

A Plan to Change the World Order

An Outline for Human Prosperity

1. When the Job is Done — What Does Success Look Like?

- No person lacks food, shelter, healthcare, or meaningful work
This means that basic human needs are met as a matter of right, not charity. The systems (agricultural, housing, medical, and economic) are built so that falling below this floor becomes structurally impossible, rather than merely politically embarrassing.
- Economies measure wellbeing, not just growth
GDP counts a traffic accident as economic activity but ignores a parent reading to a child. New indices: such as the Genuine Progress Indicator or national wellbeing accounts, capture what actually matters: health, security, meaning, environmental quality, and social trust. This is not 'well-being' in the modern self-absorbed sense, but a function of well-organised communities.
- Ecological systems are stable and recovering
Biodiversity-loss has been halted, carbon concentrations are declining, and ocean, soil, and freshwater systems are being actively restored. This is not a romantic ideal, it is a precondition for stable food and water supplies for all future generations.
- Power is distributed — no single nation, corporation, or ideology dominates
Concentration of power (whether in states, corporations, or ideological movements) is the historical root of most large-scale human suffering. A healthy world order has genuine checks, balances, and plurality at every level.
- Communities have genuine agency over their own lives
Subsidiarity is the key: decisions are made at the lowest effective level: parish, town, region, nation, and elevated only when genuinely necessary. People are not governed by remote bureaucracies they cannot influence or hold accountable.
- Future generations are treated as stakeholders, not afterthoughts
Formal mechanisms, such as Future Generations Commissioners (as pioneered in some places), long-term impact assessments, and constitutional protections, ensure that decisions made today do not simply transfer costs onto people not yet born.
- Population: stabilises naturally at around 9–9.5 billion by 2060
The evidence is clear: when people have education, economic security, and reproductive choice, birth rates fall voluntarily to replacement level or below. No coercion is required: the goal is simply to remove the conditions of poverty and powerlessness that drive high fertility. And then world population will start to fall, as it already has in the West.

2. What Needs to Change?

1. The Measurement System

Replace GDP as the primary metric with wellbeing and ecological indices.

Governments and international bodies currently optimise for what they measure. If the primary number is GDP growth, that is what policy serves, regardless of whether it produces happy, healthy, secure lives. Adopting composite indices (covering health, inequality, ecological footprint, social

connection, and subjective wellbeing) would redirect the entire apparatus of government planning, taxation, and public investment.

2. Money Creation

Align capital flows with long-term human and ecological benefit.

Currently, most money is created by commercial banks as interest-bearing debt, which structurally privileges short-term financial returns over long-term social or environmental value. Reform means ensuring that investment (public and private) flows toward genuinely productive (ie practically focused not merely job-creative!) and regenerative activity, including through reform of central banking mandates, green investment banks, and the regulation of speculative financial instruments.

3. Corporate Purpose

Shift from shareholder primacy to genuine stakeholder accountability, including nature.

The legal and regulatory framework that requires companies to maximise returns to shareholders above all else is a relatively recent invention, not an eternal truth. Reforming company law to require boards to account for workers, communities, supply chains, and ecological impact (as some jurisdictions are beginning to do) fundamentally changes what corporations are for and how they behave. There is also the possibility that ‘corporatism’ will give way to an earlier, smaller, and more amenable commercial system.

4. Global Governance

Real power for smaller nations, not just symbolic inclusion.

The current international system was largely designed by the victors of the Second World War and reasonably reflects their interests. Genuine reform means smaller and poorer nations having binding votes on trade rules, financial systems, climate obligations, and conflict resolution, not merely the right to speak in forums where the great powers decide. A degree of mentoring would help the process develop and flourish.

5. Work and Income

Decouple survival from employment; universal basic services over pure cash.

In an era of automation and structural job displacement, tying human dignity to paid employment is increasingly untenable. Universal basic services: guaranteed healthcare, education, housing, transport, and digital access as rights, provide a floor of security without the bureaucratic complexity of means-testing, while preserving and including sensible incentives to work and create.

6. Land and Commons

Restore community ownership of shared resources: land, water, data, knowledge.

Land, water, the atmosphere, and increasingly data are resources that were not created by their current owners but have been progressively privatised. Mechanisms such as land value taxation, community land trusts, open-source knowledge commons, and public data infrastructure return the value of these shared assets to those who collectively generate it.

3. The Governing Forum

A Reformed United Nations

The UN is the only body with near-universal legitimacy. Rather than replacing it, restructure it.

Creating a new institution from scratch would take generations and would immediately be seen as a vehicle of whoever created it. The UN, despite its flaws, has the membership, the infrastructure, and the symbolic authority to be reformed into something genuinely effective. The prize is worth the effort of reform.

A World Parliament alongside the Security Council

A directly elected chamber (with proportional representation but with minimum seat guarantees for small nations) would give democratic legitimacy to global governance for the first time.

Representatives would be accountable to populations, not governments, breaking the monopoly of state executives on international decision-making.

The Security Council veto abolished or restricted

The permanent-member veto has been used hundreds of times to protect the interests of great powers at the expense of international law and human life. Restricting it to genuinely existential matters (and making even those subject to supermajority override) would make the Council a body that serves collective security rather than great-power convenience.

A Planetary Stewardship Council

A body with binding authority over ecological red lines (drawing on scientists, practical 'knowledge holders', and civil society) would ensure that the planetary boundaries identified by earth system science have the same legal force as trade rules or financial regulations. This is the institutional equivalent of giving nature a vote.

The IMF and World Bank under UN oversight

Both institutions currently serve a development model oriented around liberalisation and debt. Bringing them under reformed UN oversight and rewriting their mandates around human development and ecological stability would redirect trillions of dollars of lending and technical assistance toward genuinely beneficial ends.

No single nation holds dominance

The US, China, and the EU become first-among-equals within a rules-based system they cannot unilaterally override. This is the hardest diplomatic sell: great powers do not voluntarily relinquish leverage), but it is achievable if framed as the only stable alternative to a world of escalating great-power conflict that serves nobody, including those powers themselves.

4. How Does Change Get Orchestrated?

The key insight: don't fight existing power directly — make the alternative irresistible and inevitable.

History shows that systemic change rarely happens through frontal assault on entrenched interests. It happens when alternatives demonstrate clear superiority, when the costs of the status quo become undeniable, and when a critical mass of actors find it in their interest to shift. The strategy below is designed around this dynamic.

Phase 1 — Demonstration (Now–2030)

City and regional governments adopt wellbeing budgets, proving that governments can plan around different goals and achieve better outcomes. Worker-owned enterprises scale visibly, demonstrating that stakeholder models outperform shareholder-only models over time. Pilot programmes in 20–30 willing nations build an irrefutable evidence base. The goal of this phase is not to win the argument: it is to make the argument unnecessary by making the results undeniable.

Phase 2 — Contagion (2030–2040)

Successful models spread through three channels simultaneously: peer pressure between governments as neighbours demonstrate better outcomes; investor pressure as climate and social risk turn stranded assets into financial crises; and citizen pressure as ecological costs become tangible in daily life (food prices, flood damage, health impacts). International institutional reform begins with the least threatening changes first: common measurement standards, transparency requirements, and expansion of voting rights in financial institutions.

Phase 3 — Consolidation (2040–2050)

New frameworks become treaty-level normal: the default assumption of international relations rather than the contested proposal. Corporations operating under the old rules face competitive disadvantage because the regulations, the investors, and the consumers have all moved. The World Parliament holds its first elections. The argument is not won by ideology but by demonstrated, lived outcomes, which is the only winning that lasts.

5. Handling Resistance

Incumbent corporations and financial interests

The key is to offer transition pathways, not punishment. Most large institutions will adapt if the rules change for everyone simultaneously: it is competitive disadvantage they fear, not change itself. Phased implementation, transition finance, and clear regulatory timelines allow adaptation without triggering the kind of existential resistance that derails reform.

Nation-states jealous of sovereignty

The framing is everything. Reforms must be presented, accurately, as restoring local and national agency that has been hollowed out by unaccountable global markets and great-power politics, not as surrendering sovereignty to a global bureaucracy. Subsidiarity: the principle that decisions are made

at the lowest effective level, must be a constitutional guarantee of any reformed global governance framework. There is still a place for the nation-state: cultural homogeneity is not a sin!

Ideological resistance from left and right

This plan is neither socialist nor libertarian, and should resist capture by either tradition. It is empirical: it asks what works, measures the results, and spreads what succeeds. Framing it in the language of evidence, practicality, and outcomes, rather than ideology or values, is both intellectually honest and strategically essential. Ideological opponents find it much harder to attack a position that simply says: look at the results.

Pace

Change fast enough to matter given the ecological and social timelines we face; slow enough that institutions (including democratic institutions) can absorb it without collapse or backlash. The sequencing above is designed with this balance in mind, building confidence at each stage before attempting the next.

6. The Honest Caveat

This works if enough people in enough places decide that the present arrangement is more dangerous than change.

That is not a given, but the conditions for it are closer than at any previous point. Ecological costs are now felt in wealthy countries, not just poor ones. Inequality has become politically destabilising even in stable democracies. The great powers are increasingly unable to manage the collective problems they face alone. The tipping point (when enough decision-makers find the status quo more frightening than reform) may be approaching.

Timescale: 25 years to structural change. 10 years to prove it is possible.