

The Free Society

Part 1: Foundation and Structure of the Free Society

The Moral Perimeters of Human Freedom - The Essence of Morality - Morality and the Free Society

The Moral Perimeters of Human Freedom

*Every person has an inherent right to freely choose her or his beliefs, values and actions **as long as . . .***

The **Alliance for Freedom analysis** is grounded on the bedrock of human consciousness, the awareness in each individual of **self**. Unlike what is the apparent case with animals, we humans are not aware only of our moment-to-moment reality experiences. Each of us is also aware of himself or herself as an individual who assesses the **meaning** and the **value** of his or her experiences.

It is the source of this awareness that makes us **persons** and not simply animals, although we cannot know (with certainty) what the source of our self-awareness is. However, we can know what some of the consequences are. And the most momentous of these is staggering.

Animals apparently make their formative choices based on the meanings and the values that evolution has engendered in them and on the training they received from birth groups and, in some cases, from humans. We make some choices on similar bases. However, because we are self-aware we also make choices based on the meanings and the values that each of us personally creates. This astounding capability makes humans free in a way fundamentally different from animals.

Each of us creates his or her personal meanings and values by choosing what he or she believes the nature of reality to be and what, in that reality, is of worth. These beliefs and values constitute each individual's **wisdom paradigm**, his or her personal basis for making self-forming choices. Unfortunately, this capability of every human to give personal meaning and value to his or her experiences is a generator of individual and collective human problems and conflicts. But it is also a generator of individual and collective human creativity and progress. And of human history.

This history, thus far, has been an ongoing account of: 1) advances in human knowledge and technologies including their positive and negative consequences, and 2) intense and, at times, violent contentions to determine whose wisdom beliefs and values will form the socioeconomic processes and the governing policies of the collective society.

And changes in broadly accepted intellectual, technological and socioeconomic paradigms have, thus far, been the major milestones of human history, with evolutionary modifications marking the "eras" and revolutionary transformations the "ages." While control over the formation and execution of the collective socioeconomic paradigm has, historically, been the essence of

political and economic power in society, it is unfettered control over the formation and execution of one's personal wisdom paradigm that is the essence of human **freedom**.

Children generally form their initial belief and value paradigms in line with their families and social groups. Hence, in an isolated tribe, agreement in basic beliefs and values is likely. If each individual's governing wisdom consciousness is in sync with the basic beliefs and values of the other individuals in the tribe, the tribe can routinely attain consensus in its wisdom governing policies. And, as long as the beliefs and values of minors are freely determined, no injustice is involved.

However, if some members of the tribe form a wisdom paradigm different from the others, a systemic problem is created. Tribal consensus in collective policies is no longer routinely attainable. Now, if the majority impose the consequences of their beliefs and values on the differing minority, injustice is involved. Imposing the consequences of the personal belief and value choices of one individual on another is the essence of human **oppression**.

A similar situation occurs when various tribes with differing meaning and value paradigms are absorbed into centrally governed geographic segments of human society termed "nations." The initial model of nation was the nation-state, wherein a racial-ethnic-cultural segment of human society laid claim to a geographic section of the planet. Most current nations, however, are geographic sections of planet Earth that encompass a diversity of races, ethnicities and cultures.

The presence of divergent races, ethnicities and cultures in nations heightens the discord in what historically has been the major dispute in these geographic segments of human society, i.e., establishing whose wisdom meanings and values will determine the socioeconomic processes and the governing policies of the nation. Presently, in established nations, governing executive and legislative hierarchies are put in place by economic, political and military coalitions or by a majority of voting citizens. These hierarchical governments impose the consequences of their personal wisdom choices on all of the humans who live within the nation's borders, regardless of what each individual's own beliefs and values are.

How can an individual or a group of individuals attain the right to impose the consequences of their personal beliefs and values on everyone in the collective society? They can't. A **right** (that to which one has an incontestable claim) is **inherent** in the nature of one's **being** which is determined by the cosmic processes that form reality. Thus, **all** of the rights of human beings are **universal, absolute and equal** and the major existential obligation of the human species is to **systemically** ensure all of the inherent rights of **every** human on Earth

The contestable claims of individuals to particular social prerogatives are assumptions, not rights. Every human has inherent rights to freely choose his or her own wisdom beliefs and values and to make self-forming choices based on those beliefs and values. And the simple assumption of a title like "emperor," "monarch," "president" or "citizen" cannot endow any human with a **valid** prerogative to impose the consequences of his or her personal wisdom choices on any other human.

Basing the governing policies of the collective society on the wisdom beliefs and values of a socioeconomic hierarchy, no matter how it is established, is **systemic oppression**. Enforcing

those policies via arrests, courts, fines and imprisonments is **systemic repression**. Nonetheless, the formation of governing socioeconomic hierarchies has been, and remains, the dominant issue in every nation.

The Age of Reason in the West that initiated the development of majority-rule representative democracies was ushered in by the equal-rights heralds of the 18th century Enlightenment. How did a revolutionary consciousness advocating the equal rights of all humans generate collective socioeconomic processes that, systematically, are oppressive and repressive?

The source of this systemic injustice, apparently, is that traditionally we humans have assumed that **morality** (the perimeters to the alternatives from which each individual has a **right** to choose) is integrally tied to **wisdom** (the **relative** beliefs and values that constitute each individual's self-forming paradigm). Individuals have based their views of moral perimeters on tribal wisdom positions, the sin and virtue precepts of religious belief systems, the ethical perimeters of humanistic ones, the requisites of political ideologies, the demands of socioeconomic hierarchies, personal ambitions, etc.

Basing moral perimeters on personal wisdom paradigms creates a circular **delusion** of moral justification for whatever beliefs and values each individual chooses to hold. Such delusions have been used to "justify" the unconscionable inhumanity of slavery and of genocide as well as of racist, caste, misogynist, ethnic, homophobic, xenophobic and religious prejudices and social exclusions. They "justified" the medieval crusades, the Catholic Inquisition and religious wars in the West and today "justify" Islamic extremists and terrorists. They have "justified" the racist supremacy and the atrocities of Nazism and the cultural and economic domination and injustices of imperialism, capitalism, socialism, communism and nationalism. And they "justify" the systemic oppression and repression by hierarchical governments in every nation, whether autocratic, oligarchic or democratic. In addition to all of this, they are the central factor in every war humans wage.

If we humans base our moral perimeters on our personal beliefs and values, we are headed for extinction because, if there are no universal and absolute perimeters to the beliefs and the values that any human has a **right** to hold, the fact that each person **must** form his or her own wisdom paradigm opens up Pandora's jar of endless ills and evils. Thus, the essential function of human morality is to determine what the **universal and absolute perimeters** to the wisdom options of **every** human are.

The Essence of Morality

The underlying paradigm of the Age of Faith in the West was that we humans and the reality we experience are brought into being by the will of a divine being and, thus, that we have access to knowledge of the nature of reality and of the ideal form of society only by divine revelation. The underlying paradigm of the Age of Reason has been that reality is objective and that, via science, the subjective minds of some humans are capable of comprehending the nature of this objective reality and, thus, of how to form Utopia.

However, some current scientific theories raise doubts about the objectivity of reality. Reality may, in fact, be relative. Hence, there may be no hard line between "objective" and "subjective."

In any case, we do not and cannot know whether any human's self-aware mind is capable of understanding the nature of reality. This, however, we do know: **no** human mind can comprehend the nature of reality with **certainty**.

Every person unavoidably forms his or her own beliefs as to the nature of reality but these beliefs are systemically uncertain. Gathering experiential evidence and constructing logical arguments in support of one's beliefs can provide a possibility and even some level of probability of truth. No amount of such evidence and argument, however, can ever prove certainty. This and the fact that it is not possible for any human to avoid forming his or her own wisdom beliefs and values underlie the most significant personal and collective consequence of self-awareness:

*Every person has an **inherent right** to **freely** choose her or his beliefs, values and actions **as long as** the consequences of those choices do not infringe on the inherent rights of any other person.*

This absolute and universal human right constitutes the **grounding principle** of an **absolute and universal human morality**. The first part of the principle affirms the equal right of every person to freedom in forming his or her personal wisdom paradigm and in choosing actions.

The second part is an imperative that establishes the perimeters of this freedom: **No** person has a **right** to hold any belief or value or to choose any action the consequences of which infringe on the inherent rights of **any other** person.

Whatever the nature of reality may be, this imperative establishes **absolute perimeters** to what any human has a **right** to believe it is. And whereas all individuals have a right to hold their wisdom paradigm as true for themselves, no human has a right to hold his or her wisdom paradigm as universally and absolutely true. Thus, the moral perimeters of human freedom are not determined by the wisdom beliefs and values of any human.

An individual's personal beliefs and values may generate religious or ethical perimeters to his or her self-forming options. But these wisdom-based perimeters, unless they happen to coincide with moral perimeters, apply only to those individuals who hold similar beliefs and values. Hence, the structure of the collective society and its laws cannot validly be based on the wisdom beliefs and values of any human(s). The collective socioeconomic processes and laws of human society can **validly** be based **only** on the universal and absolute principle of human morality.

Morality and the Free Society

Historically, in periods of faith, geographic segments of human society have been formed on the basis of what the dominant group believed "divine" revelation about the nature of reality to be. In times of reason, the collective socioeconomic processes of these segments have been formed on the basis of what the dominant group believed the "wisest" views of human reality to be. The grounding principle of morality, however, affirms that every person has an **inherent right** to **freely** determine his or her **own** beliefs as to the nature of reality **within moral perimeters**.

This absolute, universal and equal right of **every** human requires the human species to establish **collective socioeconomic processes** that will ensure a **systemic equality** of freedom in
Page 4 of 14

self-formation, within moral perimeters, to **every** human on Earth. This is the **primary existential-moral obligation** of the global human society and of each of its geographic segments. Thus, the major moral mandate the humans in every nation face is to form collective socio-economic processes that will ensure systemically equal freedom in self-formation, within moral perimeters, to **every** person who lives within the nation's borders.

To be equally free in self-formation each individual must have: 1) the liberty to freely determine his or her own self-governing policies, 2) unrestricted access to the complete range of formative opportunities that is available to any person, and 3) unfettered control over his or her options and choices. For these to be the case, each human must not only be at liberty to freely make self-forming choices but also be in control of a **successful share** of the **human economy**.

Thus, the inhabitants of every nation are morally required to establish collective socioeconomic processes that ensure **every** person who lives within the nation's boundaries liberty in self-government and a systemically equal opportunity to develop a successful share of the economy in her or his control.

The major systemic factor necessary for an equal opportunity to develop a successful share of the economy in one's own control is a collective process that guarantees every adult in society **equal** access to **economic capital**. For there to be a systemic equality of freedom in self-formation **every** person must be certain that, regardless of gender identity, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, financial situation or personal beliefs and values (within moral perimeters), she or he will have equal access to the economic capital necessary to develop and control a successful share of the economy. Equal access to economic capital is the systemic basis of **socioeconomic justice** which is as essential for freedom as is socioeconomic liberty.

Certitude of equal access to economic capital will enable every human to freely join with other humans who hold the same basic beliefs and values to form a participatory **cultural-economic democracy**. Equal access to capital will ensure each democracy a systemically equal opportunity to develop a successful economic base designed specifically for its members. The criterion of success is that every member of the democracy who wants employment has a satisfying job that generates the income necessary to finance any formative opportunity that is available to anyone for herself or himself and for her or his dependents.

In a cultural-economic democracy every member has an equal voice in determining the wisdom policies governing the democracy. If a community enterprise is in financial trouble, everyone involved in the enterprise has a say in what changes should be made to attain or regain financial success and everyone stays employed. Which formative opportunities are the responsibility of individuals to provide for themselves and which are provided by the community collectively are also determined democratically. But, by whatever process each democracy chooses, the full range of formative opportunities is systematically available to every person in the democracy.

Sovereignty is the right to freely determine one's own wisdom beliefs and values within moral perimeters. Self-government is the right to form personal governing policies based on one's own beliefs and values. Only **individuals** have inherent rights of sovereignty and self-government. For an assemblage of humans to have a morally valid prerogative of democratic wisdom governing, it must first attain consensus in basic beliefs and values. A geographic segment of the all-

inclusive society in which individuals and groups hold different basic beliefs and values cannot attain such a consensus. But subdivisions of society that are based on commonly held beliefs and values can. This is why freely formed clubs, tribes and cultural-economic democracies validly have the prerogative of democratic wisdom governing and nations **do not**. Any socioeconomic system in which the governing wisdom policies of some individuals are imposed on others is **systemically immoral**.

Hence, the morally valid goal of social formation is not to determine whose meanings and values will form the socioeconomic processes and the governing policies of the collective society. The moral goal of social formation is **to determine what socioeconomic processes are required to freely subdivide the global society into self-governing and self-sustaining cultural-economic democracies**.

In addition to equal access to economic capital two other collective processes are necessary. The first is a legislative process to develop and coordinate collective infrastructures in transportation, communications, energy, research, technology, critical health care, safety, environmental health and disaster relief. Systemic equality of freedom in self formation requires these infrastructures. Free enterprise can provide products and services in these areas but the infrastructures must be collectively developed and coordinated to guarantee universally equal access and interpersonal responsibility.

The second is a two-part process of justice. First, is a process to clearly delineate the personal rights and interpersonal responsibilities that universally ensuring the equal right to freedom requires. These rights and responsibilities demarcate the universal moral perimeters within which every person is free to form his or her own wisdom constructs. Second, is a judicial process to determine when an infringement of freedom has occurred and what corrections are necessary.

Thus, structuring the **Free Society** requires three collective socioeconomic processes:

1. A **capital access process** that guarantees every person equal access to the economic capital necessary to develop a successful share of the economy in his or her control.
2. A **legislative process** that develops the collective infrastructures necessary to ensure systemically equal freedom and delineates the moral criteria that determine how they function.
3. A **justice process** that: a) delineates the personal inherent rights and the interpersonal responsibilities that determine the moral perimeters of human freedom, and b) establishes a judiciary that bases its judgments solely on the equal right of every person to freedom within these perimeters. If it determines that an infringement of freedom has occurred, the judiciary will then decide what corrections are necessary and oversee their enforcement.

Hence, the socioeconomic imperatives we humans are morally obligated to fulfill (presently in every nation and, ultimately, globally) are to establish collective socioeconomic processes that will systemically ensure full equality in socioeconomic opportunity and that will delineate and enforce the absolute and universal moral perimeters by which and within which every person is equally free in self-formation.

Once these morally based socioeconomic processes have been established as the universal collective processes of human society, every human will be able to freely join with others who hold similar beliefs and values and form a self-governing cultural-economic-consensus democracy. Each democracy will have a systemically equal opportunity to develop an economic base that provides the option of satisfying and permanent employment to all members, thereby ensuring them and their dependents the freedom to form themselves, within moral perimeters, as they choose. And, because the members of each democracy will hold the same basic beliefs and values, they will be able to form the wisdom governing policies of the democracy by consensus.

Consequently, the **Free Society** on planet Earth will have two levels: 1) the global collective level that is responsible for ensuring systemically equal socioeconomic opportunity and for delineating and enforcing the universal moral perimeters of freedom, and 2) the cultural-economic- democracy level that is responsible for ensuring individuals systemically equal opportunity for economic success and for enacting the wisdom governing policies of each democracy.

Part 2: The Free Society and History

America, the World and You

America

In colonial America, “enfranchised citizens” were European, male and, almost exclusively, Protestant, property-owners. In each colony they had wider latitude in exercising their inherent rights to socioeconomic justice and liberty than other humans. However, the exercise of their inherent rights, as well as the exercise of the inherent rights of other humans who lived in the colonies, were “legally” limited by the wisdom governing enactments of colonial governments and of the English parliament under the “authority” of a hereditary, “divine-right” monarch.

In 1776, the thirteen English colonies in America declared their independence from England in order to “secure” the “equal...inalienable rights” of “all men” living in the colonies. Using the principle that the collective society is responsible for ensuring the equal inherent rights of everyone in the society was, in effect, a promise to form the **Free Society** in America.

However, in 1787, only white, male property-owners from twelve of the former colonies were delegates at the Philadelphia constitutional convention to establish the collective processes of the new nation. The core of the constitution they framed was their revolutionary belief that the “authority” of “government” is grounded not on the wisdom views of a hereditary, “divine-right” monarch, but on the wisdom views of a hierarchy of representatives elected, for limited terms, by “enfranchised citizens.”

In 1776, the *Declaration of Independence* had promised to **equally** ensure **all** of the **inherent rights** of every **person** in the new nation. But fulfilling that promise was not the goal of the framers of the constitution. Their goal was to form a central government that would secure the union of the thirteen “sovereign” states as one nation and the socioeconomic liberties of the white-male-Christian-property-owning “enfranchised citizens.”

To secure their rights to some particular liberties, a *Bill of Rights* protecting those liberties from "legal" restrictions was added, via ten amendments, to their constitution. But the *Bill of Rights* does not protect all of the liberties to which every person has an inherent right. Nor, more crucially, does it ensure the inherent right to socioeconomic justice which is also a sine qua non of freedom.

Underlying these failings is the fact that the American constitution is not a valid constitution for a geographic segment of human society. The American constitution that has inspired national revolutions around the world was, essentially, a voting-citizen contract for a geographic-socio-economic club. Historically, "nations" have been dominated by particular races, ethnicities and cultures and, thus, have been organized and operated as though they are geographic racial-ethnic-cultural clubs. But no subset of human society has a morally valid prerogative to appropriate a geographic section of the planet as its private club. **All** humans, whatever their race, ethnicity or belief and value culture may be, have an inherent right to live in systemically equal socio-economic freedom **wherever** on planet Earth they **choose** to live.

From a moral perspective, nations (geographic segments of the global human society) are **all**-inclusive. **Every** human who lived in the American "colonies"--Natives, slaves, indentured servants, Africans, women, immigrants, Jews, Catholics, Muslims, atheists, et al.--had the same **inherent right** to freedom in self-formation as did male, European, Protestant, property-owners and **all** had an equal right to inhabit the section of planet Earth called North America.

Hence, the primary moral imperative of every nation is to establish collective socioeconomic processes that will systemically ensure **all** of the inherent rights of **every** human who chooses to live within the borders of the nation. To achieve this goal the constitution of every nation must be based on universal moral principle and not on the personal wisdom views of any humans. The American constitution is not a valid social constitution for the America section of planet Earth because it is based on the personal beliefs and values of a subset of the humans who live in America and not on universal moral principle.

In 1776, in their *Declaration of Independence*, the rebel colonial citizens asserted a right to independence from England based on moral principle: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that **all** men are created **equal**... with (inherent and) unalienable **rights**" and that it is the responsibility of the collective society "to secure these rights" (which the English monarchy was not doing). In 1787, however, the goal of the citizens who drafted the American constitution was to form a central government that would "secure" the inherent right of socioeconomic liberty, but only for some humans, not all.

Nevertheless, their constitution, too, was a revolutionary document. It moved the former English colonies in America systemically out of the Age of Faith and into the Age of Reason. The exercise of inherent rights by humans who live in America would no longer be legally subject to the wisdom choices of a hereditary, "divine-right" monarch. Their exercise of inherent rights would now be legally subject to the wisdom choices of a governing hierarchy of elected citizen representatives.

However, no title can entitle **any** human to impose his or her wisdom views as perimeters to the inherent rights of any **other** person. The only **valid** legal perimeters to the inherent right of every

person to freedom in self formation are universal moral perimeters. Every person has the right to impose wisdom perimeters to his or her own options at any time. This is the essence of the right to self-government. But **no** individual has the right to impose his or her wisdom perimeters as limits to the options of any other person **ever** (except for the safety of minors).

From the time of America's independence, state and national governments have enacted their wisdom choices as "legal" perimeters to human options within the state or national borders. Many of these immoral "laws" have focused on limiting the options of particular subsets in the nation: Native Americans, slaves, women, Black Americans, immigrants, homosexuals, paupers, et al. Hence, in spite of the moral principle of the equal right to freedom of all humans that grounded their *Declaration of Independence*, the "founding fathers" established wisdom-based processes in their constitution that moved America out of one oppressive and repressive socioeconomic system and into another. Enfranchised citizens, who, as colonists, had been systematically oppressed by the British monarchy, now systematically oppressed others.

Thus, both of America's founding documents were revolutionary but not for the same revolution. Because the universal principle that grounds the *Declaration of Independence* is **all**-inclusive it requires a **morally** based revolution with collective processes that ensure every person systemically equal socioeconomic liberty and justice. The collective processes established by the 1789 constitution did not achieve this moral revolution. But the majority-rule, representative democracy the constitution did establish did achieve a wisdom-based revolution that moved America out of the Age of Faith and into the Age of Reason and transformed the West.

The 13th (1865), 14th (1868), 15th (1870), and 19th (1920) amendments to the constitution abolished slavery and extended the prerogatives of "citizenship" to more humans in America. However, the collective socioeconomic processes that were formed under the constitution (state and federal governments elected from and by "enfranchised citizens," the "private" financing system of capitalism and "justice" based, not on moral principle, but on the personal beliefs and values of the 18th century white, male, Protestant, property owners who framed the constitution) systematically generate socioeconomic inequities that limit the formative opportunities and options of most humans who live in America. So the "New Deal" in the 1930's began patchworking some processes to attain, not systemic equality in socioeconomic liberty and justice, but at least a greater measure of socioeconomic equity, a reform process still pursued by liberal politicians.

Some Americans who protested these systemic inequities in the late 1960's and early 1970's attempted to identify what modifications of "the system" would ensure systemically **equal** socioeconomic liberty and justice to **all** and, thus, finally and fully fulfill America's founding promise. However, they failed to come up with any that could do so. Ensuring **systemically equal** socioeconomic liberty and justice to **every** person in America requires radically different socioeconomic processes. There are no possible modifications of the existing processes that will do the job.

However, forming the **Free Society** is not just an unfulfilled promise of America's *Declaration of Independence*. Humanity's existential-moral imperative to systemically ensure the **inherent rights** of **every** human **mandates** its formation. Thus, forming the **Free Society** is **morally**

incumbent on **all** humans, individually and collectively, and has been from the moment we humans became self-aware.

The only way to fulfill this moral imperative is to universally transition from the present wisdom-based processes that systematically generate the governing socioeconomic hierarchies of "nations" to the moral-based processes that will systematically generate self-sustaining and self-governing cultural-economic democracies in a global **Free Society**.

Over two hundred and forty years ago rebel American colonists promised the world a moral-based revolution they did not have the moral vision, integrity and courage to undertake. However, for the human species to survive and thrive, this moral-based revolution has to happen. So the critical question for the future of humanity is: When will enough humans, in America or any nation, attain the moral vision, integrity and courage necessary to initiate the socioeconomic revolution that will systematically generate the **Free Society**?

... the World

The looming existential decision humanity, as a species, faces is how to structure a global socioeconomic order that will generate systemically equal socioeconomic liberty and justice for every person on Earth. If we succeed in doing so, humankind will survive and thrive, If we fail, we will self-destruct.

Historically, there have been contentions in most, if not all, nations between those who strive to exert exclusionary racial-ethnic-cultural dominance in the nation and those who seek the participatory inclusion of various races, ethnicities and cultures. Since the end of World War II, the movement of history has generally been one of plodding progression toward inclusion. However, in the second decade of the current millennium a surge of reactionary nationalist movements arose in a number of nations. This, in spite of the fact that the millions of humans who were slaughtered by war and purges in the 19th and 20th centuries definitively demonstrated the systematically destructive consequences of basing the formations of different geographic segments of human society on nationalistic wisdom paradigms.

Clearly, we humans do not have a right either to form exclusionary nation-states or to form all-inclusive nations with central governments, hierarchical economies and legal justice systems based on wisdom constitutions and "enacted" wisdom "laws." Both of these socioeconomic models are systemically immoral. They cannot possibly ensure systemically equal freedom to **all**.

Consequently, the socioeconomic paradigm of human society will continue to evolve until there is a revolutionary transformation from the present wisdom-based processes of nations to the collective moral-based processes that will systematically generate cultural-economic democracies in a global **Free Society**. Moral principle clearly mandates us to do so. And the unrelenting spur of **every** person's **inherent** right to freedom insures that we humans will never live in true peace with one another until we do.

In the **Free Society**, governing wisdom policies are determined by individuals and by freely formed consensus democracies, not by centralized, hierarchical governments. The economy of the **Free Society** is neither private, hierarchically controlled capitalism nor collective, hierarch-

ically controlled socialism. It is a universal free enterprise economy that is generated by freely formed cultural-economic democracies each of which has equal access to the economic capital necessary to achieve success. And justice in the **Free Society** is grounded on moral principle, not on the wisdom constitution and the wisdom enactments of governing hierarchies.

At the collective level of the global **Free Society** there will simply be the three morally based socioeconomic processes that guarantee every person in society systemic equality in socioeconomic liberty and justice. These processes will ensure that every person is systemically free to exercise personal sovereignty in determining his or her own wisdom consciousness and self-governing policies within universal moral perimeters.

Forming global socioeconomic processes that enable all individuals in society to join with others of like mind in cultural-economic democracies that have systemically equal opportunities to develop successful shares of the human economy in their own control is the only way that **all** humans will be systemically free to form themselves, within moral perimeters, as they choose.

And these morally mandated socioeconomic processes are the only way we humans will establish a planetary human society that is universally **free**, universally **prosperous** and universally at **peace**.

... and You

Two issues are presently preventing humanity from structuring the **Free Society**: 1) a widespread failure to understand and embrace the essential differences between the universal and absolute nature of morality and the personal and relative nature of wisdom, and 2) a widespread fear of fully embracing the responsibilities and consequences of freedom.

Only when a majority of humans fully grasps the absolute and universal character of human morality and the relative and personal character of wisdom will the collective society, whether in a nation or globally, be prepared for the socioeconomic transformation that is necessary to form the **Free Society**.

And, historically, the widespread resistance to personally engaging the full responsibilities and consequences of freedom has enabled the hierarchically ambitious and the avaricious to take the lead in forming collective socioeconomic processes that are designed to attain their personal meanings and values.

Establishing collective socioeconomic processes that enable the greedy and the controlling individuals in society to attain extravagant wealth and power is categorically immoral. The systemic socioeconomic positions that provide them their excessive wealth and power do give them access to every formative opportunity available in the society and personal control over their own options, to which they have a moral right. But those positions also give them **immoral** control over access to formative opportunities and over the options of **other** humans.

The social moral imperative requires humankind to form collective socioeconomic processes that **systematically** enable **every** person to attain the wealth and the power necessary to independently access any formative opportunity and to independently control his or her own

options and choices. However, these processes will take form only when a majority of humans fully embraces freedom, with all of its rights and responsibilities, and demands a transition from collective socioeconomic processes that systematically generate the existing hierarchical systems of nations to collective processes that will systematically generate the cultural-economic democracies of the **Free Society**.

All of the present hierarchical systems of nations are systemically immoral. They do not have a right to exist. They will remain in effect, however, as long as most individuals in each nation choose to form themselves and their lives in line with their nation's established socioeconomic system. Hence, each individual who so chooses is morally responsible for all of the socioeconomic injustices these systems generate--the systemic oppression and repression by centralized governments, the hierarchical controls and socioeconomic injustices of both capitalism and socialism, war, poverty, homelessness, hunger, unemployment, inadequate healthcare, etc. If you are one of these individuals, **you**, too, are responsible.

The choice by most humans to align themselves with their national hierarchical processes also inevitably generates global crises. Currently, the three most pressing ones are: 1) the destructive impact that past and present choices by socioeconomic hierarchies are having on Earth's climate and environment, 2) the disastrous consequences of the dehumanizing prejudices that are required to sustain these hierarchies and 3) the worsening contentions between nuclear-militarized national socioeconomic hierarchies.

Changes in Earth's climate and environment are undermining some of the physical conditions necessary to sustain animate forms of life on Earth. Science has provided ample evidence that major causes of this ongoing deterioration are power-and-wealth-aggrandizing choices by human socioeconomic hierarchies around the world. Currently, achieving unity among these hierarchies for the choice changes necessary to prevent an environmental disaster has been stymied by economic and political wrangling.

In addition, hierarchical socioeconomic systems need some groups of humans to be the grounding tiers on which the hierarchies are structured. Historically, systemic prejudices have generated these human footings. However, humanity's torturous past and present clearly show that one segment of human society's denying another segment the free exercise of their **inherent rights** is, per se, immoral and inevitably inflames ever escalating conflict.

But, presently, the most perilous consequences of governing hierarchies are their war-making capabilities and their ever-widening access to nuclear weapons. To attain their **personal** meanings and values, these hierarchies can initiate **war** between different geographic segments of human society. And the overruling scientific probability is that an all-out nuclear war will bring about the **extinction** of animate life on Earth. Even a limited nuclear war will, at a minimum, result in incalculable levels of horrific suffering and death and in enduring, lethal contamination of Earth's environment.

The **Free Society** is grounded on a realization that, if the consequences of any option infringe on the inherent rights of any other person, that option is immoral and **no** human has a **right** to choose it. The crisis issues cited above systematically infringe on the inherent rights of all humans. These issues are not wisdom matters up for debate. They are moral issues with

mandated answers. The only certain and enduring way to collectively resolve these issues is to universally establish the morally based socioeconomic processes that will ensure individual and collective moral accountability in human choices.

Hence, the plot line of the human story on Earth, thus far, has been a race between forming the **Free Society** and human extinction. At the beginning of the human story the pace of the race was slow and sporadic. Over centuries, however, the movement of human history steadily quickened that pace. Now, a dramatic surge in the Age of Reason has moved us to the climax of this race where the prompt fulfillment of our moral mandate to form the **Free Society** is **required** for the human species on Earth, not only to no longer be plagued by systemic oppression and repression with all of their injustices, but to continue to exist at all.

Nevertheless, the formation of a planetary **Free Society** will not happen until there is a radical change in human consciousness. Historically, because most individuals formed themselves and their lives on the basis of the established socioeconomic order of their time and place, there was deeply ingrained resistance to revolutionary socioeconomic change. For such change to occur, there first had to be a transition period of incremental evolutionary shifts. In the West, three hundred years of transitional modifications were necessary before the radical transformation from the wisdom paradigm of the Age of Faith to that of the Age of Reason kicked in and the American revolution could happen.

However, the change in consciousness necessary to form the **Free Society** is not another radical transformation in collective wisdom. The necessary change in consciousness is a widespread realization of the systemic differences between **morality** and **wisdom** and of our **existential-moral obligation** to structure the collective human society on universal moral principle and not on the personal wisdom beliefs and values of any humans.

This realization, incipient in self awareness, has been awaiting its time in history to blossom since humans became self-aware. When this time comes, human consciousness will be transformed and humanity will transition from the Age of Reason with its systemic oppression and repression to a new age of systemically equal liberty and justice for **all** and, thereby, finally fulfill the millennia-long moral arc of present human history.

The good news is that, apparently, "this time," historically speaking, is at hand.

The developments of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction in World War I and of nuclear weapons in World War II were harbingers not of human fulfillment but of human annihilation. Thus, apparently the nuclear devastation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, in 1945, effectively invalidated the grounding paradigm of the Age of Reason, thereby moving human history into a transition phase to a new age.

Fulfilling our existential-moral obligation to systemically ensure the inherent rights of **all** humans has been and remains the major driving force of human history and the only way to fulfill this imperative is to establish the **Free Society**. The **Alliance for Freedom analysis** shows what the **Free Society** means and what changes in human consciousness and in our collective socioeconomic processes are necessary to make it happen. Everyone who reads this analysis

should have all the information necessary to work effectively to bring the **Free Society** into being.

Ensuring the systemically equal socioeconomic freedom of **all** humans is the primary social-moral mandate of **every** human. This moral imperative should have been fulfilled at the onset of human self-awareness and perhaps in some isolated tribes it was. But humanity has not been prepared to fulfill it at the all-inclusive level of human society in recorded human history. However, if we do not fulfill this moral mandate soon, the human species on Earth will, almost certainly, become extinct. History has apparently brought us face to face with our inescapable, existential either-or: Transition to systemic equality in socioeconomic liberty and justice and thrive **or** hold on to systemic socioeconomic hierarchy and face extinction.

Which do **you** choose?

Remember: *"The hottest places in hell are reserved for those who, in times of great moral crisis, maintain their neutrality."* Dante

by J. D. Prudhomme