

Table of contents

0. Prologue: What is the purpose and intent of this booklet?	4
1. Will Homo Sapiens survive?	5
1.1 Our challenges	5
1.2 Looking ahead.....	7
1.2.1 War	7
1.2.2 Homo Deus	9
1.2.3 Happiness	10
1.3 What we can change	11
1.4 The good and the evil re-invented.....	12
1.4.1 Spaceship “Earth”	13
1.4.2 Earthlings go into space	13
1.4.3 Terraism.....	15
1.5 Denial of utopia is totally utopian	18
1.6 The journey is not the goal	19
1.6.1 Collective actions	20
1.6.2 Asgardia.....	21
1.6.3 The journey.....	22
2. How much club dairy can a club tolerate?	24
2.1 President	28
2.2 Council of elders.....	30
2.3 General assembly.....	31
3. What is mission critical?	32
3.1 Mission planet preservation.....	32
3.1.1 Committee for education	33
3.1.2 Committee for population control.....	35
3.1.3 Committee for green technology	36
3.1.4 Committee for collective action.....	38
3.2 Mission for ethical handling of progress	40
3.2.1 Committee for cyborg technology.....	41

3.2.2 Committee for genetically modified organisms	44
3.2.3 Committee for longevity.....	48
3.2.4 Artificial intelligence committee	49
3.2.5 Committee for paths to happiness.....	49
3.3 Mission colonization of space.....	51
4. How do "terraists" communicate?.....	53
5. Who pays, buys! Really?.....	54
5.1 Rights for persons	55
5.2 Rights for organizations	55
5.3 Rights for states.....	56
6. Epilogue: 60 Pages of hot air?	57

0. Prologue: What is the purpose and intent of this booklet?

It all started with a big bang 13.8 billion years ago. The earth has existed for about 4.5 billion years. Life came to our planet 3.5 billion years ago. The earliest ancestors of mankind developed about 7 million years ago and Homo Sapiens, as he prevailed over all the other human races, is just about 200 thousand years old. The way we humans currently live and love - albeit some of us consider themselves/us eternal and divine - is only a snapshot in the long chain of evolution. We are continuously evolving; in very small steps into something new. Hopefully.

Where are we heading? If we do not blow up the earth into small pieces, evolution will continue - despite the destructive behavior of Homo Sapiens. Someday, likely without him. We ourselves are creating environmental conditions in which we can no longer live. Other life forms are more robust. The spark of life will probably be carried on. That in itself is somewhat comforting.

But for all the consolation that lies in this thought: The present life can be so much fun and I see so much potential in human beings that I personally like to work for the preservation and further development of Homo Sapiens. One does not have to agree. There is the argument that our lovely planet would be better off without us. However, at least those of you that agree with my opinion will have come to realize that we have to do something differently. Otherwise, it is highly unlikely that things will continue with Homo Sapiens and his successors for the next 10,000 years.

Of course, I do not have the solution, the single silver bullet. Still I see a way to contribute to it. Within this essay, I am detailing a concept to create a better future. It won't solve all challenges. The intrinsic charm of it is that we can start implementing the idea tomorrow and thus very probably move things at least in the right direction. I do not want to spend much time and efforts detailing the problems and challenges that we face. We are flooded with catastrophes, drama and suffering through all media channels every day.

My approach is to focus on possible solutions. However, I cannot avoid presenting common basic assumptions about how our environment will develop in the short and medium term. The assumptions are shared without extensive discussion. Temporal variances of a few decades or slight deviations in the various causal chains and future scenarios are not relevant, not essential for the presented conclusions. Time will have to show to which extent the implementation of the ideas and basic ethical principles of Terratism will influence the likely future scenarios. As we all know, the flap of a butterfly's wings in China may trigger a hurricane in the USA. If this booklet is such a flapping of

wings, I hope it will provide a tailwind for the continued existence of Homo Sapiens and its further development.

Two groups of readers might be disappointed: (1) This is not a scientific paper or a comprehensive depiction of the philosophical landscape, theorems and history. The focus is on a constructive, pragmatic proposal to address challenges. (2) If you would like to see a concrete opportunity for contribution or a clear roadmap for implementation of the idea, you may also be disappointed. The idea and concepts suggested need to be discussed before it is implemented. There are plenty of pitfalls to be avoided. They must reach a degree of maturity and generate resonance that will lay fertile ground for its implementation. At the end, there are some considerations on how the ideas can or could be turned into reality. But there are a thousand ways. These pages are hopefully a seed. Not the tree and certainly not yet the fruit.

1. Will Homo Sapiens survive?

Let's start by describing reality. What are our biggest problems? How will technology and humanity develop? Which of the developments can be influenced so that we can focus our energy on them? And in this new world, how should we distinguish good from evil? Are the laws of the market, the ten commandments or Kant's categorical imperative enough for us? Only after these topics have been addressed do I introduce the new concept and ideas to help save the planet. A path that can help us to shape the great challenges of the future.

1.1 Our challenges

Growth and resources: Now we are 7+ billion people, and the number is growing every day. Forecasts predict 10 billion by 2055, and per capita consumption of energy continues to rise. The resources of energy, raw materials, food, and water are limited. Of course, one could argue that we have a distribution problem in the first place. Currently. But projections over the next hundred years do not look encouraging. Moreover, it is difficult to argue from the perspective of an industrialized nation that other people do not have the right to a comparable consumption of resources. Certainly, in addition to the number of people, the per capita consumption of energy will also multiply. It remains an irritating concept that pure coincidence of the place of birth and

the legal invention of ownership determine when, how and why we use the resources of our planet that have been around for and developed in millions of years. The battle for water, rare earths and minerals has long since begun. We are only just beginning to discover air as a resource. We still live in a world of abundance. That will change.

War and peace: We are an aggressive species. Although the last 70 years have been extremely peaceful, at least in larger parts of the world than ever before, the trend is currently moving in a critical direction again. Economic protectionism, as currently practiced by many eloquent or at least loud presidents and heads of state, is the prequel of nationalism. The UN is losing support. The EU is struggling with its first withdrawal. The legitimacy of supranational alliances, including NATO, is being publicly questioned. This destabilization, although often driven by ostensibly justified economic reasons, endangers peace in the medium term. Ironically, the lack of esteem for peace at present is probably the flip side of the actual midterm existence of peace. A large part of the present generation knows nothing else and takes peace for granted.

The search for happiness and religion: A polarization is also taking place in the religious sphere. In the western industrialized nations, religious beliefs dissolve into a lack of interest. Consumption has risen from the ashes of religion as a "raison d'être". The search for the increase of individual happiness, as it is offered in countless courses and workshops from yoga and meditation to NLP (Neuro-Linguistic Programming), is becoming a spiritual business branch. I do not mean to be depictive. Many of these spiritual paths are embedded in a world view and encourage also ethical behavior. Most of these offers are not in demand because of their ethical component, but because they "do you good". That is not wrong either. The quest for individual happiness is an evolutionary given, but the competitive focus of an entire industry sector on it does not help in the search for a social consensus and does not form a cross-border, common basic ethical understanding.

At the same time, there seems to be in other parts of the world a return to fundamental religious values, e.g. in the Muslim environment. In some regions, states, and denominations, this goes so far as to lead to segregation between people of different faiths and ignorance of the findings of science. This tendency is not at all limited to Islam. The "intelligent design" movement of predominantly American Christians holds the view that man cannot descend from apes because God created us in his image and likeness. They mean that literally. This is not a small group of sectarians, but the predominant opinion in many southern states (the so-called "Bible Belt"). It is taught in public schools. Teachers believe in it. The influence of marginalized Christians in the USA who are oriented on the literal wording of the Bible - such as the "Family" - is also increasing. This has little to do with the Enlightenment or scientific education.

All in all, one cannot help but notice that the population of our Planet Earth - despite all globalization and networking opportunities and despite education and scientific knowledge - is not on the best path to growing together. On the contrary: Political and religious forces that separate and strengthen borderlines seem to be popular everywhere. Even for environmental protection topics one must nowadays "fight" and point with fingers to the "others". Polarization everywhere.

1.2 Looking ahead

The future is unpredictable, and history teaches us that disruptive ideas and inventions may re-route an apparently predetermined path. However, this should not be an excuse for not worrying about the emerging and probable developments. The blind trust that at the right time - not foreseeable so far - technologies will solve all relevant problems is another excuse often used when discussing future developments. In this context I am always amazed at the strength and vehemence with which scientists try to ignore obvious developments. It is often reminiscent of our first attempts to "play hide and seek". We close our eyes and believe that then the other person will not see us. Of course, there is a chance that the following scenarios will not evolve. However, I consider it - together with many others - as our best current guess.

1.2.1 War

If we extrapolate "challenges" into the future, we see how the gap between rich and poor is widening. Resources are becoming scarcer. Polarization is advancing. These are harbingers of war. One would think that the insight of a tens of thousands of times overkill by nuclear weapons alone would stand in the way of a weapon-based conflict. Up to now, it is precisely this deterrence that has been said to be one of the most important drivers in securing peace. But the memory of the horrors of war is fading in the current generations. In addition, there are some psychological phenomena that make new, larger wars more likely in a not too distant future.

Acceptance: The coming decades of accelerated technological progress will also further increase inequality among nations in the field of warfare. If autonomous combat systems can be used to keep the blood toll on one side extremely low, there is a danger that new wars will gain greater social acceptance. Especially if the wars are fought at great distances. Due to the way they are presented in the media, this form of war is probably even perceived as exciting. Perhaps they will replace other reality shows or series in the future, will be streamed like e-sports events via corresponding online

platforms. In any case, a tendency towards such a reality show was already apparent during Desert Storm, the invasion of Iraq by a US-led alliance. The search and assassination of Osama bin Laden was also staged in the media. Pictures of Barack Obama were shown, who was switched live to the cameras of the executing special unit in the War Room in Washington ... This reminds me of every second action series that is currently running.

Desperation: The greater the pressure on the established, religious systems through progress and knowledge, the more they will have to fight for their existence. The enemy in the outside world is a welcome excuse to strengthen the sense of community among the "faithful". It gets harder every day to justify a God who calls us the "pride of creation", while creation is demonstrably still in progress (evolution). Even less does it seem reasonable to me that god spurs us humans to bring discord and fight against his own creation ... but a few will take that position to hold onto their faith, their authority and their power. The desperation to devalue thousands of years of efforts and the belief in "having a good life" at least after death will make these people blind for any rational argument and the insight into possible consequences.

Psycho bubbles: As a basic psychological current, social media and individualized search algorithms can play a role as catalysts/fire accelerators. They include a growing number of people more and more into self-affirming filter bubbles. On Facebook, you make friends with people who are like you. This then leads to suggestions and offers, which in turn address the same circle of friends and with the same opinions. Also, in these psycho bubbles opinions are public and subject to a strong coherence pressure. More and more people are living in a real world that is digitally pre-filtered. Algorithms of search engines generate hit lists according to the (political and ideological) preferences of the searchers. They also contribute to the fact that we deal less and less with people, media, and opinions that have a different view of the world - unless it is to outrage, to distance ourselves, and thus to further solidify our own standpoint. Tolerance is therefore no longer asked and trained on many levels. This alone is - of course - no reason to go to war. However, it reduces the resistance against (armed) conflicts through the influenceability of the masses and the lack of tolerance and willingness to compromise.

Media: Thanks to our smartphones, media content reaches us always and everywhere. Ever more blatant scandals and disaster images are needed to catch our attention. Therefore, we live in a world of disasters and media distortion. It is amazing to see how differently and yet polarizing a rocket attack on Israel from the Gaza Strip is reported around the world. The phenomenon that the reporting is looking for ever stronger images impacts our way of thinking. Most astonishing are the live recordings of catastrophes and assassinations, some of which are streamed into the net by those affected or even by the assassins themselves. We are addicted to them. The way of

reporting contributes to polarization and is at the same time a self-confirming prophecy. Murder, manslaughter and rape are omnipresent. And if nothing bad happens nearby, a headline illustrates a shootout in Pakistan. Violence has become something normal. We want it. Without this sensory overload in newspapers, on television, in documentaries, in computer games, we no longer feel life properly.

Summary: The cracks in society are deepening and the deterrence of war is decreasing. Not only between, but also within many societies. This will lead to armed conflicts. At which border a new war will start and whether the reason will be greed, religion or water is unclear. Thinking about the next decades the actual reason will not make a big difference. No matter where it happens: The chance is great that many states and interest groups will get involved. The conflicts in Syria and Libya already give us a taste of it. The multitude of warring parties and the interest groups of the worldwide supporters of certain splinter groups and warlords is extremely confusing. The next wars will become more and more of a proxy war. It has the potential to expand beyond the borders of the originally affected area and the triggering population groups.

1.2.2 Homo Deus

Sooner or later one or more new classes of people will emerge. On the one hand, performance-optimized cyborgs will live on earth. There will be individuals whose senses are changed or improved, whose performance is greatly enhanced by chips and direct networking, and those whose reaction speed and power will be increased. A real-life example of this are rats that have an infra-red sensor attached to their head. The output of the sensor is fed into the brain via a cable and connector chip. The rats learn to interpret this completely new sensory impression to find warm food in the dark. This is only the beginning. Think about the possibilities. For long our instruments and sensors can see and track things that our natural senses are not able to read.

In addition, transgenic representatives of our species will also establish themselves. This is widely accepted in farming, but it is also reality in the mammal's world. Pigs, which have a growth gene sequence of a fly implanted, grow unrivalled fast and produce a surprising amount of meat per feed unit. The game has only just begun and fantastic combinations are conceivable. In China, the first scientist declared in 2018 that he had created genetically optimized children who are said to have resistance to AIDS genetically anchored. The CRISPR scissors technology enables the targeted implantation of specific gene sequences into the genome. The animal world is full of undreamt-of qualities. Better ears, better eyes, better noses, more strength, more speed

and freedom from cancer, longevity, better food conversion. Everything seems possible in the long run.

The combination of cyborg technology with transgenic human offspring is also promising. Anyone seeking inspiration just needs to take a closer look into science fiction literature and corresponding movies. Trans- and post humanists consider this development to be desirable because it has the potential to solve the problems of humans (up to conquering death) or challenges of the planet with humans. In any case, there are hardly any limits to the imagination.

Of course, not everything will be realizable in the next 100 years or at all. The complexity of the problems also exceeds our wildest imaginations. Therefore, these technologies likely are not the solution to all of our challenges. To the contrary, the technology itself can also become part of the problem. Despite all the dangers, I cannot imagine how further development in these areas can be stopped. So far, nobody could give me an example where a technology/application was possible but was not developed for ethical reasons. Already during the development of the crossbow - which for the first time even penetrated strong armored protection - the technology was banned because of its "absolute lethality". History tells, it did not last for very long. Regardless of your personal attitude towards the mentioned technologies, the development cannot be stopped. That is why we should start thinking now about how we want to deal with it – rather than fighting the development.

1.2.3 Happiness

Finally, the pursuit of happiness will – inter alia - lead to regular and high consumption of designer drugs and pharmaceuticals. The feeling of happiness is evolutionarily nonpermanent. This is the only way to maintain the incentive to strive for happiness again and again and thereby to improve life circumstances. Pharmaceuticals offer an easy way out of the evolutionary "trap".

Deep Brain Stimulators can also make you feel happy at the push of a button. Increased performance and libido, all kinds of mood and even thought manipulation are already possible with electrical stimulation of the corresponding areas of the brain. Not possible? Yes, it is. In the meantime, brain manipulation can be performed at a level where cockroaches can be controlled to go left or right at the push of a button. At the University Hospital of Erlangen, a woman was cured who had been suffering for years from such a strong phobia of garbage that she could no longer leave her house. No therapies have responded. Eventually, they inserted Deep Brain Stimulators into her brain, while she was awake, and then varied the flow and direction of current until she

no longer panicked at the sight of garbage. In Magdeburg, the university hospital in Germany has conducted a study to help extremely strong alcoholics by electro stimulating certain regions of the brain. Here, too, we are just getting started. And again, it is not a question of whether such manipulations are good or bad. They will come. They are already happening. That should be clear to anyone who can see realistically and far enough into the future. So, let's focus on how to deal with them.

1.3 What we can change

My plea, my firm conviction is that we must and can create a framework that enables us to deal with these issues in a meaningful way. To do so, we cannot and must not wait for the actions of national state legislators. In creating such framework, we should imagine this "new" future as magnificent as possible. Horror scenarios and dystopia are the wrong guides in creating such a future. They spread fear among the majority and greed among the few unscrupulous. We need the power of positive proposals and utopia, to create a pull effect and positive self-fulfilling prophecy.

One of the concepts that we need to rethink - and in some cases the root of the problem itself - are nations. As long as these entities vie for the attention of capital and corporations and compete with each other, in a world where information is always available from everywhere, there can be no meaningful limits to profit-making and conflict. As long as the national states want to distance themselves from each other in their supposed pride, and even have to do so to justify their rather young and randomized existence, it will be difficult to develop uniform ethical standards as required for the new technologies. If resources belong to the state that happened to be created there in the last few hundred years or even decades, and not to humanity, there will be cause for conflict. As long as humanity is educated not to be a "we" but a "we and the others" through state driven national education systems, we cannot get to common ground. The nations - as we know it - has become an obstacle and even dangerous. At the very least, in my view, it is negligent to trust that essentially meaningful concepts such as the common good economy will be implemented in nation states across the board and around the world in the near future. In any case, such concepts need a global tailwind.

The UN - once designed to secure world peace - has become to some degree a technocratic monster. Certainly, the forum and its organs make a valuable contribution to international understanding. The UN's "sustainable development goals" are a good example. However, decisive impulses for a new world order and for securing world peace are lacking. Perhaps this can no longer be expected from such an established

partner. After all, more than a hundred nation states must agree on changes. Even in the Security Council, the right of veto is a trump card that is often used. Of course, I do not want to diminish the success and importance of the UN. However, as an association of nations, it has an inherent weakness in times when nations themselves are causing some of the problems. For one, because they compete for the favor of industry to fulfill their mission of creating and securing prosperity for the population - or in some less fortunate states: for the ruling class. On the other hand, because nations have an intrinsic interest in a strong national feeling and orientate education and news accordingly. Since the UN is made up of nations, it is unlikely that working towards the abolition or at least relativizing the importance of nations would really receive support. Thus, alliances of states reach their limits when the crisis is not so severe that only a single solution to save all is possible. All in all, the world community is still too well off to expect any strong new initiatives from this side. Waiting for the Third World War to be over before transnational alliances get seriously moving again does not seem to be a desirable alternative.

I therefore propose a new way. A counterweight to the national states and established international bodies, all of which are based on difficult intergovernmental treaty negotiations. Something agile, a construct that may have changed the world more in the last two centuries than most nations and interstate structures. A form of organization that is dedicated to a defined goal and is capable of combining forces towards this goal: An association under private law! Yes, exactly, something like the sports club around the corner ... and the corporations.

The following pages establish a social, planet-spanning, new design. First the goals of such an association are defined and ethical guidelines are drafted. Finally, the differentiating factor to a sports club and a commercial corporation is the goal of such an organization. For this purpose, we need to re-consider some basic ethics, ask some unpleasant questions and be ready for some uncomfortable answers.

The future scenarios outlined above do not allow us to stick to outdated rules. The new goals and ethical rules are summarized as "Terraism". For the conversion of the Terraismus into the reality the idea is to set up an internationally active, non-profit association in such a way that it makes nations, their borders and legislation less important. In addition to natural persons, members can also be societies, foundations, other non-profit associations, and even national states. The ideas are in many parts new and not perfect. But ideas must be born in order to be tested and develop.

1.4 The good and the evil re-invented

To design new ethics, it is helpful to first change the perspective. If we maintain that man is the “creation’s crowning glory” and that the world should be subject to him; if we maintain that not only the earth, but the whole universe with its millions of planets, suns and galaxies was created to serve man, we remain mentally stuck in the Middle Ages. Those who are not prepared to break away from this perspective will not have much fun with this booklet. I cordially invite all others to an experimental change of perspective. Furthermore, I will propose to think about a goal that at first glance sounds somewhere between silly and superfluous. But it is not. From my point of view, it can provide psychological support for the change of perspective and the concrete next steps we need. I would like to briefly present these ideas here, only to return to them again and again later to explain their deeper meaning and purpose.

1.4.1 Spaceship “Earth”

Imagine the earth as a spaceship. We glide through space at a stellar speed of 108,000 km/h. We even have our own protective, magnetic shield. What it doesn't stop will hopefully burn up in our secondary, spherical shield - the atmosphere. The ship is built with so many redundancies that even punctures from asteroids do not leave us helplessly exposed to space. Gravity forces bind our secondary shield. Our life support system is perfectly adapted to the crew, i.e. all earthly life forms. Both the crew and the spaceship Earth even can adapt to new needs. As an energy system, it uses a sun around which it orbits. But apart from our external power station, the Earth has formed very efficient internal life circuits overall. We certainly could not have designed it any better. What rules would we have established on our spaceship? We will come to that later.

1.4.2 Earthlings go into space

What, if we - as humanity - set ourselves the goal of colonizing first the Earth's orbit, then the Moon and, after terraforming the Mars as well? That would be a big and hard to achieve goal. We would need new technologies. We would have to bundle resources. We would have to create new organizational structures that are geared to the goal.

"Colonization of space" sounds far-fetched, silly, maybe even crazy at first sight. And how, for god’s sake, should this help us to solve the challenges of our future mentioned above? Here's my theory: There are two ways to achieve personal change, and from my point of view this also applies to the collective: great pain or great goals. Great pain of

civilization - such as the Second World War - has really made people rethink. Many of the international organizations were created or strengthened as a result. However, it seems more desirable than waiting for further catastrophes to bring about change through a big goal. We are evolutionarily programmed to achieve goals. New goals will change our perspective. The more difficult the goals are to achieve, the better suited they are to mobilize (unexpected) forces. In management we speak of "big hairy audacious goals" and in our personal environment of dreams. Strong driving forces for individuals and large groups. Corporations use the mechanism daily to motivate global teams.

Why shouldn't the obvious need for preservation of the planet be the big, unifying goal? Why the reach for the stars? First, it should be made clear that planetary preservation and even preservation of Homo Sapiens are of course underlying goals. Although, sustainability goals are certainly obvious to every thinking being, it is not yet enough to orientate mankind towards them. It is a bit like living a healthier life. Everyone knows that a lot of meat, chips and fatty pizzas are unhealthy. We also know that alcohol, cigarettes, and city air do not exactly support a long life. Everyone is aware that strength and endurance sports combined with sufficient stretching promote the quality of life. Hardly any person does it consistently. Why? It is an obvious goal. It is like the preservation of the planet for mankind. An obvious goal in the life of everyone. However, the minute we set ourselves a goal outside the everyday, self-evident zone - take a marathon run in 12 months as an example - most of us start to live healthier. We need to be healthy to perform in the run! Apart from exceptional individuals, the human psyche does not seem to accept the natural/reasonable as a motivating goal. Even people who are dedicated to researching topics to prolong human life or who are dedicated to human health as doctors are not aligned with their obvious insights in their own life habits. When the same people have goals in the outside world, such as success with a person they adore, a certain job, or even a travel dream, and a healthy lifestyle is helpful to achieve such a goal, it suddenly works. Evolutionary we are problem optimizers. The self-evident does not exert the same attraction. These mechanisms can be transferred from the individual level to the collective. It would therefore be helpful for humanity to find a goal in the outside world that makes planet preservation seem important - as a reflex - and changes the perspective on our togetherness. Space colonization, in the sense of an extended sphere of action for humanity - not in the sense of leaving an exploited earth behind - could be such a goal. Of course, environmental protection and sustainability as such must continue to be promoted. In fact, the efforts must be significantly increased. But as the sole goal, the preservation of the planet has mass psychological difficulties. As a reflex this is much likelier to work.

Of course, space colonization will not be “the goal” of every single human being and it is not supposed to replace or relativize inner goals like happiness, redemption, bliss. Not everybody will or will want to participate directly or indirectly in a space program. You may also object that such a goal does not have the potential to reach everyone in the more rural or less developed areas of the world. This is certainly true. If you fight for survival every day, such topics should not really move you. But not everyone needs to be motivated. After all, the moon landing in 1969 attracted so much attention that my parents still talk about it today. The launches of the space shuttles were broadcast live for years and made international headlines. The landing of the first remote-controlled robots on Mars was intensively discussed and noted worldwide. The new Space-X rocket, which brought astronauts to the International Space Station for the first time after many years using American technology, was on everyone's lips. Anyone who reads the newspapers attentively will repeatedly read reports from the European, Russian, American, and Chinese space agencies and programs. Does the colonization of space have the potential to fascinate the media and thus the global public? I would say yes. It has already proven it, although it was mainly just national initiative.

Let us assume that a large part of mankind would potentially be enthusiastic about the goal of colonizing space. An individual state or a corporation alone cannot achieve this goal. We would have to pursue this together. The sense of community would be additionally strengthened by the fact that there would then be the "others" again. Mentally and at some point perhaps in reality, not with regard to other nations but to mankind on other celestial bodies. People who do not live on the planet Terra. We will have to deal with the fact that there is a constructive interaction with the others - but first a helpful "we-feeling" is anchored over a long period of time in the people on our planet Earth. Also, such an enormous goal will make it necessary that we need to start thinking in longer periods of time again. Away from my paycheck this month and my tax return this year, away from the election the year after next, and towards a view over decades.

1.4.3 Terraism

Now, back to the question which rules we would have on our spaceship Earth - if we were to pursue the common goal of colonizing space. To answer we must question the current ethics on the planet without prejudice. With all respect for the Enlightenment and the humanism, it seems to me that it is time to discuss whether the optimization of the well-being and development of the individual is still the right ideal. As Yuval Harari clearly describes, humanism has developed from an educational ideal to a religion, a worldview. In the western world, to point out that the well-being of the individual may not be the foundation of a decision is close to a sacrilege these days. The individual is the

sacred center of this cult. Individualism is preached by states and the liberal economic environment. Everyone is called upon to optimize himself in his environment. Everyone is called upon to optimize the environment for himself. The economy has made customer demand the measure of success- not to fulfil a need with as little resource as possible. In our democratic societies those parties will usually be elected that profit as many individuals in their strive for self-optimization as possible. This orientation of individuals, companies, the market and states towards the individual wellbeing at different levels is completely independent of the consequences for others, our planet, and other species.

Admittedly, in Germany we have had bad experiences in recent decades with more community-oriented concepts of society such as the Third Reich and communism. But this does not necessarily mean that the concept is bad per se. Where there are great risks often great benefits are achievable. Without a strong community orientation, humanity would never have been able to maintain and develop itself to the present day. From packs, village communities, ever larger states and religions to corporate identities, the individual has historically often had to sacrifice his or her own interests for the common goal. This was not always voluntary. Over the millennia, however, the concept has inspired many human cultural achievements. Now, is the time to face the reality that if we want to enable each individual to achieve his/her optimal state to the extent that he/she does not directly harm another individuals, we are entering a dead end: We can better distribute food, improve health standards worldwide, eradicate diseases, increase prosperity, reduce energy consumption per capita worldwide - in the end we are only postponing the point in time when the resources on our spaceship are exhausted.

This leads to difficult ethical considerations and decisions, which are unavoidable. The new ethical concept has in the first place to be oriented at the preservation of our spaceship. Our planet "Terra". This does not contradict a relative free development of the individuals living on it. However, not only the freedom of other individuals but the preservation of the planet is a limit, which was hardly considered so far. Ecological movements of the present want humanism AND environmental protection. But they do not resolve the contradiction therein. Interestingly, at least in Germany, it can be observed that politically increased environmental awareness often correlates strongly with non-discriminatory, increased emphasis on individual freedom. I do not plead for radical, discriminating, inhuman solutions - on the contrary! I think we must now set the appropriate and balanced strategic course so that we do not end up in a dead end where ethically acceptable solutions are no longer possible.

Secondly, the ethics to be designed cannot be black and white. An ethical concept that is to last over time must consider that in the near future we will have different kinds of creatures, transgenic humans and cyborgs, probably also artificial intelligences with different qualities on earth. It must therefore be scalable and expandable above and

beyond the Homo Sapiens. The categorical imperative of Kant: "Everyone acts in such a way that his will could at the same time serve as the basis for general legislation", starts from the individual and sets the freedom of other individuals as a limit. The balance with the preservation of the planet and the foreseeable emerging of Homo Deus is missing. Following the idea of Terraism, we could re-formulate as follows:

Everyone may act in such a way that his/her intention could serve as a basis for global rules that ensure the habitability of the earth in the long term and allow each creature to develop within the scope of his/her possibilities without discrimination, as long as this does not collide with the interests of other living beings.

If at the end of the formulation we were to refer to other people instead of living beings, we are again in a variant of humanism. The formulation is taking it one step further. It assumes that all living beings - not just humans - have a comparable right to exist on our planet. The fact, that our talent for logical thinking, tool usage and communication are superior in comparison to other talents at this very moment of the evolution, does not justify placing us above other living beings. Other living beings also have unique abilities that are much superior to ours in certain circumstances, such as the relative strength of ants and the ultrasonic detection of dolphins and bats. Rather, our current, accidental, evolutionary advantage results in an increased responsibility towards other living beings on the spaceship. This includes looking for solutions of co-existence that affect them as little as possible. Since it is rather un-realistic to protect all living creatures at this very moment, due to our eating habits and our habitat, the imperative is to promote development in this direction. Cultivated meat cells and meat substitutes are already available, but currently a plaything of the industry. It should be an ethical mandate of civil society.

The idea of using "creatures" rather than Homo Sapiens as a subject of the imperative includes the future development of cyborgs, transgenic beings and artificial intelligence in particular. Man, in his present form will be inferior to these future creatures. If we stick to our current ethics that the most powerful being on the ship is allowed to make the world its subject without restriction, then those future beings will be allowed to keep, control, eat, and kill Homo Sapiens as we do with farm animals now. It is high time to give every living being an equal value on our planet.

The terraistic imperative is not derived from the thought of animal protection. On the contrary, the new ethical evaluation results in respect for all creatures as a reflex from the fact that Homo Sapiens will not be the superior being on the planet in the future. It is also mandated by the need to survive and balance the resources on our spaceship- Terraism should not be reduced to the justification of vegan nutrition and animal protection. However, it is correct that the new imperative calls for an increased respect

for the planet and other creatures – besides Homo Sapiens. The positive ecological aspects of not eating or eating little meat give an extra push to the ethical imperative not to kill animals. Furthermore, from an ethical point of view, the way in which farm animals are kept does also not adhere to the new imperative of mutual respect. To put it crudely, it is, among other things, a call to seriously apply the simplified form of the categorical imperative "Do not do to others what you do not want them to do to you" - not only between people, but also with regard to other living beings. Only if we now lay the foundation for terraiistic ethics and start living it will optimized humans in the near future grow up in an environment of mutual respect – from their perspective also with regard to us “normal” humans. So, Terrraism is not primarily about changing our diet – it is more of a reflex because we do not want to end on the menu of Homo Deus.

This general attitude to understand the planet as a unit and life on it as a community of destiny with a common goal is what I call "Terrraism". The commandment of Terrraism is to ensure the peaceful, non-discriminatory co-existence of all "living beings" on an adequate standard of living while preserving the planet, as well as to advance into space. The core statements of Terrraismus in short:

Preservation of the planet as the highest commandment, respect for all animate beings and the way into space as a common goal.

1.5 Denial of utopia is totally utopian

Why should you read a booklet that describes at least parts of a utopia, i.e. a fictitious new social order that lies in the distant future, has no relevance at present and is unlikely to be implemented in its pure form? In Germany we have rather mixed experiences with right-wing and left-wing utopias. We certainly have seen how quickly utopias become ideologies and how bloody they can fail. It is right and valuable to learn from the past and we Germans would do well to look at our history to avoid repetition.

However, the conclusion to avoid all kinds of utopia misses the essential point. With an idea you have the chance to promote change: Actually, the idea already changes reality because it creates a reality in which an idea exists that did not exist before. Any major social change without an underlying new idea is hard to imagine. A new idea has to emerge and then “materializes”. With inventions (technical, new ideas) this is immediately obvious. But also, the influence of new philosophies (ethical ideas) - for example the Enlightenment - or religions on our experienced reality can hardly be overestimated. Some of them materialize. Capitalism itself, which guides and permeates all our destinies today, is a thought construct that cannot be taken for granted and began as utopia just a few centuries ago. Capitalism – at that time – for

some was the perfect way to distribute capital according to needs, to create incentives to bring prosperity and peace to the whole planet. The implementation of the capitalist idea, for example within the East India Trade Company, which financed a private army of more than 30,000 soldiers, shaped entire continents and co-founded the British Empire. The early capitalist even had the idea of financing a revolution in Greece by means of stock bonds on the market. Certainly, new and not an obvious idea and yet - born out of a utopia - it has been realized. Ideas and utopias shape our world when we take a mid-term approach.

The fact that many people and politicians in Germany and Europe currently shy away from any far-reaching ideas, this too has a repercussion on reality. To propagate a world without utopias is a self-contained world of ideas and thus itself a utopia. One of a future in which changes happen only through reactive management geared towards specific problems. A Catch 22 - even the fear of utopia and rejection of any unforced change is a utopia. One that promotes the status quo and wants to keep changes as little as possible. However, as stated swift change is needed and a not-changing-world is utopian. So, if it is not possible to shape the future without ideas, it may be time to come up with another idea that could have a positive impact - even if it does not solve all problems right away and also even if it imposes some risk to interpreted as an ideology.

Ideas and utopias can create effects way before they are implemented. For example, a community that thinks terraistically would work to limit the effects of sovereign states. A community that sees it as the next common step of mankind to go into space would at least change the perspective on the planet - even if none of the structures I propose below would be implemented. Here, I would like to give an example of the "founding" of Asgardia see chapter 1.6.2. which I experienced as an inspiring step. Already the foundation of the mentioned association, yes, even reading this essay could be a (small) contribution to peace and environmental protection – although this is not a complete utopia, but a new idea to approach a better future.

Therefore, I will take the liberty of thinking as broadly and comprehensively as possible at this point and encourage you to follow this example. No fear to come near utopia. We should not allow ourselves to be discouraged by possible difficulties in implementation to imagine and empower the best conceivable world. This is the only way that major changes have a chance. Forward-looking changes that go beyond reacting to necessities, crises and pain. And we need change!

1.6 The journey is not the goal

It is en vogue in the intellectual scene to speak up with clear words and good arguments against the current power distribution and market conditions. Few also offer new targets. Where this happens, for example with so recognized present philosophers like Thomas Gabriel, Rutger Bergman, Richard David Precht or Yuval Noah Harari, hardly clear ways are offered to reach these goals.

Much more implementation-oriented are concepts of a cooperative market economy that are oriented toward the common good instead of profit maximization. There are some remarkable ideas out there that also contain a pathway for political implementation. One of the better-known representatives of the common good economy, with a strong social enthusiasm is Christian Felber. However, since they all require legal changes in national legislation and regional alliances and are also challenging in the international arena, they require a great deal of energy and time to implement. In the past, I too have often dropped out at this point. Giving the UN a new mandate, establishing a world tax and finance law that is oriented towards the common good, or getting the nations excited about an idea in which they no longer play a decisive role, is a very hairy and ambitious, long-term goal. I need an approach that seemed easier and timelier to realize. It took two impulses for my idea. First the impetus, then the idea.

1.6.1 Collective actions

As a lawyer and compliance officer for a large corporation, I dealt with "Collective Actions". These initiatives require stakeholders to establish certain common compliance rules. In my case, it was competitors agreeing within the framework of an international industry association whether to invite spouses of customers to dinner, for example, or how much a meal at a business negotiation may cost per person, or how much entertainment a training session for customers may include, etc. All these questions are regulated differently in each country around the world and usually market pressure "forces" sales to go to the limit of what is permissible in each country. Yet - in contrast to a very common opinion about "the industry" - it is not at all in the interest of the players to move into the grey area of the law or even to finance as many invitations as possible. Following this logic, it was surprisingly easy to agree between competitors on a common denominator. Such rules need to be admissible in all jurisdictions and be simple as well as comprehensible. The decision was made voluntarily, without pressure and across company boundaries, to apply the strictest compliance rules from all areas internationally. In some places, competitors even went beyond the strictest of rules because it seemed easier to ban all gifts than to exempt those for customer

anniversaries or promotions and then agree on value limits. The experience made a lasting impression on me.

Industrial associations are clubs. Within the framework of "Collective Actions", they can, in addition to binding rules for their members, have audit rights granted to their members and establish mediation/arbitration centers for disputes. If they agree on rules that are at least as strict as those in the strictest countries, they are independent from national jurisdictions. To be compliant, all they have to do is to abide by the code agreed in the Collective Action. They are happy to let the association monitor such compliance. On the one hand this guarantees a "level playing field" and on the other hand the penalties in such association are usually "only" financial. No loss of reputation. No blacklisting. No prison. A way to continuously improve ethical behavior without being over proportionally punished for the misbehavior of individuals. There is a limit of course when you would have to get state law enforcement involved – but up to that limit, it is a reasonable way the act ever more ethical.

Do corporations “want” child labor, corruption, environmental pollution, and tax havens? The answer is - with a few exceptions: No. They are motivated by the different national legislations in the marketplace to exploit advantages to offer customers the lowest possible prices. Condemning customers for not yet being willing to pay extra for fair trade products and conditions on a large scale does not help either. There is a desire in the industry, at least of all large international corporations, for clear and ethical rules in global competition. Through the - often overrated - lobbying of the corporations, they are usually just defending themselves against regional or national rules, which may make ethically sense - but also distort competition even more on an international level. Sometimes lobbying efforts are directed against liability for unforeseeable misconduct. I do not think any cooperation would lobby against globally applicable and enforced ethical regulations. The idea, the product and the service should be the deciding factor in competition. The COMBAT Charter of the UN contains the essential requirements for worldwide fair play. Unfortunately, it is addressed to the nation states, which have a different set of interests. In the struggle for survival, corporations then tend to follow the financial incentives, such as for example low wages, which are favored by allowing child labor and pollution.

1.6.2 Asgardia

The second food for thought was the founding of "Asgardia" (www.asgardia.space). This is an association that has proclaimed itself as the first "space nation" in 2018. The clear goal is the colonization of the earth-near orbit - before it tackles the moon and

Mars. Anyone who has internet access, signs a charter of tolerance ("Association Statutes") and is willing to support the goal - regardless of religion, origin, gender, and financial means - can become a "citizen". At the time of publication of this essay, Asgardia has more than one million citizens from almost all countries of the world.

One may smile at that. But the thought changes the perspective, and the perspective shapes the reality. Furthermore, Asgardia is not alone. Steven Hawking, too, has pleaded throughout his life to make the colonization of space a common goal. He wanted to increase the global research budget for this purpose from 0.2% of research funds to 2%. This would cause attention to explode due to the media impact of research in this area. He also had a similar thought. The common goal for humanity outside the planet can ultimately save the planet. A good investment.

Nations such as India, China and Russia are also using their space programs to attract media attention. Unfortunately - in contrast to Asgardia - to differentiate, stand out, build national pride. The race of nations into space has long since begun. The Trump Administration is using the creation of a Space Force and the orientation of NASA towards the colonization of the moon in 2025 to deflect internal tensions. A nice example that the topic is in the wrong hands - not strengthening global cohesion. On the contrary, if it remains with the big competing nations, it may encourage peak performance - but unfortunately with a danger for peace. This is precisely why I find the founding of Asgardia inspiring. It is a planet wide undertaking. Not to stand out, but to unite.

1.6.3 The journey

Besides Terraism as a new ethical concept, I want to show a feasible way to approach and implement the ideal. In all brevity and simplicity - derived from the above thoughts - I propose to establish a society of private law nature, as it has become the basic building block of capitalism in its various forms. In my proposal, I would establish it as a non-profit association and commit it to Terraism as a statutory purpose. Really? An association like the allotment garden association around the corner should ensure the survival of mankind in a dignified ethical environment. Yes, exactly. The advantages over state structures are enormous. The possibilities of influence are very impressive.

The impact of legal entities on the world is generally underestimated. We like to think of individuals rather than organizations. However, multinational corporations have long had budgets comparable to smaller states and sometimes have more employees. Walmart, for example, currently has 2.3 million and VW still has almost 650,000 employees. This means that VW has more female employees than Luxembourg's

overall population and twice as many as Iceland. Walmart plays in the same league as Slovenia, Lithuania or Qatar. Walmart's turnover of more than 500 billion USD corresponds to the state revenues of countries like El Salvador, Botswana or Malta. About 100 out of 238 countries in the world have fewer inhabitants than Walmart employees. About 100 countries in the world also have lower budgets than Walmart's turnover.

Much like nations, strong corporations also create a form of identity and a sense of belonging. Apple employees and – for this specific one - even users tend to like and get along with each other. They share certain values and goals. Many companies have their own values and belief systems. Some even have a common vocabulary and their own educational system.

Legal companies are one of the greatest creative forces on earth. Without these "associations", neither the empires of the last centuries would have come into being nor would any national or supranational organization have been able to act. They shape the market, embody and breathe life into capitalism. The market participants motivate thousands of cross-border teams through jointly formulated goals, a sense of purpose, against which they measure and are measured. Corporations such as Siemens, Sony, GE, and Google are aware of their origins, but they are real examples of a functioning international cooperation that is comparatively non-discriminatory. Certainly, there is still a lot of potential to achieve real equality at all levels especially gender equality. Even in this environment, this will still take a long time - yet such companies are often shining examples compared to the reality in many sovereign nations. As an employee of a large corporation, my own team consists of Indians, Chinese, Americans, Brazilians, Colombians, Mexicans, British, South Africans and many other nations. We all work together very well. Every day we try to understand each other and to keep intercultural irritations as low as possible. Tolerance is natural and an expression of our mutual respect. In this environment, it is not an effort, but rather a joy and gift to learn from the perspective of the other person.

So, I do not only propose a new ethics ("Terraism"), but also a path that can be taken in small steps and without any social or even warlike conflict. The foundation of a non-profit, international association happens constantly. Hundreds of times every day. It is the starting point for the implementation of the idea - and has the potential to be an important step on the way to the defined goal. Members of the association can be natural persons, companies, other non-profit associations, foundations and even nations or federations of states.

Before we come to the design of such an association in detail, we first need some basic considerations about the purpose and orientation of such an undertaking. An association under private law is a very flexible legal construct, which can be relatively

freely formed with regard to its organs and organizational structures. So, how should one organize an association that embodies Terraism and wants to change the world? Wouldn't it make sense to follow the basic concepts of democratic states and to build it up in decision-making structures similar to those? Would we stagger it regionally (community, district, state, federation etc.)? Should we dare more or less rights of co-determination? What does a look at democratic reality teach us?

2. How much club dairy can a club tolerate?

First and foremost, I would like to express a clear commitment to democracy. It is the best and most sustainable form of organization of nations and also supra-regional alliances to date. However, this should not prevent us from questioning this form of organization in certain areas. The most far-reaching attempts at organizational reform of democracy by the established political parties in Germany are currently limited to the reduction of the federal parliament and a few concrete demands for more referendums. However, it seems to me that a few other issues have not yet been perfectly resolved. Since a terraistic association is supposed to be trend-setting and effective, which elements do we want to take over and which should possibly be adapted.

The community council, the district council, the district parliament, the state parliament, the Bundestag and the European Parliament all differentiate themselves from each other and are accountable to each other only to a limited extent. This complexity is difficult to understand. In spite of my general interest in politics - besides work, family, friends, sports, household and other hobbies - I do not have the time to deal with regional and subject matter responsibilities of all political actors, let alone their individual opinions. I read the last complete party program when I was 18 or 19. Although I familiarize myself every day with online newspapers, that is just enough for a superficial understanding of topics on the federal politics. That is it. I spend an hour a day on politics. More would interfere with my lifestyle and balance. Does that make me an apolitical, antisocial outsider? In my predominantly academic neighborhood and among my friends, I seem to be at the upper end of the information scale! I can also confirm this for my 17 and 19-year-old daughters and their circles of friends. I find this a little scary. No one is well informed.

There is hardly a concrete, political topic from the local community to European and German issues on which I could give a factually well-founded opinion. I am a family man, lawyer, manager and am used to making decisions in difficult situations on an incomplete, ambiguous database. On the question of whether the new EU data protection regulation (GDPR) makes sense or whether the urban railroad system in my

city makes sense, I would have to work full-time for at least a few weeks - despite my inclination and legal education - in order to come close to a meaningful basis for decision-making. Even the relatively simple issue of a suburban railroad is an investment of 300 million euros. Money that may not be available for other projects, such as the expansion of daycare centers or health. The urban light rail system and the new EU data protection regulation are large, complex and interlinked topics with a history and a claim to anticipate an uncertain future. I don't have the time to deal adequately with even two of the hundreds of interesting and essential topics! So, I vote without any meaningful know-how. I guess a little. I follow my gut feeling. A single argument may build my opinion because I know it and it serves rather as a reasoning fig leaf in case, I have to justify myself. Not even at the community level do I manage to get a minimum of clarity. Surely, I can be accused of not taking my democratic obligations serious and setting the wrong priorities in life. Possibly right. Unfortunately, I personally do not know a single citizen in Germany who sets the "right" priorities ... democracy degenerates into child's play. Nobody would make decisions of this magnitude for himself, his family or his company on such a poor fact basis.

This does not mean that co-determination and petitions for a referendum are not useful. They are often only applied to the wrong challenges. Prioritizing which goals and values are important for improving the quality of life for the majority of a community or nation is a basis for decision-making that all politicians could use as a guideline. The right question would then be: What is more important to you: childcare, bicycle-friendliness, expansion of public transport, environmental protection, working conditions, educational opportunities, etc.? This then results in a picture of values and objectives from which people who have enough time to deal with concrete issues and investment opportunities can derive decisions. It sets the goals but leaves the decision how to best get there to people that hopefully know better than the average citizen.

Independent of this, I would wish that a democracy would be managed as lean as possible according to its goals. Good politicians are eloquent and committed - but not necessarily good managers. They are not elected for that either. Exceptions confirm the rule. Wherever you look, there is duplication and waste. This does not only refer to the waste of taxpayers' money in initiatives and projects, as they are uncovered annually by the black book. The federal structures that we afford to have duplicate know-how and costs in Germany in sixteen states. The educational system is a great example. Each federal state maintains its own staff to deviate from the neighboring state in a few percent. It also seems unlikely to me that our tax system has a reasonable cost/benefit ratio in all areas. Unemployed people only have to work in an environment that is appropriate to them, even if there is a lack of work in public road construction, park maintenance etc. Each prisoner costs the taxpayer 60k€ per year. That is almost twice the average income. Are we well managed?

And in theory, almost everyone belongs in jail anyway. Have you already been on the black market several times? Snacked cherries and apples from foreign trees? Entered fenced-in properties of others? Insulted or slandered someone? Driving through red lights several times in your life? Taken drugs in your youth or on occasion? Applied for child benefit even though the child had no real desire to study? Always respected data protection? If everyone had been caught for every wrongdoing and sued for every private offense, many of us would be in jail or at least have a criminal record! At least that holds true for me. Nevertheless, I consider myself to be a cultured, socially committed and average citizen! Are these efficient and meaningful structures? I don't want to propagate impunity for all and encourage anarchism, but there are plenty of other ways and means to ensure that the rules are observed. In any case, taxes based on the common good or claims for damages with a penalty clause would not immediately lead to the criminalization of society. These are just a few examples of hundreds of cases in which our society is inefficiently getting out of hand.

Other areas for improvement? Our German chancellor earns about 290k€ per year - correspondingly less for ministers. Do we really think we get the best of the best for this? Certainly, the best managers are not always the ones who are paid the best. Admittedly, we do not want the money-driven in politics. It is also true that manager salaries are completely excessive and a limit - at least to me - seems reasonable. At least in an unchanged environment, one can still ask oneself whether the competition for talent really takes place at the highest level. After all, we are talking about an annual budget of €400 billion! The right decision makers in these positions can save us all billions every year. Every medium-sized company, many car dealers and pub owners, every individual in the higher management of large companies earns similarly - often with higher social security and certainly with less responsibility and public pressure. If we can assume that the market value of a worker is at least partly expressed in his or her salary, comparisons with listed companies and banks show an extremely worrying assessment of the workforce of our Chancellor and her ministers. If political offices were significantly higher paid, this would conceptually strengthen my confidence. Subject matter expertise would also be helpful - contrary to current practice.

I could fill many more pages with structural problems of our German democracy. Topics that recur in many other democracies in variations. All in all, neither democracy nor meaningful decision-making seems to me to function optimally in this form. At least I would not want to build a planet-wide organization on this principle. Parliamentary democracy itself needs considerable changes to appear meaningful. Internationally, it would be a nightmare, because the demarcations and duplications that we already have here in federal Germany and Europe alone would be multiplied.

There are some conclusions that we can draw from the democratic reality. In my opinion, we want to make such an association agile, lean, and appropriately co-

determined. The structures of an association can be adopted according to the growing and changing requirements and should be re-assessed in each annual general meeting. Therefore, only an initial concept is proposed, which must prove itself and will change over time.

On the following pages, I will roughly sketch a first proposal for a structure that at least preserves the capacity of the terraistic association to act and addresses some essential points of criticism of political organizations. I am aware that none of the conclusions is necessarily compelling. I start from the basic assumption that "informed" and balanced decisions in a complex world require so much knowledge and time that the majority cannot make the decision itself properly.

My hope is to contribute to the discussion and show a new perspective. Although I am aware of many inherent risks of both the Terraism and the proposed form of organization, the statement that it does not work in the current structures and that there is a significant need for change remains true. Taking risks seems to make more sense if we are aware of the future, which is very likely to happen if we do not change anything.

The following suggestions are very concrete. Some of them can also be understood as suggestions for the organization of democratic structures. It should be noted that one must agree on a "North Star", a goal. The equivalent of a business purpose. The human rights as pure weighing criteria are helpful but not sufficient. For our democracy, the current "North Star" could be somewhat cynically formulated as follows: "Increase the prosperity of as many people as possible, sufficiently secure jobs and a clean, orderly infrastructure, as far as possible without violating fundamental rights of other - and take environmental protection in account where it does not interfere with any of the aforementioned". In my example the North Star is Terraism. The weighing of values of all members as a guideline to management should be aligned at the election year for the presidency.

In an association only the meeting of the members and the executive committee are prescribed by the law. All in all, it has therefore a very adaptable structure which will be set forth in its statutes. When I speak of president in the following, I mean the chief executive officer from a legal point of view. He is supported by a board of directors. As a controlling body of the board of directors outside the general meeting and with the right to call a general meeting at any time, I propose a "Council of Elders". In most cases a comparable body is called advisory board or supervisory board. For the general meeting I also use the term plenary meeting. The plenary assembly is the highest organ of the association and all rights are derived indirectly from it. In the following I will roughly sketch out the framework of the above-mentioned structures and some details that seem important to me.

2.1 President

In the general assembly I propose to generally elect people in functions, not parties. The goal would be to elect a person as president, who is trusted to manage functions, funds, projects, and staff to achieve the defined purpose. A person who is trusted to steer the fortunes with whom the majority shares basic values. The human being is evolutionarily oriented to trust people and not party programs. This does not contradict the fact that people compete with a "program". This program should not primarily contain concrete measures but should convey a picture of values and goals of the basis of which future decisions will be made. It does not make sense to hold the president to a promise that after the election turns out not to promote the goals. Furthermore, an essential part of the task of a president is to react appropriately to situations that are at the point of election still unknown. Transparency with respect to the underlying values is part of confidence-building, and from this, examples of actual decisions and proposals for concrete measures can be derived. However, the focus is reversed compared to the usual elections. This person would then organize the board of the association and be responsible for the management.

In our parliamentary democracies, there is a fundamental concern about endowing presidents with too much power. This concern could extend to a comprehensive terraistic association. Of course, an association is not comparable to a state, if only because of the lack of an executive and military power. Nevertheless, one or the other reader will be concerned whether a co-determined concept of the association can do without a body comparable to parliament. Is it enough co determination to have once a year a general assembly? Why not? Wikipedia tells us that there are some companies that have existed since the 8th century AD. These include not only hotels and restaurants, but also mechanical engineers and foundries. In the case of religious associations - which after all are also committed to a purpose and partly limited co-determination concepts - there are even significantly older ones. Thus, associations have existed much longer than most states and often still pursue their original purpose – hopefully adapted to current reality. Where ownership structures were in family hands, the managing directors are usually not even elected according to qualification and orientation, as in the proposed concept. Surely over the last nearly 1500 years in these associations not everything ran perfectly. I would like to turn the original question above upside down. Would the pursuit of the purpose of these organizations over more than 1000 years have run better, if the managing director had a parliament elected by the employees at his/her side? No option is failsafe. I think that the efficiency gains due to the absence of structures comparable to parliaments at all levels, and the speed with which such a person can make decisions, justifies an attempt to trust the president over

the course of one year. Transferred to our democratic structures, I would even doubt whether the people involved in the various parliamentary structures, for example in the district or community council, can make qualified decisions in their area of responsibility at all, or whether they prefer to resort to polemics and party politics. In any case, it seems justified to me to establish a strong association president who is accountable to the general assembly and is not constantly bound in the voting process with other co-determination bodies.

Our terraistic president may earn well. It is not understandable why some board members earn fifty times more than the German Chancellor. It is my personal opinion that such salaries should be banned generally – but that is not up for debate here. We should get into an area that attracts talent - but not money-hungry self-promoters. In return, and to prevent abuse, I think it would be appropriate to demand full financial transparency from such a person. In Finland, for example, every income declaration is published on the Internet. At least for individuals with job in the associations that should be standard to prevent corruption and grudge.

Would only rich people have the means to run for president? In times of the Internet money is still an advantage, but no longer a pre-requisite to finance a campaign. People with persuasive power and good ideas will reach enough supporters to act efficiently in social networks. In addition, a digital platform for qualified applicants should be provided by the association (more on this under 2.5).

A further improvement, at least at the planetary level, would be to extend the term of office / election period significantly. Currently, after coalition formation and familiarization, there are often only two years left before the next election campaign begins. However, successes and failures for which a government is responsible take several years to become visible. Eight to ten years could be a reasonable time period that also gives one the chance to learn from mistakes and profit from own successes. To limit coterie and powerplays, and to allow for new perspectives on the planetary challenges, there should be only one term of office and no re-election possible. This restriction could be anchored in the statutes with at least a two-thirds majority necessary to effect change. To influence the multinational members of natural persons, through companies, associations, and associations of states in an improper manner is likely to be a difficult undertaking. The classic path to despotism via a constitutional amendment approved by parliament is thus at least very unlikely. In addition, the general meeting of the association has the possibility to remove the executive committee including the president from office every year. This control mechanism alone seems to me to be suitable to raise the comfort level to a reasonable level during longer terms of office.

2.2 Council of elders

As a further control mechanism - apart from the general meeting - for the president and the management a committee of few incorruptible world citizens could serve ("Council of the Elders"). In terms of the law of associations, this would be somewhat like a supervisory board. To remain agile, it should not comprise too many persons. The persons should be internationally recognized. The areas of success should be of different nature and require different competences. They could be philosophical, entrepreneurial, social, or political, for example. To ensure continuity and to keep the loss of know-how during the transition from one president to the next to a minimum, past presidents should be members of the Council of Elders for one additional term of office. The other members of the Council of Elders would be elected via the internet during the general assembly.

In addition to an advisory function for the president and the management, the Council of Elders would have the right to dismiss the president by a simple majority if his or her actions endanger the survival of the planets, the non-discriminatory coexistence or other essential contents of the statutes objectively and demonstrably. The same should apply if he or she is very likely to be held criminally responsible. This does not mean to undermine the principle of "in dubio pro reo", it is necessary to safeguard the association's reputation. Until the next assembly, someone from the Council of Elders would then continue to manage the associations. To carry out this toughest of all interventions and to make abuse at least less likely, it would make sense to make such decision of the Council of Elders subject to the approval of an independent arbitration board (see point 3.2 below).

Ancient institutions - like the Council of Elders - often serve basic needs. These days we are all missing a comparable ethical instance. There are hundreds of expert commissions. One of them, the German Ethics Council, at least addresses interdisciplinary ethical question that arise with new technologies. However, it is being mandated, contracted. It is not a political or social institution. It misses the legitimization through elections. The council does not aim to impact the public opinion nor does it seek publicity. It remains to be an expert gremium with little effect in society.

Uralte Institutionen haben oft einen tiefen Sinngehalt. Der Ältestenrat als moralische Instanz fehlt uns. In unserer Welt gibt es nur noch Expertengremien. Der Ethikrat in Deutschland nimmt immerhin interdisziplinär zu neuen Technologien Stellung. Er wird aber beauftragt und ist keine politische Institution. Ein Leichtgewicht. Die

Zusammensetzung ist nicht durch Wahlen legitimiert. Es fehlt die Wirksamkeit und das Vertrauen der Öffentlichkeit.

2.3 General assembly

The most important organ of the association is the general assembly. It gives the president a quasi-democratic legitimation through election. Once a year the president has to report how he/she has furthered the goals of the association and intends to promote them in the future. Any change in the purpose of the association requires the approval of the general assembly. The general assembly is legitimated to dismiss the president and the whole board upon written application. To ensure continuity, a quorum above the simple majority, e.g. 75%, would be required for such an action. Otherwise there would be the danger that every annual meeting would be used for such a power vote.

In the general assembly any member may ask questions, which must be answered by the board. Subjects and proposals can also be presented and discussed in the forum. As always there will be a few stakeholders who will and wants to take the chance to promote his or her cause rather than focus on the purpose of the general assembly. That is a downside we must accept. In any case, a statement of the Council of Elders would have to be presented - with a recommendation to exonerate the management for the past and suggestions for prioritization for the future. The managing board may or may not be discharged for the past year. "Discharge of the management" means that the general meeting determines to best of its knowledge that there are no claims for damages or of enrichment against the members of the management. Such personal liability of the management members may arise if they act against the interests of the association.

The meetings should be organized digitally. This does not exclude the possibility of a larger number of interested people meeting in person. Digital participation must be possible with reasonable effort. However, because not everyone has access to the Internet at all times and because many certainly support the purpose of the statutes in the matter, but do not see themselves to be competent in specific matters, a right of assignment for votes makes sense. Like larger stock corporations, such representation would have to be obtained anew for each meeting and proven in advance. Misuse in certain cases can of course not be fully excluded. To make it more difficult for such misuse to take effect, the maximum accumulation of voting rights for the various types of members would have to be limited, for example to 2-5%.

Up to this point it was simple and almost theoretical. The further content and topics I propose are based on personal evaluations, world views and subject matter conclusions on my part. The setting of priorities is to be discussed. It builds a bridge to the introductory considerations about a probable future and builds on it.

3. What is mission critical?

A terraistic association would need certain divisions and committees that cover relevant topics to further world peace and the continued existence of the planet and humanity. These organizational units the "missions" are not organs of the association, but can be changed, dissolved, and adapted at any time by the board. I propose three missions which seem to me to be the most relevant now:

The preservation of the planet is the central concern. In my view, this is not only about environmental protection. We need a mid- to long-term strategy for dealing with other challenges, especially peacekeeping. Additionally, I propose to establish a division for development of progressive ethics to deal with foreseeable dilemmas. For one thing, no supranational organization seems to be seriously engaged, and for another, there can be no meaningful consensus on this topic as long as nations are in a race for capital and influence and therefore have an interest to avoid long-term ethical discussions. Finally, the unifying goal of advancing us into space requires planetary coordination and communication and will help with the two topics mentioned before.

Of course, I am not a specialist in all areas and my plea is that specialists deal with the implementation and definition of the topics. Therefore, the following list of missions and their topics is only exemplary and hopefully a good start for discussions.

3.1 Mission planet preservation

The "Planet Conservation" mission is not only committed to environmental protection. Rather, there are several activities that must be tackled in parallel. It is obvious that peace must also be part of planet conservation. Not only because of the thousandfold overkill caused by the existing atomic and hydrogen bombs, but also because of the at least equally planet-endangering biological weapons.

And finally - even if we produce and use our energy ever more efficiently - there is always an upper limit to the number of people who can be sustainably supplied with

energy. Population development will interact with both environmental protection and peacekeeping. I am aware of the danger that this is bordering to utilitarian concepts which, in case of doubt, place the preservation of the planet above human life. We can argue at length about whether this is the right ethical approach. But the longer we talk about it instead of acting, the bigger the problem will be - and the more radical measures will probably have to be to preserve the planet. To avoid dramatic conclusions, such as in "Kingsman: The Secret Service" and many other films, we need to face the reality now and swiftly follow a common, ethically justifiable path. That includes population control and green technology. Any of the above topics seem to be impacted heavily by education. So, that is where we are going to start.

Here are my first thoughts on the organizational substructure within the Mission "Planet Conversations" that I call "committees".

3.1.1 Committee for education

The influence of education is generally underestimated in political discussions. It has been proven by science that education leads to a higher quality of life, longer life, fewer children. It enables both awareness of environmental protection and to initiate some of the measures needed to implement it. The mere fact of mastering a common language will raise the understanding between people to a new level. Understanding each other is an essential contribution to maintaining peace. Nevertheless - or perhaps precisely because of this - education is currently regarded as something very national. In Germany, responsibility for education is even still held at the level of the federal states.

Global education for planetary conservation through a terraistic association can have several facets:

Education is rewarded: Soon every second person on earth will have a smartphone. Even in very poor areas, where there is a shortage of the most necessities, smartphones are available. There are currently 3.3 billion active devices in the world. At least teaching apps for reading, writing, basic math and English should be established in such a way that they are freely available to everyone in the world in their native language. How much effort it is, or whether such a goal should be pursued as an open source project, are already detail that do not need to be discussed here. They should be decided by a knowledgeable and capable manager. One thing is certain: With such learning programs, the illiteracy rate could be reduced and participation in knowledge and politics could be strengthened. One would also reach women and minorities in remote regions of the world or in regions with high discrimination. Ideally, a terraistic society could promote these learning apps or even establish advantages when they are

being successfully used. It would be a great result if the apps were available pre-installed on the start page of every smartphone.

Education creates values: Education is not only knowledge. Many detrimental developments could be prevented if young people around the world were also taught deeper values and self-understanding. I missed both elements in my high school education in Germany and I do not see any serious attempt in my daughters' school career to further the topics. Psychology, ethics, philosophy, and peace studies could be exciting and really rewarding topics. I don't mean learning historical numbers by heart, but really understanding the effects of war and peace in the course of human history. Dealing with ethics and philosophy ultimately forms an inner compass, which is becoming increasingly important in a society driven by consumption and media manipulation. Since one's freedom is increasing in an ever more interconnected world, and since there is a high probability that working life in the next generation will no longer serve as the sole purpose of life, it is becoming more and more important to start exploring the purposes of life early on. Also - and especially in this area - it would be desirable to have at least one global provider of such learning content that is independent of business and politics. National egoisms, the desire to present one's own history in a positive light and religious convictions at least distort the presentation of the past and ethical content. If an association striving for neutrality provides such content, this can lead to a healthy debate of the content of national curricula. In the end, education should neither purposeless learning machine nor be geared to support an undesirable labor market. It should anchor values in younger generations that lead to a desirable society in future.

Education strengthens personalities: Furthermore, it would be time to integrate interpersonal elements into education. How do I cultivate friendships? What are elements of a functioning partnership or love relationship? Sex education is still not a subject in all schools around the world and even where it is taught, essential elements on how to live it outside of stereotypes with one another are often missing. Many of the interpersonal topics are based on a deeper understanding of oneself. What feels good? What can I do well, what not? What is important to me? When do I run into subconscious patterns that can get in my way in the rest of my life? Of course, school is not intended to become a psychotherapy institution, but there is a long way to go between getting to know yourself and today's understanding of education.

Since happiness will take on a new meaning in peace-rich societies, this too needs become a school subject. Pilots already exist, even in Germany. Beyond taking psychotropic drugs and using deep brain stimulators, what are the possibilities to be happy, to stay happy? In addition to Buddhist and other teachings, elements of neuro-linguistic programming offer interesting approaches. As obvious as these topics are to all my interlocutors, they are not included in the national curricula. Here, Latin,

mathematical topics, which at least I have never used again, and blunt knowledge transfer are still prioritized. Probably because it is easier to check. A subject without grades is still difficult to imagine. In any case, teaching content that is currently needs to be acquired in expensive seminars for privileged adults should at least be addressed through apps, podcasts, live and video sessions. Because of its importance I revert to this topic in more detail later.

New forms of education: If education is seen as a key component in preserving the planet, it would be exciting to rethink not only the content of teaching but also the form of instruction. In the third millennium after Christ, schools are accessible to more people in percentage terms, but teaching still takes place as it did then. One person talks live or virtually and teaches the children. In “modern” schools this is sometimes interrupted by group work. Strangely enough, nobody invests in completely new, promising forms of teaching. Hypnotherapy or suggestopedia, for example, seem to have the potential to take the learning experience to the next level. Those who can learn the material required in the national school systems faster have more time to deal with the important things outlines above. In my view, research into these learning and teaching methods can make a real contribution to planetary conservation in the medium term. This could lead to the development of a new type of school, in addition to net- and smartphone-based forms of education. Comparable to Waldorf and Montessori schools, the terraistic association could establish a private school system in which not only the most important future-oriented values are taught, but also a next generation could grow up who, through trance-based learning, could bring a real advantage to a society in which lifelong learning becomes the norm. The association could use the successful franchise-like operation of these schools to generate funds in developed countries that could be used in other regions or online for education in poorer societies. Otherwise there is a danger that the new form of learning could become the privilege of the elite.

3.1.2 Committee for population control

Undoubtedly, one of the main challenges facing the planet is the proliferation of the human species. Even if we produce energy ever more efficient and resource-saving and reduce energy consumption in production and use, these efforts will be nullified in the medium term by the worldwide increase in population and the ever higher demands of both developed and emerging societies. At some point, there will no longer be enough energy sources, food and water on spaceship earth. We need to start addressing the challenge as soon as possible. If this problem is not tackled planet-wide from a non-discriminatory organization, ethically dubious solutions or struggles for resources will inevitably result. If, for example, China or some other powerful nation feels compelled to

solve the planet's overpopulation problem to have a future of its own, very radical solutions may emerge.

Again, education is recognized as a fast and efficient way to address this challenge. Campaigns that propagate small families with well-educated children can support the cause. Somewhat more radical would be a self-commitment of the members of the terraistic association not to have more than two children or a financial incentive of employers organized in the association for families with a maximum of two children. In many and very relevant countries around the world, such support would not need to be high to make a difference. The free or subsidized distribution of condoms and IUDs would probably also be a benefit to the planet's overall welfare balance.

Delicate, but in my opinion unavoidable, is to deal with the religions of this world. It cannot be that the Catholic Church in the third millennium after Christ's birth still propagates contraceptive-free sexual intercourse. In industrialized societies, only marginalized groups adhere to it anyway, but precisely where a lower birth rate would be desirable - in Latin America and parts of Africa – a change in policy could make a difference. As a secondary effect, the usage of condoms would help tackling some diseases and improve world health. I have not researched on the dogmas of other religions in detail in this area, but they exist. Wherever one finds teachings condemning contraception or praising abundance of children as God's will, this should be counteracted. A non-profit organization committed to Terraism would be the right partner to engage in dialogue with religious representatives, organize conferences and bring about transparency and publicity about the approach and effects.

3.1.3 Committee for green technology

While many new technologies have environmental benefits, they can be dangerous for established industries or do not currently have a business case that really inspires private investors. We see the same phenomena in the health sector. Here, for example, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation is therefore promoting ideas and companies worldwide that have the potential to advance humanity in major health challenges. This is then independent of the short-term business case and of detrimental effects on existing commercial business. In the pharmaceutical sector, developments are often so expensive that profit-oriented companies focus on financially strong customers rather than on the benefits for mankind. For example, new forms of therapy are constantly being developed for diseases such as obesity and diabetes, but the fight against epidemics in Africa is not being pursued. This is due to a lack of financing power in

Africa. However, even if such developments are not a good business case to begin with mid- to long-term there could be great benefits and profits based on them.

Like the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, a terraistic association could promote new companies and technologies that have the potential to serve planet conservation, regardless of the short-term business case. If this is done skillfully and with the support of global corporations, a self-financing approach is thinkable. This may turn into a business case if we do not think in the short term, but beyond the five-year horizon.

Often the added value lies in the combining different ideas with a purpose. Greenpeace has created a major showcase. As an organization with donations of about 300 million Euros, Greenpeace has already shown in 1996 that it is possible to build a three-liter car. Unfortunately, the statutes or self-image did not seem to allow Greenpeace to build this car and use the proceeds to develop further environmentally friendly technologies. But exactly this seems to me to be the right way. Profits would benefit the charitable cause of Terraism. That would generate real added value in the sense of the common good economy. Another advantage of the approach would be that companies would also be integrated as members. They could support the realization financially, provide machines and infrastructure or accompany it with know-how. Their own interest would be supported if, in return, the member companies that are helpful in the development would be granted a non-exclusive right, free of charge for a certain period of time, to commercially exploit further developments based on the technology in their field of business. I am currently not aware of any comparable non-profit, financially strong consortium with the goal of planetary conservation.

The terraistic association has an interest in ensuring that environmentally friendly technologies are used as much as possible and by as many as possible. However, there may be situations in which profit-oriented companies develop or buy up ideas which, although they should be realized as quickly as possible from a terraistic perspective, are too early for a company for strategic reasons, or even endanger the current business model. I could imagine that an oil company would have little interest in a brilliant idea for the use of hydrogen in automobiles being made public or implemented, immediately. Even if it were a great business case, oil companies would often not even be able to implement the idea. Moreover, it would attack their core business so radically that it would be psychologically difficult to pursue. They would have to be prepared to cannibalize themselves. In most cases, such ideas would be kept secret or, to the extent that they are protected by industrial property rights, this could prevent or hinder the immersion of the technology. Therefore, it seems to me to be beneficial to buy up or license in patents and technologies that serve environmental protection. Rights of use of these industrial property rights could be offered to all members at advantageous conditions and to the rest of the world at market conditions. This approach again has the potential to eventually become self-financing if not

profitable. One would then use the license income to buy new ideas, rights and technologies. In the mid-term, this would at least reduce the probability that existing industries would sit on intellectual property rights and thus deliberately curb environmentally friendly technologies and inventions in the market.

Even if this were not a lucrative initiative, the transparency provided by systematic market research alone would be a real added value. On the one hand, the right companies could be made aware of interesting topics, and on the other hand, there is the possibility of building up pressure through publicity. Often the right ideas are just missing the stage or are in need to be combined. Organizing trade fairs and creating publicity would be a further, important contribution to the preservation of the planet.

3.1.4 Committee for collective action

Members of the terraistic association can be natural persons, companies, other non-profit associations, foundations and even nations/federations of states. According to the idea of collective actions outlined above, a code of conduct would have to be adopted depending on the circle of members, which is committed to the goals of Terraism. We would start with the lowest common denominator in order to create trust and to achieve first results quickly. The 10 principles of the United Nations Global Compact Initiative would be a possible starting point for such a low common denominator. The Sustainable Development Goals of the UN contain further important topics. Many of these goals, such as the abolition of child labor, are based on a very broad ethical consensus. It has never worked among nations and corporations due to the given competitive situation and due to missing enforcement provisions in these regulations. Especially the very poor states thought that they would be more attractive for corporations if they allowed even younger and therefore cheaper workers. If now at least the large corporations were obliged under the association's statutes not to employ children under 14, the nations would no longer have to cooperate in this area to achieve the same goal. In doing so, one does not need all the companies in a sector. A considerable market share is sufficient. This is possible because these rules would also extend contractually via compliance clauses to the supplier companies of the members. In addition, we could, similar to the fair trade or comparable seals, establish a mark that verifies compliance with the codes of the terra-terrestrial association. The world of these seals is certainly questionable in some areas, but I know of many who pay attention to organic or fair-trade logos, among others. Competition between companies not to abide by the collective action rules or not become member could only be avoided and buyer confidence would only be established if these "voluntary commitments" were also monitored and enforced. After all, a company does not have an intrinsic motivation to

adopt unethical child labor. It is "driven by the market" to save money as far as legally possible in order to be cheaper or more profitable in competition. Collective actions have the power to end this spiral – even without the cooperation of nations.

The same applies to corruption, lobbying, sustainability, and environmental protection. As soon as a critical mass of private companies would be part of the association, the enforcement of uniform values and standards would no longer depend on the nation states. The association could have its own audit team and a statutory right to impose appropriate association penalties in the event of non-compliance with the self-imposed rules. If the fundamental issues in which no company has an interest of its own are addressed, more difficult issues such as the existence of tax havens could be addressed. If every company that pays less than 15% tax had to pay the difference to the association, this would dry up the most blatant oases. Again, one would have to oblige the member companies to apply these requirements with all contract partners. Through regular audits and possibly an information service, the association would support the implementation. Also, collective actions among the member states or in mixed constellations with companies could be explored to achieve more not by power and threat - but by creating win-win situations. There must be a reason why Panama and the Bermuda Islands establish tax havens. What do they really want? Maybe not states but companies are part of the solutions. The association could establish a platform for a new communication on these issues.

In the Corona crisis we were able to witness that states without companies are in some places quite clue- and powerless. There was a lack of a suitable communication platform to organize crisis response. Who produces masks and protective clothing? Who develops and produces PCR and antibody tests? Who has the best prospects of developing a vaccine in a timely manner? Who decides where, what is produced? Who decides who gets how many masks? Suddenly, private companies are the focus of the nation states. It goes even further. The nations are not aware of the interconnection of global supply chains. The export stop of masks from one mask-producing country can lead to the fact that in return no materials necessary for production are supplied from another country. Many productions of other important goods, for example semiconductor technologies, are carried out in clean rooms, which in turn also require masks as part of the manufacturing process. These semiconductors are not only used in the military environment, but also in the manufacture of medical products such as respirators. The global maintenance forces of medical device manufacturers needed masks and protective equipment to keep the medical infrastructure in hospitals running. Governmental official just did not know. Without maintenance of the healthcare infrastructure the fight against the pandemic would have been made more difficult or impossible in almost all hospitals around the world.

In any case, the attempt by nation states to regulate the distribution of protective clothing in the world has led to many unwanted and unhelpful artifacts. Likely, an association of industrial companies would have produced much more appropriate rules. Believe it or not, in some companies even ethical considerations play a significant role in companies when it comes to deciding to whom they deliver what and how much. Compromises have been made in the achievable price. In a networked world and towards your own employees, you have a reputation to lose, which is worth more than the quick Euro from an overpriced sale. Transparency in public plays a decisive role in this. In any case, as part of society we all - including profit-oriented companies - have an interest in the worldwide functioning of the medical infrastructure, supply chains and logistics. At this point, a strong private organization with proven collective action mechanisms could have done much good - or at least prevented much unnecessary suffering. At the very least, the communication platform between companies and national authorities would have been helpful.

In the context of the ethics of Terraism, I have emphasized the idea that the colonization of space as a far-reaching goal can have a strong unifying force. If we imagine the world in 50 years, the question arises who will found the first city in orbit and settle on the moon permanently. In my imagination, a society that has natural people, associations, companies, and states as members and is committed to Terraism would be the better alternative to a nation-state race! The NASA mission "Artemis", which assumes a permanent settlement of the moon starting from 2029, is a reason to worry. The Chinese will not be watching. The same applies to the management of the Antarctic and the exploitation of international waters. The idea that no rules apply in these vast unexplored areas is not particularly comforting. Collective actions can and should also contribute to solving these issues.

3.2 Mission for ethical handling of progress

Mankind is not sustainably positioned in its current stage of development. If we continue without change, the end is foreseeable. Whether it is 50 or 250 years does not matter and does not make it big difference from an evolutionary point of view. Contrary to the opinion of various fringe groups - such as the Rastafarians - I also think it is rather unlikely that we will go "back into the caves" without external compulsion. How would we manage such a procedure without the death of billions of people and who would participate? Also, waiting for God's help is not very satisfying approach to me. Even if you believe in God, it can't hurt to take care of the preservation of God's creation. Now, I am not aware of any realistic and influenceable scenario in which we would return to nature in a sustainable way and give up the current state of comfort and connectivity. I

am also currently not aware of any realistic and influenceable scenario in which we will survive at the current level of development without serious changes. So, we can and must see the accelerated development of humanity's capabilities as a chance to reach a sustainable state before we ruin our own chance of survival and the planet.

Does a further development of mankind come without risk? No! Great opportunities usually involve just as great a risk. By developing transgenic beings, for example, we might accelerate the end of Homo Sapiens by a few decades - after a few hundred thousand years of existence. However, since we have no alternative and not changing will surely lead to our downfall, we might as well focus our energy on increasing the chances of success. This seems to me to make much more sense than draining our energy for the creation of a good future with horror scenarios and nightmares of such a high-tech future. Of course, it is more comfortable for the individual to reject change - especially if he or she is one of the winners of the current system. At this point a second Enlightenment is needed. A break from the current coma. The winners of the system, who regularly also hold power in the nations and corporations, must be shaken up. Here, too, a terraistic association play a major role.

3.2.1 Committee for cyborg technology

For people with a strong affinity for technology, the idea of enhancing one's own body through technical instruments is obvious and does not have a strong social and ethical threshold. This is already no longer a marginal phenomenon. The transhumanists have arrived in the middle of society. As already mentioned in the introduction, I postulate that mass-suitable developments of advanced cyborg technologies to optimize the abilities of healthy people are only a matter of time. To repeat: We should not be afraid of this, but rather look forward to the additional possibilities and help shape their use. Let's avoid fighting water. Contrary to what was predicted in the Middle Ages, the invention of the absolutely deadly crossbow did not directly lead to the extinction of mankind. To put energy into the sensible use of the technology and not the fear of it is the key.

The technical challenge of cyborg technologies lies in the interface between man and machine. Many such interfaces already exist especially in medicine. Through the wireless connection of external cameras, images are transmitted from electrical plates onto the retina, thus providing the intact optic nerve with information. In this way, blind people can see again. So-called "Kocher implants" are installed in their thousands. They help deaf individuals to hear again. It works through a direct interface of the implant with the auditory nerves. This is also possible if the auditory bones have been

dysfunctional since birth. The implant bypasses them and transmits the signal directly to the nerve. Artificial hearts, teeth, hips, and knees are known to us all. Pacemakers already control the nerves responsible for the contraction of the heart. Neuronally controlled arm and leg prostheses are in use. Relatively new and promising are deep brain stimulators. These are electrodes that are sunk into certain active areas of the brain. They are connected via a cable to a pulse generator often placed under the chest muscles. This impulse generator is addressed via a remote control. Originally developed to suppress tremor in Parkinson's patients, they have now also been successfully used to cure drug patients or anxiety states through stimulating certain areas of the brain. It seems only a matter of time before you can be focused, aggressive or happy at the touch of a button. A great potential in the hands of the right people.

Why do I report in such detail here? Because it is important to realize that the cyborg age has already begun. It is not science fiction. We have no choice. It is reality.

If brain-compatible memories or fast network connections are added later, this will lead to a clear superiority of the cyborg over the natural Homo Sapiens. The richest citizens will claim the most powerful enhancements, and so for the first time in history they will not only be the ones born into the right families at the right time. They will truly be "something better". The chances of a non-optimized average citizen to outperform then tend towards zero. At the last Olympic Games - for the first time ever - a sprinter who had prostheses fitted in place of his amputated lower leg was not admitted. The reason was not that a disabled person would not have had a chance in the comparison. To the contrary, it was seen as a disadvantage for the uninjured.

What is true for the individual is also true for the collective on a national level. The rich states become more and more powerful because they can afford more optimized citizens. This development holds enormous explosive potential. It re-enforces hopelessness at the lower end and will lead to the "justified" assumption at the upper end that one is excessively superior.

To counteract this drifting apart of whole populations is one of the tasks of the association. Since it has no legislative powers, it could exert influence through private-sector mechanisms such as patent pools and targeted investments in high-tech companies. Instead of waiting for an international patent convention that would prohibit protective rights for human-machine interfaces, the association could build up its own portfolio and make it available to companies from poorer countries on an advantageous basis. If the companies involved in the association play along, a critical mass could quickly develop. The transfer of such patent portfolios to the association could be incentivized by reducing membership fees in return or by agreeing on a coded distribution of the profits generated. In any case, it will seem desirable to a large number of companies in such key technologies for humanity that there is not just one economic

operator who happens to hold the decisive patent and all other companies sink into insignificance. Broad access to such a man-machine portfolio enables competition in the matter, in the concrete implementation.

All in all, it seems reasonable to me not to guarantee a 20-year patent protection in this area, which is critical for human development. The span is too long and will drive the differences in the world too far apart. Technology such as man machine interfaces will become cheaper and more accessible after expiration of industrial property rights. A good and visible example of this mechanism are the generics in pharmaceutical industry. Three years could also be sufficient as investment protection. Again, for the legislator to act it will take decades until all major states have agreed on a common approach.

The patent pool of all major companies could be extended beyond human-machine interfaces to every critical application of a technology. The companies concerned could then agree on appropriate investment protection under the expert guidance of the association without having to rely on national legislators. As far as such a pool is also open to non-members under comparable conditions, this could probably also be arranged in conformity with cartel law.

In addition to creating supportive economic conditions, a fundamental ethical discussion is needed. As indicated at the beginning, our overall understanding of the importance of certain technologies on the humanity and planet would have to be developed. If Homo Sapiens continues to see himself as the center of the universe, sooner or later this will kill us all. I have already explained that the preservation of the planet, our spaceship Terra, must be a priority. I have also pointed out the risks of such utilitarian approaches. However, we have no alternative. The basis of humanism and religions is the perception that we are the smartest and strongest living beings on the planet. That will soon be wrong. How did we end up thinking that the planet and the whole universe were created for us? How could we build consensus that we rightfully have full control over all other living beings? Just until recently under the law they were treated as “things” not living beings. Same by the way with slaves just a few hundred years earlier. In the meantime, in some states there are minor from animal protection laws. Let us test some of our humanist beliefs. What, if aliens land on earth, who are smarter and stronger than we are? May they generalize our rules and start breeding us for food or labor - because now they are the smartest and strongest on earth? What about then Homo Deus, as Jouval Harari calls cyborgs and transgenic humans? Are they the new crown of creation? Should we wait until a prophet comes to them and justifies by his inspiration to exploit Homo Sapiens?

Can the degradation of Homo Sapiens be prevented permanently? I do not know. What is clear, is that we would do well to change our anthropocentric ethics already now. I

have already explained an adaptation of the categorical imperative under 1.3 and defined it as a central element of Terraism:

"Each individual acts in such a way that his/her will could serve as the basis for global rules that ensure the habitability of the earth in the long term and allow the individual to develop within the framework of his/her possibilities without discrimination, as long as this does not collide with the interests of other living beings. "

It is existential to establish this new idea in our minds, societies, and laws. To make this necessity clear will certainly be one of the most fundamental and difficult tasks of the terraistic association. In doing so, we stand against religions, against humanism and against the foundations of our exploitative, human-centered forms of society and market. Much enemy much ore!

3.2.2 Committee for genetically modified organisms

Even the German Ethics Council concluded in a statement in the summer of 2019 that the human germ line is not sacrosanct. It advocates future interventions in the germ line, provided the method is sufficiently safe and effective, under three circumstances: 1) to prevent serious hereditary diseases, 2) to reduce the risk of disease, and 3) to specifically **enhance human characteristics and capabilities (enhancement)**. The effectiveness and safety of the method still requires some research, especially the so-called mosaic formation has to be counteracted and it remains a current ethical challenge that for a genome analysis a cell has to be destroyed at present. Therefore, it is currently difficult to detect the desired change in the affected cell. One must wait until the cell divides. For animals, however, cloned female germ cell cultures have already been successfully created. With this, the altered germ cells can be multiplied in cultures and individual ones can be tested for success. Only then would the successfully edited cell nucleus be introduced into an egg cell. One could be sure of the successful modification of the gene sequence without interfering with of an embryo.

Genetically modified people are people in whom a genetic modification has been made in the fertilized egg, sperm, or stem cell. It is possible that gene sequences are switched off or those of other people are inserted. The aim is to prevent diseases, mitigate concomitant circumstances or to "design" healthy, especially beautiful, resistant, fast, smart or strong children. There are also other conceivable ways in already developed

humans to switch certain gene sequences on or off or to use virus taxis to specifically place certain gene sequences in all relevant cells.

The difference to the selection of a sperm donor in the sperm bank or the external fertilization of a selected mother with the sperm of a selected father is not spectacular from a purely genetically point of view. The same result can be achieved with targeted breeding. Of course, the selective intervention leaves uncertainties of interaction with other gene sequences. But to a certain extent, even this cannot be predicted at present in natural reproduction. Mutations that create completely new genetic combinations are also commonplace and an important part of evolution. There are also known cases in which people themselves - often caused by very strong experiences and traumas - subsequently auto-activate or deactivate certain genes. Ethically, one can argue about the path of active intervention by humans, but conceptually genetic modifications based on other human DNA is nothing new. The result of the mentioned procedures is a conscious modification of the genetic make-up of a human being from the human gene pool.

However, it is also possible that gene sequences from plants or animals are used in DNA enhancement. In such cases one speaks of "transgenic" interventions or beings. This is ethically more difficult to evaluate. The focus is more on innovative gene design and leads to results that would probably not occur in the natural germ line. Both in the first generation and in the long term, the results are hardly predictable for the population on earth. Over the millions of years of life on our planet, however, it is not new. It is normal that existing life forms disappear, and new ones emerge. In so far, we may also put our personal concerns into perspective. Based on the terraistic world view, one could formulate that the concern arises from the fact that current humanity (we), for some reason or another, takes itself especially important and considers itself - as it happens to be right now - to be the unchangeable crown of creation and evolution. A drastic change of our DNA would contradict the will of God who created us. However, the same God created the planet and evolution. Even beings with the ability to influence their genetic make-up and even develop transgenic ones are part of god's plan. Interestingly, many of us who do not believe in a God nevertheless share instinctively the same - difficult to justify, human-centered - worldview. I call this - for lack of better terms - a "humanistic religion" or a form of general anthropocentrism. This anthropocentrism only places the human being in the center of the world. It is part of such a belief system that mankind as he currently is the best imaginable one and it comes along with an undefined unease to intervene in his own evolutionary development. This "feeling" adds the religious dimension to such kind of anthropocentrism.

Are these discussions theoretical? Is it still possible - unlike cyborg technologies - to prevent existence of transgenic creatures? The answer is: No! Even the creation of

transgenic creatures is already happening today and now. The required technology is called CRISPER/Cas Scissors. It is not particularly expensive and is already being mastered by many people and companies in many countries around the world.

Only a few interventions on humans have become known so far. A Chinese researcher, who at least claims to have genetically instilled resistance to AIDS in his two children, has already been mentioned. In medicine, research is being conducted on the treatment of monogenic diseases and the germ line. Its application is being publicly discussed. Once again, we would like to refer to the very detailed statement of the German Ethics Council of June 2019, which states that in the case of monogenic diseases, there is an error in a defined gene sequence that certainly leads to a disease pattern during adolescence or at a later stage. The correction of a germline mutation in the BRCA1 gene, for example, could reduce the breast cancer risk of a woman affected by this form of familial breast cancer from about 75% to the "normal" about 12% of the female general population. Even better: after the gene has been altered, such woman's female children would also no longer be exposed to the extraordinary breast cancer risk. In this way, hereditary diseases could be "eradicated" or at least reduced in number. Would you wish for these possibilities for your child? This is not yet being done (publicly) because it would probably take a few attempts at the moment to have a fertilized egg with the successfully edited gene. And one could only take a sample cell at the embryonic stage, after cell division for verification purposes. But even in the case of "normal" in vitro fertilization, there are procedures (so-called pre-implantation diagnostics) in which fertilized eggs are not used and are disposed of. The threshold for application can therefore no longer be very high and depends largely on a social consensus as to when life begins and how interventions at this early stage are balanced against later burdens in life. Do we really believe that there will be a worldwide consensus for decades that no one questions or chooses to ignore? From monogenic to polygenic gene editing to enhancement, there are only many, tiny steps.

However, this would not yet be transgenic interventions in humans. Such are also not known up to now. But there are already thousands of transgenic beings produced by mankind – some of which are patented. With plants it is already widely known, but also with animals it is already common. A pig breed was created with the growth gene sequences of the housefly. They grow rapidly and generate enormous amounts of meat per unit of feed. Genetically modified goats produce an active substance in their milk that inhibits blood clot formation in humans. This so-called molecular farming is now a major emerging industry. Because of the ease of ethical justifications often these technologies start in the health industry. Should the patient die or ...? And again, we humans are not the first to be transgenic. The solar-powered sea snail *Elysia Chlorotica* forms the leaf pigment chlorophyll, which is necessary for photosynthesis, in its own skin. The necessary gene sequences are taken from the alga *Vaucheria*. What if we

could do the same? We could generate a significant part of our nutrition through sunlight on our green skin. What would that mean for the planet?

The pressure to act in this direction is growing with the opportunities that arise here and our ability to implement them safely. There are animals that are immune to cancer (for example naked mole and blind mice) and those that are extremely long-lived (for example Greenland sharks, turtles, macaws, and certain lobsters). A tropical jellyfish (*Turritopsis Dohrnii*) is relatively immortal due to special re-generation cells. The jelly fish will not die of a natural death and it is said that specimen have been found to be a few thousand years old. A Mexican amphibian grows whole body parts by itself ("Axolotl") if they are separated and ... The possibilities are almost unlimited in their combination applied to humans.

In contrast to cyborg technologies, transgenic changes in creatures capable of reproduction will enter the Earth's germ line and gene pool. This is critical because the long-term consequences are hardly predictable. The risk is matched by considerable temptations. The possibility alone of starting a cancer-free and particularly long-lived family is certainly attractive. We still lack knowledge of the interrelationships and we may have to become better at the targeted modification of sequences. But the technology is developing rapidly and is neither expensive nor particularly difficult. So, it will also come to humans, if it does not already unofficially happen. Instead of fighting against it, I think it would be more sensible to focus the discussion on framework conditions that could be helpful in this development. I do not see any reason for panic. It is nothing new for planet Earth: The snail *Elysia Chlorotica* does it and we already do it on other than human animals. If you don't take yourself too seriously as a *Homo Sapiens*, you will have to admit the great potential in it. People who live to be 400 years old would certainly plan and handle resources differently than they do today.

What does that mean for our terraistic association? First, the measures are comparable to those for cyborg technology. If living creatures and their production are patentable, a pool of protective rights at the terraistic association would certainly make sense. In the context of ethical development, the question of how society wants to deal with undesirable developments and what "undesirable developments" are in this context is even more important than in cyborg technology. Systems that capture non-viable organisms and enable them to reproduce artificially are probably of little use from a planetary conservation perspective. Conversely, the "producers" of these beings will have to be made responsible for enabling the creature to live in dignity. For this purpose, there will have to be insurances that permanently guarantee the financial feasibility of such obligations. Also, a self-obligation to insurance would be a good Collective Action. At this point it requires thus still substantial basis and public work of the association.

Furthermore, a voluntary commitment of the members to submit any new attempt to establish a globally uniform Ethics Committee would be desirable. This would ensure uniform standards at least for an application-oriented part of research and prevent the same mistake being made several times around the world. In addition, member companies could be obliged not to cooperate with research institutions that do not submit their work to this international commission. Such indirect bans have long been common practice in other areas. For example, many national legislations oblige their resident companies not to cooperate with economic operators who use child labor. Also, to combat corruption, some countries do not allow by law companies to work with companies where there are indications that they are corrupt. In Germany an extension to all human rights is currently being discussed. In this way, a welcome industrial ethic will be created. Unfortunately, nations are sometimes hesitant to follow such feasible and welcome concepts. The association could enforce this through collective actions and develop it into a new standard. Also, the insurance level for possible consequences of transgenic developments could thus become valid worldwide. Unlike nations, the association would also have its own, unbureaucratic and cross-border enforcement possibilities (see above).

3.2.3 Committee for longevity

Life prolonging measures are within reach. Cyborg technologies - whether artificial hearts or pacemakers - make it possible to continue living. However, these technologies, together with medicine, will probably only make the already possible human lifespan of 100+ years on average more often possible. Hormone cures for cell rejuvenation, transgenic interventions and icing technologies, however, promise to drastically prolong the period of time experienced by humans.

The ethical questions of this foreseeable development are not yet an active part of the social debate. As far as I know, it is still difficult to predict when and if these technologies and interventions will actually be successful. However, companies like Google- via Calico and others are beginning to invest considerable sums in this area. I think it would be desirable for an international commission of experts to examine the social consequences, assuming a life span of 200 years. What does this mean for the retirement age (67) and pensions? What health and social benefits can, and will society provide for 200-year-old citizens? Should there be temporary marriages? Do we need asset management rules for cryonized fellow human beings that will only wake up in decades to come? How do we deal with people who are impoverished in cryostasis? The search for the Fountain of Youth and the Philosopher's Stone has always energized humanity and has also led to controversy. To be active here in an accompanying and

translational way can mitigate conflicts and injustice in the future. Leaving this area to philosophers and science fiction authors could turn out to be a little short of reality.

3.2.4 Artificial intelligence committee

Artificial intelligence is no longer a vision, but omnipresent. Only the fields of application and the degree of intelligence will expand. Here, too, it makes more sense not to leave the need for regulation to the nations. A commission of experts led by a neutral organization and dealing with self-regulation issues seems to me to make much more sense conceptually. Otherwise, there is a danger that nations will outbid each other in terms of liberalism in the hope of competitive advantages for capital allocation. Moreover, similar to the situation with data protection, it is likely that some states will not deal with the issue properly at all. Some companies have already positioned their servers on ships in international waters to completely escape the arm of the law. Here, too, the power of collective actions is evident in the association. No company can operate its server farms in international waters without depending on other companies. Self-regulation in the industry therefore provides the best chances to close such loopholes.

Additionally, the question would also have to be answered as to when not only the protection of organic beings from artificial intelligence is required, but also the protection and involvement of artificial intelligence must be addressed. Where is the dividing line? We should start thinking before it happens. In our national politics, which are focused on short-term advantages and the management of the present challenges, I see hardly any strategic masterminds for questions of this kind. The book "Quality Land" by Karl Uwe Kling shows here - in a funny but thoughtful way - some of the serious questions that will come up. We would do well not to let Google, Facebook, Amazon & Co. take the lead on this topic. They are strongly driven by self-interest. What is needed is a strong global voice of terraists who are striving for an international framework.

3.2.5 Committee for paths to happiness

"Pursuit of Happiness" will be one of the central research and business areas of the future. We are already in the prequel in many areas of society.

Pharmaceuticals: In the field of psychological effective pharmaceuticals, the line between illegal drugs and pharmaceuticals will continue to blur. The opiate scandal in the USA is only the tip of the iceberg. The ability to focus on any given time, change the

mood, reduce distraction, and manipulate hormones that intensify sensation and binding are certainly useful in the right situation. The use undoubtedly also entails risks. So-called micro-dosing, in which stimulating drugs and pharmaceuticals are administered in very small quantities, is intended to prevent undesirable side effects like addiction and still release the invigorating stimulant. There can be no doubt that these developments will have an impact on societies and our lifestyle. In the long run, these issues will not directly endanger the continued existence of humanity and the planet. So why do we address it in this booklet?

The use of such "means to happiness" at school, university and work exerts considerable social pressure. It will become impossible to equal the ability to concentrate under the influence of drugs or by electrostimulation of the brain by mere practice or talent. While transgenic humans and cyborgs differ from the rest simply because they are different and probably need specialized training and working environments, in this case the unmodified Homo Sapiens is driven into a pharmaceutical and stimulant trap. This will lead to the danger of dependence and manipulation by companies - not only physical, but psychological or even factual. I am already now wondering why ADHD is diagnosed so frequently and treated mainly by taking pharmaceuticals in recent years. As a result, many children are officially on drugs as they go to school and get better grades due to increased concentration. To me personally this already seems to be a harbinger of the expected development. Preventing the use of these drugs in school and professional environments through lobbying, collective action, education, and transparency seems to me to be valuable - even if I cannot see at present how it endangers the existence of the planet. More happy and productive people, even if they live perhaps shorter lives, would principally not be our main challenge. One topic that is still unclear and hard to evaluate could be that the way we view the world and how we assess it under the influence of such drugs. Will it make people less aggressive? Do they tend to look at everything in an un-reflected positive way? Do they simply not care about the state of the world anymore?

Awareness and Spirituality: A relatively new and striving industry are the many expensive seminars designed to teach inner growth and happiness. The span is large and reaches from Tantra, over aura reading, self-experience courses, meditation up to trance, embodiment and neurolinguistic programming. There are hardly any state regulations in this area. From the point of view of the legal system it is simply a service - like ironing, car washing or wallpapering.

Of course, there is no right or wrong in something as personal as the search for happiness and inner peace. The right way for one person can be exactly be the wrong way for another person - because of his/her abilities, values, or personal disposition. Still, I find it astonishing that one must have a training as a cosmetician to cut nails and remove skin impurities, but the area of "self-discovery" is completely blank. Sure, one

must not be diagnostically or therapeutically active. But even understanding the line requires a certain amount of education. In this area, the association could provide a very basic training for everyone. Participants could then prove with a certificate that they uniformly respect certain boundary conditions and understand when and how to deal with difficult or clinical cases.

An overview of the various providers worldwide could also be provided on a homepage with evaluation by seminar participants. Perhaps, with a little research, it might even be possible to create a decision matrix for individual to see under which conditions, which awareness raising may be particularly promising. With a feedback loop one could train an artificial intelligence to come up with ever better and more individualized advice.

On top of that, it would make sense to integrate the competencies for one's own very personal path to happiness into state education from kindergarten onwards. Because one thing is clear: We will not save this world only through more sustainable energy sources, Homo Deus, and population control. It needs more people who are happy and pass on happiness. It needs more people who have found or worked hard enough to bring peace to the world. It does not matter which theory you apply - whether you call it an energy level, a spiritual level, a transformative force. In the end, the collective is made up of individual people and the more people are peaceful and happy, the more likely the result on a collective level becomes. So, the successful pursuit of happiness and balance of the individual is not just a private matter. The planet needs it. Those who work for more authentic, fear-free, peaceful, and happy children and grown-ups are working for the peace of the planet. A terraistic association should promote this on all levels.

3.3 Mission colonization of space

Another important aspect of Terraism is to give people a unifying goal. Something they can talk to each other about and get excited. Of course, you will not be able to reach everyone - but depending on the intensity of communication in this regard, there is a chance to inspire many across borders. The plan to colonize the universe creates room and inspiration for longer-term dreams. To draw upon the multiple facets of the change of perspective is - as explained above - part of the terraistic concept. I am firmly convinced that appropriate public relations work will also encourage other organizations and nation states to develop and pursue longer-term ideas again. As already mentioned, I consider the firm belief in the impossibility of realizing great ideas and dreams to be the saddest and most energy less of all utopias. Unfortunately, this belief

is probably contagious and drags many into an "I do not care a rap for it" and "it doesn't matter what I want" world.

The plans for achieving and implementing the goal of colonization of space should, in order not to miss their effect, pursue a non-discriminatory "One World" idea. Supportive would be global calls for proposals and idea competitions for colonization concepts as well as more technical global competitions for solving specific problems. It might also be interesting to develop a constitution for societies in this new habitat. Due to the scarcity of raw materials, food, oxygen and water, violations in this area are likely to be pursued much more intensively than would seem appropriate on our richly endowed earth. Some decisions would have to be made very quickly in this cramped habitat, while other decisions may favor the involvement of everyone. A new form of living together will have to be designed. From the discussion we can certainly deduce a few things for our spaceship Earth. In the past, we have benefited in everyday life on Earth, especially technically, from the advances in space travel. In the future, we should also start to draw ethical and political conclusions about how we live together on our planet.

I have already mentioned that the idea of a race of nations to colonize the moon seems quite undesirable to me. Do we really want to make the same mistakes in outer space that we make in maintaining nations on earth? A competition for resources in space quickly ends deadly for all involved. Short-term thinking may already at the beginning lose the chance for a permanent settlement. In any case, an association with members and companies from all states of the world, to which many states themselves belong, has a better chance to build up structures that reduce discrimination and would also be able to support men and women from poorer states and the poorer states themselves to participate. Without a global organization African and Latin American people, companies and states would be left high and dry.

Is a permanent colonization of space even thinkable? Is it conceivable that a terraistic association will take the lead here? If it were a pure fantasy, it could hardly have any effect. In any case, such a development does not seem to me to be excluded. On the one hand, the nations are dependent on the cooperation of private companies in any space mission, and on the other hand, there is time to convince the states and the community of states of the idea that instead of going to war, they should work together to ensure the peaceful spread of mankind in space. At least we can build an alternative and nourish the hope that nations - even if it takes several decades - will come to the reasonable conclusion that an independent third party can solve many problems that could otherwise threaten their existence.

4. How do "terraists" communicate?

After all the target discussions and the examination of the inner structures of a terraistic association, there are a few boundary conditions that I consider essential if such an association is to function.

For a virtual global organization, which also and especially lives from the integration of its members, a strong digital platform is required. This should not only include the general assembly, the elections but also an area for the representatives of the various types of members and religious representatives. It should also be a stage on which all participants can form opinions, communicate with each other, and discuss. On difficult topics of certain urgency, the opinion of the members could be asked in an advisory or even binding manner. Due to a lack of expertise, I consider - as already discussed - a "grassroots democratic" participation through binding opinion polls and referendums to be inappropriate for many issues outside of the value scale described earlier. Want another example? 90% of the British who voted on the BREXIT had no idea what they were voting on. If anything, they were emotionally triggered by their very immediate environment. Perhaps they would have preferred British instead of Polish service staff in their pub. Or maybe a German person "stole" their job in London. The economic effects in the domestic market are difficult to grasp, even for specialists. What does the joint, cross-border funding of research by the EU mean for the future security of the member states? The peace-making effect of the EU in a Europe shaken by decades of war? How important is the EU's foreign policy influence as a counterweight to the USA, Russia and China? Which statements used in election campaigns are true and which are not? How strong is an EU without the United Kingdom in its ranks? Each of these questions is more worthy of a doctorate thesis than a quick answer on a questionable ballot.

The information about and within the association should not be left to uncontrollable data kraken like Facebook, Google & Co. If such platforms are used, manipulation cannot be ruled out due to a lack of transparency both through data selection and evaluation. Open source or own tools would be necessary. The open source movement has a good and expandable portfolio and network. The internet presence of the association must be well organized and informative. The platform should be available without censorship to all members with a self-organizing concept. The articles of association and terms of use should clearly state that upon request an investigation will be launched to check contribution for their degree of truth. Outcomes will be shared in the respective forum. In case of not objectively untrue statements contributors need to be banned from using the platform for ever longer intervals the more often misconduct happens or in case of mal-intentional behavior fines would be possible and could

include a penal damage payment to personal victims. That concept will motivate to think before posting.

A system for digital authentication would have to be provided. This would not have to meet governmental requirements, but from a cyber security point of view it should go beyond a very simple password. Fingerprint scanners - which are now included in every cell phone - would be a possible approach. However, this would require members to own a smartphone. In this respect, another network-based solution is needed, for example via dongles. Addressing global citizens who are not connected to the net would be difficult. In terms of information technology, they would be disconnected and isolated. But they should also have a voice. I suggested earlier that such population groups should have the opportunity to cede their voice to a person or organization of their trust, who should then inform them independently. These organizations and persons need to be accredited by the association in order to ensure that information is largely objective and that they understand and promote Terraism.

5. Who pays, buys! Really?

An association must have some financial resources. This could be generated via donations. Greenpeace has a donation income of about 300 million €. Financial foundations would be a good guarantor for independence. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, which has already been cited several times, manages a donated capital of €30 billion and annual investments of approximately €2 billion.

At the beginning the association will likely depend on moderate membership fees. In contrast to donations, they enable a budget that can be planned. Especially for members who are private persons, financial contribution should not be made a prerequisite for membership. Otherwise one may exclude the poorer population strata from participation. My suggestion would be to encourage “voluntary membership fees” or re-occurring small donations from private individuals. Organizations and companies should pay a reasonable, minimum membership fee. Some of the earlier discussed activities from start-up participation, IP licensing, to self-production should reduce dependence on membership fees and donations over time.

Which rights and obligations are connected to membership and what would be a good participation structure in the association? I will again come up with some suggestions to steer up a thoughtful and detailed discussion. I know that some of the topics will be controversial.

5.1 Rights for persons

I suggest that natural persons should be admitted from the age of 16. At this age they are already expected/allowed to work in most jurisdictions. Who contributes to society should already have voting rights - at least in our association? Furthermore, puberty is largely completed at this age on average. From an evolutionary point of view, this is when they should take responsibility and challenge parents and older people. In many industrialized countries no changes happen after puberty. Education and training of a young person extends nowadays usually into the twenties. To counterbalance we should strive for an early effectiveness of young people in the association. In addition, inclusion from the age of 16 onwards prevents an ageing of the structures.

People above an age limit should no longer have a say in decision-making. This suggestion is certainly highly controversial. However, even today, most people above a certain age cannot (or do not want to) understand the possibilities and dangers of new technologies such as cyber-currencies, block chain and big data. The natural reaction is fear of change. This is already true now and everything indicates that technological changes will accelerate. So, despite some exceptions, I think it is healthy to exclude generally very young and very old individuals from direct influence due to a lack of knowledge of the world or willingness to change. Moreover, almost all older people are in the industrialized countries of the northern hemisphere because in developing countries medical care, nutrition balance, education, and hygiene is not yet good enough that a comparable average age is reached. In so far, my proposal would also promote equal opportunities in a global comparison between developing and developed regions.

5.2 Rights for organizations

Private legal entities participate in day to day live and have their own opinion-forming mechanisms. As such they should be able to become full members of the association and should - unlike nations (see below) - also have their own voting right. To repeat: A company like Walmart has over 2 million employees and a turnover of 500 billion. Volkswagen still has 670,000 employees and sales of 280 billion. By comparison, Liechtenstein has 26,000 citizens and annual revenues of 730 million euros. It is therefore understandable that the size of the organization - whether it is a non-profit organization or a commercial conglomerate - should be relevant to its importance within the association. To a certain extent, the organizations also represent the interests of their members in a specific area. In the case of non-profit organizations, this is self-evident and quite homogeneous. In companies, one can assume that at least in part the

interests of the employees at their workplace and working conditions are considered. I suggest taking the number of natural persons behind the organizations as a benchmark. If one were to take turnover as a criterion, banks would certainly be rated disproportionately high. They move a lot of money with few employees. Of course, these membership rights would have to work with membership numbers at certain key dates in order not to create a bureaucratic monster.

In the absence of practicable alternatives, it would have to be accepted that in elections, a member of the association whose employer is a member and who is perhaps also involved in a non-profit association would have multiple voting rights, at least indirectly. However, this may well be appropriate and at least provide a realistic picture in a networked society. Certain aspects of a living environment are represented independently. So, in sum, in my opinion the best of many unsatisfactory alternatives.

Of course, there will be separate committees for companies and non-profit organizations as well as for nations, in which collective actions will be agreed upon. In specific committees, only those affected will then be called upon to vote. Depending on the committee, the association's board of directors may propose specific voting procedures to prevent one or a few member organizations from blocking committee work.

In accordance with the right to vote, it is obvious that the membership fees of organizations should be based on the number of persons represented. The amount of the payment should not simply be based per capita on the membership fee of the average donation contribution of the individual. It should take the profitability of an organization into account. Non-profit organizations could, for example, be involved for symbolic fees.

5.3 Rights for states

The nations and their competition among each other are part of the problem. On the other hand, the terraistic goals can be reached faster and better with the cooperation of the nations. Therefore, some special features are required for their membership in the association.

Nations sometimes have many citizens, but even in the best democratic form they usually represent the interests of just over half the population. In autocratic forms, depending on the leadership, only very few citizens and elites may be represented. There are quite some other differences as compared to private organization. For one thing, it is usually possible to decide for or against certain employers and to change

them. Secondly, the representation of interests by companies is usually oriented towards the purpose of the company in terms of content. In contrast to most countries, most commercial enterprises will not interfere in religious, ethical, educational, family and similar issues. As always, exceptions confirm the rule. In the case of nations, however, this rule is to some degree reversed. In this respect, it is obvious that, unlike in other organizations, voting rights should not be based on the number of citizens. Instead, member states should have information rights and an advisory vote in the association. This increases transparency and thus also reduces concerns about the association's activities.

One would not relate the membership fees to the population size. This would have the advantage of keeping the entry threshold low, especially for states that are rich in population but financially poor. To further its goals and become even more effective, the association has an interest to have them on board. So instead of a membership fee, it would be the requirement to grant the association an advisory voice and a right to information in national committees in return for membership. All in all, this would create a learning cycle that would hopefully maintain or create understanding for each other.

The member states could then agree on collective actions in working groups similar to the companies. The mediation and arbitration offices of the association would be accessible for their enforcement. Each new national member would have to accept the already agreed upon contents of collective actions. This would also create an incentive for early membership and, again, an interesting dynamic. In terms of the association's goal, in addition to peacekeeping, which will probably not be easy at this point, fair access to resources, participation in space programs and the setting of minimum ethical standards for national legislation are crucial. Also, there may be preferential agreements with the association regarding its training projects. Conversely, support from nation states in effectively promoting the colonization of space will be welcome. Through membership, nation states also gain privileged access to the network of companies and organizations that are members of the terraistic association and have access to new planet-securing technologies and public relations bodies. This results in opportunities for cross cooperation, which in turn makes membership in the association more attractive for all parties involved.

6. Epilogue: 60 Pages of hot air?

If the idea of Terraism and the terraistic association were good promoters of change into the right direction, why does this association not already exist? Why do I write a

manifesto about the association and not just found it and make it happen? What are the stumbling blocks and risks? Good questions. Here are some answers:

Can a terraistic society become strong enough to make a difference? Greenpeace, Amnesty International and Asgardia are very scalable. The more people participate, the better. But even if only a few participate, they make a small contribution for a good cause. It cannot go wrong. In the case of the terraistic association, there are some concepts that only work if a critical mass of members is reached. A good example are the collective actions. They only work if many companies in a particular industrial sector participate. Otherwise, the companies that commit themselves to the principle of e.g. no more child labor in their own company and in their supply chain would end up at a disadvantage. Only if a significant number of companies join in, will there be enough pressure in the market to move suppliers. Some other ideas, such as the patent pool for socially critical and peacekeeping technologies, need at least sufficient financial resources to make a difference in the market. It is therefore fair to say that some aspects of the terraistic association can only be launched once a critical financial mass or number of participants has been reached.

Does the association only make sense over and above a certain threshold? Certainly not. As described, the association will also have goals and initiatives that are comparable to other non-profit organizations. The more of them, the better. Even a small beginning makes a difference. Planetary protection and public relations for education, terraistic philosophy and ethics will be meaningful at any scale. In some areas it will depend more on the quality of members and actions than on quantity. Who starts a constructive and goal-oriented dialogue with the Catholic Church on contraception? And above all, how is it conducted and with whom? Clearly, neither quality nor quantity is an excuse to put the issue on the back burner.

How should something like this be founded and develop? The association has a good chance to become strong quickly if social influencers get enthusiastic about the idea. It needs role models, who can embody and promote the ideals of Terraism in the public: Barack Obama, Richard Branson, Bill Gates could be such role models – but of course also younger social media influencers. Just take a look at the movement that Greta Thunberg started within a few months. In any case, there is a need for a few experienced public relations professionals. The desirable chance for rapid growth will be increased if at least some of them can focus on the topic professionally and full-time from the beginning. A relevant financial foundation or donation to the future association, or a re-dedication or expansion of an existing organization, could help to achieve this.

One of the new aspects is that in addition to natural persons, states, companies, and non-profit associations should also be members. With the nations, which are part of the problem, it will certainly be somewhat difficult in the beginning. Whoever takes the reins

would have to invite and convince CEOs of major corporations and representatives of large existing non-profit organizations right from the start. A possible crystallization point would be, for example, the World Economic Forum in Davos. A global claim and communication channel are open right away via the corporations and joining non-profit organizations. Another interesting question, for example, would be whether Asgardia is prepared to make the transition from a technology-oriented and fun-driven organization with good effects on people's sense of connection to a full-time world saver. It would also be conceivable that other non-profit organizations would join forces to cover partial aspects of the described association and found a kind of terraistic umbrella organization.

In whatever variant, the team of founding members would need to work out a charter and coordinate it among themselves before they approach the public in a media-effective action. Of course, there are other ways. Since it is high time for a change, speed and size are values in and of themselves. Founding the association just with a couple of friends in a coffee shop in Erlangen has such a low probability of becoming effective that I prefer to invest my limited time in essays like this one. When the seed comes up, I will be there.

As emphasized at the beginning, some of the ideas are - at least to my knowledge - relatively fresh and certainly need discussion, revision, and detailed study. Attention must also be paid to the fact that in turning away from our current total humanistic approach, inhuman or discriminatory interpretations do not undermine the goals of the association. If one already breaks with the prevailing opinion of humanism, there is a strong temptation to break with all existing ethics and to be intoxicated by the radicality of the new. That is not my approach. My idea may develop slowly and should be discussed thoroughly before it is implemented. Swinging pendulums tend to cause mischief.

Finally, in my view, some of the solutions proposed in this essay can also be applied, with some modification, to the further development of our liberal democracies and associations of states. For - despite all the justified criticism of democracy - there is currently no better form of society. However, it is time to courageously develop it further. Otherwise the incompetence, lack of flexibility and inefficiency inherent in the current system will drive democracy as a form of government into the abyss. Dissatisfaction is palpable everywhere and is blossoming wildly in the world.

Last but not least: It is unclear whether and how a terraistic association will develop. But if this booklet contributes to the understanding that the universe was not created for us – but that we have the honor to live in it. If it sharpens the view that we humans in

our present form are anyway only a snapshot in the 3.5 billion years of evolution. If it clarifies that we must prepare ourselves for a foreseeable future, which we should embrace instead of fearfully preventing. If there are aspects that make individuals, companies, associations, and organizations think. Then the time for writing down these thoughts was very much worthwhile.

Once again: The present life is so much fun and I see so much potential in humans that I personally like to support the chance of Homo Sapiens to develop further into something new. You do not have to see it that way. But if you agree with my opinion, you will not get around realizing that we have to do something different.