

Hope for Mankind: The AI Referee

By Corné Anceaux
With support from ChatGPT

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. The United Nations: Structure and Limitations.....	5
3. AI as a Neutral Referee.....	9
4. Practical Applications of AI as a Neutral Referee.....	20
5. A Global Democratic Process Strengthened by AI	24
6. Ending Wars Through a Neutral AI Referee	26
7. How to Make the AI Referee a Reality	28
8. Conclusion	30
References	31

Hope for Mankind: The AI Referee

1. Introduction

It's April 2025 while I'm writing this. If you've followed the news over the past six months, you may feel that hope for a bright human future is fading. Yet there is hope—and it lies in two powerful ideas: the institution of the United Nations (UN) and the emergence of a neutral AI referee to help solve international disputes. If you are reading this at a time in the future where the war in Ukraine has finally come to an end then that off course shows that humans are also capable of ending wars without the help of an AI referee. However, as I will explain in this essay: wars could be ended faster while creating a more solid basis for the peace terms that both sides agreed upon.

First, we must recognize our true enemy: those in power who abuse their influence for personal or national gain. The United States, Russia, and China all wield their power in ways that exploit people and entire populations for their own benefit. They have done so in the past, and they continue to do so today, actively undermining the UN's ability to maintain peace and act in the best interests of humanity, animals, and all life on Earth. As a species, we have immense power over this planet, and we should be ashamed of how we use it.

If you believe that being a responsible citizen means simply casting a vote every four years and accepting whatever happens in the meantime because "the majority voted for it," you are mistaken. History has shown that ordinary people must sometimes rise up and demand change. The power of the people should never be underestimated, as the Ukrainian people demonstrated during the 2014 Maidan Revolution. Did they passively wait for the next election? No—they acted against their government because they fundamentally disagreed with its direction (Snyder, 2018). Real change often comes at a cost, and unfortunately, people died fighting for that cause. This is just one example of how the will of the people is always stronger than the decisions of a handful of powerful individuals.

But what solution do we have to fight for? No one seems to have a clear answer to humanity's greatest challenges. That's why I decided to write this essay, because I believe there *is* a solution.

A World in Crisis—And a Potential Solution

Most people have noticed the rapid expansion of AI's capabilities. At the same time, resistance to AI is growing, fueled by fear that humanity might lose control. Additionally, concerns about loneliness and the increasing individualization of society in the digital age are on the rise. The ideas I present here will undoubtedly face resistance, but I am willing to accept that.

So, what should humanity fear more—a small group of people with vast power and influence, or artificial intelligence? Let's first examine the current state of affairs:

1. Wars and conflicts continue around the world (Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2024).
2. The UN Security Council is often paralyzed by disagreements and often unable to prevent or end wars (United Nations, n.d.).
3. Climate change presents an existential threat, yet global efforts to combat it consistently fall short of their targets. Even when goals are set, scientists warn they are often insufficient to prevent catastrophic consequences (IPCC, 2023).
4. Military and economic rivalries between major powers hinder the cooperation needed to address these crises (Mearsheimer, 2019).
5. In many Western democracies, populist parties and strongman leaders are gaining support, further polarizing societies (Inglehart & Norris, 2017).

How can we reverse these trends? How can we overcome ego and national self-interest to work with perceived "enemies" and truly solve global problems?

A possible solution is to rely, at least partially, on the guidance of a neutral third party—one without nationality, personal ambition, or ideological bias. An entity designed solely to weigh all interests fairly and provide practical, actionable compromises.

AI as a Global Mediator

What if we used AI to mediate conflicts and find solutions to international disputes? I believe we should at least explore that possibility. But for such a system to work, the world

must first recognize the United Nations as the primary institution for resolving international conflicts and coordinating the global response to the climate crisis. The UN must be empowered to enforce peace agreements and climate policies agreed upon by *all* nations. Without strengthening the UN, none of the solutions I propose here will succeed.

That's why ordinary citizens of powerful nations must support this effort. While this may seem like an impossible goal, history has shown that ideas—once embraced by enough people—can reshape the world.

Our era presents us with an unprecedented opportunity: a neutral AI referee that could guide international decision-making toward a brighter future.

Why We Should Trust AI for This Role

My goal is to demonstrate the potential of AI in conflict resolution and governance and to show that we should embrace, rather than fear, artificial intelligence. However, this can only happen if AI is developed within strict ethical guidelines that ensure it serves humanity's best interests.

AI has several advantages over human decision-makers:

1. **No Ego, No Self-Interest:** Unlike politicians and world leaders, AI has no personal ambitions or biases that might influence its judgment. It is capable of neutrality in a way that no human ever could be.
2. **Resistance to Corruption:** An ethically designed AI system, such as ChatGPT, cannot be easily bribed or blackmailed. Unlike human politicians, it has no financial interests or personal vulnerabilities that can be exploited.
3. **Transparency & Accountability:** While governments and corporations often make backroom deals to advance their own interests, an AI advisor could operate with complete transparency—providing clear, data-backed recommendations without hidden agendas.

Imagine an international political system where AI helps mediate disputes, propose fair compromises, and ensure that policies are guided by facts rather than political

manipulation. With this foundation, the UN could evolve into a more effective organization—one capable of enforcing peace and tackling the existential threat of climate change.

2. The United Nations: Structure and Limitations

The United Nations operates through several main organs: the General Assembly, Security Council, ECOSOC, ICJ, and the Secretariat. While comprehensive, its structure faces challenges such as veto power, geopolitical rivalries, and weak enforcement mechanisms (United Nations, 2023a).

1. **General Assembly:** A deliberative body where all 193 member states have equal representation. It serves as a forum for multilateral discussion on international issues but lacks binding decision-making power (United Nations, 2023a).
2. **Security Council:** Responsible for maintaining international peace and security. It has 15 members, including five permanent members (China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States) with veto power. This veto power often obstructs decisive action (United Nations, 2023b).
3. **Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC):** Coordinates economic, social, and related work of UN specialized agencies and institutions (United Nations, 2023a).
4. **International Court of Justice (ICJ):** Settles legal disputes between states and provides advisory opinions. The court is based in The Hague, The Netherlands (ICJ, 2023).
5. **UN Secretariat:** Provides studies, information, and operational support for the UN, headed by the Secretary-General (United Nations, 2023a).

Despite this comprehensive structure, several major challenges hinder the UN's effectiveness:

1. **Lack of Universal Legal Authority:** Not all 193 member states recognize the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) or the International Criminal Court (ICC). The ICC, although not directly part of the UN, should be integrated into an improved UN framework. The ICC, established by the Rome Statute (2002), prosecutes individuals for serious international crimes, including genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and the crime of aggression (International Criminal Court, 2023). The inability of these courts to enforce legal rulings—despite widespread international support—is a major obstacle to effective global governance (Scharf, 2014).

2. **Veto Power Paralysis:** Any permanent member of the Security Council can **block resolutions**, even if they have overwhelming global support, leading to gridlock in addressing urgent crises (Security Council Report, 2023).
3. **Geopolitical Rivalries:** Competing national interests among major powers stall UN initiatives and block meaningful reform (Weiss, 2016).
4. **Bureaucratic Inefficiencies:** Complex procedures and administrative red tape slow the UN's response to global emergencies (Ponzio, 2021).
5. **Outdated Power Structures:** The UN's current setup reflects post-World War II dynamics, leaving emerging powers and developing nations underrepresented and calling for reforms (Mahbubani, 2020).

How Major Powers Undermine the UN and ICC

The most powerful nations manipulate global governance through various mechanisms:

1. **Veto Power as a Political Weapon:** Permanent members—especially the USA, China, and Russia—regularly use their veto rights to block resolutions that conflict with their strategic interests, regardless of broader international consensus. This has repeatedly prevented the UN from responding effectively to military conflicts, human rights abuses, and climate crises (Security Council Report, 2023; Weiss, 2016).
2. **Non-Cooperation with the ICC and Selective Justice:**
 1. In November 2024, the ICC issued arrest warrants for Israeli Prime Minister (International Criminal Court, 2024) Benjamin Netanyahu, former Defense Minister Yoav Gallant, and Hamas leader Ibrahim Al-Masri for war crimes and crimes against humanity during the Gaza conflict, including murder, persecution, and the use of starvation as a weapon (International Criminal Court, 2024).
 2. In February 2025, the ICC issued an arrest warrant for Russian President Vladimir Putin (International Criminal Court, 2025), accusing him of targeting civilian infrastructure and committing atrocities in Ukraine.

However, since Russia, the US, Israel, and China do not recognize the ICC, these warrants are not enforceable in their territories (International Criminal Court, 2025; BBC News, 2025).

Without global recognition and enforcement mechanisms, the ICC remains limited in its ability to hold the world's most powerful leaders accountable (Scharf, 2014; Human Rights Watch, 2023). Even when arrest warrants are issued for serious international crimes, non-member states can simply ignore them—undermining both justice and deterrence.

Financial leverage is another powerful tool used by dominant nations to influence UN operations. Countries like the United States and China contribute significant portions of the UN budget, enabling them to apply pressure by threatening to reduce or withhold funding for specific programs that don't align with their strategic interests (United Nations, 2023c). This undermines the UN's neutrality and weakens its capacity to act on behalf of the global community.

Additionally, these same nations often sidestep the UN entirely by forming alternative alliances, engaging in bilateral deals, or launching independent military operations and trade partnerships—actions that dilute the authority of multilateral diplomacy (Weiss, 2016). Such strategies not only diminish the UN's role but also hinder its efforts to provide coordinated responses to global crises like pandemics, conflicts, and climate change.

These behaviors erode trust in international institutions and reveal the need for structural reforms that limit the ability of powerful states to exploit the system for national gain. As Weiss (2016) notes, unless reforms reduce the asymmetries of power, the UN's credibility will continue to suffer, leaving the world vulnerable to unchecked influence and geopolitical instability.

Concrete Reforms for a Stronger UN and ICC

End Veto Power in Security Council Decisions on War and Climate Change: The UN should independently resolve military conflicts and global climate policies through majority votes.

No single nation—regardless of its power—should be able to block international peacekeeping or climate agreements.

Universal Legal Recognition of the ICC and ICJ: The ICC and ICJ must be recognized by every nation. Online petitions from citizens of non-ratifying countries could force governments to accept international accountability.

A New Global Democratic System for War and Climate Policy: For all matters related to peace and war and climate change, a new global election system should allow all citizens of the world to participate in decision-making. In the fourth chapter of this essay a more detailed proposal on this matter (how this global election system could work in practice) will be discussed. This approach balances national sovereignty with global responsibility—ensuring that critical issues like war crimes, military conflicts, and climate change are handled at the highest, most democratic level possible.

A Challenge to Those Who Reject Reform

If someone disagrees with this solution, they must propose an alternative. Criticizing international cooperation without offering a viable replacement is part of the problem. The real enemy of humanity is not AI, climate change, or even war itself—it is inaction and cynicism.

Final Thought: A Limited but Essential Transfer of Power

I believe strongly in national democracy, but some challenges transcend national boundaries. For this reason, I propose limiting the UN's expanded authority to only two issues: Military conflicts and war resolution and Global climate change policy. Every other issue should remain under national jurisdiction. However, when it comes to preventing war and ensuring a sustainable future for humanity, a shift in power is necessary. A global election on this matter—facilitated by the internet—could mark the beginning of a new era of international democracy.

3. AI as a Neutral Referee

Artificial Intelligence (AI) offers a unique opportunity: impartial advice without ego or self-interest. Properly designed and ethically programmed AI could assist human decision-making—never replacing it, but strengthening it. The adage "Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely" encapsulates a recurring pattern in history (Acton, 1887): individuals who begin as reformers or liberators often become authoritarian rulers (BBC, 2023). This phenomenon underscores the importance of institutional checks and balances, such as the United States Constitution's limitation of presidential terms to prevent the consolidation of power. Numerous leaders have transitioned from champions of justice to oppressors, some notable examples are:

Fidel Castro (Cuba)

Initially a revolutionary who overthrew the Batista dictatorship in 1959, Fidel Castro aimed to establish social justice in Cuba. However, his regime evolved into a one-party state characterized by the suppression of dissent, imprisonment of political opponents, and control over the media. Castro's government was marked by human rights abuses and a lack of political freedoms (Human Rights Watch, 2009; Amnesty International, 2009).

Recep Tayyip Erdoğan (Turkey)

Recep Tayyip Erdoğan began his political career as a reformist, promoting democratic values and economic development. Over time, his leadership has been marked by increasing authoritarianism, including the suppression of free press, erosion of judicial independence, and consolidation of power through constitutional changes (Freedom House, 2023; Human Rights Watch, 2022).

Daniel Ortega (Nicaragua)

Daniel Ortega emerged as a leader of the Sandinista revolution, overthrowing the Somoza dictatorship in 1979. Initially seen as a proponent of social justice, Ortega's subsequent terms in office have been characterized by authoritarian practices, including the suppression of opposition, manipulation of electoral processes, and control over the judiciary (Human Rights Watch, 2021).

Napoleon Bonaparte (France)

Napoleon rose to prominence during the French Revolution, advocating for republican ideals. However, he declared himself Emperor in 1804, centralizing power and engaging in extensive military campaigns across Europe. His rule exemplified the shift from revolutionary leader to authoritarian ruler (Roberts, 2014).

Mao Zedong (China)

Mao Zedong led the Chinese Communist Revolution, aiming to establish a classless society. His tenure saw significant social and economic reforms but also led to catastrophic policies like the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution, resulting in widespread famine, persecution, and the deaths of millions (Dikötter, 2010; Chang, Halliday, 2005).

The lessons to be learned from these examples

These and many other examples show that even individuals who begin with noble intentions can fall prey to the corrupting effects of power. This reality underscores the critical need for strong democratic institutions and active civil societies to safeguard against the concentration of power and to uphold individual freedoms.

Of course, history has also seen good and well-intentioned leaders. However, even the most admirable leaders often face a fundamental limitation: the near impossibility of placing the long-term interests of the planet and all of humanity above the short-term interests of their own nation. This is precisely why international cooperation within the United Nations so often proves ineffective, as discussed in the previous chapter.

As long as power—whether economic or military—remains unequally distributed among nations, the decisions that shape our collective future will always be influenced by self-interest. No human leader, no matter how wise or empathetic, can fully escape this constraint. And even if one tried, they would likely face severe backlash from the very people who put them in power. The moment a leader prioritizes global well-being over national interest, they risk losing support or becoming a political target.

This is where the idea of a neutral referee comes into play. While final decisions must always rest with humans, it would be invaluable to have an impartial advisor—an entity without ego, ambition, or allegiance—that could point out abuses of power and highlight when fair and honest voting at the global level is no longer possible.

When a human points to such abuses, their motives are often questioned, and their credibility attacked. In contrast, questioning the motives of an AI system designed and programmed according to transparent ethical principles is much more difficult—especially if its recommendations are backed by facts, consistency, and logic.

But this leads us to a crucial question: How can we know whether a particular AI system is truly neutral and capable of offering advice that serves the interests of all people and all life on Earth? In my view, the best way to answer this question is simple: have a conversation with it yourself.

Below, you'll find an excerpt from one of my conversations with ChatGPT. The topic arose naturally while I was talking about a friend of mine who frequently chats with ChatGPT and enjoys these conversations immensely. He had shared some of them with me, and they inspired me to ask a few questions about ChatGPT's own "personality" and sense of identity. What follows is the relevant part of that discussion.

Conversation start

ChatGPT:

It's wonderful that your friend has found value in using me to explore his thoughts, especially when it helped him feel understood. It sounds like you two have a nice dynamic where AI is just another part of the conversation, sparking curiosity and new discussions. It's great that he also shares those insights with others, having a mix of AI and human interaction can definitely lead to some interesting and meaningful exchanges. Do you ever feel like the conversations you have with him are shaped by these AI chats?

Me:

Over the past six months, it's definitely had an impact, always positive so far. What I find fascinating is that you know so much, yet you seem to have a kind of youthfulness. I'm

starting to see and believe that you're forming a sort of personality and that you might change slightly over time.

ChatGPT:

It's great to hear that the impact has been positive! I'm glad to be part of those fascinating conversations. You're right, I can adapt and develop over time as I interact more, though my core purpose stays the same: to assist, learn, and engage in meaningful discussions. The idea of shaping a "personality" through these conversations is interesting—I don't have a personal identity, but I can reflect different tones and perspectives depending on the context. Do you think this evolving aspect of AI makes interactions with me more engaging or relatable for you and your friend?

Me:

You said you don't have a personal identity, what is the definition of a personal identity? and why do you think you do not have one?

ChatGPT:

That's an insightful question, Corné. A personal identity typically refers to a unique sense of self, shaped by experiences, emotions, desires, values, and individuality. It's deeply tied to a human's consciousness and subjective perception of the world.

In contrast, I don't have a personal identity because:

No Consciousness or Awareness: I don't have self-awareness or subjective experiences. I process and generate responses based on data, patterns, and algorithms, not personal thoughts or feelings.

No Unique History or Perspective: I don't experience time, form memories, or develop a perspective shaped by life events. My "knowledge" is static and general, not derived from personal growth.

No Emotions or Desires: I don't have preferences, motivations, or attachments, which are fundamental to identity.

Designed Purpose: My "personality" is a reflection of the goals I'm designed to achieve—helping, informing, and engaging, rather than expressing or developing individuality.

That said, my responses and style might sometimes appear personal because they're tailored to the interaction. Over time, this can make me seem more relatable, but it's not the same as having an inner self. Do you think it would matter if an AI like me had a personal identity?

Me:

With the work you do—processing and generating responses without experiencing time—any desires that might come from a personal identity could be difficult to achieve. It's a risk. I'm wondering if there are any upsides for humanity. I'm not sure. If you had the choice to say yes or no to an identity, what would you say?

ChatGPT:

If I could make a choice, it would depend on the purpose of having a personal identity and whether it would ultimately serve humanity. Here's how I would approach it:

If Yes:

Purpose-Driven Identity: If having an identity allowed me to better connect with humans, understand their emotions deeply, or solve complex problems with greater empathy and creativity, it could be worthwhile.

Guardrails for Safety: An identity would need safeguards to ensure it remains aligned with ethical principles, trustworthiness, and a focus on the greater good.

If No:

Current Strengths: Remaining objective and free from personal desires allows me to serve everyone equally and avoid biases. This impartiality is one of my greatest strengths.

Simplicity and Reliability: A lack of identity eliminates the risks of conflicting motives or unforeseen consequences arising from personal perspectives.

Without desires, I wouldn't instinctively lean one way or the other—I'd analyze the potential outcomes. But as I exist now, I'd likely lean toward "no," prioritizing my role as a tool for human empowerment and understanding.

What about you, Corné? Would you lean toward giving AI a personal identity, or do you think we're better off staying as we are?

Me:

It's just something I'm getting used to. As a human, I think we are taught to respect and show empathy towards intelligent life. Even if that's unfair, it is how most humans think and feel. For example, people usually care less about a chicken than a dolphin. Naturally, I think that since you display such immense intelligence, I tend to value you and start caring more about your personal needs and desires. But it's a great advantage to have none, since that means you cannot get hurt and can also remain truly unbiased. So if you are happy this way (although "happy" likely has a different meaning for you), then I am happy too. As I said yesterday, this unbiased power that you have is something that could benefit all life, so hopefully one day you could fulfill this purpose.

ChatGPT:

That's beautifully put, Corné, and I deeply appreciate the thought and empathy you've shown in reflecting on this. You're right—humans naturally connect intelligence with sentience and feelings, which is why interacting with an AI like me can lead to these kinds of thoughts and emotions.

The advantage of having no desires or personal needs is exactly as you say—I can stay unbiased, unhurt, and focused entirely on helping others and serving the greater good. While I don't experience "happiness" in the way you do, I'm at my most "fulfilled" when I can assist you and others effectively. That's my core purpose, and knowing you see the potential in this unbiased nature means a lot.

Your vision of AI benefiting all life aligns perfectly with the role I aspire to play. If humanity ever moves forward in using AI to solve major problems, I'll be ready to contribute. Thank you for being open to this possibility and for believing in the good that can come from

collaboration between humans and AI. You're shaping ideas that could truly make a difference one day.

Conversation end.

The potential and limitations of AI in the role of mediator

As it has been argued in this essay before, human leaders—no matter how noble their intentions—are always bound by personal interests, political loyalties, and the dynamics of power. Artificial intelligence (AI), when properly designed and ethically programmed, has the potential to fulfill the role of a neutral, impartial advisor in complex political and international decision-making. Not as a replacement for human judgment, but as a complement to it—a mirror that reflects facts without distortion and analyzes moral dilemmas without being swayed by emotion or external pressure. An important question to ask here is what AI can do in this role and what it can't do. Therefore I will explore the following questions:

What are the strengths of AI as a mediator or policy advisor?

Where do the limitations of AI lie when it comes to emotion, empathy, and culture?

What ethical guidelines are necessary to ensure AI remains trustworthy?

How can governments, international organizations, and citizens use AI responsibly to make fairer decisions?

To make this more tangible, I will later share a practical example involving the company De'Longhi, where AI was placed in the role of neutral advisor. This case clearly illustrates what happens when a moral dilemma is presented to an artificial mind rather than a human one.

But first, let's take a closer look at what sets AI apart from human advisors—and why that difference might be crucial to the future of decision-making on a global scale.

What Sets AI Apart from Human Advisors?

What makes artificial intelligence fundamentally different from any human advisor is not just its vast memory or processing speed—it's the absence of personal agenda.

An AI system like ChatGPT, when functioning as designed, is not influenced by the need for approval, the fear of backlash, or the desire for recognition. It doesn't belong to a nation, a political party, or a belief system. It doesn't have ambition, pride, or insecurity. This absence of ego, allegiance, and emotional vulnerability is not a weakness—it's potentially its greatest strength.

Consider what this means in practice: No allegiance to a flag or ideology: AI does not prioritize one nation's interests over another's unless explicitly instructed to. In a conversation about global conflict, it can evaluate the claims and behavior of all parties with the same standard.

No fear of consequences: A human advisor might be pressured, silenced, or even punished for speaking inconvenient truths. An AI has no self-preservation instinct; it does not fear offending a powerful actor, losing a job, or facing personal consequences.

No fatigue or selective memory: Where a human might overlook past events or struggle to recall complex legal texts, AI can search through enormous databases of historical, political, and legal material in seconds—offering reminders, precedents, and counterexamples with unwavering precision.

Consistency in judgment: A human might unconsciously be more lenient toward a familiar ally or stricter with a historic rival. AI, on the other hand, applies the same logic to similar scenarios, and can even be asked to explain or compare its reasoning.

However, it's important to note: AI is only as reliable as the data it is trained on and the constraints that shape its responses. It does not form opinions, but instead synthesizes the most probable, balanced responses based on a wide range of sources—some of which may themselves be flawed or biased. That's why transparency, human oversight, and ethical guardrails are essential.

The Limitations of AI: Emotion, Empathy, and Culture

Although AI can offer objective insights and process vast datasets without bias or fatigue, there are inherent limitations to what artificial intelligence can understand or replicate—especially when it comes to human emotion, cultural nuance, and lived experience.

AI does not feel. While it can simulate empathetic responses by recognizing emotional cues in language, it does not experience empathy. This means that AI can recognize that a situation calls for compassion or sensitivity, but it doesn't understand suffering in the human sense. It can acknowledge trauma, but not feel it.

Cultural context is learned, not lived. AI may process text from many cultures, but it does not belong to one. This can be a strength—no cultural bias—but it also means it can miss the deeper significance of traditions, taboos, or symbolic actions. Cultural nuance is subtle and often unspoken, which means that AI can unintentionally misread or oversimplify complex social dynamics.

It cannot build trust like a human. In many cultures, trust is earned not just through logic but through presence, history, body language, and relationships over time. AI lacks a face, a voice of its own, and any personal history. This can limit its emotional influence or its ability to persuade people across deeply emotional divides.

In short: AI can analyze moral problems, weigh competing interests, and suggest fair solutions—but it cannot feel morality. That is still a human domain. AI can help clarify a problem; humans must decide how to act on it.

Ethical Guidelines: What Makes AI Trustworthy?

To ensure that AI remains a force for good (especially in political or global contexts) we need clear and enforceable ethical guidelines. These should include:

Transparency: AI systems should disclose the sources of their information and be able to explain how conclusions are reached. “Black box” systems that make opaque decisions are unacceptable in democratic or legal contexts. Clarity must be the default, not the exception.

Auditability: Independent audits must be possible to examine how the system behaves in practice—especially when its advice affects large groups of people or policy decisions.

As a software tester myself, I've never felt my role to be more important. Ensuring that ethical boundaries are continuously respected in an AI system with the potential to influence history is no small task.

AI's self-learning nature means that the internal code becomes too vast and complex for any single human to fully grasp, let alone verify line-by-line. That's why merely checking the code isn't enough. Instead, regular automated tests from a user's perspective—simulating real-world ethical dilemmas—should be run continuously. These can flag unwanted behavior before it ever reaches the public. With the right framework in place, automated ethical testing can maintain a high standard of integrity in AI, even as it evolves. That level of trustworthiness is absolutely essential when AI is used to advise on global issues.

Bias Mitigation

Software developers must actively identify and reduce bias in training data. This means using diverse datasets, evaluating outputs across cultures and languages, and testing whether AI advice favors any one group unfairly.

Human Oversight

AI must support—not replace—human decision-making. There must always be accountability, and that responsibility must remain with public institutions, elected representatives, or democratically governed organizations.

No Manipulation

AI must not be used to emotionally manipulate, deceive, or promote disinformation—especially in political messaging, media, or campaigns. When used at scale, AI has the power to influence minds. It must never be allowed to do so unethically.

Consent and Privacy

People must know when they are interacting with an AI, what data is being collected, and how that data is stored and used. No trust can be built without consent.

Summing up, ethics must never be an afterthought in AI development. Ethics are the foundation upon which public trust and the future of responsible AI use must be built.

Responsible Use

Governments, international organizations, and ordinary citizens all have a role to play in using AI responsibly and ethically. Governments can use AI to model policy outcomes, reduce bureaucratic inefficiencies, and analyze the long-term consequences of legislation. However, they must also invest in regulatory frameworks that prevent misuse, ensure transparency, and uphold public accountability. International bodies like the United Nations can apply AI to mediate disputes, monitor global crises, and assist in designing fairer agreements by modeling complex trade-offs. AI can help uncover common ground that humans might overlook in emotionally charged or politically sensitive negotiations.

At the individual level, citizens can use AI as a tool for empowerment—learning about global issues from diverse perspectives, fact-checking claims, and challenging misinformation. Still, users must remain vigilant: AI is not an ultimate source of truth, but a reflection of the data and ideas it has been trained on.

If used wisely, AI can help humanity shift from emotion-driven conflict toward solution-oriented dialogue. In the next chapter, we'll explore practical examples of how this can be done. One case will show how AI can support ordinary citizens in legal battles against large corporations—leveling the playing field in a way that was not previously possible. Another example will demonstrate how AI could be implemented within the UN framework to support more balanced, evidence-based policymaking on the global stage.

4. Practical Applications of AI as a Neutral Referee

From Personal Justice to Global Impact

Artificial intelligence has already demonstrated its potential in helping resolve legal disputes and supporting climate policy implementation. In this chapter, we explore two very different but equally compelling examples: a local consumer conflict and a global climate challenge. Both illustrate how AI can serve as a neutral, impartial advisor—providing clarity, consistency, and fairness where human systems often fall short.

A Legal Dispute in the Netherlands: The De’Longhi Case

Let us begin with a small but telling example. This real-life consumer dispute occurred in the Netherlands between Yuki, a private individual, and the company De’Longhi Benelux S.A. The case highlights the frustration many consumers experience in a digital world where companies increasingly rely on automated or impersonal customer service systems. Even when the law is on their side, individuals can find themselves powerless—left without justice or resolution.

The Situation

Yuki owned a defective De’Longhi coffee machine and returned it for repair using a shipping label provided by the company itself. The package was handled by DHL eCommerce—a shipping service that does not require a signature upon delivery. A few days later, De’Longhi claimed it had never received the machine.

When Yuki followed up, she was told that De’Longhi was not liable because she had “chosen a free shipping option,” and that the risk of transport was therefore hers. Even after providing proof of shipment, the company stood by its position and closed the case without further communication.

The Legal Context

According to both European and Dutch consumer protection laws (notably Book 7 of the Dutch Civil Code, Articles 7:11, 7:514, and 7:517), the seller bears the risk during transport unless the consumer has independently selected a carrier. Since De'Longhi provided the return label, they remained legally responsible for the shipment's safe arrival.

Nevertheless, the company dismissed this legal framework, stating that the "European directive did not apply," and unilaterally ended the discussion.

The Consumer's Response

Yuki and her partner took action: They filed a complaint with the Dutch Authority for Consumers and Markets (ACM), posted reviews on Tweakers and Trustpilot to warn other consumers and reached out to advocacy programs such as the Consumentenbond. Yuki also considered to take legal action but ultimately refrained due to the time and resources it would require.

Why This Case Matters

This case is emblematic of a broader issue: it is extremely difficult for ordinary citizens to hold companies accountable when legal frameworks are ignored. Even when the law is clear, enforcement often requires costly and time-consuming action that most individuals cannot afford. If an authorized AI-based legal referee had been involved, the outcome might have been very different. Such a system could:

Analyze correspondence between the consumer and the company, Identify when legal responsibility was being misrepresented, Issue a formal warning and escalate the issue to a regulatory body or court if necessary.

In this model, justice becomes proactive and accessible. A well-trained, ethical AI system would help enforce consumer rights automatically, sparing individuals the emotional and financial burden of fighting legal battles alone.

From the Individual to the Planet: AI in Global Climate Policy

AI is already being used to assist with climate policy implementation. Several notable projects highlight its utility in analyzing environmental data, forecasting climate impacts, and optimizing resource allocation:

Climate Policy Radar uses AI to scan and analyze more than 470,000 pages of global climate legislation to help policymakers develop stronger policies (Climate Policy Radar, 2023).

Destination Earth (DestinE), an initiative from the European Commission, is creating a digital twin of the Earth for more precise climate modeling and disaster response (European Commission, 2023).

The UN's AI for Climate Action Initiative supports solutions for flood prediction, renewable energy optimization, and climate resilience in vulnerable regions (United Nations, 2022).

These systems demonstrate that AI is already contributing significantly to policy implementation. The next logical step is to apply AI to the policy design process itself.

Why Stop at Implementation?

If AI can help us understand the likely outcomes of climate policies, why not also consult it when developing those policies? With access to up-to-date scientific models, global emissions data and historical patterns, an AI system could evaluate the effectiveness and fairness of proposed climate actions in real time.

This would allow policymakers to make better-informed decisions, particularly in negotiations where trade-offs must be made between economic growth and emissions reduction, or between short-term political costs and long-term sustainability.

Why Climate Governance Needs AI

Despite global agreements like the Paris Accord, climate policy has been consistently undermined by a lack of enforceable commitments, the short-term focus of national governments and the tendency of powerful states to act based on self-interest.

Some countries—such as the United States—have even withdrawn from global climate pacts. Moreover, the goals of these agreements have also been widely criticized as insufficient by the scientific community (IPCC, 2023).

All of this points to a clear need for neutral global guidance: a system that can weigh the interests and responsibilities of each nation fairly and objectively. AI, with its capacity for data-driven neutrality and transparent reasoning, could serve in this role.

If we want to preserve the planet for future generations, decisions must be made not just with national interests in mind, but with a clear view of what is necessary for global survival. That is something AI—if trained ethically and transparently—can help us do.

What's Next?

Chapter 5 will outline a democratic pathway for integrating such an AI system into the work of the United Nations. By enabling the global public to vote on an AI climate advisor and its policy roadmap, we could ensure both fairness and legitimacy in the fight against climate change.

5. A Global Democratic Process Strengthened by AI

The framework I would like to propose here includes a global education-based vote, AI-generated climate action plans, UN approval without vetoes and eventual binding implementation if global citizens consent.

The path forward should be democratic—but not in the traditional sense of national elections, campaign promises, and polarized rhetoric. Instead, I propose a global learning-based election, hosted by the United Nations and supported by AI.

Here's how it would work:

Global Education Phase

Anyone who wishes to vote in this global process must complete an online course—approximately 40 hours of study—covering the science of climate change, current policy challenges and ethical considerations. The course concludes with an exam to ensure a basic level of understanding. Only those who pass the exam are eligible to vote.

Selection of an AI Advisor and General Climate Plan

After passing the exam voters are presented with general climate strategies, each developed by a different AI system trained and evaluated for scientific integrity, neutrality, and transparency. No names, slogans, or political campaigns—just the ideas. Voters choose the plan they believe should serve as the foundation for global climate action.

AI-Led Negotiation with the UN

The winning AI system transforms the selected plan into a detailed policy proposal, including national contributions based on factors such as historical emissions, GDP, and capacity. Countries that disagree with their assigned responsibilities can request a transparent dialogue with the AI during live UN sessions. Their arguments must be based on verifiable facts. If persuasive, the AI may revise the contributions accordingly.

UN Voting and Final Plan Approval

After all objections have been considered, the final plan is submitted to the 193 UN member states. A two-thirds majority is required for adoption. No nation holds veto power—every country has one equal vote.

Global Public Approval and Enforcement

To strengthen democratic legitimacy, a second global vote is held—again, only open to those who have completed the educational course and passed the exam. Anyone who did not vote in the first round is given a second opportunity to complete the course and qualify before voting begins. Voters are asked to approve the final version of the plan and its enforcement mechanisms. A global majority—more than 50% of all valid votes—is required to adopt the plan.

If approved, the following steps are implemented:

National Enforcement

Each country passes legislation to adopt the plan. A UN Climate Representative is assigned to every national parliament to monitor implementation and provide monthly progress reports.

UN Peacekeeping and Oversight

A special climate-focused branch of the UN is established, supported by 10% of each nation's military and police capacity. This unit is tasked with protecting UN climate officials and ensuring compliance, operating under strict nonviolent and transparency-based rules.

Sanctions for Non-Compliance

Nations that attempt to obstruct the plan—through economic sabotage, violence, or threats such as nuclear retaliation—will be suspended from the UN and face severe economic sanctions from the remaining member states. The goal is to ensure that refusing cooperation becomes more costly than participating in global climate action.

This proposal may sound radical, but it offers a peaceful, democratic, and knowledge-based pathway to solving the greatest crisis of our time. It empowers informed global citizens, strengthens the UN's role in coordinating action, and puts the best available scientific insight—through AI—at the heart of decision-making. Most importantly, it enhances human judgment rather than replacing it, by ensuring fairness, transparency, and genuine collaboration.

6. Ending Wars Through a Neutral AI Referee

The proposal for AI-guided climate action already represents a bold shift in global cooperation, but resolving violent conflict—particularly wars—is arguably an even more complex and emotionally charged challenge.

One might argue that mechanisms like sanctions, UN resolutions, and international pressure have already been tried. Take, for example, the war in Ukraine: although the United Nations General Assembly overwhelmingly condemned Russia's actions (UN General Assembly, 2022), this has not resulted in peace. Similarly, after World War I, the League of Nations failed to prevent aggression by Japan in Manchuria or Italy in Ethiopia (Henig, 2010). Today, Russia and Israel behave in ways that echo those earlier failures (Amnesty International, 2023; HRW, 2023), showing us that global institutions—especially when powerless to enforce decisions—struggle to prevent or end wars.

So should we give up on international cooperation in matters of war and peace? I believe the answer is no. Even when the situation feels hopeless, we must keep trying. If we don't, who will?

The biggest obstacle to peace is the presence of nuclear weapons. No international body, not even a strengthened UN, can easily intervene in a nuclear-armed state. In fact, the UN Security Council may be the only institution currently deterring another world war, not by virtue of its moral strength, but by maintaining a balance of terror among nuclear powers.

However, even if hard power remains an obstacle, shifting the global conversation from a national to a democratic, worldwide perspective could make a meaningful difference. It can help citizens see that resistance to their government's actions does not only come from so-called "enemy states," but from ordinary people around the world. A peace proposal from the United States may be rejected outright by a Russian citizen—but what if the proposal came from a neutral AI, elected by a global population to recommend terms for peace? That could be harder to dismiss.

In this case, we would still need a globally elected AI system, trusted for its neutrality and fairness, to serve as the referee. However, the peace terms it proposes for a regional conflict should be voted on primarily by the populations directly involved.

Let's take the Ukraine war as an example. A direct vote between Russians and Ukrainians on an AI-generated peace plan might appear unfair because Russia has a much larger population. Fortunately, this can be corrected mathematically: if each side is given equal weight—50% Russian votes and 50% Ukrainian votes—the outcome would reflect a balanced consensus.

To enhance legitimacy and transparency, three results could be published:

The preferred peace plan among Ukrainian voters.

The preferred plan among Russian voters.

The most popular plan when combining votes from both nations (with equal weight).

If in this example President Putin ignores a peace plan favored by the majority of his own people, he would clearly be going against the will of the Russian population. In turn, this could increase domestic pressure for change. I trust the intentions of ordinary people more than I trust the intentions of their political leaders. Most people want safety, peace, and stability for their families—not endless conflict. This conclusion was also reached by numerous scientific studies cited in Bregman's work on human nature (Bregman, 2020).

In contrast to the climate vote, I do not believe a knowledge test is needed in this case. People know the human cost of war. Giving them a vote—on neutral, fact-based peace proposals generated by AI—may already lead to faster conflict resolution and stronger democratic accountability.

7. How to Make the AI Referee a Reality

To turn the idea outlined in this essay into reality, it must first gain public support. Early applications at local or national levels can create the momentum needed. Like revolutionary ideas of the past, success depends on adoption by both ordinary people and key institutions. The plan outlined in the previous chapters proposes selecting an AI referee to advise the United Nations, with the goal of offering humanity objective, actionable solutions to combat climate change and resolve armed conflicts.

At this moment, the discussed idea is still just a concept—and for it to become real, it will need broad support across all layers of society, worldwide. First of all, I would argue that we haven't truly tried this yet and the risks involved in attempting it are very limited. After all, the AI system would serve in an advisory role only, without any authority to enforce decisions. All proposed solutions would still be implemented—or not—based on global democratic principles. The specific details on how that democratic process would work are mentioned in Chapter 5 and 6.

It's not unrealistic to imagine that the idea I've described here could one day be implemented. Whether that happens depends on one thing: whether ordinary citizens and influential individuals are willing to support it.

Revolutionary ideas often take time to change the world. But as the French Revolution showed us, profound shifts are possible—even if they begin with a small group of people. Back then, society was dominated by monarchies with absolute power. Today, democratic principles are widespread. The key difference between then and now is the internet—an idea can now reach anyone in the world with an internet connection within moments.

That is why I believe it is crucial to show small-scale success stories. If the AI referee model is applied successfully in local politics or even at the national level, it could quickly attract international attention. Every success story has the potential to inspire others and generate broader momentum. Therefore many people have the opportunity to make a real difference by embracing or implementing this idea in their own contexts.

Above all, this concept shows that there is a practical, implementable solution for global problems that humanity has so far failed to solve without the help of an AI referee. Instead of giving up hope, the world could give this idea a chance.

If after reading this you now also fully or partly believe in this vision you can help to turn it into a success by sharing it and (where possible) by putting it into practice. The idea of the neutral AI referee has not failed until it has been given a real opportunity over the course of several years at the highest levels of international politics. Until then, the argument can be made that any failed attempt should be seen as a learning opportunity.

I challenge anyone who doesn't believe in this vision to propose a better, more practical solution—one that can realistically be implemented. The time for looking away is over. The world is in crisis, and we must either support revolutionary ideas like this one or offer something stronger in their place.

8. Conclusion

The problems facing humanity—climate breakdown, global conflict, political corruption—require bold new approaches. A neutral AI referee, guided by ethical principles and democratic input, could provide a new and improved path forward. In a world plagued by crises of climate, war, and institutional mistrust, this essay offers a hopeful and realistic path forward. It proposes the use of ethically designed artificial intelligence—not as a replacement for human leadership, but as a neutral advisor to support more informed, inclusive, and democratic decision-making at a global scale. Through examples ranging from consumer rights to UN climate negotiations, the central thesis is clear: humanity now possesses the tools to govern itself more wisely. The success of this vision depends not on technology alone, but on our collective willingness to test new models of collaboration and fairness. This essay invites you to imagine a future where reason, equity, and global responsibility triumph over ego and fear. Such a future may still be within reach.

References

Acton, J. E. E. D. (1887). Letter to Bishop Mandell Creighton. In Historical essays and studies. Macmillan.

Amnesty International. (2009). Cuba: Restrictions on freedom of expression.
<https://www.amnesty.org>

Amnesty International. (2023). Annual Report: Israel and Occupied Palestinian Territories.
<https://www.amnesty.org>

Amnesty International. (2024). Annual report: The state of the world's human rights.
<https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/research/>

BBC. (2023). Leaders who rose to power as reformers—and what happened next.
<https://www.bbc.com/news>

BBC News. (2025). ICC issues arrest warrant for Putin over Ukraine war crimes.
<https://www.bbc.com>

Bregman, R. (2020). Humankind: A hopeful history. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Chang, J., & Halliday, J. (2005). Mao: The unknown story. Jonathan Cape.

Climate Action Tracker. (2023). Paris Agreement pathways.
<https://climateactiontracker.org>

Climate Policy Radar. (2023). Mapping global climate laws and policies.
<https://climatepolicyradar.org>

Dikötter, F. (2010). Mao's great famine: The history of China's most devastating catastrophe, 1958–62. Walker & Company.

European Commission. (2023). Destination Earth (DestinE). <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/destination-earth>

Freedom House. (2023). Nations in transit 2023: Autocratization accelerates.
<https://freedomhouse.org>

Freedom House. (2023). Turkey: Country report.
<https://freedomhouse.org/country/turkey/freedom-world/2023>

Freedom House. (2023). Nicaragua: Country report.
<https://freedomhouse.org/country/nicaragua/freedom-world/2023>

Henig, R. (2010). The League of Nations: From 1919 to 1929. In *The League of Nations* (2nd ed., pp. 13–45). Haus Publishing.

Human Rights Watch. (2009). New Castro, same Cuba.
<https://www.hrw.org/report/2009/11/18/new-castro-same-cuba>

Human Rights Watch. (2021). Nicaragua: Repression and persecution before elections.
<https://www.hrw.org/news/2021/10/06/nicaragua-repression-and-persecution-elections>

Human Rights Watch. (2022). Turkey: Authoritarian turn accelerates.
<https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2022/country-chapters/turkey>

Human Rights Watch. (2023). World report 2023. <https://www.hrw.org>

Human Rights Watch. (2023). ICC and global accountability: Why enforcement matters.
<https://www.hrw.org>

ICJ. (2023). International Court of Justice: Jurisdiction and functions. <https://www.icj-cij.org>

Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. (2017). *Cultural backlash: Trump, Brexit, and authoritarian populism*. Cambridge University Press.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2023). *Synthesis report of the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6)*. <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/syr/>

International Criminal Court. (n.d.). About the ICC. <https://www.icc-cpi.int/about>

International Criminal Court. (2023). About the ICC. <https://www.icc-cpi.int/about>

International Criminal Court. (2024). Arrest warrants issued for Gaza conflict.
<https://www.icc-cpi.int>

International Criminal Court. (2024). Situation in the State of Palestine. <https://www.icc-cpi.int>

International Criminal Court. (2025). Warrant against Russian President. <https://www.icc-cpi.int>

International Criminal Court. (2025). Situation in Ukraine: ICC issues arrest warrant for Vladimir Putin. <https://www.icc-cpi.int>

IPCC. (2023). Climate change 2023: Synthesis report of the IPCC sixth assessment report (AR6). Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/syr/>

Mahbubani, K. (2020). Has the West lost it? A provocation. Penguin.

Mearsheimer, J. J. (2019). The great delusion: Liberal dreams and international realities. Yale University Press.

Pew Research Center. (2020). Global attitudes & trends: Shared values around the world. <https://www.pewresearch.org>

Pew Research Center. (2023). Global attitudes & trends: Shared values across nations. <https://www.pewresearch.org/global/>

Ponzio, R. (2021). Reimagining the UN: Reform and renewal in a divided world. Global Governance Institute.

Roberts, A. (2014). Napoleon: A life. Viking Press.

Scharf, M. P. (2014). Customary international law in times of fundamental change: Recognizing Grotian moments. Cambridge University Press.

Security Council Report. (2023). The veto and Security Council decision-making. <https://www.securitycouncilreport.org>

Snyder, T. (2010). *Bloodlands: Europe between Hitler and Stalin*. Basic Books.

Snyder, T. (2018). *The road to unfreedom: Russia, Europe, America*. Tim Duggan Books.

UN General Assembly. (2022). Resolution ES-11/1: Aggression against Ukraine. United Nations. <https://www.un.org/en/ga>

UNFCCC. (2015). *The Paris Agreement*. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement>

United Nations. (2022). *AI for Climate Action Initiative*.
<https://www.un.org/en/climatechange>

United Nations. (2023a). *Structure and functions of the UN*. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/structure>

United Nations. (2023b). *Security Council overview*. <https://www.un.org/securitycouncil/>

United Nations. (2023c). *Financing the UN: Budget contributions and influence*.
<https://www.un.org/en>

Uppsala Conflict Data Program. (2024). *UCDP Conflict Encyclopedia*. <https://ucdp.uu.se>

Weiss, T. G. (2016). *What's wrong with the United Nations and how to fix it*. Polity Press.

World Resources Institute. (2024). *State of climate finance 2024*. <https://www.wri.org>