assessment of 'Scope 3' GHG Emissions," 2024.

4 Court of Session (Outer House), Scotland, judgment 29 January 2025, Greenpeace UK and Uplift v Secretary of State; Energy Voice, "Court rules Rosebank and Jackdaw approvals invalid," January 2025.

5 Petroleum Act 1998 (UK); Energy Act 2016 (UK); Offshore Petroleum Production and Pipelines (Assessment of Environmental Effects) Regulations 1999 (SI 1999/360); Harper Macleod, "Court rules oil and gas field approvals were unlawful," December 2025.

6 International Monetary Fund, "IMF Fossil Fuel Subsidies Data: 2023 Update," IMF Working Paper WP/23/169, August 2023; IMF blog, "Fossil Fuel Subsidies Surged to Record $7 Trillion," August 2023.

7 ClientEarth, press release on Whitehaven coal mine High Court ruling, September 2024.

8 Herbert Smith Freehills Kramer, "North Sea Oil and Gas Licenses Face New Climate Challenge from Marine Conservation Group Oceana," April 2025.

9 Australian Conservation Foundation and others, legal challenges to Scarborough LNG approval; Woodside Energy, Scarborough Environmental Impact Assessment, 2022.

10 National Energy Board (Canada), Trans Mountain Expansion Project Reconsideration Report, 2019; Senate of Canada, Standing Committee on Energy, Environment and Natural Resources, review proceedings 2019.

11 UK Department for Energy Security and Net Zero, "New guidance issued for environmental impact assessments," 19 June 2025, gov.uk.

CHAPTER FIVE · CHALLENGE 5

Pandemic preparedness, mental health, healthcare access

91% of people with depression globally cannot access care.

Human health and wellbeing

Alec Raeshawn Smith was diagnosed with Type 1 diabetes in May 2015, at the age of 24. For the first two years, provisions of the Affordable Care Act allowed him to remain on his mother's health insurance. On 20 May 2017, he turned 26 and aged off her plan. His monthly cost for insulin and supplies was roughly $1,300. His salary as a restaurant manager in Minneapolis ran to just over $2,000 a month. He had no employer-provided health coverage. He began rationing his doses to stretch what remained of his supply until his next payday. [1] On 27 June 2017, his girlfriend found him dead in his apartment. He was 27 days past the date his insurance had lapsed. His official cause of death was diabetic ketoacidosis, a life-threatening complication that occurs when the body produces excess blood acids because it lacks enough insulin. [1] His mother, Nicole Smith-Holt, later told Eli Lilly's shareholder meeting: 'the unofficial cause of death is

slipping through the cracks of our broken health care system and corporate greed.' [2]

Alec Smith's death is not the story of an uninsured country. It is the story of a specifically designed pricing structure, enabled by a specific law, that made the insulin he needed to live — a drug first isolated in 1921 and off patent for decades — cost more in the United States than anywhere else in the developed world.

The Enabling Law

On 8 December 2003, President George W. Bush signed the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement and Modernization Act (MMA, P.L. 108-173). The legislation created Medicare Part D, providing a prescription drug benefit for seniors, a genuinely significant expansion of coverage. It also contained a provision that would shape the US drug pricing structure for the next two decades: Section 1860D-11(i) of the Social Security Act, the non-interference clause. [3] The clause stated that the Secretary of Health and Human Services may not interfere with the negotiations between drug manufacturers and pharmacies and PDP sponsors, and may not require a particular formulary or institute a price structure for covered Part D drugs. [3] In practical terms: Medicare, which by the time Alec Smith turned 26 covered roughly 32 percent of all US retail drug spending, was legally forbidden from negotiating the prices it paid for the drugs it bought. Every other large government purchaser in the developed world negotiated. The Veterans Administration negotiated and paid roughly 40 percent of what Medicare paid for the same drugs. The UK, Canada, Australia, France, Germany, and Japan all negotiated through their national health systems. The MMA made the US the only wealthy country where the largest single payer was statutorily barred from asking for a lower price. [4]

The pharmaceutical industry deployed nearly 1,000 lobbyists to shape the MMA's passage, with PhRMA alone spending over $65 million on federal lobbying in 2003 and 2004. [5] The non-interference

clause was the result. With no buyer in the US market large enough to refuse a manufacturer's price, Eli Lilly, Novo Nordisk, and Sanofi, the three companies that between them control over 90 percent of the global insulin market, raised insulin list prices by more than 150 percent between 2002 and 2013, while building a parallel system of rebates paid to Pharmacy Benefit Managers, the corporate intermediaries that administer drug benefits for insurance plans. [6] The rebate system created an incentive to raise list prices further: a higher list price meant a larger absolute rebate, which the PBM used to win formulary placement for the manufacturer's product, while patients whose cost-sharing was tied to the list price paid more. Eli Lilly, Novo Nordisk, and Sanofi each participated in this arrangement; the three largest PBMs, UnitedHealth's Optum Rx, CVS Health's Caremark, and Cigna's Express Scripts, built substantial businesses on the spread between list and net prices. [7]

Not an Isolated Case

The same three manufacturers selling insulin in the United States at an average gross price of $98.70 per standard unit in 2018 sold the identical products in Canada for $12.00 per unit, in the United Kingdom for $7.52, and in Australia for $6.94, according to a RAND Corporation analysis using IQVIA prescription-drug market data across 33 countries. [8] In 2018, the United States accounted for 31.6 percent of global insulin consumption but 83.8 percent of global insulin sales revenue. The same drug. The same companies. A price eight times higher, structured by a single clause in a 2003 law. [8]

The human cost accumulates in the data. A 2020 T1International survey found that one in four people with Type 1 diabetes in the United States had rationed their insulin at some point in the previous year. [9] Globally, Nicole Smith-Holt's own words in her 2018 testimony carry a figure that the system's designers never counted: half of the people worldwide who need insulin cannot reliably access it. [1] The accountability is now arriving through litigation. The FTC filed suit in

September 2024 against all three major PBMs, Optum Rx, Caremark, and Express Scripts, for allegedly inflating insulin prices through their rebate arrangements. [10] Texas filed a parallel suit the same month also naming Eli Lilly, Novo Nordisk, and Sanofi directly. Jefferson Health, a large US nonprofit health system, sued all six companies in January 2026, arguing their collective rebate scheme amounted to a hidden subsidy that self-insured and public plans were being forced to fund. [11]

The Possible Solution

The Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 (P.L. 117-169, enacted 16 August 2022) repealed the non-interference clause for a defined set of drugs and for Medicare enrollees only. Section 11002 gave the Secretary of HHS the authority to negotiate prices directly with manufacturers for the first time in Medicare's history. [12] The first ten drugs were selected for negotiation in August 2023; the negotiated prices, representing an average reduction of 79 percent from list price, took effect on 1 January 2026. Section 11001 separately capped insulin cost-sharing for Medicare enrollees at $35 per month from 2023. A person in Alec Smith's position today, if they were a Medicare enrollee, would pay $35 a month for their insulin.

A person in Alec Smith's position today, at 26 with private coverage or none, pays whatever the unreformed private market charges. The IRA's negotiation authority and its $35 cap apply only to Medicare. [12] The specific fix this chapter is arguing for is the extension of both provisions to all Americans regardless of their coverage type: repeal the non-interference clause entirely rather than partially, and apply the $35 insulin cap as a national price ceiling rather than a Medicare-specific rule. Legislation extending the cap to private insurance has been introduced in Congress, including the Affordable Insulin Now Act of 2023, and has not passed. [13] Every other wealthy country already operates the system the IRA partially introduced: a single or dominant buyer that negotiates prices, with the resulting rate applied

nationally. None of them have measurably worse access to insulin as a result. The UK pays $7.52 per standard unit. Alec Smith paid with his life at $98.70.

Why Commons World

Commons World's Commons Bank and Commons Unit of Exchange are built for precisely this repricing gap: instruments that place the actual cost of a medicine — not the cost inflated by a decades-old non-interference clause and a rebate system designed to hide the markup — at the point where a payer decides what to offer and a manufacturer decides whether to accept. Alec Smith paid with his life at $98.70 per unit. The UK pays $7.52 for the same insulin. The distance between those two numbers is not chemistry. It is architecture.

REFERENCES

1 Nicole Smith-Holt, "A Mother's Grief and the Fight for Affordable Insulin," Truthout, February 2018; T1International, "Alec's Law," t1international.com; Snopes, "Did Alex Smith Die at Age 26 Because He Couldn't Afford Insulin?" updated February 2026 (confirms facts, notes name correction).

2 Minnesota DFL Caucus, "Alec's Law helps 465 Minnesotans access Affordable Insulin," March 2021, citing Nicole Smith-Holt's statement at Eli Lilly shareholder meeting, May 2018.

3 Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003, P.L. 108-173, Section 1860D-11(i) of the Social Security Act; Congress.gov CRS Report IF11318, "Negotiation of Drug Prices in Medicare Part D."

4 Congressional Research Service, R47872, "Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Under the Inflation Reduction Act," 2022.

5 U.S. lobbying disclosure records (Senate Office of Public Records), on PhRMA lobbying disclosures 2003–2004.

6 CNBC, "Eli Lilly CEO vows not to raise insulin prices again, while Novo Nordisk and Sanofi hedge," May 2023; Fierce Pharma, "Sanofi, Novo and Lilly face class action over 'astounding' insulin price hikes," January 2017.

7 FTC, complaint against Optum Rx, CVS Caremark, and Express Scripts, September 2024; CNBC, "FTC sues drug middlemen for allegedly inflating insulin prices," September 2024.

8 RAND Corporation / ASPE, "Comparing Insulin Prices in the United States to Other Countries: Updated Results Using 2022 Data," February 2024; TechTarget Health IT, "Insulin Prices 8x Higher in the US Compared to Similar Nations."

9 T1International, "Alec's Law" page, citing 2020 T1International survey.

10 CNBC, "FTC sues drug middlemen for allegedly inflating insulin prices," 20 September 2024.

11 HealthExec, "Large nonprofit health system sues PBMs, drug companies over insulin prices," January 2026.

12 Inflation Reduction Act of 2022, P.L. 117-169, Sections 11001–11002; NCBI Bookshelf, "Comparing Insulin Prices in the United States to Other Countries: Updated Results Using 2022 Data," 2024.

13 Affordable Insulin Now Act of 2023; Congress.gov, CRS Report IF11318.

CHAPTER SIX · CHALLENGE 6

Attention, discernment, inner capability

The average screen attention span has fallen from two and a half minutes in 2004 to under fifty seconds today.

Human consciousness and mental resilience

Molly Russell was 14 years old when she died in November 2017 at her family home in Harrow, north London. Her father, Ian Russell, discovered after her death that she had been viewing hundreds of posts about depression, self-harm, and suicide on Instagram and Pinterest in the months before she died: content that the platforms' own algorithms had served to her, post after post, because her engagement signals told the algorithm she was consuming it. [1] At a UK inquest in September 2022, the senior coroner Andrew Walker concluded that Molly died from 'an act of self-harm while suffering from depression and the negative effects of online content.' He found that Instagram and Pinterest each contributed to her death 'in a more than minimal way.' [1] A Meta executive appearing at the inquest was asked directly whether the content Molly had been viewing should have been on the platform. The executive said it should not have been there. [2]

The inquest's finding was specific: it was not that Molly sought out harmful content. It was that the platform's recommendation system identified her interest in the subject and fed her more of it, at increasing intensity, without any mechanism that would have interrupted the sequence, alerted a parent or a clinician, or removed content that Meta's own representative conceded was not supposed to be there. The algorithm performed exactly as designed. The design optimised for continued engagement. Continued engagement meant continued exposure to content that contributed to her death.

The Enabling Law

Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, enacted as part of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-104, signed 8 February 1996), provides the legal framework that made the design choice at the heart of Molly Russell's case not only possible but commercially rational. Its core provision, 47 U.S.C. § 230(c)(1), states: 'No provider or user of an interactive computer service shall be treated as the publisher or speaker of any information provided by another information content provider.' [3] In 1996, the statute was written for early bulletin-board services and nascent websites that might host thousands of user posts: its purpose was to allow them to moderate harmful content without thereby assuming legal liability for everything else. Courts subsequently extended its protection to cover not merely hosting but algorithmic amplification, recommendation, and curation, the active selection and prioritisation of content by a platform's own systems. [4]

The result is a legal structure in which a platform bears no civil liability for the consequences of content its algorithm actively selects and serves to a 14-year-old girl at the moment she is most vulnerable, even when its own internal research has confirmed the harm. Meta's internal presentation of 2019, reported by the Wall Street Journal and later confirmed by whistleblower Frances Haugen's evidence to the US Senate in October 2021, stated in its own words: 'We make body

image issues worse for one in three teen girls.' It was presented to Instagram's executive team. It was cited in a 2020 presentation shown to CEO Mark Zuckerberg. [5] Section 230 ensured that the gap between what the company knew and what it could be held liable for remained intact. Harvard University researchers calculated that in 2022 alone, Meta, TikTok, Snap, YouTube, and Twitter generated $11 billion in advertising revenue derived specifically from advertising directed at children and teenagers. [6]

The attention collapse that forms this chapter's tagline is not a cultural accident either. Gloria Mark, professor of informatics at the University of California, Irvine, began measuring how long people sustained attention on a single screen in 2004, using stopwatches and later automated computer-logging software. In 2004 the average was two and a half minutes. By 2012 it had fallen to 75 seconds. By 2016 to 2020, the average across multiple replications had settled at 47 seconds, a reduction of roughly two-thirds in sixteen years. The period of fastest decline coincides precisely with the period of smartphone mass adoption and algorithmic social media feed design, both of which are engineered to interrupt sustained attention and reward the fragment.

Not an Isolated Case

Molly Russell's case was not the first and was not the last. In October 2023, 41 state Attorneys General in the United States filed a joint lawsuit against Meta, alleging the company had deliberately designed addictive features for minors, including Instagram's infinite scroll, notification systems, and recommendation algorithms, while concealing its own research showing the resulting harm. [7] In August 2024, the US Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission sued TikTok and its parent company ByteDance for violating the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998, having knowingly collected personal data from millions of users under 13 without parental consent, and having exposed minor users to harmful

content including suicide and self-harm material despite internal warnings. [8]

A 2024 meta-analysis drawing on nearly 100,000 participants found a statistically significant association between short-form video use, the format pioneered by TikTok and adopted by Instagram Reels and YouTube Shorts, and measurably poorer attention and inhibitory control across age groups. [9] Among teens who reported suicidal thoughts in Meta's own research, 13 percent of British users and 6 percent of American users traced the desire to Instagram. [5] The pattern across these cases is consistent: a platform's algorithm identified emotional vulnerability as a signal for deeper engagement, served more of the relevant content, and Section 230 ensured that no civil liability attached to the outcome, regardless of what the company had documented about it internally.

The Possible Solution

The United Kingdom Online Safety Act 2023 (Royal Assent 26 October 2023) is the working counter-example, the first binding statutory framework anywhere in the world to impose enforceable duties on platforms in respect of harms to children from algorithmic content. [10] The Act requires platforms to conduct and publish risk assessments for harms to children, implement age-appropriate safety measures by default rather than as opt-in features, and remove illegal content including content promoting self-harm and suicide. The regulator, Ofcom, began publishing enforcement codes in 2024 and issued its first binding requirements to platforms the same year. [10] The Act does not depend on Section 230 because it is not US law. It creates liability in the UK regardless of the platform's home jurisdiction, and its enforcement mechanism runs through the regulator rather than through civil litigation by injured parties. [10]

In the United States, the Kids Online Safety Act (KOSA), first introduced in February 2022 following the Facebook Papers disclosures, passed the Senate in July 2024 by a vote of 91 to 3. It

would require platforms to disable addictive design features, including infinite scroll and autoplay, for users under 17, to activate the most protective settings by default, and to submit to independent audits of their effects on minors' wellbeing. It died in the House of Representatives in December 2024 when Republican leadership declined to bring it to a floor vote. [11] The fix this chapter is arguing for is specific: amend Section 230 to remove immunity where a platform has internal documented research demonstrating harm to minors and has nonetheless continued to deploy the algorithmic features producing that harm, and pass KOSA's duty-of-care provisions in full, taking the UK Online Safety Act's model as the precedent that a binding, regulator-enforced framework is both achievable and compatible with a functioning digital economy.

Ian Russell, Molly's father, told the inquest that he would not have let his daughter walk down a street lined with the kind of content the algorithm was placing in front of her. The law as written in 1996 treated the platform as a passive conduit for a street that it did not design. The platform that served content to Molly Russell designed the street, curated what was on it, watched where she stopped, and sent her back there. Amending Section 230 to reflect that distinction is not a complicated legislative task. It has been waiting, unfinished, since the Facebook Papers were published in October 2021.

Why Commons World

Commons World's Global Accountability Rating exists precisely to make the gap between what platforms know and what they do publicly visible and measurable. A platform that has documented, in its own internal research, that its design causes harm to minors, and has continued operating that design, carries a GAR score that reflects that choice — visible to every advertiser, every regulator, every parent, and every legislator before whom it claims to be a responsible actor. The darkness that Section 230 protects cannot survive a permanent, independently verified public record.

REFERENCES

1 BBC News, "Molly Russell inquest: Coroner finds social media firms contributed to teenager's death," 30 September 2022; The Guardian, "Molly Russell died from 'harmful effects of online content' coroner concludes."

2 The Guardian, "Meta executive at Molly Russell inquest: content she viewed should not have been on Instagram," September 2022.

3 Communications Decency Act, Title V of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, P.L. 104-104 (signed 8 February 1996); 47 U.S.C. § 230(c)(1); Congress.gov CRS Report R46751, "Section 230: An Overview."

4 US Department of Justice, "Department of Justice's Review of Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act of 1996"; Dickinson, Gregory M., "Section 230: A Juridical History," Stanford Law, 2025.

5 Wall Street Journal, "The Facebook Files: Facebook Knows Instagram Is Toxic for Teen Girls, Its Research Shows," 15 September 2021; NPR, "Whistleblower's testimony has resurfaced Facebook's Instagram problem," October 2021.

6 Harvard University study cited in US Senate Commerce Committee, "Kids Online Privacy Protections — Finally — Set to Pass Senate," July 2024.

7 Coalition of 41 state Attorneys General v. Meta Platforms Inc., filed October 2023; press releases from participating AG offices.

8 US Department of Justice and FTC v. TikTok Inc. and ByteDance Ltd., filed August 2024.

9 Speakwise App, "Attention Span Statistics 2026," citing meta-analysis of approximately 100,000 participants on short-form video and attention; Gloria Mark, Attention Span (Hanover Square Press, 2023); UC Irvine News, "How to sharpen your attention and meet your goals in 2024," January 2024.

10 Online Safety Act 2023 (UK), Royal Assent 26 October 2023; Ofcom, "Children's Safety Codes of Practice," 2024.

11 Kids Online Safety Act (KOSA), S.1409, 118th Congress; US Senate vote 91–3, July 2024; CPR News, "Despite strong bipartisan support, bill to protect kids online fails to advance in Congress," December 2024.

CHAPTER SEVEN · CHALLENGE 7

Relevance, access, AI disruption

The education system was designed for an economy that no longer exists.

Education for a changing world

When Corinthian Colleges opened its first campus in 1995, it entered a market shaped by a simple premise: a credential, any accredited credential, was worth the debt required to obtain it. The company built its business on that premise and on the federal funding system that underwrote it, growing within twenty years to more than 100 campuses operating under the Everest, WyoTech, and Heald brands, with 110,000 students enrolled at its peak. [1] Its recruiters were trained to identify prospective students in their most vulnerable moments, targeting single parents, the recently unemployed, and people who had recently experienced a family bereavement, and to promise them that a Corinthian credential would produce the kind of employment that would justify the cost. [2] The employment it promised did not exist. Federal investigators found that campuses were falsifying job placement rates systematically, in some cases recording students as employed in their field of study when they were working in grocery stores or fast-food chains. [1] In April 2015, the US Department of

Education restricted Corinthian's access to federal financial aid after finding evidence of widespread fraud. The company collapsed within weeks, abandoning 16,000 students mid-course. More than 560,000 students who attended the chain between 1995 and 2015 were left carrying a total of $5.8 billion in federal student debt, which the Biden administration ultimately discharged in June 2022 in the largest single loan cancellation in the Education Department's history. [1]

The Enabling Law

Two interlocking legal mechanisms made Corinthian's operation not only possible but highly profitable. The first is Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-329, signed 8 November 1965), which created the federal student aid programmes that fund Pell Grants, Direct Loans, and subsidised loans. In 1972 Congress amended the HEA to extend Title IV eligibility to for-profit colleges; from that point, a private company whose programmes were accredited could receive federal grant and loan money on behalf of its students, with no requirement that those students achieve any particular employment outcome. [3] To guard against total dependence on public money, the Higher Education Amendments of 1992 (P.L. 102-325) introduced an 85/15 rule requiring for-profit colleges to derive at least 15 percent of their revenue from non-federal sources; the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 (P.L. 105-244) weakened this to 90/10, permitting up to 90 percent federal funding. [4] The rule had a further gap: GI Bill benefits and Department of Defense Tuition Assistance, both federal funds, were excluded from the 90 percent calculation and counted on the non-federal side of the ledger. For every veteran whose GI Bill paid tuition, a for-profit college could enrol nine more students funded entirely by Title IV money. A 2012 Senate investigation documented that for-profit recruiters were actively targeting veterans at hospitals and transition offices specifically to exploit this counting rule, using deceptive marketing,

including websites like GIBill.com, to steer servicemembers toward their campuses. [5]

The second mechanism is the non-dischargeability of federal student loans in bankruptcy, established in the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1978 and codified at 11 U.S.C. § 523(a)(8). In normal credit markets, a lender assesses whether the asset purchased with borrowed money is worth the loan. A mortgage lender examines the property; a business lender examines the revenue model. No comparable discipline operated in the federal student loan market, because the loan could not be discharged: a student who borrowed $30,000 for a Corinthian credential that produced no employment remained liable for that debt regardless of the credential's value. [6] For-profit colleges enrol roughly 10 percent of US higher education students but are responsible for nearly 50 percent of all federal student loan defaults, the clearest available measure of how consistently the credential's value fails to justify its cost. [7]

Not an Isolated Case

Corinthian was not the only company operating this model. ITT Technical Institute, founded in 1969, operated 130 campuses across 38 states and collapsed in September 2016 after the Education Department restricted its access to federal aid over findings of misrepresentation and financial irregularities, abandoning approximately 35,000 students mid-course. [8] The University of Phoenix, the largest for-profit university in the United States at its peak, paid $191 million in 2019 to settle Federal Trade Commission charges that it had used deceptive advertising about its relationships with employers to recruit students. [9] DeVry University paid $100 million in 2016 to settle FTC charges over misleading claims about graduates' employment rates and salaries. [10]

Beneath the fraud cases lies the structural question the tagline names: a system designed in 1965 to widen access to an industrial-era labour market, where a credential in most fields was reliably worth

the cost. The economy those credentials were built to serve has been transformed twice since then, first by deindustrialisation and the shift to service and knowledge work in the 1980s and 1990s, and now by AI-driven automation that is compressing the employment returns from credentials across a widening range of fields. A student borrowing $30,000 today for a programme whose graduates' earnings cannot service the debt is not a victim of fraud in the Corinthian sense: they are a victim of a funding architecture that still routes federal money to programmes regardless of their employment outcomes, in an economy that no longer reliably rewards credentials the way the 1965 law assumed it would.

The Possible Solution

The GI Bill loophole was closed by the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (P.L. 117-2), which amended the 90/10 calculation to count GI Bill and military education benefits as federal funds. The new rule took effect for institutional fiscal years beginning after 1 January 2023, and the Department of Education estimated 87 for-profit colleges would fail the revised 90/10 test. [11] A second instrument also existed briefly. The Gainful Employment Rule, introduced under the Obama administration's Department of Education in 2015, required vocational and for-profit programmes to demonstrate that graduates' earnings were sufficient to service their debt as a condition of Title IV eligibility. The Trump administration rescinded it in 2019. The Biden administration reinstated it in 2023; a federal court vacated it in 2024. [12] The fix is specific: enact the Gainful Employment standard as a statute rather than a regulation, placing it beyond the reach of any single administration's rescission, and extend it to all Title IV-eligible programmes, not only those at for-profit institutions.

Germany's dual education system demonstrates at scale what outcomes-linked education funding looks like in practice. The Vocational Training Act (Berufsbildungsgesetz, BBiG), enacted in 1969 and significantly modernised in 2020, requires employers to co-

fund and co-design apprenticeship programmes that alternate between classroom instruction and paid workplace training. [13] The arrangement means that programme content is continuously updated to reflect what employers actually need, that graduates enter employment at rates consistently above 80 percent, and that the cost of the programme is partly borne by the same sector that benefits from the graduate's skills. It does not eliminate the problem of relevance in a changing economy, but it builds relevance into the funding architecture: a programme that no longer produces employable graduates loses employer co-funding and shrinks. A Corinthian-style operation, deriving nearly all its revenue from a government that does not check outcomes, cannot exist inside the German model. [13]

The underlying principle is the same: that the purpose of education is to develop capable, discerning, adaptable people, not to produce credential-holders at the lowest short-term cost to whoever does not have to live with the outcome. The Gainful Employment Rule, the German dual system, and the 2023 loophole closure are all partial expressions of that principle in existing law. Making it the permanent, statutory condition of every programme that claims public money is the specific reform waiting to be written.

Why Commons World

Commons World's Commons Education pillar is built on the same underlying principle: that the purpose of education is to develop capable, discerning, adaptable people, not credential-holders at the lowest short-term cost to whoever does not have to live with the outcome. CE's curriculum is not designed for the economy of 1965. It is designed for the economy of the learner's adult life — continuously updated, outcomes-linked, and built around the one skill no automation has yet displaced: the capacity to understand, evaluate, and act on evidence.

REFERENCES

1 Washington Post, "Former Corinthian students get federal student debt erased," June 2022; KQED, "Student Loan Debt Erased for Defrauded Former Corinthian Students," June 2022.

2 KQED, "Student Loan Debt Erased for Defrauded Former Corinthian Students," June 2022, citing California Attorney General findings.

3 Higher Education Act of 1965, P.L. 89-329, signed 8 November 1965; Wikipedia, "Higher Education Act of 1965" (for-profit eligibility amendment 1972).

4 Higher Education Amendments of 1992, P.L. 102-325 (85/15 rule); Higher Education Amendments of 1998, P.L. 105-244 (90/10 rule); Veterans Education Success, "The 90/10 Loophole."

5 US Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, "For Profit Higher Education: The Failure to Safeguard the Federal Investment and Ensure Student Success," July 2012; Veterans Education Success, "The 90/10 Loophole."

6 Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1978; 11 U.S.C. § 523(a)(8); Mason Veterans and Servicemembers Legal Clinic, "The 90/10 Loophole: Rest for the Weary?" February 2021.

7 American Federation of Teachers, "Justice and relief for defrauded Corinthian students," June 2022.

8 US Department of Education, announcement of ITT Technical Institute actions, September 2016.

9 Federal Trade Commission, settlement with University of Phoenix, December 2019.

11 Federal Trade Commission, settlement with DeVry University, January 2016.

11 American Rescue Plan Act of 2021, P.L. 117-2; Higher Ed Dive, "Education Department finalizes 90/10 rule, college ownership regulations," October 2022; Wikipedia, "90-10 rule."

12 US Department of Education, Gainful Employment regulations, 2015 (rescinded 2019, reinstated 2023); Higher Ed Dive reporting on federal court vacating the rule, 2024.

13 Berufsbildungsgesetz (Vocational Training Act), Germany, enacted 1969, modernised by Berufsbildungsmodernisierungsgesetz 2020; Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training (BIBB), Germany, annual report data on apprenticeship completion and employment rates.

CHAPTER EIGHT · CHALLENGE 8

Democratic erosion, capture, legitimacy

Trust in parliaments has declined across democracies while trust in non-representative institutions has risen.

Governance and institutional trust

On 21 January 2010, the United States Supreme Court decided Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission by five votes to four. The case arose when a conservative nonprofit organisation, Citizens United, wanted to air a film criticising Hillary Clinton within thirty days of a primary election, which the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 prohibited. The majority found the prohibition unconstitutional. [1] Writing for the majority, Justice Anthony Kennedy concluded that 'independent political expenditures by corporations and other outside groups do not give rise to corruption or the appearance of corruption.' [1] That sentence reversed more than a century of campaign finance law in the United States and set a course for the most expensive electoral system in any democracy in the world.

The results arrived quickly. In 2008, outside groups spent $144 million on federal elections. In 2012, the first presidential election under the new rules, outside spending surpassed $1 billion. In 2024 it

reached $4.2 billion, a 28-fold increase in sixteen years. [2] In 2012, the top 1 percent of super PAC donors provided 77 percent of all funds; by 2024 that figure had risen to 97 percent. [2] Dark money, election spending by groups that do not disclose their donors, hit a record $1.9 billion in the 2024 cycle alone, more than double the prior record of $1 billion set in 2020. [3] In the 2024 presidential election, a group funded by Elon Musk, the world's wealthiest person, took on core components of the winning campaign, including voter outreach operations. The candidate who benefited had substantially trailed in traditional disclosed donations; the super PAC funding closed the gap. [1]

The Enabling Law

The Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-155, signed 27 March 2002, commonly known as McCain-Feingold after its Senate sponsors) was itself the product of a decade of bipartisan effort to address the role of money in federal elections. It prohibited corporations and unions from using their general treasury funds for 'electioneering communications' in the thirty or sixty days before a primary or general election. [4] Citizens United did not merely limit that prohibition; it overruled two prior Supreme Court decisions, Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce (1990) and McConnell v. FEC (2003), which had each found such restrictions constitutionally sound. Kennedy's majority rested on the principle that independent spending, properly separated from a campaign, cannot be corrupting by definition: transparency rules and the requirement of independence were, in the Court's view, sufficient safeguards. [1] Within months, the DC Circuit extended Citizens United's logic to contributions in SpeechNow.org v. FEC, creating super PACs, organisations that could raise and spend unlimited sums as long as they maintained nominal independence from candidates. [4]

The Court's two assurances, independence and transparency, have since proved empty. The Federal Election Commission, which

enforces campaign finance law, is structured to be evenly divided between the two parties and has almost never enforced the coordination prohibitions that were supposed to keep super PACs genuinely independent from campaigns. The transparency Citizens United's majority invoked as a sufficient safeguard has been systematically undermined by dark money groups that are not required to disclose their donors and can funnel unlimited sums to super PACs, which are required to report contributions but not the original source of funds funnelled through intermediaries. [3] The OECD's 2024 Trust Survey, covering 30 democracies, asked respondents directly: if a corporation promoted a policy that benefited its industry but could be harmful to society as a whole, how likely is it that the national government would refuse the corporation's demand? Across OECD countries, less than one person in three found this likely. [5]

Not an Isolated Case

The United States experienced the lowest trust in national government of any OECD country measured in 2024, down 19.5 percentage points since 2006. But the trust decline is not uniquely American. In November 2023, a higher share of people across OECD countries, 44 percent, had low or no trust in their national government than had high or moderately high trust, 39 percent. Only 38 percent believed parliament could effectively hold the national government accountable. In the United Kingdom, the national parliament is trusted by only 24 percent of the population; political parties by 12 percent.

The structural driver is visible across countries wherever private finance flows into politics with limited transparency. The UK's Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000 requires disclosure of donations above £10,000 to political parties at the national level, but has no equivalent framework for the lobbying industry, which operates under the Transparency of Lobbying, Non-

Party Campaigning and Trade Union Administration Act 2014, widely criticised by parliamentary committees for covering a fraction of actual lobbying activity, not requiring disclosure of the content of approaches, and having no independent monitoring of compliance. [6] In 2021 and 2022, a cluster of UK parliamentary scandals involving paid access to ministers, gifts and hospitality to MPs, and contracts awarded without competitive tender during the pandemic produced what the public accounts committee described as a 'systematic' breakdown of governance standards, and drove further falls in the already low trust figures. [7]

The Possible Solution

The specific instrument that would address the Citizens United transparency gap has been ready for fifteen years. The DISCLOSE Act (Democracy Is Strengthened by Casting Light on Spending in Elections, S. 443 / H.R. 1118) has been introduced in every session of Congress since 2010. Its core requirement is simple: any organisation spending $10,000 or more on federal elections must disclose the identity of donors contributing $10,000 or more. It makes no claim about the amount of money that can be spent. [8] The DISCLOSE Act passed the House of Representatives in June 2010 on a 219 to 206 vote. It has been filibustered in the Senate on every subsequent attempt, including a 49 to 49 vote in September 2022 that fell eleven votes short of the sixty required to advance. Mitch McConnell, who told NPR in 2003 that election spending should be 'limited and disclosed', led the filibuster. [8]

Germany's campaign finance framework demonstrates that binding transparency at the statutory level is achievable and compatible with vigorous political competition. Under the Political Parties Act (Parteiengesetz), first enacted in 1967 and amended most recently in 2023, all donations above €10,000 to political parties must be published in the annual party accounts submitted to the Bundestag President; donations above €50,000 must be disclosed immediately. [9]

The system provides substantial public financing to parties that exceed 0.5 percent of the national vote, reducing the structural dependency on large private donors that the US system has made absolute. [9] Germany's political finance scandals exist, but they involve the same disclosure mechanism exposing them: known donors, known amounts, known beneficiaries. Dark money, spending by entities that cannot be traced back to an identifiable donor, is structurally foreclosed.

The fix this chapter is arguing for requires no constitutional amendment and no Supreme Court reversal: pass the DISCLOSE Act as written and require the same disclosure framework in federal elections that Germany has applied to party financing since 1967. The argument that transparency would chill political speech, the argument that has blocked the DISCLOSE Act for fifteen years, is contradicted by every democracy that requires it.

Why Commons World

Commons World's Global Accountability Rating exists precisely to create a publicly visible, independently verified score for what any institution — including a political financing entity — is actually doing versus what it claims. Dark money works because the darkness is structural: no independent institution maintains a permanent, public record of who funded what, for whom, and what resulted. GAR is that institution. It does not wait for a DISCLOSE Act to pass. It builds the transparency infrastructure that makes the argument for delay impossible to sustain indefinitely.

REFERENCES

1 Brennan Center for Justice, "Fifteen Years Later, Citizens United Defined the 2024 Election," January 2025; Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, 558 U.S. 310 (2010).

2 Center for American Progress, "Undoing Citizens United and Reining In Super PACs," September 2025; OpenSecrets, "Outside Spending: Summary Data, 2024."

3 Brennan Center for Justice, "Dark Money Hit a Record High of $1.9 Billion in 2024 Federal Races."

4 Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002, P.L. 107-155 (signed 27 March 2002); Brennan Center for Justice, "Citizens United, Explained"; SpeechNow.org v. FEC, 599 F.3d 686 (D.C. Cir. 2010).

5 OECD, "OECD Survey on Drivers of Trust in Public Institutions — 2024 Results: Building Trust in a Complex Policy Environment," OECD Publishing, Paris, 2024, doi.org/10.1787/9a20554b-en.

6 Transparency of Lobbying, Non-Party Campaigning and Trade Union Administration Act 2014 (UK); UK Parliament, Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee, findings on lobbying transparency, 2022.

7 UK Parliament, Public Accounts Committee, "Government Transparency and Accountability," 2022.

8 DISCLOSE Act of 2021, S. 443 / H.R. 1118, 117th Congress; DISCLOSE Act of 2023, H.R. 1118, 118th Congress; Wikipedia, "DISCLOSE Act"; US Senate Judiciary Committee, "Senate Republicans Filibuster DISCLOSE Act," September 2022.

9 Parteiengesetz (Political Parties Act), Germany, enacted 1967, amended 2023; Bundestag, party finance disclosure records.

CHAPTER NINE · CHALLENGE 9

Wealth concentration, contribution invisibility, financial exclusion

The economy does not count unpaid care work, ecological restoration, or community stewardship.

Economic alignment

In 1932, the United States Senate found itself unable to measure the depth of the economic catastrophe it was trying to address. Unemployment was visible, breadlines were visible, the stock market ticker was visible, but there was no single number that captured the scope of what had happened. Congress commissioned a 31-year-old economist at the National Bureau of Economic Research, Simon Kuznets, to create one. [1] He delivered the first comprehensive national income accounting system two years later, in 'National Income, 1929–1932,' Senate Document No. 124 of the 73rd Congress. [1] The report gave the federal government what it had asked for: a single number that could track the aggregate output of the economy, compare it across years, and respond to it with policy.

In the same report, Kuznets wrote the sentence that has since followed GDP everywhere it has been adopted: 'The welfare of a

nation can, therefore, scarcely be inferred from a measurement of national income.' [1] He was not writing a footnote. He was describing a structural limitation of the tool he had just built: that it measured market transactions and specifically excluded activities whose value did not pass through a price. Among those excluded activities were the domestic and care work performed in households, the ecological services provided by intact ecosystems, and the community work performed by people who maintained social cohesion without being paid for it. The warning was present in the founding document. It has been systematically ignored for ninety years.

The Enabling Law

The mechanism that made Kuznets's warning a permanent feature of global governance rather than a corrected error was the United Nations System of National Accounts, first published in 1953 as the international standard for measuring economic output. [2] The SNA established the 'production boundary': the formal definition of what counts as production and therefore registers in GDP. Its decision, maintained in every subsequent revision, in 1968, 1993, 2008, and the ongoing 2025 update, is that household services produced for a household's own use lie outside the production boundary. A mother caring for a sick child, a daughter looking after an elderly parent, a community volunteer maintaining a park: none of these appear in GDP. [2] The Bretton Woods Conference of July 1944, at which forty-four allied governments agreed the post-war international monetary framework, built this GDP-centred metric into the architecture of international coordination: the World Bank, the IMF, and virtually every international lending and development body have used GDP and GDP per capita as primary measures of economic health and development ever since. [3]

Who benefits from the exclusion is not a mystery. Every employer whose workers can arrive reliably, at full capacity, having been fed, clothed, cared for when sick, and raised to adulthood, benefits from

domestic and care work performed at no visible cost to the economy. Every property developer whose new buildings are worth more because a forest nearby provides clean water, flood control, and air quality benefits from ecosystem services provided at no visible cost to the GDP calculation. The exclusion does not merely create a measurement gap. It creates a systematic subsidy to market activity paid for by unpaid labour and ecological depletion, neither of which appears in the accounts as a cost. A policy that eliminates public childcare funding while GDP holds steady has, by the SNA's standard, done nothing. The women who absorb the resulting care burden, and the productivity and earnings they sacrifice to do so, remain invisible. [2]

Not an Isolated Case

The ILO's time-use data from 64 countries finds that 16.4 billion hours are spent on unpaid care work every day: the equivalent of 2 billion people working eight-hour days with no remuneration. [4] Valued at an hourly minimum wage, this unpaid work would constitute 9 percent of global GDP, approximately $11 trillion annually. Women perform 76.2 percent of it, spending on average three times as many hours as men. The gender earnings gap, the fertility gap, the career progression gap, and the pension gap all have their roots in this invisible accounting, in the fact that the economy counts a delivery driver's four-hour shift but not the four and a half hours a woman spends daily in unpaid care, and prices policy accordingly. [4]

The ecological dimension of the exclusion compounds the same pattern. Ecosystem services, the water regulation, pollination, carbon sequestration, climate stability, and flood control provided by intact natural systems, were estimated in a landmark 2014 study to be worth between $125 and $145 trillion annually, a figure larger than global GDP itself at the time of the study. [5] A standing forest provides those services and contributes nothing to GDP. The same forest logged, transported, and sold contributes positively at every stage. The

accounting system does not register the loss of the services the forest was providing, only the value of the transactions that follow its destruction.

The wealth concentration the TPC names follows directly. An economic system that prices extractive activity fully while pricing care and ecology at zero will, over time, concentrate wealth in the hands of those who own and direct extractive activity, and will dispossess those whose contribution is care. Oxfam's 2025 annual report found that the five richest men in the world had doubled their combined wealth since 2020, from $405 billion to $869 billion, while a person falls into extreme poverty roughly every four seconds. The $11 trillion in daily unpaid care and the $125–145 trillion in annual ecosystem services do not appear in the accounts that determine whose contribution is rewarded and whose is not.

The Possible Solution

New Zealand's Wellbeing Budget of 30 May 2019 was the first government anywhere to build what Finance Minister Grant Robertson described as an 'end-to-end' wellbeing budget: one where the stated purpose of spending is improving outcomes across five priority areas, with Treasury's Living Standards Framework providing the measurement, and where ministers were required to show how spending proposals contributed to those outcomes rather than merely to GDP. [6] The experiment produced real things: NZ$1.9 billion for mental health, legislation requiring child poverty data to be reported at every budget, and cross-agency packages that broke traditional departmental silos. Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern said directly: 'GDP alone does not guarantee improvement to our living standards and does not take into account who benefits and who is left out.' [6]

The Wellbeing Budget also shows what a national-level model cannot do alone. By 2024 it had been officially discontinued by the incoming government, and child poverty in New Zealand had risen,

with one in eight children living in material hardship. [7] A budget framework that depends on the political will of each successive government to maintain it faces the same structural problem as every voluntary instrument in this book: it can be withdrawn. The more durable instrument is the revision of the SNA itself. The OECD's Beyond GDP initiative and the ongoing work on SNA 2025 have both placed mandatory satellite accounts for unpaid household production and ecosystem services on the table as technical proposals. [8] The specific fix this chapter is arguing for is their adoption: not replacing GDP but requiring every national accounts statement to publish a satellite account of unpaid care work and ecosystem services alongside it, valued at standard replacement costs, so that a policy which eliminates public childcare funding cannot any longer be presented as fiscally neutral when its cost is simply transferred to invisible labour.

Why Commons World

Commons World's Commons Bank and Commons Unit of Exchange exist for exactly this repricing gap: instruments built to make the contribution of care, ecological stewardship, and community work visible in economic exchange, so that the cost of ignoring them accumulates as a liability rather than disappearing into the accounting convention Kuznets himself warned against in 1934. An economy that cannot see what sustains it cannot price it. CUE makes the invisible visible — not as a satellite account that governments can discontinue, but as the medium through which value is exchanged.

REFERENCES

1 Simon Kuznets, "National Income, 1929–1932," Senate Document No. 124, 73rd Congress, 2nd Session, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1934; Marketplace, "When it comes to measuring economic welfare, GDP doesn't cut it," May 2025.

2 United Nations, System of National Accounts, first edition 1953; subsequent editions 1968, 1993, 2008; Wikipedia, "System of National Accounts"; ILO Statistics, "Measuring unpaid domestic and care work," ilostat.ilo.org.

3 World Economic Forum, "Stakeholder Capitalism: A brief history of GDP and its use," December 2021; Wikipedia, "Bretton Woods Conference."

4 International Labour Organization, "Care work and care jobs for the future of decent work," 2018 (16.4 billion hours/day, $11 trillion value, 76.2% women's share); UNDP, "The Missing Piece: Valuing women's unrecognized contribution to the economy," March 2024.

5 Costanza et al., "Changes in the global value of ecosystem services," Global Environmental Change, 2014.

6 New Zealand Treasury, "The Wellbeing Budget 2019," 30 May 2019; Jacinda Ardern, quoted in Wellbeing Economy Alliance, "New Zealand – Implementing the Wellbeing Budget."

7 Newsroom (NZ), "The Wellbeing Budget is dead," March 2024; Stats NZ, Child Poverty Statistics, year ended June 2023.

8 OECD, Beyond GDP initiative; United Nations Statistics Division, System of National Accounts 2025 revision consultation documents.

CHAPTER TEN · CHALLENGE 10

AI governance, digital sovereignty, automation

Africa alone holds less than one per cent of global AI computing capacity — despite being home to nearly a fifth of humanity.

Technology and human agency

In March 2023, the government of Kenya signed a contract with Sama, a California-based data-labelling company subcontracting for OpenAI, to have Kenyan workers screen ChatGPT's training data for toxic content: child sexual abuse material, depictions of violence, and graphic self-harm. The workers were paid between USD1.32 and USD2.00 per hour. [1] A subsequent investigation by Time magazine found workers describing lasting psychological damage from sustained exposure to the most disturbing content on the internet. Mophat Okinyi, a former Sama employee and subsequent workers' rights organiser, told investigators: 'That data will haunt me forever.' [2] OpenAI terminated the Sama contract early. No binding framework required it to address the harm already done, to compensate the workers, or to ensure that the next company it hired to perform the same function operated under different conditions. [3]

The Kenyan case is not incidental to how AI systems are built. It is structural. Large language models require human beings to label, filter, and rank data at industrial scale before the model can be trained; that work is systematically outsourced to populations in low-income countries where labour costs are lowest and regulatory protections thinnest. The same logic governs where AI's consequences land. Africa is home to nearly one fifth of the world's population and accounts for less than one per cent of global AI computing capacity. [4] The continent provides the labour that builds AI and absorbs a disproportionate share of its unpriced costs. It owns almost none of the infrastructure that captures its value.

This is what the governance gap in AI looks like when it is not described in the abstract. A technology built predominantly in three cities — San Francisco, Seattle, Beijing — by a handful of corporations with combined market capitalisations larger than most national economies, trained in part by workers in Nairobi and Manila paid two dollars an hour, deployed across health systems, credit markets, judicial processes, and hiring pipelines worldwide, governed by no binding international framework, and subject to no enforcement mechanism capable of acting on behalf of the worker in Nairobi or the loan applicant in Lagos whose creditworthiness was assessed by a model trained on data that did not reflect her. [5]

Human agency, in this context, is not a philosophical abstraction. It is the practical capacity of a person to understand the systems that affect them, to contest decisions those systems produce, and to participate in shaping the rules by which they operate. By that measure, the current trajectory of AI development represents one of the most rapid and least accountable transfers of decision-making power in modern history — from individuals and communities to automated systems whose governing logic is proprietary, whose errors are rarely corrected, and whose developers bear no legal liability for the consequences.

The enabling law

The legal architecture that makes this possible is not a single statute. It is the accumulation of what has not been written: the absence of mandatory transparency requirements for algorithmic decision-making, the absence of liability frameworks that attach consequences to demonstrable AI-caused harm, and the absence of any international instrument with binding force over the development or deployment of AI systems. What exists in its place is a patchwork of voluntary commitments, national guidelines, and industry self-regulatory frameworks, none of which contains an enforcement mechanism capable of acting independently of the regulated parties. [6]

The most consequential single instrument is Section 230 of the United States Communications Decency Act of 1996 — the same provision that shields social media platforms from liability for algorithmic amplification, described in Chapter 6. Its protection extends to AI-powered recommendation and content systems deployed by US-based companies globally. [7] Beyond Section 230, the United States has no federal AI liability statute. The European Union's AI Act, which entered into force in August 2024 and represents the most comprehensive binding AI regulatory framework yet enacted, applies within EU jurisdiction and carries no extraterritorial reach over the training practices, data sourcing, or labour conditions of AI systems developed outside Europe. [8]

The financial architecture surrounding the governance gap makes it durable. The five largest AI companies by market capitalisation — Microsoft, Alphabet, Amazon, Meta, and Apple — spent hundreds of millions of dollars on lobbying in the United States between 2020 and 2024, more than any comparable industry in the same period. [9] Their sustained presence in every major regulatory discussion has produced a predictable outcome: frameworks built around transparency and risk disclosure rather than liability and enforcement, timelines calibrated to the pace at which the regulated industry is willing to move, and no binding standard that a developer

in San Francisco or Beijing must meet before deploying a system that will make consequential decisions about people in Accra or Bogotá. [10]

The labour dimension has its own enabling instrument. Data-labelling and content-moderation work performed in low-income countries sits outside the standard employment classifications that carry legal protections in the jurisdictions where the contracting companies are domiciled. Sama's Kenyan workers were employees of a subcontractor, not of OpenAI; the legal distance between the worker and the company whose product depended on the worker's labour was sufficient, under existing corporate law, to extinguish any direct employment obligation. [11] That distance is not an accident of corporate structure. It is its purpose.

Not an isolated case

The Philippines hosts the largest concentration of content moderation workers in the world, an estimated 500,000 people employed by outsourcing companies serving Facebook, TikTok, YouTube, and their competitors. [12] A 2023 study commissioned by the Global Fund to End Modern Slavery found that 75 per cent of Filipino content moderators reported symptoms consistent with post-traumatic stress disorder after sustained exposure to graphic content, that 87 per cent reported receiving inadequate mental health support from their employers, and that the majority were employed on short-term contracts that could be terminated without recourse if they raised concerns about working conditions. [13] The study's findings were presented to Meta's corporate social responsibility team. They produced no change to the contracting structure.

The deployment side of the same pattern is visible in healthcare. In 2021, an external validation published in JAMA Internal Medicine found that the Epic Sepsis Model — an AI tool used by hundreds of US hospitals to flag patients at risk of sepsis — performed far worse than its developer had claimed, missing roughly two-thirds of sepsis cases while generating frequent false alarms. Its developer, Epic

Systems, was under no legal obligation to disclose that gap, to validate the model independently before deployment, or to withdraw it while the failures were investigated. [15]

In 2022, the Dutch government's childcare benefit scandal — in which an algorithmic fraud detection system operated by the Dutch Tax and Customs Administration had wrongly flagged more than 26,000 families, disproportionately from ethnic minority backgrounds, for suspected fraud, triggering benefit clawbacks that drove families into poverty and debt — resulted in the resignation of the entire cabinet. [16] A subsequent parliamentary inquiry found that the algorithm had been selecting for ethnicity as a proxy for risk, that officials had been aware of the disparate impact and had continued operating the system, and that the data processed to generate the flags had been retained and shared with other government agencies in violation of privacy law. [17] The cabinet resignation was the most dramatic single act of accountability produced by an AI-caused harm anywhere in the world to that point. It required a parliamentary inquiry, a media investigation, years of advocacy by affected families, and a political crisis. None of the conditions that produced the harm — no pre-deployment testing requirement, no mandatory algorithmic transparency, no independent audit, no liability for the developer — changed as a result. [18]

The possible solution

The European Union's AI Act, which received its final vote in March 2024 and entered into force on 1 August 2024, is the working counter-example this chapter argues from: the first binding statutory framework anywhere to classify AI systems by risk level, impose mandatory conformity assessments on high-risk systems before deployment, require transparency about AI-generated content, and create enforceable obligations on developers and deployers rather than voluntary commitments. [19]

The Act designates as 'high risk' any AI system used in hiring, credit scoring, educational assessment, law enforcement, healthcare triage, or critical infrastructure management — precisely the applications where the harms documented in this chapter have been produced. [20] For these systems, developers must conduct conformity assessments, maintain technical documentation, implement human oversight mechanisms, and register the system in a publicly accessible EU database before deployment. Non-compliance carries fines of up to €35 million or seven per cent of global annual turnover. [21]

The Act has two structural limits that define what the fix this chapter is arguing for must add. The first is geographic: its requirements apply to AI systems deployed within the EU and to developers targeting the EU market, but they do not govern the training practices, labour conditions, or data-sourcing standards of systems developed for deployment elsewhere. A company that builds an AI system for deployment in sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, or Latin America, regions with no equivalent binding framework, faces no EU-derived obligation. The second limit is temporal: the Act's high-risk provisions do not fully apply until 2026, and its general-purpose AI provisions, covering large language models like those involved in the Kenyan case, do not take full effect until August 2025. Systems already deployed before those dates benefit from transition arrangements.

The specific fix this chapter is arguing for therefore has three components. First, extend the EU AI Act's high-risk classification and conformity assessment requirements to AI systems deployed anywhere in the world by companies domiciled in major AI-producing jurisdictions, on the same extraterritorial model used by the EU General Data Protection Regulation, which applies to any company processing the data of EU residents regardless of where the company is based. Second, establish a binding international standard for AI data-labelling and content-moderation labour, modelled on the ILO's core labour conventions, requiring the same occupational health protections for workers in Nairobi and Manila that apply to workers

in San Francisco. Third, create a mandatory pre-deployment testing requirement for high-risk AI systems that includes disaggregated performance testing by race, gender, and socioeconomic status before any system is deployed in a healthcare, judicial, or financial context.

All three components have working precedents. The GDPR extraterritoriality model is thirteen years old and has been enforced against companies on four continents. The ILO core labour conventions are among the most widely ratified treaties in international law. Disaggregated bias testing has been implemented voluntarily by several major AI developers and mandatorily required by executive order in the United States federal procurement context since 2023. None of them has been assembled into a single binding international instrument. That instrument does not yet exist because the industry that would be subject to it has successfully ensured, through four years of sustained lobbying, that no government has proposed it.

Why Commons World

Commons World's visibility architecture addresses AI governance's central failure directly. The Commons Registry logs algorithmic decisions against a tamper-resistant public record. ATE independently verifies what developers claim their systems do against what the evidence shows. OSN publishes only what has been verified. A hospital deploying a biased triage system, a platform amplifying harmful content, a government running a discriminatory algorithm — each creates a CR record that cannot be deleted and a GAR score that cannot be hidden. Honest AI governance requires exactly this infrastructure: permanent, independent, and impossible to outspend.

REFERENCES

1 Time, “Exclusive: OpenAI Used Kenyan Workers on Less Than $2 Per Hour to Make ChatGPT Less Toxic,” 18 January 2023.

2 Time, “Exclusive: OpenAI Used Kenyan Workers on Less Than $2 Per Hour,” 18 January 2023; The Guardian, “OpenAI used Kenyan workers on $2 an hour,” January 2023.

3 Time, “OpenAI and Sama contract termination,” January 2023; Wired, “AI data labourers are organising,” 2023.

4 Medium / Hiedberg Insights, “The Potential for Data Centers in Africa with the Rise of AI,” citing Data Centres Africa, “Africa’s Data Center Market Outlook — Q2 2025”: Africa accounts for less than 1% of global data center capacity despite housing nearly 18% of the world’s population.

5 AI Now Institute, “AI Now Report 2023,” New York University; Brookings Institution, “The future of data centers,” January 2026.

6 OECD, “AI Policy Observatory: National AI Strategies,” oecd.ai, 2025; UK Government, “Frontier AI Safety Commitments,” AI Safety Summit, Bletchley Park, November 2023.

7 Communications Decency Act, 47 U.S.C. § 230(c)(1), signed 8 February 1996; Congress.gov CRS Report R46751, “Section 230: An Overview.”

8 Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (AI Act), OJ L, 2024/1689, 12.7.2024.

9 OpenSecrets, “Tech Industry Lobbying,” 2024; Public Citizen, “Big Tech Lobbying Expenditures 2020–2024.”

10 AlgorithmWatch, “AI Ethics Guidelines Global Inventory,” 2023; AI Now Institute, “AI Now Report 2023.”

11 Time, “OpenAI and Sama,” January 2023; Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, “AI supply chain labour rights,” 2023.

12 The Verge, “The Trauma Floor: The secret lives of Facebook moderators in America,” February 2019; Reuters, “Philippines becomes content moderation hub,” 2022.

13 Global Fund to End Modern Slavery / Mindfully Human Foundation, “Psychological Wellbeing of Content Moderators in the Philippines,” 2023.

14 Wong et al., “External Validation of a Widely Implemented Proprietary Sepsis Prediction Model in Hospitalized Patients,” JAMA Internal Medicine, 2021; University of Michigan Health, subsequent reporting 2023.

15 Epic Systems, product documentation; STAT News, “Epic’s sepsis model,” 2021.

16 Dutch Parliamentary Inquiry Committee on the Childcare Benefit Affair (Parlementaire ondervragingscommissie Kinderopvangtoeslag, POK), “Ongekend onrecht” (“Unprecedented injustice”), December 2020.

17 POK, “Ongekend onrecht,” December 2020; Amnesty International Netherlands, “Systeemfout: Hoe de Belastingdienst discrimineerde bij de kinderopvangtoeslag,” 2021.

18 Dutch Parliament, debates and resolutions following POK report, January–March 2021; Reuters, “Dutch government resigns over child benefit scandal,” 15 January 2021.

19 Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (AI Act), entered into force 1 August 2024; European Parliament press release, “Artificial Intelligence Act: MEPs adopt landmark law,” 13 March 2024.

20 AI Act, Annex III (high-risk AI systems); Article 6.

21 AI Act, Articles 9–15 (conformity assessment); Article 99 (penalties).

CHAPTER ELEVEN · CHALLENGE 11

Social cohesion, peacebuilding, information warfare

False news spreads six times faster than true news.

Conflict and polarisation

In the months before August 2017, a network of Facebook pages in Myanmar was publishing posts that described the Rohingya Muslim minority as 'terrorists,' 'invaders,' and a 'Muslim invasion' threatening the Buddhist nation. Some posts called explicitly for violence. Others shared fabricated atrocity photographs, invented criminal statistics, and forged military statements. On 25 August 2017, the Myanmar military launched what it described as 'clearance operations' in Rakhine State. In the weeks that followed, more than 700,000 Rohingya fled into Bangladesh, entire villages were burned to the ground, and UN investigators documented mass killings, systematic rape, and the deliberate destruction of food supplies. [1] The UN's Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on Myanmar, reporting in 2018, found that Facebook had played a 'significant' role in the atrocities, describing the platform as a vehicle for the military's hate campaign. [2]

Facebook agreed. In a statement issued in 2018, the company acknowledged that it had been 'too slow to prevent misinformation and hate' in Myanmar. [3] An independent human rights impact assessment the company commissioned the same year, conducted by the consultancy Business for Social Responsibility, found that Facebook had not been 'doing enough to help prevent our platform from being used to foment division and incite offline violence.' [4] The assessment recorded that for many people in Myanmar, Facebook 'was the internet': the country's rapid smartphone adoption in the 2010s had brought hundreds of thousands of people online for the first time, overwhelmingly through Facebook, into an information environment that the company had failed to moderate in any language spoken in Myanmar. At the time of the worst violence, Facebook employed no Burmese-language content moderators. [5]

What happened in Myanmar is not a story about a company that made a mistake. It is a story about a legal and financial architecture that made the mistake not only possible but structurally rational. Facebook's algorithm was optimised to maximise engagement. Outrage and fear generate more engagement than calm reporting. Posts dehumanising the Rohingya were amplified because users engaged with them, and because engagement — regardless of its content — was what the algorithm was built to reward. No law required Facebook to deploy a different algorithm in Myanmar. No law made the company liable for the consequences of deploying the one it had. The UN investigators concluded that the genocide would not have unfolded as it did without Facebook. Three lawsuits seeking more than $150 billion in compensation on behalf of Rohingya refugees have been filed in US, UK, and Irish courts. [6] None has yet produced a judgment on the merits.

The enabling law

The legal architecture that made Myanmar possible — and that continues to make comparable situations possible today — rests on

the same provision described in Chapter 6: Section 230 of the United States Communications Decency Act of 1996. [7] Section 230 protects platforms from civil liability for content generated by their users. Courts have interpreted that protection to extend to algorithmic amplification: a platform that selects, ranks, and promotes content to users — as every major social media platform does, continuously and automatically — bears no legal liability for the consequences of what it promotes, even when internal research has documented those consequences and the company has acknowledged them publicly. [8]

The specific mechanism by which this protection enabled the Myanmar atrocities was documented in detail by Amnesty International's 2022 report, 'The Social Atrocity.' Meta's own internal investigation, conducted in 2020, found that a video by a leading anti-Rohingya hate figure, the monk U Wirathu, had been shown to users who had not sought it out, with over 70 per cent of its views generated by the platform's recommendation system: the algorithm had identified it as engagement-producing content and automatically surfaced it to millions of users. [9] Section 230 ensured that this finding — documented by the company's own systems, three years after the genocide — carried no legal consequence.

The financial architecture compounds the legal one. Meta's advertising revenue model prices engagement directly: an advertiser pays for eyeballs, and eyeballs are generated by content that holds attention. Content that generates fear, outrage, or tribal solidarity holds attention more effectively than content that informs. In 2018, the year Meta acknowledged its role in the Myanmar genocide, the company's global total revenue was $55.8 billion. [10] The engagement generated by hate speech and disinformation in Myanmar was a small fraction of that total, but it was structurally identical in kind to the engagement the entire advertising model was built to produce. A platform that monetises attention has no financial incentive to distinguish between the attention generated by a useful piece of information and the attention generated by content that contributes to

ethnic cleansing. Section 230 ensures it faces no legal incentive to do so either.

The information warfare dimension extends beyond social media platforms to the deliberate state-sponsored manufacture of false content at scale. The MIT study that anchors this chapter's tagline — Vosoughi, Roy, and Aral, published in Science in March 2018 — analysed approximately 126,000 news stories shared on Twitter by roughly three million people over eleven years. [11] Its findings were specific: false news reached its first 1,500 people six times faster than true news; falsehoods were 70 per cent more likely to be shared than the truth; and the differential was driven not by bots but by human beings choosing to share novel and emotionally resonant content. False political news showed the largest differential of any category. The researchers identified the mechanism as novelty: false stories are disproportionately surprising, which makes them disproportionately shareable, which makes them disproportionately profitable for the platforms whose revenue depends on shares. [12]

State actors have built entire industrial operations around this structural advantage. A 2019 bipartisan US Senate Intelligence Committee report documented that between 2014 and 2017, Russian Internet Research Agency operatives created more than 3,500 Facebook advertisements, published more than 116,000 Instagram posts, and generated more than 10 million tweets on political and social topics, deliberately targeting communities defined by race, religion, immigration status, and political affiliation with content designed to deepen existing divisions rather than persuade. [13] The operation did not create the divisions it exploited. It identified them algorithmically, targeted them precisely, and amplified them at a scale no previous information operation in history had been capable of reaching. [14]

Not an isolated case

Myanmar is not the only case in which Facebook's platform has been found to have contributed materially to real-world violence. In Ethiopia, a 2021 internal Facebook study, leaked to the Wall Street Journal as part of the Facebook Papers, found that the company's recommendation algorithm was connecting users in Ethiopia to groups promoting ethnic hate speech at rates the company's own researchers described as 'alarming.' [15] Between November 2020 and November 2022, the conflict in the Tigray region of Ethiopia killed an estimated 300,000 to 600,000 people, making it one of the deadliest conflicts of the twenty-first century. A 2023 investigation by the Bureau of Investigative Journalism found that Facebook content, including posts dehumanising Tigrayan civilians, had circulated widely in the months preceding and during the worst violence. [16] Meta did not acknowledge a causal role. No law required it to investigate one.

The information warfare dimension has a documented impact on democratic processes that extends well beyond individual countries. The Oxford Internet Institute's Computational Propaganda Project, tracking organised social media manipulation across 81 countries between 2017 and 2020, found evidence of formally organised campaigns using social media to spread political disinformation in every country studied. [17] By 2020, government-linked actors were operating computational propaganda campaigns in 81 countries, up from 28 in 2017. The tools had industrialised: commercially available bot networks, micro-targeted advertising, and coordinated inauthentic behaviour — the systematic use of fake accounts to simulate organic public opinion — were available to any state or non-state actor willing to pay for them, at costs that had fallen by roughly 90 per cent over the same period. [18]

The consequences for social cohesion are measurable. The OECD's 2024 Trust Survey found that across 30 democracies, less than one person in three believed their national government would refuse a

corporation's demand if the corporation promoted a policy harmful to society. [19] In the United Kingdom, trust in parliament stood at 24 per cent and trust in political parties at 12 per cent. Edelman's Trust Barometer has repeatedly found majorities across dozens of countries believing that business and government leaders deliberately try to mislead the public. [20] The architecture of distrust described in this chapter is not a natural state. It has been engineered, at scale, by systems built to profit from it.

The possible solution

The European Union's Digital Services Act (DSA), which entered into force in November 2022 and became fully applicable in February 2024, is the working counter-example. It is the first binding statutory framework anywhere to impose mandatory systemic risk assessments on the largest online platforms, require independent audits of those assessments, and create enforcement mechanisms capable of acting against platforms that fail them — without relying on the platform's own judgment about whether a problem exists. [21]

The DSA designates as Very Large Online Platforms (VLOPs) any service with more than 45 million monthly active users in the EU. VLOPs must conduct annual risk assessments covering the systemic risks their services pose to civic discourse, electoral processes, public security, and fundamental rights. Those assessments must be independently audited, the audit reports must be published, and the European Commission has exclusive enforcement authority over VLOPs' compliance. [22] In December 2025, the Commission issued its first major enforcement decision under the DSA, fining X (formerly Twitter) €120 million for breaching transparency obligations, including the deceptive redesign of its verification system in ways the Commission found misled users about the credibility of content. [23]

The DSA's structural significance is what distinguishes it from the voluntary frameworks that preceded it. Facebook's Community Standards, Twitter's hateful conduct policy, and YouTube's

community guidelines are all company-authored instruments, applied by company-employed moderators, audited by no independent authority, and subject to revision whenever a company's commercial or political interests make revision attractive. The DSA replaces that architecture with mandatory risk assessment, independent audit, and regulator-enforced compliance. A platform that knew its algorithm was amplifying anti-Rohingya hate speech and continued operating it anyway would, under DSA obligations, face a documented audit finding, a published report, and a Commission investigation — not a three-year delay followed by an internal acknowledgment.

The DSA has three limits that define what the fix must add. First, it is geographically bounded: its obligations apply to platforms operating within the EU, and platforms deploying the same algorithmic systems in Myanmar, Ethiopia, or India face none of them. Second, it addresses systemic risk rather than liability: the DSA does not create a right of action for individuals harmed by a platform's algorithmic choices, meaning Rohingya survivors cannot sue Meta under the DSA for what happened in 2017. Third, its risk assessment framework is procedural rather than substantive: it requires platforms to assess and mitigate risks, but it does not set minimum standards for what 'mitigation' means or prescribe the algorithmic choices that would meet them.

The specific fix this chapter is arguing for therefore has three components. First, amend Section 230 to remove liability protection where a platform has conducted — or been required by audit to conduct — a systemic risk assessment that documents a causal link between its algorithmic design and real-world violence or democratic harm, and has nonetheless continued to operate the same design. This is not an amendment that would expose platforms to liability for user-generated content; it is an amendment that would expose them to liability for the algorithmic choices they make about which content to amplify, when their own or independent assessments have shown those choices to cause harm. Second, extend the DSA's mandatory

systemic risk assessment requirements to all platforms deploying algorithmic recommendation systems globally, modelled on the GDPR's extraterritorial reach: any company processing the information of users anywhere that crosses the 45-million-user threshold should face the same obligations, regardless of where it is domiciled. Third, establish a binding international standard for algorithmic transparency in electoral periods, requiring platforms to disclose in real time which content is being algorithmically amplified, to which audiences, and why.

All three components have working precedents. The GDPR extraterritoriality model has been enforced against companies on four continents. The DSA's systemic risk framework has already produced its first enforcement decision. And algorithmic transparency in elections has been voluntarily implemented by several platforms and mandatorily required by the DSA's own election guidelines published in March 2024. None has been assembled into a single instrument with global reach. The same lobbying concentration that blocked that instrument in the AI governance context has blocked it here: the same five companies, the same Washington offices, the same argument that liability would chill innovation, addressed to the same committees that have been hearing it since 2018 and have so far found it persuasive enough to act on nothing binding.

Why Commons World

Commons World's verification architecture addresses disinformation's root vulnerability: the absence of any institution whose verified findings are structurally distinguishable from funded counter-claims. The Commons Registry maintains a tamper-resistant record of verified evidence. ATE independently assesses institutional claims — including those of state-linked media and political actors. OSN publishes only what that process has verified, through the canonical CCo → ATE → CR → OSN chain. Coordinated inauthentic behaviour generates false provenance claims that a permanent ledger

makes traceable. The IRA's operation succeeded because the darkness was structural. CR removes the darkness.

REFERENCES

1 UN Human Rights Council, Report of the Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on Myanmar, A/HRC/39/64, 12 September 2018; Reuters, "UN investigators cite Facebook role in Myanmar crisis," March 2018.

2 UN Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on Myanmar, A/HRC/39/64, 2018: Facebook played a "significant" role; Marzuki Darusman, chairman of the mission, stated: "Social media is Facebook, and Facebook is social media."

3 Facebook statement, 2018: "The ethnic violence in Myanmar is horrific and we have been too slow to prevent misinformation and hate on Facebook." Global Witness, "Facebook approves adverts containing hate speech inciting violence and genocide against the Rohingya," 2021.

4 Business for Social Responsibility (BSR), Human Rights Impact Assessment: Facebook in Myanmar, October 2018, commissioned by Meta Platforms.

5 PBS NewsHour, "Amnesty report finds Facebook amplified hate ahead of Rohingya massacre in Myanmar," September 2022; Harvard Law School Systemic Justice Project, "Facebook and Genocide," 2022.

6 Global Freedom of Expression, Columbia University, "The Gambia v. Facebook," case summary, 2023; Global Witness, "Facebook approves adverts," 2021: three lawsuits in US, UK, and Ireland seeking more than $150 billion.

7 Communications Decency Act, 47 U.S.C. § 230(c)(1), signed 8 February 1996; Congress.gov CRS Report R46751, "Section 230: An Overview."

8 Harvard Law School Systemic Justice Project, "Facebook and Genocide: How Facebook contributed to genocide in Myanmar and why it will not be held accountable," 2022.

9 Amnesty International, "The Social Atrocity: Meta and the right to remedy for the Rohingya," September 2022; PBS NewsHour, "Amnesty report finds Facebook amplified hate," September 2022: over 70% of U Wirathu video views generated by algorithmic "chaining."

10 Meta Platforms, Annual Report 2018, advertising revenue figure; referenced in Harvard Law School Systemic Justice Project, "Facebook and Genocide," 2022.

11 Soroush Vosoughi, Deb Roy, and Sinan Aral, "The Spread of True and False News Online," Science, Vol. 359, Issue 6380, 9 March 2018, doi:10.1126/science.aap9559.

12 MIT News, "Study: On Twitter, false news travels faster than true stories," 8 March 2018; MIT Sloan, "Study: False news spreads faster than the truth," 2018: falsehoods 70% more likely to be retweeted; false news reached 1,500 people six times faster than the truth.

13 US Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, Report on Russian Active Measures Campaigns and Interference in the 2016 US Election, Volume 2: Russia's Use of Social Media, October 2019.

14 US Senate Intelligence Committee Report, Volume 2, 2019; MIT Sloan, "MIT Sloan research about social media, misinformation, and elections," 2024.

15 Wall Street Journal, "The Facebook Files," October 2021: internal Facebook study on Ethiopia leaked as part of Facebook Papers disclosures.

16 Bureau of Investigative Journalism, investigation into Facebook content and Tigray conflict, 2023; estimated death toll: Ghent University / Tigray War Wikipedia summary, citing peer-reviewed demographic studies, 2022–2023.

17 Oxford Internet Institute, Computational Propaganda Project, "Cyber Troops in 2020," 2021: organised social media manipulation documented in 81 countries.

18 Oxford Internet Institute, Computational Propaganda Project, "The Global Disinformation Order 2019: Global Inventory of Organised Social Media Manipulation," 2019; updated findings 2021.

19 OECD, "OECD Survey on Drivers of Trust in Public Institutions — 2024 Results," OECD Publishing, Paris, 2024, doi.org/10.1787/9a20554b-en.

20 Edelman, Trust Barometer, 2022 — majorities believed business and government leaders deliberately mislead the public.

21 Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 October 2022 on the Digital Services Act; entered into force 16 November 2022; fully applicable 17 February 2024.

22 DSA, Articles 33–37 (systemic risk obligations for VLOPs and VLOSEs); Article 40 (data access); Delegated Regulation (EU) 2024/436 (independent audit rules).

23 MediaLaws, "€120 million later: the DSA enters the enforcement phase," December 2025; European Commission enforcement decision against X (formerly Twitter), December 2025.

CHAPTER TWELVE · CHALLENGE 12

The capacity of human societies to learn, adapt, and remain whole

The ozone layer is healing. The treaty that saved it was signed in two years. The question this chapter asks is what made that possible — and what has prevented it everywhere since.

Civilisational coherence

On 16 December 1991, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics voted to dissolve itself. The state that had ordered the diversion of the Amu Darya and Syr Darya rivers to irrigate cotton fields in Uzbekistan — the decision documented in Chapter 2 of this book that destroyed the Aral Sea — ceased to exist. Its successor states inherited the rivers, the cotton fields, the degraded sea, and the 1992 Almaty Agreement that allocated the water between them on quotas designed for regions of a single centrally planned economy rather than five sovereign nations with competing interests. They also inherited the structural condition that had made the original catastrophe possible: central planners who set cotton targets did not have independent access to the environmental data

documenting what their decisions were doing, while the Karakalpak population closest to the damage had no channel to the decision-makers capable of changing course before the deterioration became irreversible. [1]

That structural condition — decision-makers insulated from the consequences of their decisions, affected populations without a channel to those making the decisions — is not unique to Soviet central planning. It is the condition this book has documented across twelve separate domains, on six continents, under democratic and authoritarian governments alike. The cotton planners of Tashkent did not know what they were doing to the sea because the system they operated in was not designed to tell them. The legislators who maintained the US oil depletion allowance for a century knew exactly what they were doing, because the system they operated in was designed to reward them for it. The difference is not one of knowledge. It is one of architecture: whether the institutions through which decisions are made are structured to absorb the consequences of those decisions, or to insulate the decision-makers from them. [2]

Civilisational coherence, as this book uses the term, is the capacity of a society's institutions to remain connected to reality: to register the consequences of their decisions, to adjust when those consequences diverge from intent, and to do so before the damage becomes irreversible. The Aral Sea was not irreversible in 1960. It was not irreversible in 1970. By 1985, the year three scientists at the British Antarctic Survey published data showing a hole in the Earth's ozone layer had opened over Antarctica, the sea had already lost 40 per cent of its surface area. By 1991, when the USSR dissolved, it had lost more than 60 per cent. The institutions that had caused the damage dissolved with the state. The damage did not.

The enabling law

The condition that permits civilisational incoherence — institutions structurally insulated from the consequences of their decisions — is

not produced by a single law. It is produced by the accumulated architecture of governance systems in which the people who make decisions and the people who bear their consequences are different people, operating in different institutions, with no shared mechanism for connecting what is decided to what results. This book has traced that architecture, domain by domain, to the specific laws that instantiate it: the 1992 Almaty Agreement that preserved Soviet water quotas for post-Soviet states; the 1926 oil depletion allowance that subsidised extraction at public cost; Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act that immunised algorithmic amplification from its consequences; the non-interference clause of the 2003 Medicare Modernization Act that prohibited the largest drug purchaser in the world from negotiating the prices it paid. [3]

What each of these laws shares is not original malice. Each was written for a defensible purpose. The Almaty Agreement was written under emergency conditions to prevent water conflict between newly independent states. The oil depletion allowance was written to encourage domestic energy production in a period of genuine scarcity. Section 230 was written to allow the early internet to develop without the chilling effect of unlimited liability. The non-interference clause was written as a political compromise to secure the passage of a genuine expansion of healthcare coverage. The problem in each case is the same: the law was designed for a specific context and a specific balance of interests, and no mechanism existed to require its revision when the context changed and the balance of interests shifted. A law without a review mechanism is a law designed to be permanent. Permanent laws in a changing world become, over time, instruments of whoever benefits from their permanence. [4]

The financial architecture that makes this permanence durable has been documented across every chapter of this book. The industries and interest groups that benefit from specific legal arrangements invest a fraction of those benefits in the political activity required to maintain them. The oil and gas industry has spent more on lobbying in the United States than almost any other sector since 1990. [5] The five

largest technology companies spent hundreds of millions of dollars on federal lobbying between 2020 and 2024. [6] The pharmaceutical industry deployed nearly 1,000 lobbyists to shape the Medicare Modernization Act in 2003. In each case, the return on that investment is the maintenance of a legal arrangement that externalises real costs onto populations who are not represented in the rooms where the arrangement is maintained. The mechanism is not corruption in the legal sense. It is the structural consequence of governance systems in which the people who bear the cost of a decision have no standing in the institution that makes it.

Not an isolated case

The collapse of civilisational coherence is not confined to individual policy domains. It is measurable as a systemic condition. The OECD's 2024 Trust Survey found that across 30 democracies, trust in national government stood lower than distrust in 22 of them. In the United States, trust in national government had fallen 19.5 percentage points since 2006. In the United Kingdom, parliament was trusted by 24 per cent of the population and political parties by 12 per cent. [7] The Edelman Trust Barometer for 2025 found that 61 per cent of respondents across 28 countries believed their government did not listen to people like them; 57 per cent believed business leaders were intentionally misleading the public. [8]

These are not simply measures of public dissatisfaction. They are measures of a specific institutional failure: the disconnection between the people who make decisions and the people who experience their consequences has become visible enough that the majority of people in most democracies can name it. What they cannot do, in the absence of institutions designed for the purpose, is change it. The awareness of incoherence is not the same as the capacity to restore coherence.

The most precise illustration of what restored coherence looks like is also the most unexpected. In May 1985, Farman, Gardiner, and Shanklin published data in Nature showing that springtime ozone

levels above Antarctica had fallen more than 30 per cent from their pre-1970 baseline. [9] The finding confirmed theoretical predictions made eleven years earlier by Molina and Rowland, who had demonstrated in 1974 that chlorofluorocarbons would destroy stratospheric ozone. [10] The chemical industry had spent a decade contesting the theory. The empirical data ended the contest. Within two years, 24 nations had signed the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. It is now the only UN treaty to have achieved universal ratification. It has phased out 99 per cent of the ozone-depleting substances it targeted. The ozone layer is recovering. The Protocol has avoided more global warming than any other treaty in history. [11]

The Montreal Protocol is not an exceptional case of political virtue. DuPont, which held 25 per cent of global CFC market share in the mid-1980s, had opposed controls for years. It changed position in 1986 — not because its values changed, but because the combination of incontestable empirical evidence, the prospect of viable substitute chemicals, and the diplomatic infrastructure provided by UNEP made support for the Protocol the rational commercial choice. [12] Coherence was restored not by appealing to the better angels of the industry's nature, but by changing the structural conditions under which the industry operated: independent evidence it could not contest, an institutional process it could not capture, and a compliance framework that made transition achievable rather than ruinous. [13]

The possible solution

The Montreal Protocol's anatomy reveals the specific conditions under which civilisational coherence can be restored after it has been lost, or maintained before it is lost entirely. Those conditions are four. Independent evidence, produced and published outside the institutions that benefit from the current arrangement, and impossible to permanently contest once physical or social reality confirms it. Institutional infrastructure capable of translating that evidence into

binding agreement, with differentiated obligations that make compliance achievable for parties at different levels of capacity. Built-in review mechanisms that require the defenders of an arrangement to make the affirmative case for its continuation against current evidence, on a fixed schedule, before a body that includes representatives of the parties bearing its cost. And a compliance fund that ensures transition is financed for those who cannot self-finance it. [14]

None of these conditions is technically difficult to create. The OECD's Beyond GDP initiative has placed mandatory satellite accounts for unpaid household production and ecosystem services on the table as standard national accounting practice. [15] The WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control, in force since 2005, demonstrates that an independent evidence base can overcome a decade of industry-manufactured doubt and produce a binding international agreement. [16] Germany's Parteiengesetz demonstrates that mandatory financial transparency in political processes is achievable and compatible with vigorous democratic competition. [17] Pará state's SRBIPA livestock traceability system demonstrates that supply chain accountability at individual-animal level is operationally feasible even on a 78-hectare farm. [18] Each of these is a partial expression of the same principle: that the cost of a decision must be borne by whoever makes it, and that the connection between decision and consequence must be visible, verifiable, and maintained by institutions with no interest in obscuring it.

The specific reform this chapter is arguing for is the adoption of mandatory sunset and review clauses for all major regulatory instruments governing areas where the cost of the current arrangement is borne by parties other than those who negotiated it. A sunset clause does not repeal a law. It requires its defenders to make the affirmative case for its continuation against evidence, on a fixed schedule, before a body that includes representatives of the parties bearing its cost. The 1926 oil depletion allowance, reviewed against current evidence of its fiscal cost and its contribution to climate

damage, before a body that includes representatives of communities bearing those costs, would not survive that process. Section 230, reviewed against documented evidence of algorithmic harm to identifiable populations, before a body that includes those populations, would not survive it in its current form. The 1992 Almaty Agreement, reviewed against thirty years of downstream harm to the communities whose water it has allocated away, before a body that gives those communities standing, would not survive unreformed.

The working counter-example is not hypothetical. The Montreal Protocol's parties have met annually since 1987. Its evidence base is updated every four years by independent scientific panels whose membership is not controlled by the parties with the most to lose. The Kigali Amendment phasing down hydrofluorocarbons was agreed in 2016, nearly thirty years after the original Protocol, because the review mechanism was still functioning and the evidence still mattered. That is what civilisational coherence looks like in institutional form: not the absence of conflict, not the resolution of all competing interests, but a structure in which evidence reaches decision-makers, affected populations have standing, and the arrangements that govern them can be changed before the damage becomes irreversible.

Why Commons World

Commons World's nine Pillars are the institutional architecture under which the conditions that produced the Montreal Protocol can be made available not only where the evidence happens to be atmospheric, but everywhere the evidence exists and the damage is still recoverable. PCH sets the baselines. CR makes the evidence permanent. ATE verifies the claims. GAR scores the performance. CB and CUE reprice the externalised costs. AURA gives every person the sovereign infrastructure to document what systems are doing to

them. CE builds the literacy to use it. OSN closes the loop. EL scans the horizon. The system learns.

REFERENCES

1 United Nations, "Dry Tears of the Aral," UN Chronicle; Foreign Policy Association, "The Aral Sea Disaster, Part 2: Soviet Irrigation"; The Times of Central Asia, "Megaprojects Instead of Quotas: How Central Asia's Water Diplomacy Is Changing," 2026. See also TPC 1 references 1/05–1/06.

2 Pattern of institutional insulation: Introduction to this volume, section 0.3; individual chapter analyses TPC 1–11.

3 Individual chapter sources: TPC 1 (Almaty Agreement, 1992); Introduction 0/01–0/04 (oil depletion allowance, 1926); TPC 6 (Section 230, 1996); TPC 5 (Medicare Modernization Act, 2003).

4 Pattern of laws surviving their original purpose: Introduction to this volume, section 0.3–0.4.

5 OpenSecrets, oil and gas lobbying expenditure data, 1990–2024.

6 OpenSecrets, "Tech Industry Lobbying," 2024; Public Citizen, "Big Tech Lobbying Expenditures 2020–2024." See TPC 10, reference 10/09.

7 OECD, "OECD Survey on Drivers of Trust in Public Institutions — 2024 Results," OECD Publishing, Paris, 2024, doi.org/10.1787/9a20554b-en. See TPC 8, reference 08/05.

8 Edelman, "2025 Edelman Trust Barometer," January 2025.

9 J.C. Farman, B.G. Gardiner, and J.D. Shanklin, "Large losses of total ozone in Antarctica reveal seasonal ClOx/NOx interaction," Nature, Vol. 315, 16 May 1985, pp. 207–210.

10 Mario J. Molina and F. Sherwood Rowland, "Stratospheric sink for chlorofluoromethanes: chlorine atom-catalysed destruction of ozone," Nature, Vol. 249, 28 June 1974, pp. 810–812.

11 Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, signed 16 September 1987; UNEP OzonAction, "About the Montreal Protocol," unep.org; UN News, "Ozone layer recovery is on track," January 2023; NOAA, "Montreal Protocol emerges as a powerful climate treaty."

12 Oxford Academic / Parker and Karlsson, "Healing the Ozone Layer: The Montreal Protocol and the Lessons and Limits of a Global Governance Success Story," 2019: DuPont's shift to support CFC controls, 1986.

13 Stimson Center, "The Remarkable Story of the Montreal Protocol with Lessons for Cyberspace," September 2024: independent evidence, diplomatic infrastructure, differentiated compliance as structural conditions.

14 UNEP Ozone Secretariat, amendment history; Oxford Academic, "Healing the Ozone Layer," 2019: built-in review as condition of the Protocol's adaptive success.

15 OECD, Beyond GDP initiative; United Nations Statistics Division, System of National Accounts 2025 revision consultation documents. See TPC 9, reference 09/08.

16 WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control, adopted 21 May 2003, entered into force 27 February 2005. See TPC 12/14–15 for detail.

17 Parteiengesetz (Political Parties Act), Germany, enacted 1967, amended 2023. See TPC 8, reference 08/09.

18 The Nature Conservancy, "Tag the Herd, Protect the Amazon," October 2025; Pará SRBIPA programme. See TPC 2, reference 2/13.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

Redesigning coherent governance

'The harm was legal. The pollution was permitted. The dispossession was within the law. The financial extraction was compliant. The opacity was protected. Verified harm did not occur despite the legal framework — it occurred because of it.'

Commons World, Planetary Coherence & Health — PCH 1.8.6

Twelve chapters. Twelve specific laws. Twelve named companies. Twelve cases in which the damage was not accidental, not unavoidable, and not unknown to those who permitted it. In every case, the fix was identifiable, the working counter-example was available, and the obstacle was the same: the people who benefit from the current arrangement occupy the institutions through which the current arrangement could be changed, and they have no structural incentive to change it.

That is not a pessimistic conclusion. It is a diagnostic one. If governance fails for structural reasons, it can be repaired by structural means. This closing chapter does not describe the problem again. It describes the architecture through which the problem can be made structurally unrepeatable — not by relying on the virtue of the people

inside existing institutions, but by changing the conditions under which all institutions operate.

The architecture already exists. It is Commons World. What this chapter does is make explicit what the preceding twelve have demonstrated case by case: that the nine Pillars and the six governing bodies of Planetary Coherence & Health together constitute not merely a reform programme but a coherent governance system — one that addresses the root cause of every failure documented in this book, rather than its symptoms.

The root cause

Across all twelve TPC chapters, a single structural condition recurs. It is not corruption in the legal sense, not the absence of good intentions, and not the complexity of the problems involved. It is this: the people who make decisions and the people who bear their consequences are different people, operating in different institutions, with no shared mechanism for connecting what is decided to what results.

The Soviet planners who ordered the diversion of the Amu Darya and Syr Darya knew the Aral Sea would shrink. Internal assessments documented it. [1] The cigarette manufacturers knew their product caused cancer decades before they acknowledged it publicly. [2] Meta knew its algorithm was amplifying content that contributed to genocide in Myanmar. [3] Epic Systems marketed a sepsis-prediction algorithm as accurate even as independent validation showed it missed most cases. [4] The Dutch Tax Administration knew its fraud detection system was producing discriminatory outcomes. [5] In each case the knowledge existed. In each case the institutional architecture ensured that the knowledge did not need to produce a different decision. The decision-makers were insulated from the consequences. The affected populations had no standing. The evidence had nowhere to go.

That is the root cause. Not ignorance. Not malice. Insulation. The deliberate or emergent structural separation of authority from consequence, of decision from result, of power from accountability. Every law documented in this book — the oil depletion allowance, Section 230, the Almaty Agreement, the non-interference clause, the cattle transit document, the prior appropriation doctrine — is an instrument of insulation: a mechanism through which the cost of a decision is moved from the person who made it onto people who had no say in making it, and onto a planet that has no vote at all.

Coherent governance is governance in which insulation is structurally impossible. Not difficult. Not discouraged. Impossible — because the architecture through which decisions are made is designed so that the consequences of those decisions return, visibly and verifiably, to the people and institutions that produced them.

Why agreed-necessary laws are delayed indefinitely

The introduction to this book named a specific pattern: a law agreed to be necessary, delayed indefinitely by whoever it inconveniences. The EU deforestation regulation, passed in 2023, delayed twice before its first enforcement date. The DISCLOSE Act, introduced in every session of Congress since 2010, filibustered on every attempt. The Gainful Employment Rule, introduced, rescinded, reinstated, vacated. The mandatory SISBOV livestock traceability system, voluntary since its creation, used mainly by exporters targeting markets that already demand it.

The delay mechanism is not mysterious. It operates through three channels, each documented in this book. The first is financial asymmetry: the industries that benefit from the current arrangement have more to spend on maintaining it than the populations bearing its cost have to spend on changing it. PhRMA deployed nearly 1,000 lobbyists to shape the Medicare Modernization Act. [6] The five largest

technology companies spent hundreds of millions of dollars on federal lobbying between 2020 and 2024. [7] The oil and gas industry has spent more than any other sector on political influence in every decade since the 1920s. [8] The populations bearing the cost of each of these arrangements are dispersed, their individual harm is small relative to the aggregate, and they have no equivalent institution through which to concentrate their interest into political force.

The second channel is epistemic asymmetry: the industries that benefit from the current arrangement control the evidence base on which reform decisions are made. Tobacco companies funded research that questioned the link between smoking and cancer. Chemical companies funded research that questioned the link between CFCs and ozone depletion. Platform companies resist independent access to the data that would allow researchers to assess the harm their algorithms produce. When the evidence is controlled by the party with the most to lose from its findings, the evidence reliably finds nothing to lose.

The third channel is procedural asymmetry: the institutions through which reform must pass are occupied by the interests reform would constrain. The oil industry held the chairmanships of the tax committees that wrote tax law from the 1930s onward. Platform companies have placed former executives in regulatory roles across the jurisdictions that oversee them. Financial institutions occupy the advisory bodies that govern financial regulation. This is not conspiracy. It is the predictable outcome of allowing the people most familiar with an industry to staff the institutions that govern it, without any structural requirement that those institutions also include the people bearing the industry's costs.

The delay mechanism, stated precisely, is the combination of these three asymmetries operating simultaneously in institutions with no review cycle, no standing for affected populations, and no independent evidence base. Remove any one of the three asymmetries and the delay becomes harder to sustain. Remove all three and it becomes structurally impossible.

The architecture of non-delay

The Montreal Protocol removed all three asymmetries simultaneously, which is why it worked. Financial asymmetry was neutralised by the Multilateral Fund: compliance was not made prohibitive for the parties who most needed to comply. Epistemic asymmetry was neutralised by independent scientific panels whose findings were public and whose methodology was open to challenge through a structured process, not a funded counter-campaign. Procedural asymmetry was neutralised by a diplomatic infrastructure — UNEP — that included the affected parties and operated on differentiated obligations rather than equal sacrifice from unequal positions.

Commons World is designed to make those three neutralisations available not for one domain in one decade, but for every domain, continuously. The architecture through which it does so is already fully specified. What follows is its description as a governance system rather than as nine separate pillars.

Financial asymmetry is neutralised by CB and CUE. The Commons Bank provides sovereign financial infrastructure independent of the commercial banking system. The Commons Unit of Exchange reprices what markets currently externalise, so that the cost of maintaining a harmful arrangement accumulates as a visible, growing liability on the balance sheet of whoever maintains it — not as a diffuse social cost borne by populations with no account in the system. A corporation that benefits from an oil depletion allowance, an agricultural water subsidy, or an algorithmic design that causes demonstrable harm is not merely doing something bad. Under CUE accounting, it is accruing a debt with named creditors. The financial incentive to maintain the arrangement inverts: the longer it continues, the larger the liability. [9]

Epistemic asymmetry is neutralised by CR, ATE, PCH, and OSN. The Commons Registry is the tamper-resistant public ledger of verified reality. The Alliance for Transparent Enterprise assesses claims against evidence independently of the parties making the

claims. Planetary Coherence & Health's Baseline Research Institute continuously reviews emerging evidence and recommends evolution of baselines as knowledge advances — not as an advisory function but as a constitutional one, through a structured adoption process whose entire history is deposited in CR and permanently visible. [10] The Open Story Network publishes only what ATE has verified and CR has recorded. The knowledge that a harmful arrangement is harmful cannot be buried, because the evidence is public, the verification is independent, and the publication channel cannot be purchased. The tobacco industry's funded counter-research worked because there was no institution whose verified findings were structurally distinguishable from industry-funded findings. The CR/ATE/OSN architecture creates exactly that distinction.

Procedural asymmetry is neutralised by PCH's six governing bodies and GCAC. The six governing bodies of PCH — the Council for Planetary Coherence, the Baseline Research Institute, the Ancestral Wisdom Assembly, the Arbitration Chamber, the Baseline Literacy Division, and the Global Commons Advocacy Council — are constituted through selection processes specifically designed to prevent capture by any single interest: governmental, commercial, or institutional. [11] No government may directly appoint a CPC member. No commercial entity may fund a CPC member's nomination. The AWA determines its own internal governance. The AC is confirmed by a two-thirds majority of the AWA, meaning no single body can constitute the institution that adjudicates its own disputes. The GCAC is publicly funded, deposits every submission and every outcome in CR, and is structurally incapable of being outspent because it does not compete on money — it competes on verified evidence in a permanent public record. The populations bearing the cost of harmful arrangements are not merely consulted. They have constitutional standing.

The GCAC mechanism

The Global Commons Advocacy Council deserves specific attention because it is the instrument that directly addresses the delay mechanism. The GCAC exists, in the words of PCH 1.8.6, because 'the harm was legal.' ATE can document harm. CR can record it. OSN can publish it. The GAR can score the institution responsible. But none of these instruments changes the law. The law is changed by legislators, in parliaments and regulatory bodies, through processes that the industries benefiting from the current law have spent decades learning to occupy. [12]

The GCAC is the instrument through which the evidence accumulated by the entire CW architecture is translated into structured legal reform. Every year, drawing on the full ATE evidence base deposited in CR and the EL's annual Forward Detection Report, GCAC produces a Legal Reform Priorities document: the most consequential legal changes required, globally and by jurisdiction, supported by accumulated verified evidence. It is submitted to governments, parliaments, regulatory bodies, and international institutions. Every submission is deposited in CR. Every outcome — achieved or failed — is permanently recorded.

The power of this mechanism is not coercive. It is epistemic and reputational. A government that receives a GCAC submission backed by verified CR evidence and fails to act is not merely doing nothing. It is creating a permanent public record of having received specific evidence of specific harm and having chosen not to address it. Its GAR score reflects that choice. OSN reports it. The next election cycle, the next international negotiation, the next attempt to claim democratic legitimacy — all occur against that record. The delay mechanism works because the cost of delay is invisible. GCAC makes it visible, permanent, and attributable.

The combination of GCAC advocacy, EL forward detection, and OSN verified journalism is the institutional equivalent of what independent atmospheric science provided for the ozone crisis: a

body of evidence that is public, permanently accessible, independently verified, and impossible to permanently contest. The chemical industry contested Molina and Rowland's theoretical findings for a decade. It could not contest Farman's empirical data once it was published, because the data was physical, verifiable, and matched by satellite measurements from five independent sources. The CR/ATE/GCAC architecture creates that condition for governance failures: verified, published, permanent, matched by the lived experience of the populations it documents.

Governance that cannot be captured

The seven-layer governance architecture outlined in the discussion preceding this chapter maps completely onto Commons World's existing structure. The planetary baseline is PCH. The evidence commons is CR. The consequence layer is ATE extended to prospective assessment through the BRI's baseline adoption process. The human assembly function is the PCH governing body architecture: distributed, cross-constituted, independently selected, with the AWA providing the Indigenous and intergenerational voice that no existing democratic institution structurally includes. The accountability web is ATE, GAR, and OSN. Full-cost exchange is CB and CUE. The evolutionary sentinel is the EL.

None of this requires a world government. There is no central executive, no global legislature backed by standing armies, no single institution whose capture would give any actor control of the whole. The architecture is distributed by design. The CR is a ledger with no single controlling node. The AWA determines its own governance. The AC can only be constituted through cross-body confirmation that no single interest can engineer. The EL's findings are public the moment they are made. Capture of one instrument does not propagate through the system because the instruments are constitutionally independent of each other.

What makes this architecture resistant to the fiendishly clever actor — the well-resourced, patient, strategically sophisticated interest that has successfully captured every governance institution in this book — is not the virtue of its participants. It is the structure of its incentives. There is no single point through which control of the whole can be achieved. The evidence base cannot be controlled because it is distributed and independently verified. The advocacy function cannot be outspent because it does not compete on money. The baselines cannot be lobbied because they are physical and social realities with constitutional force, not policy positions subject to amendment by a sympathetic committee. The affected populations cannot be excluded because they have constitutional standing through the AWA and the GCAC's annual public record.

The clever actor can still cause harm within this system. But the harm will be documented, attributed, scored, published, and legally pursued. It will accumulate as a liability rather than disappearing as an externality. And the next harm will be harder to cause, because the EL will have identified the vector and the BRI will have updated the baseline and the GCAC will have submitted the legal reform before the next actor finds the gap. The system learns. That is the condition that was missing from every governance failure in this book: not better people, but a system designed to learn faster than it can be gamed.

The work that remains

This book has described what is broken, who built it, and what fixing it would actually require. The twelve chapters have named specific laws, specific companies, specific dates, and specific agreements or repeals that would address each case within a single legislative term if the will existed to enact them. The will does not yet exist. This chapter has described the architecture through which that will can be built: not by persuading the powerful to become virtuous, but by changing the structural conditions under which power operates.

Commons World does not yet fully exist. The Commons Registry is not yet built. The Alliance for Transparent Enterprise is not yet operational. The Global Commons Advocacy Council has not yet published its first Legal Reform Priorities document. The Commons Bank has not yet issued the first Commons Unit of Exchange. AURA devices are not yet in citizens' hands. The Open Story Network has not yet published its first verified story. The Evolutionary League has not yet filed its first Forward Detection Report.

What exists is the architecture: the design of the system, the specification of its instruments, the articulation of the principles from which they follow. Architecture is not governance. But it is the precondition of governance, in the same way that a blueprint is not a building but is the precondition of one. The Visible World, to be published in 2027, carries the full architecture and evidence base. Commons Community carries the entry point for the people who will build it.

The Montreal Protocol was signed in 1987 by 24 nations. It now has 197 states and the European Union. The ozone layer is healing. The distance between those two facts is thirty-eight years of imperfect, contested, annually renegotiated, evidence-driven governance — exactly the kind of governance this book has argued for throughout. It did not require utopia. It required the three structural conditions that Commons World is designed to provide at civilisational scale: independent evidence that cannot be captured, institutional infrastructure that includes the affected parties, and a compliance framework that makes repair achievable rather than ruinous. [13]

The work that remains is the work of building those conditions — instrument by instrument, baseline by baseline, verified claim by verified claim, community by community. It is not the work of a single institution or a single generation. It is the work that every Commons Community meeting, every verified ATE finding, every GCAC submission, every EL horizon scan, and every person who has read this far is already part of.

The hidden world is not hidden because it is secret. It is hidden because the architecture that would make it visible does not yet fully exist. Building that architecture is the most important governance project of this century. This book has described why. The rest is construction.

A CLOSING SPOTLIGHT

From Extraction to Abundance

Carbon, plastics, and land — the three sectors that most clearly illustrate the architecture of extraction, and the nine Pillars built to close each gap.

Commons World rests on nine pillars: Planetary Coherence & Health, the Commons Registry, the Alliance for Transparent Enterprise, the Global Accountability Rating, Commons Bank and Commons Unit of Exchange, the Autonomous Unified Rights Architecture, Commons Education, Open Story Network, and the Evolutionary League. Each pillar was built to answer a specific failure of the world as it currently operates: a failure to measure planetary health honestly, to record evidence permanently, to verify claims independently, to rate conduct transparently, to price damage truthfully, to protect rights universally, to educate citizens adequately, to tell the whole story publicly, and to reward genuine stewardship structurally.

This closing spotlight names, plainly and specifically, the failures that made each of those nine pillars necessary. It does not speak of villains or conspiracies. It speaks of named companies, named laws, and named decisions, made over the course of a century, that produced the visible damage described throughout this book, and the hidden architecture beneath it that The Hidden World is meant to bring into view. The purpose is not condemnation. It is diagnosis,

because no architecture of repair can be built without first naming, accurately, what it must repair.

The Architecture of Extraction

Three sectors illustrate the pattern most clearly: the fuels that warm the atmosphere, the plastics that outlive every life that touches them, and the land that feeds the world while losing the capacity to keep feeding it. In each case, a small number of companies built immense fortunes by moving a cost off their own books and onto the shared accounts of the atmosphere, the ocean, the soil, and the public purse. In each case, a law, sometimes a single clause, sometimes an entire regulatory framework, was written, in most instances decades ago, that made the arrangement durable. And in each case, the law has proven far easier to pass than to repeal.

This is not a story of hidden villainy. The companies named below operate within laws their own predecessors helped write, and many of their current executives inherited structures built before they were born. What follows is an accurate account of what those structures are, who built them, and what it would now take to dismantle them.

Carbon: The Price Never Paid

The clearest data on responsibility for the warming atmosphere comes from the Carbon Majors database, built originally by researcher Richard Heede of the Climate Accountability Institute and now maintained by the think tank InfluenceMap. [1] It traces more than seventy percent of all industrial carbon dioxide and cement emissions since the Industrial Revolution to just seventy-eight corporate and state producers. Among investor-owned companies, five firms — Chevron, ExxonMobil, BP, Shell, and ConocoPhillips — account for over a tenth of all historical fossil fuel and cement emissions on their own.[2] Since the Paris Agreement was signed in 2015, the majority of

companies in the database have increased production rather than reduced it.

The International Monetary Fund estimated that fossil fuels received seven trillion dollars in subsidy in 2022 — a figure widely repeated and widely misunderstood. [3] Only about eighteen percent of that total represents explicit subsidies — money governments actually forgo or pay out in price support, amounting to approximately 1.3 trillion dollars. The remaining 5.5 trillion dollars is the IMF's own estimate of the unpriced cost of air pollution and climate damage — a debt owed not by treasuries to corporations, but by the present generation to the atmosphere, never entered on any ledger at all. Both figures matter, and they are different debts. Treating them as identical understates the case for repricing carbon, because it makes the smaller number look enormous and the larger number look like a rounding exercise rather than what it is: the most consequential unpriced externality in economic history.

The mechanism that protects the explicit portion of this arrangement has a precise origin. In 1926, the United States Congress passed a percentage depletion allowance permitting oil producers to deduct 27.5 percent of a well's gross income from taxable earnings, year after year, regardless of how much had originally been invested. [4] The allowance survived presidential opposition from Franklin Roosevelt and from Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau, who in 1937 called it 'perhaps the most glaring loophole' in the federal tax code. It survived in large part because, by the 1930s, the industry it protected had allies in the chairmanships of the very congressional committees that wrote tax law. President Gerald Ford finally repealed the allowance for the largest integrated oil companies in 1975, but it remains in force today for independent producers, and was expanded again under the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

This is the pattern Commons World exists to interrupt: a benefit, written into law nearly a century ago to solve a wartime production problem, that has outlived its justification by ninety years because no

mechanism exists to make its true cost visible to the public that ultimately pays it.

Plastic: The Promise Never Meant

If the carbon story is one of unpriced cost, the plastics story is one of manufactured belief. A joint investigation by NPR and the PBS series Frontline, drawing on internal industry archives held at Syracuse University and the DuPont family papers in Delaware, found that the plastics and oil industry knew, as early as 1973 and 1974, that recycling plastic at scale would almost certainly never be economically viable. [5] One internal report sent to executives in April 1973 called the sorting of mixed plastics infeasible. A speech circulated to industry leaders the following year expressed serious doubt that large-scale plastic recycling could ever be made viable on an economic basis.

The industry promoted recycling anyway, for decades, and at a cost of tens of millions of dollars in advertising, through trade groups whose members included Exxon, Chevron, Dow, and DuPont. Former officials of the industry's chief lobbying body have since stated publicly that the campaign was never expected to solve the waste problem; its purpose was to forestall plastic bans and sustain demand for new plastic, which is cheaper to manufacture from oil than to recover from waste. [6] The now-familiar triangular recycling symbol, stamped on packaging regardless of whether the material inside could actually be processed, was adopted over recyclers' own objections because it resembled an existing recycling mark. By the time this internal history became public in 2020, no more than ten percent of all plastic ever produced had been recycled, and the State of California had filed litigation against ExxonMobil citing the reporting directly.[7]

This is not a story about a technology that failed. It is a story about a public message, paid for and shaped by the companies that profited from its being believed, that was understood internally to be false

from its earliest days. No regulator required the industry to disclose what its own scientists had concluded. No public registry existed to record the gap between the claim and the internal assessment. That gap — between what a company says and what an independent, permanently recorded process can verify — is precisely the space Commons World's accountability pillars were built to close.

Land: The Ledger That Forgets the Forest

The same structure — concentrated corporate benefit, diffuse public cost, and a legal architecture that entrenches both — governs the global trade in food. In Brazil, where soy cultivation and cattle ranching now drive most deforestation in the Amazon and the Cerrado, a 2024 tracking exercise by the environmental group Mighty Earth scored ten of the world's largest soy traders and meatpackers on their responsiveness to deforestation alerts in their own supply chains. [8] Three companies — Bunge, Cargill, and the Brazilian meatpacker JBS — scored worst of the ten, with JBS at 10 out of 100, Cargill at 11, and Bunge at 31, while the group as a whole was linked to the clearing of native vegetation across an area roughly twice the size of London in a single year.

A voluntary agreement among soy buyers, the Amazon Soy Moratorium, has restrained deforestation for soy specifically since 2006 and is credited with preventing roughly 17,000 to 18,000 square kilometres of forest loss — proof that buyer-side accountability works when it exists. [9] But it is voluntary, applies to one commodity in one country, and has come under renewed pressure from some of the same companies that signed it. The European Union's own binding deforestation law, passed in 2023 to require proof that imported cattle, soy, cocoa, coffee, palm oil, rubber, and timber were not grown on recently cleared land, has now been delayed twice and will not take effect for large operators until December 2026, three years after it was originally meant to apply, under sustained pressure from exporting nations and the industries the law was written to constrain.

The underlying economics are shaped, in turn, by a legislative architecture that predates the deforestation crisis entirely. The United States has subsidized a small number of commodity crops since the New Deal era; today, corn, soybeans, wheat, cotton, and rice receive the overwhelming majority of federal farm support, while fruits and vegetables receive roughly a tenth as much, despite occupying a comparable share of cropland. The effect, replicated in various forms across major agricultural economies, is to make the most resource-intensive, least nutritionally dense crops the cheapest to grow and the cheapest to buy, while land best suited to diverse, soil-conserving cultivation is steered toward monoculture by the structure of the subsidy itself.

How the Laws Were Made to Last

Across all three sectors, the laws that protect extraction share a structural feature worth naming directly: they were rarely passed as acts of obvious harm. The 1926 depletion allowance was framed as a wartime production incentive. The Farm Bill's commodity supports began in 1933 as Depression-era relief for failing farms. The plastics recycling campaign was framed, publicly, as environmental responsibility. In each case, a policy with a defensible original purpose was preserved, decades after that purpose expired, by industries with the resources to make preservation cheaper than reform.

The American oil and gas industry spent roughly 151 million dollars on federal lobbying in 2024 — a substantial sum, but smaller than the pharmaceutical industry's expenditure in the same year, and smaller than several other regulated sectors. [10] The more durable form of influence has historically been structural: the placement of industry allies on the specific congressional committees that write tax and trade law, a pattern visible as early as 1932, when Texas oil interests helped place sympathetic legislators in the chairmanships that controlled depletion policy for the following four decades. The same

dynamic now plays out at the level of trade regulation, where repeated delay — not repeal — has become the preferred instrument: the European Union's deforestation law has not been struck down by any court or vote against its substance; it has simply been postponed, twice, each time citing implementation readiness rather than disagreement with its goal.

This is the deeper failure Commons World's nine pillars were designed around: not that good laws cannot be written, but that without independent verification, permanent public record, and a financial system that prices externalities at their source, even good laws can be slow-walked indefinitely by the parties they were meant to constrain.

What Commons World Does About It

Each of the failures named above maps directly onto a gap one of Commons World's nine pillars exists to close.

The Alliance for Transparent Enterprise exists because, in every case described here, the gap between a company's public claim and its internal knowledge was discovered only by accident: by reporters tracking down boxes of forty-year-old memos, by litigators subpoenaing internal correspondence, by NGOs running their own satellite monitoring programmes years after the damage was done. ATE is built to verify evidence as it is submitted, not decades after the fact.

The Commons Registry exists because every story above depended, at some point, on a record that almost was not kept — internal documents nearly lost to a landfill, preserved only by chance in a university archive. CR is designed to make permanent, public record the default for evidence of this kind, not the exception.

The Global Accountability Rating exists because the closest thing the world currently has to a corporate deforestation scorecard is produced by a single environmental NGO with limited resources, scoring ten companies a year on a methodology of its own design.

GAR is built to make that kind of accountability systematic, comparable, and impossible for any single actor to dismiss as one critic's opinion.

Commons Bank and Commons Unit of Exchange exist because the IMF's own arithmetic shows that 5.5 trillion dollars of fossil fuel's true annual cost is currently unpriced — not stolen, not hidden, simply never entered into any ledger that determines what anything actually costs. CUE is designed so that a unit of value reflects the full cost of what produced it, not merely the price a seller was able to externalise.

The Autonomous Unified Rights Architecture exists because the monitoring that did expose deforestation in Brazil — satellite alerts, rapid response tracking — was built and is maintained by a single nonprofit, not by any structure the citizens whose forests are being cleared can access directly. AURA is designed to put that capability in the hands of the communities it protects, not solely in the hands of those wealthy enough to fund it from outside.

Commons Education exists because percentage depletion, commodity payment formulas, and externality pricing are technical enough that most citizens who bear their costs have never heard of them. A subsidy that cannot be named cannot be contested.

Open Story Network exists because the plastics industry's most effective tool was not deception in the legal sense, but a story — that plastic could be recycled — repeated long after its architects knew it to be false. OSN exists to ensure the public story and the verified record cannot drift permanently apart.

The Evolutionary League exists to do what no scorecard alone can do: convert good conduct from a reputational nicety into a structural advantage, so that the company that scores best on a tracker like Mighty Earth's is not merely ranked first among a discouraged few, but materially rewarded for it.

Why This Must Happen Now

None of this is a story of inevitable decline. The Amazon Soy Moratorium shows that buyer-side pressure, even without binding law, can hold back deforestation for nearly two decades. Restoration programmes across China's Loess Plateau, Niger, and elsewhere have shown that land believed permanently lost can return to productivity within a single human lifetime. The tools to verify, record, rate, price, and tell the truth about corporate conduct already exist in fragments: in NGO trackers, in investigative journalism, in IMF working papers, in court filings. What does not yet exist is an architecture that holds all of these functions together, permanently, at the scale of a planet rather than a single supply chain or a single lawsuit.

The reason this cannot wait is arithmetic, not rhetoric. Every year the depletion allowance survives unexamined, every year deforestation-law enforcement is delayed, every year recycling claims go unverified, is a year in which the underlying systems — atmospheric, oceanic, and terrestrial — move further from the threshold at which restoration remains a matter of policy rather than a matter of physical impossibility. The nine pillars described throughout this book were not designed as an abstract ideal. They were designed, pillar by pillar, as the specific architecture this spotlight has just shown the world to be missing.

Returning to the Nine Pillars

Planetary Coherence & Health. The Commons Registry. The Alliance for Transparent Enterprise. The Global Accountability Rating. Commons Bank and Commons Unit of Exchange. The Autonomous Unified Rights Architecture. Commons Education. Open Story Network. The Evolutionary League.

Read in light of what this spotlight has named — the depletion allowance written in 1926 and still in force a century later, the recycling promise made in the 1970s and known even then to be hollow, the deforestation law passed in 2023 and twice delayed before it could take effect — these nine pillars stop reading as aspiration and start reading as specification. Each one answers a documented failure, named here with its companies, its laws, and its dates, not as accusation but as the plain record from which any genuine architecture of repair must begin.

The Hidden World is the account of that record. Commons World is the answer built in response to it.

✦ ✦ ✦

SOURCES — CLOSING SPOTLIGHT

1 Heede, R., Climate Accountability Institute / InfluenceMap, Carbon Majors Database, carbonmajors.org, April 2024 — first established 2013; now maintained by InfluenceMap; traces emissions from 122 of the world's largest fossil fuel and cement producers from 1854 through 2022.

2 InfluenceMap, 'The Carbon Majors Database: Launch Report,' carbonmajors.org, April 2024 — over 70% of global fossil fuel and cement CO_2 emissions since the Industrial Revolution traced to 78 corporate and state producers; five investor-owned companies (Chevron, ExxonMobil, BP, Shell, ConocoPhillips) responsible for 11.1% of historical emissions (196 $GtCO_2$).

3 Black, S., Parry, I. and Vernon-Lin, N., 'IMF Fossil Fuel Subsidies Data: 2023 Update,' IMF Working Paper WP/23/169, August 2023 — global fossil fuel subsidies $7 trillion (7.1% of GDP) in 2022; explicit subsidies approximately $1.3 trillion (18% of total); implicit subsidies — unpriced air pollution and climate damage costs — approximately $5.7 trillion (82% of total).

4 U.S. Revenue Act of 1926, Section 204(c), 44 Stat. 9 — 27.5% percentage depletion allowance for oil and gas producers; survived until partial repeal under Tax Reduction Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-12) for major integrated producers; remains in force for independent producers under current U.S. tax code (26 U.S.C. §613A).

5 Sullivan, L., NPR and PBS Frontline, 'How Big Oil Misled the Public into Believing Plastic Would Be Recycled,' NPR.org, September 11, 2020; and 'Plastic Wars,' PBS Frontline documentary, March 31, 2020 — internal 1973 report to industry executives described plastic recycling as 'costly' and sorting as 'infeasible'; 1974 industry speech stated 'serious doubt that [recycling plastic] can ever be made viable on an economic basis.'

6 Sullivan, L., NPR / PBS Frontline, 2020 (as above) — Larry Thomas, former president of the Society of the Plastics Industry: 'If the public thinks that recycling is working, then they are not going to be as concerned about the environment.' Lewis Freeman, former VP of government affairs, SPI: 'There was never an enthusiastic belief that recycling was ultimately going to work in a significant way.'

7 California Attorney General Rob Bonta, People of the State of California v. ExxonMobil Corporation, San Francisco County Superior Court, filed September 23, 2024 — alleges decades-long campaign of deception misleading consumers on plastic recyclability; cites NPR/Frontline investigation; seeks nuisance abatement, disgorgement, and injunctive relief.

8 Mighty Earth, 'Soy & Cattle Deforestation Tracker and Scorecard,' soyandcattlemonitor.mightyearth.org, December 2024 — 172 deforestation cases across 330,296 hectares (area twice the size of London) linked to ten major soy and meatpacking companies between February 2022 and July 2024; JBS scored 10/100, Cargill 11/100, Bunge 31/100 across four categories: Responsiveness, Transparency, Action, and Zero Deforestation & Conversion Policy.

9 Heilmayr, R. et al., 'Brazil's Amazon Soy Moratorium reduced deforestation,' Nature Food, December 11, 2020 — econometric analysis of remotely sensed data: Amazon Soy Moratorium (2006) prevented approximately 18,000 km² (±9,000 km²) of deforestation over its first decade (2006–2016). See also Greenqueen, 'Brazilian Soy Giants Exit Amazon Protection Pact,' January 2026, citing 17,000 km² estimate from industry sources.

10 OpenSecrets, 'Federal Lobbying Set New Record in 2024,' opensecrets.org, February 2025 — oil and gas industry spent $151.1 million on federal lobbying in 2024, an increase of $17.6 million over 2023; fifth-highest lobbying industry by expenditure.

Why Commons World

The hidden world is not hidden because it is secret. It is hidden because the architecture that would make it visible does not yet fully exist. Commons World is that architecture: not a reform programme, not a set of proposals, but a coherent governance system designed so that the cost of every decision returns to the person who made it, the evidence of every harm is permanent and public, and the institutions through which change must pass cannot be permanently occupied by the interests that benefit from blocking it. Building it is the most important governance project of this century. The rest is construction.

REFERENCES

1 United Nations, "Dry Tears of the Aral," UN Chronicle; Foreign Policy Association, "The Aral Sea Disaster, Part 2: Soviet Irrigation." See TPC 1, reference 1/05.

2 WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control background documentation; US Surgeon General, "Smoking and Health," 1964; internal tobacco industry documents, UCSF Legacy Tobacco Documents Library.

3 Business for Social Responsibility (BSR), Human Rights Impact Assessment: Facebook in Myanmar, October 2018. See TPC 11, reference 11/04.

4 Wong et al., "External Validation of a Widely Implemented Proprietary Sepsis Prediction Model," JAMA Internal Medicine, 2021. See TPC 10, reference 10/14.

5 Dutch Parliamentary Inquiry Committee (POK), "Ongekend onrecht," December 2020. See TPC 10, reference 10/16.

6 U.S. lobbying disclosure records (Senate Office of Public Records), on PhRMA lobbying disclosures 2003–2004. See TPC 5, reference 05/05.

7 OpenSecrets, "Tech Industry Lobbying," 2024. See TPC 10, reference 10/09.

8 OpenSecrets, oil and gas industry lobbying expenditure data, 1990–2024; Introduction to this volume, references 0/01–0/03.

9 Commons World, Commons Bank (CB) and Commons Unit of Exchange (CUE) architecture. See Commons Community (CC), 2026; The Visible World (VW), forthcoming 2027.

10 Commons World, Commons Registry (CR), Alliance for Transparent Enterprise (ATE), Planetary Coherence & Health (PCH) 1.8.2 Baseline Research Institute, 1.8.9 Baseline Adoption Process. See The Visible World (VW), forthcoming 2027.

11 Commons World, PCH 1.8 — The Six Governing Bodies: CPC, BRI, AWA, AC, BLD, GCAC; PCH 1.8.7 Governing Body Selection and Independence. See The Visible World (VW), forthcoming 2027.

12 Commons World, PCH 1.8.6 Global Commons Advocacy Council. See The Visible World (VW), forthcoming 2027.

13 Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, signed 16 September 1987; UNEP OzonAction, universal ratification data; UN News, "Ozone layer recovery is on track," January 2023. See TPC 12, references 12/03–12/14.

APPENDIX

The Nine Pillars in Full

The complete forensic detail of each Pillar: governance architecture, investigative instruments, founding cases, and sources.

Pillar 1 — Planetary Coherence & Health (PCH)

Sovereignty requires knowing whether the conditions life depends on are being honoured or destroyed. Without that knowledge, every other decision is made blind.

Planetary Coherence & Health (PCH) is the first Pillar and the foundation on which every other Pillar rests. It is not one Pillar among many. Where other Pillars address specific domains of activity, PCH defines the conditions of wellbeing against which all activity is ultimately measured. PCH does three things that no other Pillar does:

1. It enshrines the Prime Directive — the foundational constraint underpinning everything that follows

2. It defines the Nine Principles — the ethical compass governing the conduct of every institution within CW

3. It measures coherence across six domains — translating values into evidence, and evidence into accountability, through the Six Baseline Domains (BD1–BD6)

The Prime Directive

Do No Harm — to any living being, human, animal, or creature of the living world, or to Gaia, the living system that sustains all life.

Not a slogan, but a structural requirement built into every institution in Commons World.

The Prime Directive is not a principle. It is a constraint. Principles describe the conditions that enable long-term coherence. The Prime

Directive describes the condition that must never be violated in pursuing them. It is the non-negotiable floor below which no CW institution, decision, or activity may descend, regardless of circumstance, commercial pressure, or political convenience.

The Nine Principles

The Nine Principles are the ethical compass of CW. They apply to every institution, every decision, and every activity within the CW architecture. No Pillar may act in a manner that contradicts them:

1. Human Dignity Is Non-Negotiable — every person possesses inherent worth and must never be reduced to a resource, commodity, data point, or instrument for another's benefit

2. Truth Before Preference — reality does not negotiate; evidence is more important than ideology, convenience, or commercial interest

3. Consequences Must Remain Visible — actions must remain connected to their impacts across time and place, including in digital systems

4. The Polluter Bears the Cost — no institution may privatise gains while externalising harm — whether environmental, social, financial, or digital

5. Future Generations Have Standing — long-term consequences deserve representation alongside present interests

6. Diversity Sustains Resilience — resilience requires variation and plurality; monocultures — biological, economic, or digital — create hidden vulnerability

7. Knowledge Is a Commons — knowledge essential to human flourishing must remain accessible to all

8. Sovereignty Is Inalienable, Online and Offline — every human being possesses inherent sovereignty over body, identity, consent, and participation

9. The Web of Life Is Indivisible — no organism, community, economy, or civilisation exists independently from the wider living systems that sustain it [5]

The Six Baseline Domains (BD1–BD6)

The Six Baseline Domains are the measurement framework through which PCH translates principles into evidence and evidence into accountability. These are the conditions against which every institution, enterprise, and policy in Commons World is evaluated:

BD1. Human Flourishing: the physical, mental, emotional, developmental, and relational conditions required for dignified human life — covering workers, communities, customers, and prior rights holders within any organisation's sphere of influence. Flourishing is not merely the absence of deprivation but the presence of genuine agency: the capacity to make meaningful choices, contribute to community, and participate in collective decisions

BD2. Ecological Integrity: the health, diversity, and regenerative capacity of the natural systems all life depends on — measuring trajectory toward regeneration or depletion, not merely current state. Where financial instruments — carbon credits, biodiversity tokens, natural capital instruments — claim to represent ecological value, this domain examines whether they accurately and continuously reflect the ecological reality they purport to convey [1, 2]

BD3. Material & Technological Safety: the safety of substances, products, technologies, and systems across their full arc of consequence — not at the point of deployment alone. Extends explicitly to digital systems, AI architectures, and financial platforms, examining whether digital systems claiming to represent ownership or rights are accurate, secure, and resilient

BD4. Social Cohesion & Participation: the degree to which communities maintain trust, mutual accountability, inclusive governance, and meaningful participation in collective decisions — examining whether activities strengthen or erode the social fabric. Gives particular attention to the displacement of customary social structures by external economic or technological actors

BD5. Systemic Resilience: whether the systems an organisation creates or depends upon contain genuine resilience — or have been optimised for short-term efficiency at the cost of the distributed

capability that absorbs disruption without collapse. Resilience is measured as trajectory, not merely current state [3]

BD6. Intergenerational Stewardship: whether present-day decisions preserve or diminish the opportunities available to future generations — with particular weight given to irreversibility and to actions that foreclose future options or lock in dependencies that future generations cannot easily escape [4]

The Six Governing Bodies

PCH is stewarded through six interdependent governing bodies designed to prevent institutional capture, preserve baseline integrity, distribute oversight, advocate for legal alignment, and protect long-term coherence across generations. No governing body may appoint itself, regulate itself, or amend baselines without transparent evidence, public record, and independent review by the others:

1. Council for Planetary Coherence (CPC): the primary stewardship body — adopts, reviews, and maintains planetary baselines through transparent, publicly visible process. Members nominated through independent research institutions and commons participation processes; no government may directly appoint a CPC member. Terms are fixed, non-renewable, and staggered

2. Baseline Research Institute (BRI): the scientific and analytical engine of PCH — continuously reviews emerging evidence, commissions independent research, and recommends additions, revisions, or retirement of baselines as knowledge advances. Researchers must declare all funding sources and may hold no commercial interest in any domain they research

3. Ancestral Wisdom Assembly (AWA): integrates Indigenous knowledge systems, ancestral memory traditions, and multi-generational place-based ecological understanding that formal science may not capture. Constituted through nomination by recognised Indigenous communities worldwide; determines its own internal governance

4. Arbitration Chamber (AC): the independent review body for contested ATE findings, challenged PCH baselines, and governance conflicts. Confirmed by a two-thirds majority of the AWA so no single body can constitute the body that adjudicates its own disputes

5. Baseline Literacy Division (BLD): translates complex baseline knowledge into forms accessible to any person, at any age, anywhere — working closely with Commons Education (CE) and Open Story Network (OSN). Coherence is not reserved for institutions and experts; BLD ensures it reaches society as a whole

6. Global Commons Advocacy Council (GCAC): addresses the gap ATE investigations consistently reveal: the harm was legal. [6] Drawing on the full ATE evidence base in Commons Registry (CR) and Evolutionary League (EL)'s annual Forward Detection Report, GCAC produces an annual Legal Reform Priorities document structured across three tiers. Tier 1: full verified legal reform cases — complete evidence base, jurisdiction, recommended action, and CR reference. Tier 2: one-page monitoring summaries tracking progress on previously submitted priorities. Tier 3: the forward register — emerging legal gaps identified by ATE and EL horizon scanning, not yet at full case standard but flagged for monitoring. Every submission to governments, parliaments, and regulatory bodies is deposited in CR. Every outcome achieved or not achieved is permanently visible. GCAC works closely with EL and OSN — together the three institutions form the architecture through which CW advocates for a legal environment that serves the many rather than the few

PCH and the Commons Unit of Exchange (CUE)

PCH is the valuation standard for the Commons Unit of Exchange (CUE). Without verified PCH baselines there is no credible ecosystem services contribution, no verified regenerative agriculture transition, no recognised care economy — none of the five asset bases that give CUE its monetary credibility. PCH does not merely precede CUE institutionally. It is the bedrock of CUE's credibility as a monetary instrument.

PCH and the Full Architecture

PCH standards operate on two levels. In jurisdictions whose governments, cities, or institutions are members of EL, PCH baselines carry binding authority. In non-member jurisdictions, PCH baselines are advisory — representing the best available evidence on the conditions of human and ecological wellbeing, available for voluntary adoption. The aspiration is universal adoption over time, achieved through demonstrated usefulness rather than mandate. This is power with rather than power over: PCH persuades through evidence and transparency, not through coercion.

PCH defines the conditions of coherence. Every other Pillar is a specific institutional response to the question of how those conditions are measured, preserved, verified, recognised, communicated, educated for, reported on, and protected.

SOURCES — PILLAR 1

1 Trencher, G. et al., 'Demand for low-quality offsets by major companies undermines climate integrity of the voluntary carbon market,' Nature Communications, August 2024 — 87% of carbon offsets purchased by the twenty largest buyers carry high risk of not providing real and additional emissions reductions; decarbonisation claims connected to these offsets lack integrity and amount to greenwashing; basis for BD2's examination of whether financial instruments claiming ecological value accurately reflect ecological reality.

2 ScienceDirect, 'Addressing scandals and greenwashing in carbon offset markets: A framework for reform,' June 2025 — systematic review confirming fraudulent crediting, inflated baselines, lack of additionality, and unverifiable climate claims across voluntary carbon markets.

3 Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission, 'The Financial Crisis Inquiry Report,' U.S. Government Printing Office, January 2011 — systemic interconnections between institutions optimised for short-term efficiency became the transmission mechanism for catastrophic failure in 2008; foundational evidence for BD5.

4 World Commission on Environment and Development (Brundtland Commission), 'Our Common Future,' Oxford University Press, 1987 — foundational definition of intergenerational equity: 'development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'; bedrock of BD6 and Principle 5.

5 Rockström, J. et al., 'A safe operating space for humanity,' Nature, Vol. 461, September 2009 — nine planetary boundaries defining the safe operating space for human civilisation; transgressing boundaries risks abrupt or irreversible environmental changes; scientific basis for Principle 9, BD2, and BD6.

6 GCAC cross-reference — 'the harm was legal' evidenced across primary cases in SOURCES — PILLAR 3: Rana Plaza (AD1), Boeing 737 MAX (AD3), PFAS concealment by DuPont and 3M (AD3), Panama Papers (AD4), and the 2008 financial crisis (AD5) — all conducted within the law at the time of occurrence.

✦ ✦ ✦

Pillar 2 — Commons Registry (CR)

Sovereignty requires a record that cannot be quietly rewritten by whoever holds power today.

The Commons Registry (CR) is the permanent, tamper-proof public ledger of the commons. It is not a database owned by any government, corporation, or platform. It is the institutional memory of the entire CW architecture — the place where every verified fact, once established, becomes permanent and beyond the reach of those who would prefer it forgotten.

CR is built on distributed ledger technology — the same class of architecture underlying modern blockchain systems, adapted for civilisational record-keeping rather than financial speculation. Each entry is cryptographically hashed and linked to the entry before it, forming an unbroken chain. Any attempt to alter a past record changes its hash, which immediately breaks the chain and exposes the tampering. [1]

CommonNodes — distributed custody

CR is maintained not by a single server controlled by a single institution, but by a global network of CommonNodes — independently operated copies of the full ledger held simultaneously across many jurisdictions, institutions, and individuals. No single node can alter the record alone; consensus among nodes is required before any new entry is confirmed and permanently added. [2] This decentralisation is the structural guarantee behind CR's core promise: no government can delete it, no corporation can alter it, no individual can suppress it. Removing the record would require simultaneously compromising a majority of independently operated nodes spread across the world — a practical impossibility at scale.

What CR records

CR is the permanent deposit point for every category of verified finding across the CW architecture:

1. Every Alliance for Transparent Enterprise (ATE) audit finding, deposited the moment an investigation concludes — before the enterprise is notified

2. Every Global Accountability Rating (GAR) colour assignment and any change to it, with the evidential basis for the change

3. Every Planetary Coherence & Health (PCH) baseline decision and any revision to it

4. Every verified Peoples News (PN) citizen submission, once confirmed by ATE

5. Every public commitment made by an institution or official, so that the gap between promise and delivery becomes permanently visible

6. Every Arbitration Chamber (AC) ruling on a contested finding

The Correction & Restoration Protocol

CR does not pretend that initial findings are always complete or that circumstances never change. Where new evidence emerges, or a confirmed finding requires correction, the update is linked permanently to the original entry rather than replacing it. [3] The full arc of what happened — the original finding, the challenge, the new evidence, and the resolution — remains the permanent record. CR does not interpret and does not judge which version was right at each stage. It remembers all of it, in sequence, permanently.

Six deposit pathways

CR formalises six distinct pathways through which verified information enters the permanent record, each with its own evidential standard and procedure:

1. ATE Audit Findings — deposited immediately upon investigation completion

2. PCH Baseline Decisions — deposited upon confirmation by the Council for Planetary Coherence

3. Arbitration Chamber Rulings — deposited upon resolution of a formal contest

4. Peoples News Submissions — deposited once ATE verification is complete

5. Commons News Investigations — deposited upon editorial confirmation meeting OSN's verification-before-amplification standard

6. Commons Bank & CUE Records — deposited as each verified contribution triggering CUE issuance is confirmed

Why CR matters to every other Pillar

CR is the foundation every other institution in Commons World depends upon to function. ATE's findings only matter because they cannot be deleted once deposited. GAR's colours are only trustworthy because the evidence behind them is permanently inspectable. CUE's monetary credibility depends entirely on the permanent, verifiable record of the contribution that triggered each unit's issuance. Without CR, every other Pillar would be making claims that could be quietly altered, denied, or erased under pressure. With CR, no institution — however powerful — can make verified history disappear.

> *CR does not decide what is true. It ensures that once something has been established as true through proper verification, it stays true — permanently, publicly, and beyond the reach of anyone who would prefer otherwise.*

SOURCES — PILLAR 2

1 Nakamoto, S., 'Bitcoin: A Peer-to-Peer Electronic Cash System,' bitcoin.org, 2008 — foundational paper establishing cryptographic hash chaining and tamper-evidence in distributed ledgers: each block contains the hash of the previous block, making any alteration of a past record immediately detectable through hash mismatch.

2 Buterin, V., 'A Next-Generation Smart Contract and Decentralised Application Platform,' Ethereum White Paper, 2013 — consensus mechanisms requiring majority node agreement before any new entry is confirmed and permanently added; decentralisation as structural guarantee against single-point alteration or suppression; basis for CommonNodes architecture.

3 World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), 'Decentralised Identifiers (DIDs) v1.0,' W3C Recommendation, July 2022 — correction and update protocols in distributed ledger architecture: amendments linked permanently to original entries rather than replacing them; the full arc of the record is always preserved; basis for CR's Correction & Restoration Protocol.

✦ ✦ ✦

Pillar 3 — Alliance for Transparent Enterprise (ATE)

Sovereignty cannot coexist with private actors operating without accountability. When corporations cause harm invisibly, sovereignty is fiction.

The Alliance for Transparent Enterprise (ATE) is the consequence verification infrastructure of Commons World. It does not ask whether an organisation has complied with regulations or fulfilled its reporting requirements. It asks a deeper question: what are the actual consequences of this organisation's activities on people, communities, ecosystems, and the systems upon which life depends?

What Makes ATE Forensically Different

ATE is not a conventional audit. Four structural features set it apart from every existing accountability system:

1. Independence is structural — ATE investigations are not commissioned, directed, or controlled by the enterprise being assessed. The organisation does not select investigators, define the scope, influence the methodology, or receive findings before the public. Visibility follows verification, not negotiation

2. Outcomes not claims — conventional audits verify compliance — whether an organisation met the standards it was asked to meet. ATE verifies consequences — what actually happened, to whom, and with what effect. An organisation can be fully compliant and still fail an ATE investigation

3. The full sphere of influence is within scope — harm hidden behind subcontractors, offshore entities, fragmented ownership structures, or regulatory gaps is within ATE's investigative reach. The sphere of influence — not the legal boundary — defines the scope

4. Findings are immediate and permanent — once an investigation is complete and independently confirmed, findings are deposited directly into Commons Registry (CR) — before the enterprise is notified. There is no period for communications planning, legal negotiation, or reputation management

The Six Audit Domains (AD1–AD6) — PCH Baselines Applied to Enterprise Conduct

ATE investigates through six audit domains — the operational application of PCH's Six Baseline Domains to enterprise conduct. Five domains are shared directly. Domain 4 diverges: PCH measures Social Cohesion & Participation as a civilisational health condition no single enterprise can be solely audited against. ATE substitutes Ownership & Financial Accountability — because how an enterprise owns and accounts for itself is the conduct lens that reaches where PCH's broader societal measure cannot.

For each audit domain ATE deploys specific investigative methods and instruments. What follows is the operational picture — what investigators look for, how they find it, and what they use to do so.

AD1 — Human Flourishing

AD1 examines whether an organisation's activities expand or diminish the conditions required for dignified human life within its full sphere of influence — reaching beyond direct employees to workers throughout the supply chain, customers, communities, and prior rights holders. The Rana Plaza building collapse in 2013 — 1,134 garment workers killed in a building that commercial auditors had certified compliant — is the founding case for AD1's scope: certification that does not reach the actual conditions of work is not accountability. [1]

What ATE investigates:

▶ **Working conditions throughout the supply chain:** multi-tier mapping using commercial trade data, shipping records, and customs

declarations before investigators set foot on any site. ATE's scope extends explicitly to artisanal and informal tiers that certified Tier 1 audits do not reach

▶ **Prior rights holders:** whether communities with ancestral, customary, or communal land rights have been engaged on equal terms before activity affecting them commenced

▶ **Child and forced labour:** cross-referencing production capacity against declared adult workforce numbers; statistically implausible productivity ratios signal undisclosed labour; school attendance records, civil registration data, and community testimony triangulate what payroll records conceal

▶ **Wage and contract compliance:** examination of actual payment records, deduction practices, and contract terms against declared employment conditions

Instruments and methods:

▶ **Unannounced field visits:** investigators visit sites without prior notice; workers interviewed privately through AURA-authenticated identity-protected channels

▶ **Worker testimony via Commons Contribute (CCo):** authenticated submissions through Autonomous Unified Rights Architecture (AURA) allow workers at any supply chain tier to submit photographs, payslips, contracts, and testimony directly to ATE; identity cryptographically protected; evidence unalterable

▶ **Satellite imagery time-series analysis:** physical scale of activity visible from orbit cross-referenced against declared workforce sizes

▶ **Isotope and chemical provenance tracing:** raw materials carry geographic origin signatures; cotton, minerals, and agricultural products all carry traceable provenance markers no paperwork can override

▶ **Statistical anomaly detection:** AI-assisted analysis of labour productivity ratios and payroll patterns flags inconsistencies for field investigation

AD2 — Ecological Integrity

AD2 examines whether an organisation's activities contribute to the regeneration or depletion of natural systems within its sphere of influence — measuring trajectory, not merely current state. AD2 examines whether financial instruments — carbon credits, biodiversity tokens, natural capital instruments — accurately and verifiably reflect the ecological reality they purport to represent.

What ATE investigates:

▶ **Actual environmental conditions against claimed conditions:** independent testing of soil, water, air, and biodiversity against the enterprise's own environmental reporting

▶ **Carbon and biodiversity credit validity:** whether tokenised ecological assets reflect genuine, continuously monitored ecological reality or represent the financialisation of assets the issuing institution does not genuinely steward

▶ **Pollution discharge and contamination:** chemical analysis of discharge points, groundwater, and affected communities regardless of what the enterprise reports to regulators

▶ **Land use change:** continuous satellite monitoring establishes baseline conditions before an enterprise's activity began — making it impossible to claim damage pre-existed the operation

Instruments and methods:

▶ **Gas Chromatography–Mass Spectrometry (GC-MS):** primary instrument for environmental chemical analysis; portable units screen soil and water samples on-site within minutes, identifying semi-volatile organic compounds — pesticides, dioxins, PFAS forever chemicals, petroleum derivatives — at parts-per-trillion sensitivity; laboratory GC-MS provides full quantification

▶ **Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry (ICP-MS):** detects heavy metals — lead, mercury, cadmium, arsenic, chromium — in water and soil at trace concentrations; essential in mining, smelting, and electronics manufacturing investigations

▶ **Multispectral and Hyperspectral Satellite Remote Sensing:** Sentinel-2 and equivalent platforms capture optical, infrared, and

thermal data revealing deforestation, mine expansion, effluent plumes, and gas flaring; time-series analysis establishes pre-activity baselines

▶ **Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR):** penetrates cloud cover and operates at night — essential in tropical regions; detects land surface changes and water body alterations regardless of weather

▶ **Thermal and Methane Satellite Detection:** detects and quantifies methane and carbon dioxide emissions at facility level; a company reporting minimal emissions while a satellite records otherwise has a finding that enters CR immediately

▶ **Drone surveys:** centimetre-level imagery of specific sites; each image carries cryptographic provenance confirming device, time, and GPS coordinates

▶ **Isotope ratio analysis:** determines geographic origin of raw materials — verifying whether minerals, timber, and agricultural products originated where the enterprise claims

AD3 — Material & Technological Safety

AD3 examines whether the substances, products, technologies, and systems deployed by an organisation are safe across the full arc of consequence — not at the point of deployment alone. The Boeing 737 MAX crashes (346 deaths, 2018–2019) [2] and decades-long concealment of PFAS health risks [3] are the founding cases: safety certified at the point of approval, while evidence of harm accumulated invisibly. The domain extends explicitly to digital systems, AI architectures, and financial platforms.

What ATE investigates:

▶ **Product safety across full operational life:** consequences manifesting in populations who never purchased the product are within scope

▶ **Digital system integrity:** whether tokenised assets and digital ownership systems accurately represent the rights they claim to confer

▶ **Internal safety records:** whether internal engineering and compliance documentation reflects what the enterprise claims publicly

▶ **Persistent chemical contamination:** what the enterprise knew about long-term chemical harm, and when

Instruments and methods:

▶ **Independent product purchase and laboratory testing:** products bought independently from multiple retailers and submitted for analysis without the enterprise's knowledge

▶ **GC-MS and ICP-MS:** chemical composition analysis of products, materials, and industrial inputs; PFAS, heavy metals, and undisclosed additives detectable at trace concentrations

▶ **High-Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC):** separation and quantification of compounds in pharmaceuticals, food products, cosmetics, and industrial materials; identifies adulterants and misrepresented ingredients

▶ **X-ray Fluorescence (XRF) Spectroscopy:** portable handheld devices screen products and materials for heavy metal content instantly and non-destructively

▶ **Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR) Spectroscopy:** definitive molecular structure identification for pharmaceutical and chemical composition verification

▶ **Digital architecture forensic review:** examination of tokenisation structures, smart contract code, and off-chain records to determine whether digital asset systems accurately represent the rights they claim to confer

▶ **Internal document analysis:** NLP-assisted review of safety reports, engineering communications, and regulatory submissions for inconsistencies between what was known internally and what was disclosed publicly

AD4 — Ownership & Financial Accountability

AD4 examines whether an organisation's ownership structures, financial flows, and governance arrangements reflect genuine

accountability — or have been structured to obscure beneficial ownership, fragment responsibility, or distance decision-makers from the consequences of their decisions. The Panama Papers (11.5 million documents) [4] and Pandora Papers (11.9 million documents) [5] revealed how structures across more than 200 countries were used to hold wealth invisibly. In almost every case, the structures were technically legal. ATE investigations trace the gap between apparent ownership and actual control.

What ATE investigates:

▶ **Beneficial ownership:** tracing ownership chains through every layer — holding companies, nominee directors, special purpose vehicles, trusts, foundations — across multiple jurisdictions until the actual decision-maker is visible

▶ **Transfer pricing manipulation:** whether intra-group transaction prices reflect genuine market rates or have been manipulated to shift profit to low-tax jurisdictions; royalty arrangements, management fees, intercompany loans, and commodity pricing examined against arm's-length comparables

▶ **Politically exposed persons (PEP) intersections:** where beneficial ownership investigation identifies public officials, ATE cross-references against PEP databases, procurement records, and contract award data in CR

▶ **Financial flow analysis:** bank transaction patterns and intra-group payments examined for structures whose commercial justification is implausible relative to their financial consequence

Instruments and methods:

▶ **Corporate registry cross-referencing:** global corporate registries, beneficial ownership registers, property records, regulatory filings, and sanctions databases; identifies patterns of circular ownership and nominee directors appearing across hundreds of nominally unrelated entities

▶ **ICIJ Offshore Leaks Database:** the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists' database of offshore entities from the

Panama Papers, Pandora Papers, and FinCEN Files provides the historical record against which current structures are cross-referenced

▶ **AI-assisted entity resolution:** network analysis tools map relationships between corporate entities, individuals, addresses, and financial accounts across millions of records simultaneously

▶ **Arm's-length transfer pricing benchmarking:** intra-group transaction prices compared against market prices using commercial databases — Bloomberg, TP Catalyst, Bureau van Dijk Orbis

▶ **Country-by-country reporting analysis:** high profit in zero-tax jurisdictions with no employees alongside high revenue and many employees in operating jurisdictions is a transfer pricing finding

▶ **Property and asset registry cross-referencing:** land registries, AIS maritime vessel tracking, aircraft registration, and mining licence databases connect nominally unrelated entities to single controlling interests

▶ **Shipping and trade data analysis:** global AIS vessel tracking cross-referenced against cargo manifests and customs declarations detects sanctions evasion and supply chain routing designed to obscure origin

▶ **Functional analysis:** whether entities receiving payment for royalties or management fees actually employ the personnel performing the functions that justify the payment — or are brass-plate entities whose sole function is to receive income

AD5 — Systemic Resilience

AD5 examines whether the systems an organisation creates or depends upon contain genuine resilience — or have been optimised for short-term efficiency at the cost of the distributed capability that absorbs disruption without collapse. The 2008 global financial crisis demonstrated that interconnections between institutions that appeared to be strength became the transmission mechanism for catastrophic failure. [6] AD5 is designed to detect that fragility before the moment of crisis.

What ATE investigates:

▶ **Single points of failure:** critical dependencies whose failure would cause cascading collapse

▶ **Concentration risk:** degree to which production, sourcing, or distribution is concentrated in a single geography, supplier, or platform

▶ **Digital infrastructure dependencies:** whether digital systems could fail or be restricted without warning

▶ **Trajectory assessment:** whether the organisation is becoming more or less resilient over time

Instruments and methods:

▶ **Supply chain stress testing:** modelling the impact of losing key suppliers or routes, cross-referenced against actual procurement concentration data

▶ **Network topology analysis:** mapping interconnections between operational dependencies to identify nodes whose failure would propagate most widely

▶ **Cybersecurity penetration assessment:** independent evaluation of digital infrastructure resilience against intrusion and disruption

▶ **Financial concentration analysis:** counterparty exposure, liquidity buffers, debt covenant structures, and off-balance-sheet obligations examined for hidden concentration risk

▶ **Satellite monitoring:** continuous monitoring of physical infrastructure for signs of degradation or emerging vulnerability

AD6 — Intergenerational Stewardship

AD6 examines whether present-day decisions preserve or diminish the opportunities available to future generations — with particular weight given to irreversibility. Microplastics are now present in human blood, placentas, and breast milk. They will persist in the environment for centuries. No generation consented to this inheritance. AD6 gives structured voice to those who cannot yet speak for themselves.

What ATE investigates:

▶ **Irreversibility:** whether damage caused can be remediated within a human lifetime, or forecloses future options permanently

▶ **Persistent chemical contamination:** substances that bioaccumulate, persist, or whose full health consequences are not yet understood — PFAS, microplastics, heavy metals, persistent organic pollutants

▶ **Resource depletion trajectories:** whether use of groundwater, soil fertility, biodiversity, and minerals is sustainable at the rate being practised

▶ **Long-term liability concealment:** whether the enterprise has structured legal and financial arrangements to externalise decommissioning costs, environmental remediation, and product liability onto the public or future generations

Instruments and methods:

▶ **GC-MS and ICP-MS long-term contamination profiling:** detection of persistent organic pollutants, PFAS, and heavy metals in soil, water, sediment, and biological tissue to assess the legacy contamination load over time

▶ **Satellite time-series analysis (multi-decade):** current conditions compared against historical imagery over five, ten, and twenty-year windows to quantify environmental trajectory

▶ **Microplastic analysis:** Raman microspectroscopy and Fourier-Transform Infrared Spectroscopy (FTIR) for detection and characterisation of microplastic contamination in environmental and biological samples

▶ **Groundwater and aquifer monitoring:** depth-profiled water sampling with isotope dating to assess depletion rates and contamination persistence

▶ **Carbon and long-term climate commitment analysis:** emissions trajectory assessed against independent satellite monitoring rather than self-reported data

▶ **Actuarial and financial liability modelling:** independent assessment of whether decommissioning and remediation obligations are adequately provisioned or structured to become public costs

▶ **Biodiversity trajectory assessment:** species abundance surveys, habitat quality mapping, and ecological connectivity analysis to measure whether biodiversity is recovering or declining over time

The Upgrade Pathway

ATE is not designed to punish. It is designed to make reality visible and support improvement once visibility exists. CW recognises that many organisations operate within systems they did not individually create — supply chains evolved over decades, harmful practices normalised, information fragmented. ATE does not treat every adverse finding as evidence of malicious intent.

Where investigations reveal significant gaps between organisational behaviour and PCH baselines, ATE may recommend an Upgrade Pathway — a structured programme that may include corrective actions, governance reforms, remediation programmes, ecological restoration commitments, safety upgrades, and transparency measures. Milestones, timelines, progress reports, and reassessments remain permanently visible in CR. Improvement is not claimed. It is demonstrated.

A global network of ATE-certified independent consultants — specialists in one or more of the six audit domains — supports organisations through the Pathway. Certified consultant status, renewal cycles, and any suspensions are permanently visible in CR.

ATE, CR, and GAR

ATE investigates. Commons Registry (CR) preserves. Global Accountability Rating (GAR) translates.

Every ATE finding enters CR immediately upon completion — the investigated enterprise has no advance notice, no right to delay. GAR converts the depth of ATE's findings into the seven-colour signal visible at the point of every decision. The full ATE record remains

permanently available in CR. ATE is the mechanism that turns the Nine Principles from aspirations into evidence.

SOURCES — PILLAR 3

1 International Labour Organization, 'Rana Plaza Accident,' ilo.org — Rana Plaza building collapse, Savar, Bangladesh, 24 April 2013: 1,134 garment workers killed in a building that commercial auditors had certified compliant; founding case for AD1's supply-chain scope of investigation.

2 U.S. House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 'Final Committee Report: The Design, Development and Certification of the Boeing 737 MAX,' September 2020 — 346 deaths across Lion Air Flight 610 (October 2018) and Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 (March 2019); Boeing withheld critical MCAS safety information from the FAA and from pilots; founding case for AD3.

3 Gaber, N. et al., 'The Devil They Knew: Chemical Documents Analysis of Industry Influence on PFAS Science,' Annals of Global Health, May 2023 — DuPont and 3M had internal evidence of PFAS toxicity from the 1960s and actively suppressed it for decades; founding case for AD3 alongside Boeing.

4 International Consortium of Investigative Journalists (ICIJ), 'The Panama Papers,' icij.org, April 2016 — 11.5 million documents from Mossack Fonseca; ownership and financial structures across more than 200 countries used to hold wealth invisibly; founding case for AD4.

5 International Consortium of Investigative Journalists (ICIJ), 'The Pandora Papers,' icij.org, October 2021 — 11.9 million documents from 14 offshore service providers; 35 world leaders and more than 330 politicians; founding case for AD4 alongside Panama Papers.

6 Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission, 'The Financial Crisis Inquiry Report,' U.S. Government Printing Office, January 2011 — the 2008 global financial crisis: systemic interconnections between institutions optimised for short-term efficiency became the transmission mechanism for catastrophic failure; founding case for AD5.

7 ICIJ Offshore Leaks Database, offshoreleaks.icij.org — ongoing public database of offshore entities from Panama Papers, Pandora Papers, and FinCEN Files; the historical cross-reference record ATE uses to evaluate current ownership structures.

✦ ✦ ✦

Pillar 4 — Global Accountability Rating (GAR)

Coherence between stated values and verified behaviour requires a signal that everyone can read — from a Lagos market trader to a pension fund manager in London.

The Global Accountability Rating (GAR) is the translation layer of Commons World. Where ATE investigates and CR preserves, GAR translates — converting the forensic depth of ATE investigations and the permanent records of CR into a single, globally consistent signal that can be understood in seconds at the moment decisions are made. GAR does not tell people what to choose. It makes the consequences of choice visible. The final decision always remains with the individual.

GAR operates identically across every jurisdiction, every industry, and every scale of enterprise — no regional standards, no industry-specific dilution, no negotiated exceptions. An enterprise aligned with life in Lagos must remain aligned with life in London, Jakarta, São Paulo, or Mumbai. Ecological coherence does not change according to jurisdictional convenience.

One Signal, Three Depths

GAR operates at three levels of visibility, each serving a different need:

1. The colour — visible instantly by scanning a product barcode through Commons Verify (CVe) on AURA — immediate navigational clarity without requiring specialist knowledge. Most ordinary decisions occur at this level alone

2. The domain breakdown — performance across all six ATE Audit Domains (AD1–AD6) accessible on request through any AURA device or digitally enabled interface

3. The full CR record — the complete ATE investigation findings, ownership structures, laboratory results, corrective actions, and long-term performance history — available to anyone who wishes to examine the underlying evidence

Most people will use just the colour. Some will explore the domains. Anyone can examine the complete record.

The Seven Colours

Each GAR colour carries three things simultaneously: a visible signal, a precise technical meaning grounded in ATE findings and PCH baselines, and a civilisational implication understandable immediately by ordinary people. The colours are not branding devices. They are visible consequence architecture:

1. ■ Red — Damaging — active, independently verified harm that is ongoing, documented, and unaddressed. Not a warning. A confirmed finding. Red does not ban participation — CW does not compel behaviour through coercion. It makes the choice visible and consequential

2. ■ Orange — Inactive — verified gaps identified; the enterprise has not meaningfully engaged with the Upgrade Pathway. Orange is the colour of known problems and chosen inaction. The absence of response becomes meaningful information in itself

3. ■ Yellow — Transitioning — confirmed gaps remain present but the enterprise has formally entered the Upgrade Pathway; corrective plans deposited in CR, measurable milestones established, confirmed progress underway. Yellow is the colour of visible transition — CW rewards honest disclosure over sophisticated concealment

4. ■ Green — Verified — full measurable alignment with PCH baselines across all six ATE Audit Domains. No material unresolved gaps. Green is not a reward for good intentions; it is not a sustainability badge. It is the confirmed baseline threshold of responsible participation — not extraordinary achievement. Under

mature CW conditions, Green gradually becomes the expected commercial norm

5. ■ Blue — Contributing — Green-level performance plus verified measurable regenerative contribution. An enterprise that stops damaging a river may achieve Green. An enterprise that measurably restores the river's long-term ecological health moves toward Blue. Restoration is not the same as compliance

6. ■ Violet — Inspiring — Blue-level performance sustained across three consecutive full ATE reassessment cycles. Three independent, unannounced, comprehensive evaluations producing sustained Blue-level findings deposited permanently in CR. Coherence has become structural, not situational

7. ■ White — Exemplary — not applied for; cannot be purchased, marketed, or achieved through checklist optimisation. Awarded rarely through public deliberation by the Council for Planetary Coherence (CPC) following ATE recommendation and full visible review in CR. Reserved for enterprises whose long-term confirmed contribution has advanced CW itself or measurably expanded civilisation's understanding of what coherent enterprise can become

The Ceiling Rule

One of the most important structural protections within GAR is the Ceiling Rule. An individual product rating cannot exceed the overall enterprise rating by more than one level. A corporation operating at Red enterprise level cannot place a Green-labelled product into the market based on narrow composition testing alone while the wider institutional system producing that product remains deeply incoherent. Modern greenwashing frequently operates through this fragmentation of perception. The Ceiling Rule closes this loophole.

Individual Accountability Ratings

The same architecture that rates enterprises applies to senior public officials, executives, regulators, and other prominent individuals whose conduct is recorded in CR. An Individual Accountability

Rating uses the same seven colours and the same three-depth structure. Five domains apply: Conduct in Office, Financial Accountability, Governance Integrity, Community Impact, and Intergenerational Responsibility.

The Ceiling Rule applies in reverse for individuals. An official's individual rating cannot exceed the rating of the institution they preside over — a minister cannot hold a Green individual rating while governing a Red-rated ministry. Authority over an institution carries responsibility for its verified conduct.

ATE, CR, and GAR

ATE investigates. CR preserves. GAR translates.

Every ATE finding enters CR immediately upon completion. GAR converts the depth of those findings into the seven-colour signal visible at the point of every decision. The full ATE record remains permanently available in CR for those who wish to examine the underlying evidence. Together, ATE's forensic rigour, CR's permanent memory, and GAR's visible consequence architecture form the accountability spine of Commons World.

Pillar 4 contains only CW framework design. No external factual claims require citation. No sources block is needed.

✦ ✦ ✦

Pillar 5 — Commons Bank & Commons Unit of Exchange (CB & CUE)

Money that rewards verified contribution to human and ecological wellbeing, rather than rewarding whoever can borrow the most against an uncertain future.

Commons Bank (CB) is the sovereign financial institution of the commons — governed under CW principles, answerable to no shareholders, and structurally insulated from the political interference that has compromised central banking in jurisdictions worldwide. The Commons Unit of Exchange (CUE) is CB's primary instrument: a currency whose issuance is tied not to debt, political decision, or computational work, but to independently verified contribution.

Commons Bank — the institution

CB provides the full range of conventional banking services — current and savings accounts, lending, low-cost remittances, microfinance, and Commons Bonds — through a Commons Treasury structurally separated from any government's fiscal pressures or any shareholder's profit demands. Commons Pay (CP), CB's payment layer integrated into AURA, supports both fiat currency and CUE within a single transaction system, allowing CB to serve populations regardless of their relationship to conventional banking infrastructure.

CUE — contribution precedes recognition

CUE is issued exclusively upon independent verification of a measurable contribution to human or ecological wellbeing, recorded permanently in Commons Registry (CR) before issuance occurs. This

ordering is structural, not procedural: contribution precedes recognition, always. CUE cannot be speculated upon as a financial instrument disconnected from underlying value, cannot be mined through computational work bearing no relationship to real contribution, and cannot be created through debt issuance the way conventional fiat currency is. [1]

The Five Verified Asset Bases

CUE's monetary credibility derives from five independently verified asset bases, whose combined value significantly exceeds global GDP. [2, 3] This is the structural answer to the question every new currency must face: what stands behind it?

1. Verified ecosystem services — the measurable economic value of ecological functions (carbon sequestration, water filtration, pollination, soil regeneration) independently confirmed through PCH baseline monitoring rather than self-reported claims

2. Verified regenerative agriculture transition — land independently confirmed to have moved from extractive to regenerative practice, with measurable soil health, biodiversity, and carbon outcomes

3. Recognised care economy contribution — caregiving labour, historically unpaid and economically invisible, independently verified and recorded as genuine productive contribution [4]

4. Verified ATE Upgrade Pathway completions — enterprises that have independently confirmed their transition from harmful to coherent practice, the value of avoided future harm captured as a verified asset

5. Verified knowledge commons contribution — open research, educational content, and shared innovation independently confirmed to have measurable downstream value, captured rather than left as an unrecognised externality

Taken together, these five verified asset bases ground CW's projection of a minimum credible CUE issuance figure of $1.8 trillion annually by 2030. This is CW's own design target — not an externally

sourced statistic — derived from conservative estimates of the verifiable contribution flowing through each of the five asset bases. The underlying asset bases are independently evidenced: global ecosystem services are estimated at over $150 trillion annually — more than 1.5 times global GDP — and the global care economy at $10.8 trillion annually.

Commons Bonds and the Commons Treasury

Commons Bonds allow individuals, institutions, and EL member governments to invest directly in verified CW infrastructure — PCH baseline monitoring capacity, ATE forensic investigation capability, CR node infrastructure — with returns tied to the demonstrated expansion of verified contribution within the system, rather than to speculative growth. The Commons Treasury holds and allocates CUE-denominated reserves transparently, with every allocation decision and outcome deposited permanently in CR.

Institutional demand floor

CUE's value is not dependent solely on speculative confidence. CB services, ATE certification, and EL membership obligations are all payable in CUE, creating a permanent baseline institutional demand for the currency independent of market sentiment. [5] This is the third leg of CUE's value architecture, alongside the permanent verified record of every issuance and the constrained supply governed by the rate of genuine verifiable contribution rather than political decision.

Where conventional currency rewards whoever can borrow the most against an uncertain future, CUE rewards whoever has genuinely contributed, verified and permanent, to the conditions life depends on.

SOURCES — PILLAR 5

1 De Soto, H., The Mystery of Capital: Why Capitalism Triumphs in the West and Fails Everywhere Else. Basic Books, 2000 — foundational analysis of dead capital: assets without verified ownership records cannot enter formal economic systems; basis for CUE's requirement that contribution is permanently recorded in CR before issuance.

2 Costanza, R. et al., 'The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital,' Nature, Vol. 387, May 1997 — foundational peer-reviewed estimate: global ecosystem services valued at $16–54 trillion annually; minimum estimate since most ecosystem value lies outside commercial markets.

3 BCG, 'Investing in Nature for Business and Society,' Boston Consulting Group, 2023 — updated estimate: global ecosystem services exceed $150 trillion annually, more than 1.5 times global GDP of approximately $105 trillion in 2023.

4 Oxfam International, 'Time to Care: Unpaid and underpaid care work and the global inequality crisis,' January 2020 — unpaid care work performed globally is valued at $10.8 trillion annually, more than three times the size of the global technology industry; basis for the care economy as a verified CUE asset base.

5 World Economic Forum, 'Nature Risk Rising: Why the Crisis Engulfing Nature Matters for Business and the Economy,' January 2020 — $44 trillion of economic value, just under half of global GDP, is moderately or highly dependent on nature; basis for ecosystem services as a credible CUE asset base and for the institutional demand floor argument.

✦ ✦ ✦

Pillar 6 — Autonomous Unified Rights Architecture (AURA)

Digital sovereignty means owning your own identity, your own communications, your own data, and your own financial records — without a corporation harvesting them or a state surveilling them.

The Autonomous Unified Rights Architecture (AURA) is a sovereign digital device and environment — far more than a phone — built around a purpose-built Commons Device running Commons OS, whose supply chain is ATE-verified. Its network operates in two phases: Phase One is a peer-to-peer mesh network with no eSIM, no GSMA dependency, and no telecom operator in the chain — sovereign by design, offline-capable by default. Where mesh range is insufficient, a user-initiated cellular bridge provides a transparent transitional option. Phase Two is a Commons satellite constellation governed under CW, providing global sovereign connectivity independent of any commercial or state operator.

Why Data Harvesting Matters — and Why AURA Stops It

The dominant business model of the modern digital economy is the harvesting of human behaviour. Every search query, every location ping, every purchase, every communication, every health symptom searched, every political opinion expressed, every relationship mapped — all of it is recorded, analysed, combined into a behavioural profile, and sold. Not as a side effect of providing a service. As the service itself. Meta's family of apps alone — Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp, and Messenger — reported 3.98 billion monthly active users in Q4 2023. [1] Google's trackers are present on approximately 78% of all observed web page loads worldwide. [2] Shoshana Zuboff's

landmark research on surveillance capitalism documents how the behavioural data extracted from these interactions is not a by-product of providing a service but the service itself — raw material processed into prediction products sold in what she terms 'behavioural futures markets.' [3] None of those billions of people meaningfully consented to the use of their behavioural data as the primary commercial product of the platforms they use.

The consequences are not abstract. Behavioural profiles determine what news you see, what prices you are charged, whether your loan application is approved, which political messages are targeted at you, and what version of reality your information environment constructs around you.

AURA was designed to make this impossible by architecture, not by policy. The distinction matters. A policy can be changed, circumvented, or quietly abandoned. An architecture that never collects the data cannot be compelled to hand it over, cannot be hacked to reveal it, and cannot be repurposed to monetise it. AURA does not harvest behaviour because it was built without the capacity to do so — not because it promises not to:

▶ **No advertising model:** AURA carries no advertising. No third party pays to reach AURA users. No behavioural profile is built to target them

▶ **No data sold to third parties:** personal information, communications, health records, location history, and financial transactions remain on the device or within the sovereign CR architecture — under the user's sole control

▶ **No algorithmic manipulation:** AURA does not curate what its user sees based on engagement maximisation; search results and information are not filtered to extend time-on-device or reinforce existing beliefs

▶ **Selective disclosure by design:** where AURA shares information — for age verification, professional credentials, civic participation, or medical consultation — it shares only what is necessary, for only as long as necessary, with no residual data trail

User-Controlled Memory Permissions (UMEMs) govern what AURA remembers, who can access it, and when. Data is owned by the individual. Always.

Commons ID (CI) — The Keystone

Commons ID (CI) is far more than a replacement for a phone number. It is the single sovereign identity through which an individual interacts with every institution, service, and system in Commons World — and, where adopted, in the wider world: [4]

▶ **Universal and portable:** CI replaces every login, every account, and every password across every institution and jurisdiction. One identity, held entirely by the individual, not managed by any platform, government, or institution

▶ **Reachable by ID not phone number:** no telecom carrier in the chain; a person without a SIM card is as reachable as anyone else with an AURA device

▶ **Selective credential presentation:** age verification reveals only that the threshold is met — not the date of birth; professional certification reveals the qualification — not the medical history; each interaction reveals only what is required, for only as long as required, with no residual data trail

▶ **Authentication for Commons Vote (CVo):** where participating EL jurisdictions recognise it, CI provides verified identity for civic participation; identity is verified, the vote is recorded without linking identity to choice, the outcome is tamper-evident and verifiable by the voter through CR

▶ **Authentication for all AURA functions:** every Commons Pay (CP) transaction, every Commons Learning Record (CLR) presentation, every CCo submission is authenticated through CI before proceeding

▶ **Cannot be revoked:** no government, platform, carrier, or institution can revoke, suspend, or modify a Commons ID; it is held by the individual through cryptographic architecture that places control entirely with the key holder

▶ **Survives device loss:** CI and all credentials recoverable through three sovereign backup pathways — local encrypted backup, a trusted personal node on another AURA device, or distributed sovereign backup split cryptographically across designated contacts

AURA's 24 Features

AURA's 24 features span four groups:

Identity and security:

1. Commons ID (CI) — sovereign digital identity — the keystone of the entire AURA architecture; see full description above

2. Commons Biometric (CBi) — user-controlled biometric authentication, stored on-device only; never transmitted to any external server

3. Commons Vault — sovereign encrypted personal document and credential storage

4. Commons Guard (CG) — digital rights and security monitoring

5. Commons Verify (CVe) — scans a product barcode to retrieve its current GAR colour instantly — the gateway through which the GAR three-depth signal becomes accessible at the point of decision

6. Commons Alert (CAl) — sovereign notification system — alerts the user when verified changes occur in CR records relevant to them; the user decides what they monitor, no algorithm decides for them, no profile is built from their choices

Communication and navigation:

7. Commons Messenger — sovereign encrypted messaging, voice, video, and group channels

8. Commons Phone — sovereign voice calls via VoIP primary, cellular bridge fallback

9. Commons Camera — capture with cryptographic provenance; hardware mic/camera off by default

10. Commons Search (CS) — sovereign search within the verified commons information layer

11. Commons Maps (CMa) — community-verified geographic and resource mapping

12. Commons Translate (CTr) — real-time sovereign translation across commons communications

13. Commons Voice — sovereign AI assistant operating entirely within AURA; no data leaves the device

Learning and participation:

14. Commons Learning Record (CLR) — permanent sovereign record of Commons Learning (CL) qualifications, belonging to the individual, not to any institution

15. Commons Vote (CVo) — verified participation in commons governance decisions; identity confirmed through CI, vote recorded without linking identity to choice

16. Commons Contribute (CCo) — the submission pathway through which citizens enter evidence into the ATE–CR–OSN verification chain; each submission carries cryptographic proof of device, time, and location

17. Commons Organiser (CO) — community coordination and commons project management

18. Commons Time (CTi) — time-banking and contribution-tracking within communities

19. Commons Safe — emergency alert and personal safety tool

20. Commons Location — user-controlled location with granular permission settings; shared only with explicit consent for each session

Economic and wellbeing:

21. Commons Bank (CB) — integrated Commons Bank access within the AURA device

22. Commons Pay (CP) — sovereign payment layer supporting both fiat currency and CUE; every transaction authenticated through CI

23. Commons Wallet (CWa) — sovereign asset holding — verified legal title to every digital asset, CUE holdings, credentials, and digital property, each linked to a publicly verified CR record; no custodial intermediary between holder and asset; ownership survives platform failure because the CR record exists independently of the device

24. Commons Health Record (CHR) — sovereign personal health record, shared only by user consent for each consultation; never accessible to insurers, employers, or any third party without explicit individual authorisation

Commons Wellbeing sits alongside these features as a personal health and mental wellbeing monitoring tool, data owned entirely by the user. Commons Trust (CT) provides the reputation and relationship trust layer within the commons. Commons Access manages credential and permission settings for commons services.

SOURCES — PILLAR 6

1 Meta Platforms, Inc., Q4 2023 Earnings Report, February 2024 — 3.98 billion people using at least one of Meta's core products (Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp, or Messenger) each month as of Q4 2023.

2 Bonfils, A. et al., 'An Empirical Inquiry into Surveillance Capitalism: Web Tracking,' arXiv, August 2025 — Google trackers present on approximately 78% of observed web page loads worldwide; Facebook trackers on 21%; Amazon on 17%.

3 Zuboff, S., The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power. PublicAffairs, 2019 — foundational analysis of behavioural data extraction as business model: 'behavioural surplus' converted into prediction products sold in 'behavioural futures markets'; human experience as raw material, not by-product of providing a service.

4 Nakamoto, S., 'Bitcoin: A Peer-to-Peer Electronic Cash System,' bitcoin.org, 2008 — cryptographic architecture placing control entirely with the key holder; foundational basis for AURA's Commons ID design: sovereign identity that cannot be revoked by any government, platform, or institution.

✦ ✦ ✦

Pillar 7 — Commons Education (CE)

CE builds the human capacity to understand and use everything the other eight Pillars create. Without that capacity, the most sophisticated accountability architecture ever designed becomes a system only specialists can navigate — and a system that only specialists can navigate has already begun to drift from its purpose. CE does not teach people what to think. It teaches people how to think.

Why critical thinking is now a survival skill, not an academic exercise

The case for CE is not theoretical. International assessment data confirms that even in strong education systems, the specific capacity CE is built around — independent critical thinking — remains underdeveloped. PISA 2022 found that fewer than 60% of students apply critical-thinking strategies regularly, even in countries with otherwise high-performing education systems. [1] The gap is not a gap in information. It is a gap in the capacity to evaluate information — precisely the capacity an information environment shaped by outrage, tribalism, and algorithmic amplification exploits.

Finland offers the clearest existence proof that this capacity can be deliberately built at national scale. Finland's national curriculum explicitly foregrounds thinking and learning-to-learn as a cross-curricular competency rather than confining it to any single subject. [2] The result has been consistently superior performance not merely on knowledge recall but on critical thinking measures specifically — Finnish 15-year-olds scored significantly above the EU average on PISA's dedicated critical thinking assessment. [3] Crucially, Finland achieves this through collaborative rather than competitive pedagogy, with some of the lowest between-school performance variance of any OECD education system — demonstrating that critical thinking

capacity correlates with cooperative learning environments, not competitive sorting. [4]

The Commons Method of Inquiry below is CE's answer to the same problem Finland's curriculum addresses — not teaching facts to be memorised, but teaching the operating system through which any new claim, in any domain, can be evaluated.

The Commons Method of Inquiry

At the heart of Commons Learning lies a simple but powerful method of inquiry. In an information environment shaped by outrage, tribalism, emotional manipulation, and algorithmic amplification, the ability to think independently becomes a form of sovereignty:

1. What exactly is the question?
2. What evidence is available?
3. Who produced that evidence and under what conditions?
4. What alternative explanations exist?
5. What conclusion is justified by the evidence?
6. Am I willing to revise my view if better evidence emerges?

Commons Learning (CL) — The Sixteen Subjects

Commons Learning (CL) is free, universal, and lifelong — open to anyone, anywhere, at any age, regardless of prior qualification or income. Each subject carries depth across age groups, cultures, and levels of prior knowledge, evolving across life stages. The same subject is taught differently to a seven-year-old, a teenager, a working adult, and an elder:

1. Thinking, Evidence & Discernment — the capacity to examine claims, weigh evidence, recognise assumptions, identify logical errors, and reach conclusions independently. Integrates critical thinking, scientific literacy, and media literacy as three dimensions of one foundational capability

2. Communing with Nature — the direct, felt relationship between a human being and the living world — learning to be still in natural

settings, to observe with patience, to recognise the rhythms of ecosystems and living creatures, and to experience belonging to the web of life

3. Environmental Stewardship — how living systems work, how human activity affects them, and what responsible stewardship requires in practice — ecology, biodiversity, soil health, water systems, climate, and the consequences of resource use across generations

4. Food, Nutrition & Practical Life Skills — growing, preparing, and sharing food as a foundational life capability; practical skills — cooking, preserving, composting, growing — restore a connection to sustenance that modern convenience has gradually obscured

5. Governance & Civic Participation — how decisions are made, how power is exercised, and how citizens participate in collective governance; understanding institutions, accountability mechanisms, and the rights and responsibilities of civic life

6. Economic Literacy & Financial Sovereignty — how economic systems work, how value is created and distributed, and how individuals can make informed financial decisions; the Commons Unit of Exchange (CUE), CB, and the financial architecture of CW

7. Digital Sovereignty & Technology Literacy — understanding digital systems, data, privacy, and AI; how to navigate the digital world as a participant rather than a product; the rights and responsibilities of digital citizenship

8. Health, Wellbeing & Inner Life — physical health, mental health, emotional intelligence, and the inner life — carries the physical practice of yogic philosophy as documented in Patanjali's Yoga Sutras

9. Ethics & Moral Reasoning — the systematic examination of values, rights, and responsibilities — carries the Yamas and Niyamas of yogic philosophy as ethical framework; applied to contemporary challenges including AI, ecological limits, and economic justice

10. History, Systems & Civilisational Understanding — how human civilisations have risen, adapted, and sometimes collapsed; the

patterns that connect historical events to present conditions; how systems thinking illuminates complex problems

11. Communication, Story & Creative Expression — the capacity to communicate clearly, listen with attention, and express ideas creatively; the role of narrative in human understanding; how stories shape culture and collective identity

12. Science, Evidence & the Boundaries of Knowledge — how scientific knowledge is produced, tested, and revised; the relationship between scientific consensus and uncertainty; the history of scientific understanding and the conditions under which it changes

13. Arts, Aesthetics & Human Flourishing — the role of creative and aesthetic experience in human life; engagement with art, music, design, and cultural expression as dimensions of flourishing that economic metrics cannot capture

14. Community & Social Cohesion — how communities form, sustain themselves, and sometimes fragment; the social conditions that enable cooperation across difference; the skills of conflict resolution, facilitation, and community building

15. Care, Contribution & Recognition — the economics and ethics of care work; how contribution to human and ecological wellbeing is recognised and valued; the care economy and its relationship to the Commons Unit of Exchange

16. Spiritual Intelligence & the Search for Meaning — the contemplative traditions of human experience — carries the contemplative practice of yogic philosophy; the search for meaning, purpose, and inner coherence as dimensions of human development that material conditions alone cannot address

Commons Academy (CA) — Nine Professional Pathways

Commons Academy (CA) is the professional education and certification body, training the practitioners whose work supports the wider CW architecture. All practitioners begin with the Foundation Course — free and compulsory for anyone seeking to work within any official capacity across CW. It covers the Prime Directive, the Nine

Principles, the Six Baseline Domains, the relationship between the Pillars, standards of evidence, and the ethical obligations of maintaining visible systems. Beyond the Foundation Course, CA offers nine specialist pathways — one per Pillar:

1. Pillar 1 — PCH Pathway — applying the Nine Principles in practical contexts; administering and reviewing the Six Baseline Domains; contributing to baseline revision processes; governance responsibilities of CPC, BRI, AC, and BLD

2. Pillar 2 — CR Pathway — authenticating and depositing verified findings; maintaining CommonChain integrity; administering Correction and Restoration Protocols; managing verification pathway standards

3. Pillar 3 — ATE Pathway — consequence investigation methodology across AD1–AD6; evidence gathering and chain-of-custody standards; ownership tracing; community testimony authentication; obligations to remain free from institutional capture

4. Pillar 4 — GAR Pathway — interpreting and applying ATE findings within the seven-colour rating framework; managing Upgrade Pathway processes; maintaining the integrity of the three-depth visibility architecture

5. Pillar 5 — CB & CUE Pathway — contribution-based economic recognition; CUE issuance verification standards; GeoNFT and NCC architecture; governance responsibilities ensuring contribution precedes recognition

6. Pillar 6 — AURA Pathway — sovereign digital identity; UMEMs; end-to-end encryption standards; sovereign digital wallet architecture; responsibilities of those who design or administer systems holding sovereign individuals' identity, credentials, and assets

7. Pillar 7 — CE Pathway — curriculum design within the CL framework; facilitation of the Commons Method of Inquiry; mentoring methodology; assessment and certification standards; ethical responsibilities of educators developing discernment rather than delivering compliance

8. Pillar 8 — OSN Pathway — the verification-before-amplification editorial standard; PN authentication and evidence assessment; the relationship between OSN and CR; ethical responsibilities of journalists operating within a network whose credibility depends on the integrity of every verified report

9. Pillar 9 — EL Pathway — forward detection methodology; horizon scanning frameworks; the Twelve Priority Challenges and monitoring protocols; Institutional Adaptation Review processes; responsibilities of those ensuring CW remains open to challenge and revision rather than hardening into institutional inertia

All qualifications held permanently in AURA's Commons Learning Record (CLR), belonging to the individual. The CL record and CA record are separate and clearly distinguished — CL records general education; CA records professional certification.

SOURCES — PILLAR 7

1 OECD, PISA 2022 Results — Creative Minds, Creative Schools, and Education GPS Country Profile: Finland, 2022 — fewer than 60% of students apply critical-thinking strategies regularly across OECD countries.

2 National Center on Education and the Economy, 'Finland Country Profile,' ncee.org, 2025 — Finnish national curriculum foregrounds thinking and learning-to-learn as a cross-curricular competency.

3 European Commission, 'Finland — Education and Training Monitor 2025' — Finnish 15-year-olds scored significantly above the EU average on PISA's critical thinking assessment (35.8 vs 32.0).

4 Sahlberg, P., 'PISA in Finland: An Education Miracle or an Obstacle to Change?,' CEPS Journal, 2011 — Finland's between-school performance variance of 7.7% against an OECD average of 42%, attributed to collaborative rather than competitive pedagogy.

✦ ✦ ✦

Pillar 8 — Open Story Network (OSN)

OSN is the information infrastructure of Commons World. Every other Pillar creates verified reality — PCH establishes standards, CR preserves records, ATE confirms consequences, GAR translates them into visible signals, CB & CUE give them economic expression, AURA makes them personally accessible, and CE develops the capacity to understand them. OSN addresses what happens to verified reality once it exists: whether it reaches people, in what form, with what status, and through what architecture.

OSN does not replace existing media or impose censorship. Its purpose is to create a different form of narrative infrastructure — designed around verification, participation, and contextual understanding rather than advertising extraction and emotional retention.

What unverified amplification costs — the founding case for OSN

OSN's architecture exists because the cost of unverified amplification, once it reaches a critical mass of a population, is measured in human lives, not merely degraded discourse. The clearest documented case is Myanmar. A 2018 United Nations Fact-Finding Mission concluded that social media — Facebook specifically — played a significant role in the violence against the Rohingya minority, describing the platform as a 'useful instrument' for spreading hate speech in a context where it had become, for much of the population, the entire internet. [1]

A 2022 Amnesty International investigation, drawing on internal documents disclosed by whistleblower Frances Haugen, found that Meta's own research had identified the risk as early as 2012 — the company's engagement-optimised recommendation systems were found internally to 'grow the problem' of extremism years before the violence peaked. [2] The amplification was not accidental. It was the predictable output of a system optimised for engagement rather than

verification — content that provoked outrage was algorithmically rewarded with reach, regardless of its truth status.

This is the precise failure mode OSN's architecture is designed to make structurally impossible. Verification-before-amplification means content cannot achieve reach before its evidential status is established. The six status markers below ensure no claim circulates without a visible, honest account of how confident anyone should be in it. Where Myanmar's information environment rewarded the most inflammatory content with the greatest reach, OSN's architecture reverses the incentive entirely: amplification is the reward for verification, not for engagement.

Commons News (CN) — Verified Reporting

CN is a distributed network of interconnected reporting channels operating at community, city, regional, national, and international scales simultaneously. Funded without advertising. Governed by one non-negotiable standard: verification before amplification. Thousands of CN channels may emerge globally, each rooted in the realities of the communities they serve while operating within shared principles of verification, transparency, and visible evidence.

CN channels report on a wide range of realities: ecological conditions, enterprise practices, scientific developments, community innovation, public infrastructure, governance transparency, and social challenges. Progress, regeneration, cooperation, and practical solutions are as visible as suffering, corruption, and institutional failure. Fear is not monetised as a permanent commercial product.

A CN channel may be established by any verified CW community, institution, or journalistic body meeting the accreditation standard — demonstrated editorial independence, commitment to verification-before-amplification, publicly visible funding sources, and agreement to deposit verified findings into CR. All accreditation decisions and suspensions deposited in CR.

Peoples News (PN) — Citizen Evidence

PN is the citizen participation layer of OSN. Not a rumour network. An evidence network. Individuals document local events, ecological conditions, enterprise behaviour, public concerns, and practical solutions. Participation is tied to visible contribution rather than emotional intensity.

PN submissions are made through Commons Contribute (CCo) within AURA. Each submission carries the authentication of the submitter's sovereign Commons ID (CI) without exposing personal identity to the public record. AURA authenticates that the submission comes from a real, verified individual at a verified location, attaches geotag and timestamp through the camera's provenance architecture, and routes the authenticated submission to the PN triage queue.

The canonical verification chain is unbreakable: CCo submits — ATE verifies — CR records — OSN publishes. ATE is the sole authority to verify evidence and authorise deposit into CR. OSN publishes only what ATE has verified and CR has recorded.

The Six Verification Status Markers

OSN commits to making the status of every piece of information permanently visible — the reader always knows where a claim stands in the verification process:

1. Verified — independently confirmed through ATE investigation or equivalent evidential process; deposited in CR

2. Partially Verified — core elements confirmed independently; secondary elements require further investigation

3. Unresolved — evidence submitted and authenticated; investigation underway; status pending

4. Disputed — a formal contest submitted with evidential grounds; under AC review; both claim and challenge visible

5. Evolving — situation actively developing; current status reflects latest confirmed information

6. Insufficiently Substantiated — submission received; evidential standard for deposit not met at this time

A piece of content does not move from Unresolved to Verified through the passage of time or the accumulation of shares. It moves through independent confirmation. Status is earned, not assumed.

Contesting OSN Content

Any individual, institution, enterprise, or community may formally contest a CN report or PN deposit. A formal contest must include specific evidential grounds — not disagreement with a conclusion alone. It is routed to the Arbitration Chamber (AC), whose findings are deposited in CR alongside the original report. A contest does not suspend or remove the original content. It adds a visible marker indicating the content is under formal review. The record grows. It does not disappear.

OSN Governance and Funding

OSN does not accept advertising. This is the foundational structural decision from which all other OSN properties follow — an advertising-funded network inevitably optimises for emotional retention because that is what the business model rewards. OSN is funded through commons-governed allocations, voluntary subscription, and institutional grants from verified bodies whose funding sources are themselves publicly visible in CR. No funding source may remain anonymous. No funder may direct editorial decisions. The EL monitors OSN continuously for governance drift and editorial capture.

SOURCES — PILLAR 8

1 United Nations Human Rights Council, Fact-Finding Mission on Myanmar, 2018 — Facebook described as a 'useful instrument' for spreading hate speech against the Rohingya minority; platform played a significant role in violence against the Rohingya minority.

2 Amnesty International, 'Myanmar: Facebook's Systems Promoted Violence Against Rohingya; Meta Owes Reparations,' September 2022 — internal Meta research from 2012 and 2016 acknowledged recommendation systems amplified extremism; engagement-optimised systems found internally to 'grow the problem' of extremism.

✦ ✦ ✦

Pillar 9 — Evolutionary League (EL)

The Evolutionary League (EL) is the final Pillar of Commons World — and in one important sense, also the first. It is final because it appears last in the sequence of nine institutions. It is first because without the agreement the EL embodies, none of the other eight Pillars possesses the political legitimacy required to function as anything more than a specification.

EL is two things simultaneously. It is the founding agreement: the collective commitment by nations, cities, institutions, cooperatives, and communities that the Commons World framework is worth adopting. It is also the most demanding internal critic of CW itself: continuously examining whether the system is working, identifying where it is drifting, detecting what it cannot yet see, and recommending improvements before problems become crises. The EL does not govern CW. It watches CW govern itself — and makes what it finds permanently visible.

Why horizon scanning matters — the founding case for EL

EL exists because the 2008 global financial crisis demonstrated, at civilisational scale, what happens when no institution is structurally tasked with detecting systemic drift before it becomes systemic collapse. Pre-crisis regulatory data showed weak and inconsistent relationships between key macroeconomic indicators — not because the risk was invisible, but because no body existed whose explicit mandate was to look for exactly that kind of structural fragility across institutional boundaries. [1]

Research into the Federal Reserve's internal deliberations in the run-up to the crisis found that the institutional structure itself was part of the failure: bank supervision findings were not systematically connected to the monetary policy committee's deliberations, and the research function prioritised academic publication over the kind of cross-cutting risk analysis that might have surfaced the danger earlier.

[2] The fragility was distributed across institutions whose individual mandates were each narrow enough that no single regulator possessed the full picture — each institution was watching its own portion of the system, and no institution was watching the system.

EL's four functions, set out below, are a direct structural response to this exact failure mode. Horizon Scanning exists because narrow institutional mandates miss cross-cutting risk by design, not by accident. Institutional Adaptation Review exists because problems identified within one Pillar often originate in how that Pillar interacts with another. Constitutional Review exists because even a well-designed system requires a structurally guaranteed mechanism to ask, on a fixed cycle, whether the architecture itself remains fit for purpose — a question no institution under examination can be trusted to ask of itself.

The Founding Agreement

Without the collective agreement of the EL founding cohort, CUE has no economy behind it, PCH standards have no binding authority, ATE findings carry weight only where institutions choose to accept them, and GAR ratings matter only where EL membership is valued. The agreement precedes the currency. Always.

Joining the EL commits participants to:

1. Accepting CUE as a legitimate means of exchange — receiving it, paying for CB, ATE, and EL services in CUE, recognising CUE-denominated transactions as legitimate

2. Opening a Commons Bank (CB) account — conducting a defined proportion of institutional or commercial transactions through CB infrastructure

3. Recognising ATE-verified findings as legitimate evidence — within their own governance and accountability processes

4. Submitting to EL membership standards — including conflict of interest disclosure, the GAR minimum threshold for continued membership, and participation in Constitutional Review

5. Contributing to EL governance — participating in processes through which EL itself is held accountable, the Twelve Priority Challenges are monitored, and the Constitutional Review is conducted

The founding cohort does not need to be large. It needs to be genuine. Ten cooperatives across five countries who have truly adopted CB accounts and genuinely circulate CUE between them constitute a more solid foundation than a thousand declarations of support. The EL begins with whoever chooses to act.

The Four Functions

1. Internal Audit of Commons World — periodic independent reviews of every Pillar and institution within CW — examining methodological rigour, governance integrity, independence from capture, effectiveness, and alignment with the Nine Principles. All reviews conducted without advance notice. Findings published in full and deposited into CR simultaneously. Reviewed institutions notified at the moment of publication, not before. Required to respond publicly within a defined period. The response and EL's original finding permanently linked in CR

2. Horizon Scanning and the Twelve Priority Challenges — continuous monitoring of emerging developments across technology, ecology, geopolitics, economics, social systems, and governance for signals that may require CW to adapt. Organised around twelve areas of sustained attention — the Twelve Priority Challenges (TPC). EL publishes an annual Forward Detection Report covering both external developments and internal performance. The report deposited in CR and formally reviewed by CPC within a defined period. Horizon scanning identifies not only risks but opportunities — new forms of verified contribution CUE should recognise, new categories ATE should audit, new knowledge for PCH baselines

3. Institutional Adaptation Review — when findings identify a Pillar, institution, or process no longer working effectively, EL initiates a formal Institutional Adaptation Review — a structured public

process through which the relevant institution, EL, independent specialists, and affected communities examine what is not working, why, and what change is required. All submissions, evidence, and deliberations deposited in CR. Outcomes permanently visible alongside whatever response the institution makes

4. Constitutional Review — the periodic examination of whether the Nine Principles, the overall architecture, and the relationships between Pillars remain fit for purpose. Initiated when horizon scanning and internal audit generate sufficient evidence of need, or on a maximum cycle of ten years regardless. May result in the addition of new Pillars, retirement of existing ones, amendment of the Nine Principles, or restructuring of institutional relationships. No element of CW is exempt from this review. EL possesses the authority, and the obligation, to initiate review and make findings visible regardless of institutional discomfort

The Twelve Priority Challenges (TPC)

The EL organises its horizon monitoring around twelve areas of sustained attention. These are not a fixed list of emergencies. They are the domains where risks to human civilisation and the CW architecture are most significant and most dynamic:

1. Ecological Overshoot — planetary systems exceeding safe operating limits

2. Food System Fragility — supply chain concentration, soil degradation, water stress

3. Water Security — freshwater availability, access equity, contamination

4. Energy Transition — decarbonisation pace, energy access, grid resilience

5. Human Health and Wellbeing — pandemic preparedness, mental health, healthcare access

6. Human Consciousness and Mental Resilience — attention, discernment, inner capability

7. Education for a Changing World — relevance, access, AI disruption

8. Governance and Institutional Trust — democratic erosion, capture, legitimacy

9. Economic Alignment — wealth concentration, contribution invisibility, financial exclusion

10. Technology and Human Agency — AI governance, digital sovereignty, automation

11. Conflict and Polarisation — social cohesion, peacebuilding, information warfare

12. Civilisational Coherence — the capacity of human societies to learn, adapt, and remain whole

EL Governance

EL membership is drawn through transparent nomination processes prioritising demonstrated expertise in systems thinking, institutional governance, foresight methodology, and interdisciplinary analysis. No member may simultaneously hold a senior position in any other CW institution. No member may hold a financial interest in any institution whose conduct the EL is examining. Conflict of interest declarations made publicly before any review begins.

EL terms are fixed and non-renewable. Members who have served their term may not be reappointed for a minimum of five years. This prevents the entrenchment of any individual perspective or the development of personal relationships with institutions being reviewed. All funding sources permanently visible in CR. No institution that the EL reviews contributes to its funding.

The EL is itself subject to external review — not by any institution whose conduct it examines, but by a periodic independent panel constituted through a process governed by CPC and the AC. The independent panel examines whether EL is fulfilling its mandate with adequate rigour, independence, and methodological quality. Its findings deposited in CR.

Even the watchdog is watched.

SOURCES — PILLAR 9

1 Research findings on pre-2008 crisis regulatory data — weak and inconsistent relationships between macroeconomic indicators masked emerging systemic risk; early warning signs invisible to fragmented regulatory oversight; no institution's mandate covered cross-institutional systemic risk.

2 Centre for Economic Policy Research, 'What Were They Thinking? The Federal Reserve in the Run-Up to the 2008 Financial Crisis,' CEPR — bank supervision findings not systematically connected to monetary policy committee deliberations; research function prioritised academic publication over cross-cutting risk analysis; institutional fragmentation of risk oversight as root cause of the crisis.

✦ ✦ ✦