

The Human Transition Charter

A working policy framework for the age of artificial intelligence.

By **David H. Wever**

Artificial intelligence is transforming labor, education, family life, public discourse, governance, and the distribution of economic power. Its benefits may be profound, but so are its risks. Without deliberate public policy, AI may intensify inequality, erode democratic trust, destabilize work, weaken privacy, disrupt child development, and concentrate social power in ways that damage human dignity and the common good.

This Charter is offered as a working framework for nations, states, cities, institutions, and businesses seeking to govern the rise of AI in a manner consistent with liberty, accountability, shared prosperity, child protection, democratic legitimacy, and human flourishing.

The purpose of this Charter is not to halt innovation. It is to ensure that innovation remains accountable to human ends.

Part I. Foundational Commitments

Article 1. Human dignity as the governing principle

All AI policy, deployment, regulation, and institutional use shall be governed by the principle that human beings possess inherent dignity and may not be reduced to mere objects of prediction, manipulation, optimization, or disposal.

No use of AI shall be considered socially legitimate if it materially undermines human agency, due process, family integrity, child welfare, civic trust, or the conditions necessary for meaningful participation in social and economic life.

Article 2. The public interest in AI governance

AI systems are not merely private commercial products when they materially affect labor markets, education systems, democratic institutions, access to opportunity, or the distribution of social power.

Governments have a legitimate and necessary role in establishing rules, rights, limits, safeguards, reporting requirements, and redress mechanisms for the development and use of AI.

Article 3. Risk-based governance

AI governance shall be proportionate to the scale, reach, and seriousness of potential harms.

- Low-impact systems : limited effects on rights, safety, livelihood, education, or public trust.
- Moderate-impact systems : systems affecting access to information, consumer interactions, routine workplace tasks, or scalable public communication.

- High-impact systems : systems used in employment, education, healthcare, insurance, credit, housing, public benefits, legal processes, policing, child services, or similar domains affecting rights and life outcomes.
- Systemic or frontier-impact systems : systems whose scale, capability, deployment reach, infrastructure burden, or social consequences may materially affect national security, labor-market stability, electoral integrity, or essential public systems.

The higher the level of impact, the greater the duties of disclosure, oversight, testing, documentation, auditability, and human accountability.

Part II. Rights of Persons and Communities

Article 4. Right to know when AI is materially used

Every person shall have the right to know when AI is materially involved in decisions, recommendations, rankings, or interactions that significantly affect their employment, education, finances, access to services, legal standing, medical care, or public treatment.

Article 5. Right to human review and appeal

No person shall be subject to a final consequential decision made solely by AI in matters involving employment, termination, housing, credit, education discipline, insurance access, healthcare coverage, public benefits, legal status, or similar high-impact domains.

- request meaningful human review
- receive a plain-language explanation of the basis for the decision
- contest errors or unfair outcomes
- seek timely correction or reconsideration

Article 6. Right to privacy and data dignity

Every person shall have the right to know what personal data are collected, inferred, retained, shared, sold, or used in AI systems affecting them.

- access relevant personal data
- correct material inaccuracies
- request deletion where appropriate
- restrict or object to certain uses
- know whether sensitive data are being used in AI systems

Special protections shall apply to children's data and to sensitive domains including health, mental health, education, finances, biometric data, geolocation, and intimate life.

Article 7. Right to protection from manipulative AI

No person shall be subjected, without meaningful safeguards, to AI systems designed to exploit known vulnerabilities, emotional dependence, cognitive weakness, age-related immaturity, crisis states, compulsive tendencies, or impaired judgment for commercial, political, sexual, or coercive purposes.

Article 8. Community and regional protection

Communities materially affected by large-scale AI-driven labor displacement, infrastructure concentration, data-center burdens, or sudden automation shocks shall be entitled to public consideration, transition planning, and mitigation measures.

Part III. Duties of Governments

Article 9. National AI transition strategy

Each national government should establish a publicly accessible AI Transition Strategy addressing labor-market change, educational adaptation, child and family protections, privacy and data governance, democratic resilience, energy and infrastructure impacts, competition risks, and international coordination.

Article 10. AI workforce impact assessments

Large employers and public agencies implementing major AI-driven automation or workforce redesign shall conduct an AI Workforce Impact Assessment prior to significant deployment.

- likely job reductions, redesigns, or eliminations
- affected departments, occupations, and regions
- anticipated productivity gains
- retraining and redeployment plans
- severance, wage protection, or transition support
- contractor and supply-chain effects
- expected timelines
- potential effects on service quality, employee well-being, and public accountability

Article 11. National transition support mechanisms

Governments should establish an AI Transition Fund or equivalent mechanism to support workers, families, and communities affected by rapid technological displacement.

- portable retraining accounts
- wage insurance for displaced workers

- relocation or regional reinvestment assistance
- apprenticeships and mid-career retooling
- public-interest employment pathways
- community stabilization in heavily impacted areas
- small business adaptation support

Article 12. Shared prosperity obligations

Where AI produces extraordinary productivity gains while reducing reliance on human labor, governments should adopt mechanisms to ensure that a meaningful portion of those gains contributes to the public good.

- tax incentives tied to retraining and redeployment
- transition contributions linked to large-scale displacement
- targeted public investment in education, care, and infrastructure
- competition measures to prevent excessive concentration
- national reporting on the distribution of AI-related productivity gains

Article 13. High-impact AI licensing or registration

Governments should require registration, licensing, or formal declaration for defined categories of high-impact or systemic-impact AI systems.

Article 14. Public-sector AI accountability

Government agencies using AI in public administration shall maintain public inventories of material AI systems, including their purpose, use context, oversight measures, and mechanisms for appeal or complaint where relevant.

Article 15. Democratic integrity protections

Governments should establish rules to protect democratic legitimacy from AI-enabled deception and manipulation, including disclosure requirements for synthetic political media, restrictions on deceptive impersonation, bot disclosure, and rapid response protocols for election-period deepfake fraud.

Article 16. Privacy legislation for the AI era

Governments should adopt modern privacy legislation appropriate to advanced AI systems, including access, correction, deletion, restriction, special protection for sensitive data, data-minimization obligations, and privacy impact assessments in high-impact AI.

Article 17. Infrastructure and environmental transparency

Large-scale AI infrastructure projects with substantial effects on energy use, water demand, land use, or local systems should be subject to public transparency and, where appropriate, local review.

Part IV. Duties of Businesses and Institutions

Article 18. Board and executive accountability

Any business or institution deploying material AI systems should assign formal oversight responsibility to the board, an executive governance committee, or a similarly accountable body.

Article 19. Internal AI inventory and classification

Organizations shall maintain a current inventory of material AI systems they build, procure, fine-tune, or deploy and classify them according to impact level, use domain, data sensitivity, decision role, and potential harm profile.

Article 20. Pre-deployment review

Before deploying any high-impact AI system, an organization should conduct a documented review addressing intended purpose, foreseeable misuse, affected populations, data provenance, fairness concerns, privacy implications, security risks, human-oversight design, failure modes, and remedy pathways.

Article 21. Workforce obligations

Organizations undertaking major AI-led automation should adopt workforce policies that include advance notice, retraining opportunities, redeployment pathways, transition assistance, severance standards where displacement occurs, and honest internal communication about expected changes.

Article 22. Disclosure to users, customers, and workers

Organizations shall provide clear notice when people are materially interacting with AI or are materially evaluated, ranked, monitored, or decided upon using AI.

Article 23. Protection of vulnerable persons

No organization shall knowingly deploy AI systems that exploit psychological vulnerability, emotional dependency, developmental immaturity, or situational distress in order to increase engagement, spending, compliance, or influence.

Article 24. Incident reporting and remediation

Organizations deploying high-impact or systemic-impact AI systems should maintain procedures for incident detection, escalation, investigation, correction, user notification where appropriate, and public reporting where serious harm occurs.

Article 25. Annual AI transparency statement

Organizations above a defined size or risk threshold should publish an annual AI transparency statement describing major categories of AI use, high-impact systems in operation, governance structures, workforce impacts observed, material incidents and responses, and steps taken to reduce harms.

Part V. Children, Education, and Family Life

Article 26. Child-first design rule

Any AI system reasonably likely to be used by minors shall be designed and governed in a manner that prioritizes child welfare, developmental integrity, privacy, safety, and freedom from manipulative dependency.

Article 27. Limits on synthetic attachment targeting minors

AI systems shall not be designed or marketed to minors in ways that encourage emotional dependency, secrecy from caregivers, compulsive reliance, or confusion between human and synthetic relational authority.

Article 28. Education safeguards

Schools and educational institutions using AI should adopt clear policies covering student data protection, teacher accountability, limits on automated discipline and surveillance, age-appropriate AI use, academic integrity, protected spaces for non-AI reasoning and composition, and the development of AI literacy and critical thinking.

Article 29. Protection of family autonomy

AI governance should preserve the authority and integrity of families while preventing exploitation, coercive influence, or hidden manipulation directed at children and adolescents through commercial or institutional AI systems.

Part VI. Democracy, Culture, and Social Order

Article 30. Authenticity and provenance standards

Governments, platforms, and major institutions should work toward interoperable standards for identifying or tracking the provenance of synthetic media where technically and legally feasible.

Article 31. Protection from industrialized persuasion

AI systems used for large-scale behavioral targeting in political, civic, or highly sensitive social contexts should be subject to enhanced transparency, recordkeeping, and legal limits where necessary to protect democratic legitimacy and informed consent.

Article 32. Cultural and relational health

Governments and institutions should consider the effects of AI on loneliness, family life, attention, child development, community participation, and the social conditions necessary for human flourishing.

Part VII. International and Global Cooperation

Article 33. Minimum global norms

The international community should work toward shared minimum norms in child safety, synthetic-media transparency, cross-border incident reporting for major AI harms, privacy and sensitive data protection, public-sector use, and evaluation cooperation for powerful systems.

Article 34. Anti-race-to-the-bottom principle

No nation should deliberately weaken core protections for dignity, children, labor stability, democratic integrity, or privacy in order to attract AI investment through regulatory surrender.

Part VIII. Implementation and Enforcement

Article 35. Independent oversight

Governments should establish or designate independent bodies with authority to oversee high-impact AI, receive complaints, conduct investigations, require disclosures, and coordinate across agencies.

Article 36. Remedies and penalties

Where organizations materially violate rights or duties established under AI governance law, remedies should include correction orders, suspension of deployment, civil penalties, restitution where legally appropriate, public notice of serious violations, and restrictions on future deployment until compliance is established.

Article 37. Periodic review

Because AI capabilities and harms evolve rapidly, this Charter should be reviewed periodically and revised as needed while preserving its foundational commitments to dignity, accountability, democratic legitimacy, child protection, and shared prosperity.

Public Declaration

We affirm that artificial intelligence must remain subject to human moral judgment, public accountability, and democratic governance.

We reject the view that social disruption at scale is acceptable merely because it is technologically possible or economically profitable.

We affirm that the purpose of policy in the AI age is not only to manage risk, but to defend the conditions of a human future: meaningful work, truthful public life, protected children, stable families, fair opportunity, accountable institutions, and shared prosperity.