
On Natural Jurisprudence: The Core Concepts



Created by The State of Exception

(3rd Edition)

<https://www.thestateofexception.com/>

This document is for free use and distribution, under the obligation that this page must not be removed.

The State of Exception is a politically neutral think tank working on spreading ideas of Natural Law. The main concepts we are dealing with are Property-in-toto, Reciprocity, Operationalism, and Testimonialism, although this introductory work features many more. Our goal is to put these ideas into the world and demonstrate what they are able to achieve.

Our organization creates articles and lectures. We also host bi-annual conferences around Europe to teach people and governments about Natural Jurisprudence.

If you found this paper useful, please support The State of Exception, which you can do by visiting our website. Feel free to read and watch other content that we have created. If you like our work so far, please support us financially so we can keep sharing and implementing these ideas. We know they will tremendously help the world, and with your support, we would be able to present our solutions to an even wider audience.

Support us on: <https://www.thestateofexception.com/support>

And now, please, enjoy our work!

Content

- Prologue 4
 - What is Natural Jurisprudence?..... 4
- Where did it all start? 5
 - Critical Rationalism 5
 - Rothbardian Anarcho Capitalism 7
- Testimonialism10
 - Test 1: Logic (Categorical, Internal consistency: non-conflation of entities; relations consistent with rules)13
 - Test 2: External correspondence13
 - Test 3: Existential possibility14
 - Test 4: Operationalism.....16
 - Test 5: Due diligence, Exhaustive accounting18
 - Test 6: Parsimony.....19
 - Test 7: Reciprocity.....20
 - Summary20
- From Man to State: Cooperation, its limits and their consequences.....21
 - Property-in-toto.....21
 - Why is this so useful?22
 - Rights24
 - Strategies24
 - Grammars27
 - Some Natural Laws of interaction.....28
 - The Road to Reciprocity29
 - Three ways to gain29
 - 1: Voluntary.....30
 - 2: Exhaustively informed31
 - 3: Warrantied31
 - 4: Productive32
 - 5: Free from negative externalities32
- Society and preference33
- Intertemporal division of perception.....35
- Markets-in-toto.....37
- Sovereignty & Self Determination38
- Organization of violence & Rule of Law41
- The Jury & Common Law42
- Market Government: finalizing Societal Division of Labour.....44

Elites, Agency and Discretionary rule	45
Dealing with GSRRM	48
Conclusion	50

Prologue

This document was created as a gentle introduction to Natural Jurisprudence, a system based on thoughts discovered and systematized by Curt Doolittle and his intellectual following since the end of the 20th century. Although we have adapted his methodology and some conclusions of his early work, our relationship with Doolittle's project ends there.

That development went along as every other scientific evaluation does: solving one problem leads to the next question. Keeping at it, a simple question leads to more and more of a naturally grown body of knowledge. Such trial-and-error-growth common in nature leads to a system that may seem awfully hard to comprehend at first – compare it with looking at a strange animal expertly adapted to its habitat, but incomprehensible in the function of all its organs.

Hence, this document hopes to explain some core concepts used in Natural Jurisprudence to you – briefly and with complexity reduced to a tolerable minimum. However, the actual truths we have acquired require critically reading many works and studies from just as many fields. Anything but a rough sketch of them would bloat this text way beyond its purpose. Still, to not betray our own standards of truth, an effort was made to phrase such statements as according to our rules as possible.

Furthermore, although some examples of direct application may be provided, this description tries to remain non-partisan and hence does not offer any directly applicable policies. It is an overview of a method you may then adapt to your own political group or strategy to test the outcomes.

What is Natural Jurisprudence?

Natural Jurisprudence is to human interaction what scientific discovery is to the natural world: it is a way of discovering patterns that reliably predict outcomes, so we may gain more control in dealing with them or even produce preferred ones. This has brought about of several discoveries which include...

The Natural Law of Reciprocity

The Wilsonian synthesis (unification of all scientific disciplines)

An improved Grammar for truthful speech

All these concepts themselves might not catch your interest in all their abstraction. But within them lay instruments crucial to solving the big problems of our age. Furthermore, all tactics and concepts can be of great help for anyone in making better sense of the world around them on a personal level and seizing control of their individual goals.

The aforementioned problems include the continuous failure of old ideologies to systematically combat issues such as growing political polarization; growing disillusionment with the incentivized modern lifestyle from all directions; corrupt global and local elites directly and indirectly profiting at society's expense; the never-ending decay of our middle classes, and, most importantly, the unfathomable amount of lying committed by media figures, corporations, politicians and members of all sides – whether intentionally or not.

As already discussed, this paper does not aim at appeasing any particular worldviews and hence avoids real-life examples of policy or application. But, as Natural Jurisprudence seeks to be the most reality-oriented system in human law, we strongly recommend using these principles to determine what you see as your own, what you **value**; how to discover and *name* offences against that; and how to pragmatically organize a solution that leaves you and others in charge of their destiny.

Where did it all start?

Critical Rationalism

Critical Rationalism is an epistemology, a philosophical theory about what we can call truth. Mainly basing their worldview on works like “The Logic of Scientific Discovery” by philosopher Karl Raimund Popper, Critical Rationalists believe that truth is fundamentally *not* what you can justify best, but what is falsifiable and has not been falsified yet. This position is called Falsificationism. Notably, Popper aimed at finding the distinct principle that makes scientific truths more effective than others in shaping our world, not at detailing how truth production developed historically.

First and foremost, in Critical Rationalism, humans are viewed as unable to construct eternal truths, because the possibility of a new fact emerging and disproving a long-held “truth” always remains.

An example: having never seen a rainbow, a man could state that they do not exist. And he would have a lifetime of proof concerning that case. This view of the world would be in

shambles the second he sees a rainbow, and all proof collected beforehand would be rendered useless.

This moment, where a theory is disproven, is the distinctly *scientific* moment for Popper. In it, your hypothesis about the world (“Rainbows don’t exist because I have never seen one”) is proven to be false by an input directly contrary to that (“I see something that very closely resembles what has always been described to me as being a rainbow”). Popper explains that arriving at a true statement by assembling data in its favour, hence justifying it (*Justificationism*), is a waste of effort, because it could all be disproven by just a single case. He proposes a different solution for creating judgments about the world: rationally create a hypothesis based on previous experience (*Rationalism*) and then try to *disprove* it by gathering data about it (*Critical*). If you fail to disprove your theory, we will know that it is not yet false, meaning we may work with it; but if it was proven wrong, we at least definitely know *not* to work with it. So, it is easier to discover and agree upon what is not true than what is.

Of course, this perception also creates some standards we impose onto our judgment of the world. Firstly, we do not arrive at truths about our world, we just make *truthful* statements. “Truthful” applies to every statement that implies an observable event able to definitely disprove it. There is no real interest in how you arrived at your hypothesis, whether by reviewing what others told you or by dreaming it, because how much you thought about it does not decide whether your statements about the world are definitely true. What really distinguishes true from false, or rather “*not yet false*” from false, is one falsifying observation.

From this, two things follow:

Firstly, that statements concerning truths must be tied to what you can observe with your sensory organs or instruments aiding them and

secondly, that statements not including any way to prove them wrong, riskless statements, can be discarded from scientific discussion right away. They are called tautologies; statements like “It will rain or it won’t rain tomorrow” carry no information relevant to any decision-making process; same applies for statements that are already contradictory to begin with and hence always false (“It will rain tomorrow whilst it will not rain tomorrow in the same place”).

A scientific theory in the traditional sense may then be understood as: formulating a risky hypothesis about the world, going out into the field and trying to find falsifying data about it, and then, after gathering an amount sufficient for statistical standards, judging whether your hypothesis was falsified and what implications follow from that. What your hypothesis cannot become is “a rule derived from data” or something along the lines of that. You may make a general statement and test it by particular cases, but one logically cannot derive general rules from particular circumstances. Otherwise, one would have to assume that these particular circumstances will always be representative of the general rule, which is a pure assumption, because we may never know the exact future. This is called “The problem of induction” and by the standard of testability, Critical Rationalism gracefully avoids that pitfall.

Critical Rationalism hence always keeps an eye out for those facts that lay outside of what one views to be right and encourages people to seek it;

it supersedes biases and still does not put a choke hold on the creation of new propositions;

its standards automatically limit what is in the scope of being called truthful to that which is related to tangible reality;

and hence automatically dismisses those things from the discourse that cannot be agreed or disagreed upon, unnecessary information that will not aid any decision.

All this does not imply that absolute truths, metaphysics or other unfalsifiable propositions cannot be moving, helpful, interesting or even essential to life; but limiting discussion to things that can be decided upon ensures that they will be productive.

To summarize:

By pre-existing knowledge we construct hypotheses about our world that we subsequently try to falsify by gathering new data; this leads to a body of knowledge that adapts its parts by trial and error, is bound by reality and minimizes effort by drastically reducing the data you need to truthfully conduct research and preemptively discards all irrelevant statements from the discourse by sensible standards.

Rothbardian Anarcho Capitalism

Anarcho-Capitalism is a political ideology that grew out of Classical Liberalism at the end of the 20th century. Even though its name alone sounds comical, several tendencies of this thought resulted in valuable insights for our project – and such inspirations definitely belong in this chapter.

Classical Liberalism, with its values of personal responsibility, individualism, restricted state control, private property and laissez-faire markets, saw historical events and movements coincide against its interests: from Fascist takeovers, to Communist control of huge swaths of the world, to the human rights crisis of the world wars, to the Great Depression, to youth movements worldwide demanding the dissolution of the free market social order whilst at the same time driving the values of free speech, self-determination and free expression to absurd lengths – the Classical Liberal project lay in shambles. Although it regained worldwide attention and powerful friends due to the Cold War, the governments of Thatcher and Reagan and groups like the Chicago Boys under the guise of internationalist Neoliberalism, that system’s characteristic mix of power and capital, politicians and entrepreneurs, public and private, forgot about or dissolved many of enlightenment liberalism’s ideals. Those had – to put it very roughly - not imagined a world of multinational, state-like corporations but one driven by rational, free individuals and small businesses bearing risks, in which the market would provide relatively equal opportunities to everyone, decentralizing power so that its abuses would be controllable. Some intellectuals, including the infamous Libertarian and Anarcho-capitalist thinker Murray Rothbard or today’s Hans-Hermann Hoppe, concluded that the case for Liberal values, those of the rights to life, liberty and property, had to be given a stronger protection: A logical system in which opposition to their principles would be clearly revealed as ethically wrong and societally disastrous.

Basing their research mainly on thinkers of the Austrian school of Economics such as Ludwig von Mises, they believed that the most accurate description of reality lay in economic deductions about individual action, unclouded by the infinite number of variables playing into empirical research. They also viewed the individual and his reasonable actions as preceding society. From those foundational principles, they arrived at the conclusion that the only ethical system and optimal societal strategy was something called the “Non-aggression Principle”.

The NAP states that only the individual has the evident ability to consciously control his own body, and that hence, all involuntary action must in the end be connected to an

outside force aggressing on that fundamental private, exclusive property. If one has the infinite right of self-control, the same pertains to everything he creates using it – his property.

Anarcho-Capitalism arrives at the conclusion that only fully voluntary actions such as trades can be ethical, and that hence institutions like the state are fundamentally an aggressor on the natural rights of every human; because, if you do not follow its orders, or even defend yourself against it, it is legitimized to hunt you down, incarcerate you or even kill you.

Some Classical Liberals might even fundamentally agree with this image of the state – but they would put forward the argument that a state is needed to ensure the freedoms and property rights you have. Their main debates then concern the question of where the line between beneficial burden and tyrannical thief would be drawn; taxes to fund roads or a public healthcare system?

Rothbardian Anarcho-Capitalism splits from Liberalism at this point. Based on nothing but logical deductions about the rational actions of individuals, Rothbard followed the praxeological view of the Austrian school: that human cooperation and division of labour are a product of rational choice, because they produce a higher profit for all individuals involved than self-sufficient isolation. Furthermore, they deduce that public goods will never exceed private ones in creating prosperity. Thus, the state is firstly not needed to centrally solve conflicts and secondly worse at it than private courts and polices would be.

Firstly, Anarcho-Capitalists propose that people care significantly more for what they can call their own than for the common good no one really feels responsible for (the so called “Tragedy of the commons”). Secondly, they argue that if something belongs to one, and one person only, conflicts about its ownership can be clearly solved.

Further classical liberal arguments incorporated into Anarcho-Capitalism include the notion that markets will always outplay centrally planned economies because their calculatory ability is much higher; no central planner can account for all people’s demands and subjective needs better than all people on their own when they engage in voluntary cooperation.

In the end, the Anarcho-Capitalist argument boils down to the fact that private property, markets and individualism are not only the most efficient system ever devised by humans, but that they’re also the only rational, ethical and natural strategy towards organizing

human society. The mixture of moral and economic propositions will often lead Anarcho-Capitalists whose ideas about the efficiency or possibility of their system have been disproven to instead argue that it is still the only *moral* way to structure society, regardless of consequences. Like most other ideologies, it is derived from idealistic ideas applied to reality, not from realistic ideas *derived* from it.

In the end, Anarcho-Capitalism mostly led us towards a more scientific analysis of how cooperation operates on all scales. Its way to analyze reality is moralist and hence unfalsifiable and pseudo-scientific, much like Marxism. But combining these two roots, we arrive at the question: What if we apply scientific, critically rationalist principles to the Anarcho-Capitalist fusion of economic analysis and both ethical and legal issues?

After this examination, several concepts remained: the higher rate of value creation, adaptation and processing of information by markets as opposed to central planning, the importance of property norms for maintaining said markets and the notion that economic language is a particularly useful tool for objectively describing human behaviour whilst incorporating the least prejudice or bias about them in our statements.

Now that we have gotten the movement's roots out of the way, let us focus on our first new concept...

Testimonialism

Testimonialism is one of *the* core ideas of Natural Jurisprudence. It ensures statements about the world are as truthful as possible, so that, when using it, you will fail or at least have a very hard time to consciously or unconsciously deceive those you are talking to.

The name stems from the word "testimony". This alludes to the fact that the majority of generally accepted hypotheses were never thought up or tested by ourselves, but rather reported to us as true. Furthermore, we only arrive at viable judgments about the world by sharing and testing our perceptions and ways of interpretation with others and deciding which parts of these are testably true or not. The most important truths in life, those people do not keep to themselves, are hence social constructs. And the required testimony by others for that may be more truthfully or less truthfully uttered.

Testimonialism comes close to a Martial epistemology because of the high stakes that implies: picture yourself as being a scout for your squad of soldiers tasked with telling your general about the enemy's forces. Your judgment of the situation could possibly lead your comrades into a crushing loss or a sweeping victory. Furthermore, if you would fail

to report something of relevance, you would be held accountable for the loss of lives and material in a military trial. Hence you are better off at always reminding your superior of the fallibility of your claims, whilst still ensuring him that you have done your job in the best way possible at that time.

To us, handing over a truth to someone else is a matter of life or death, returning home in great numbers with great treasures to share... or terribly defeated, with open wounds and the cold bodies of your comrades ready to be buried.

Testimonialism is not concerned with every little, private talk. We use imprecise, moral, emotional, non-testable, non-defined or supernatural terms all the time without a great loss – the less impact your speech will have, the less protective measurements you need to install against it.

But truth is a common good, and the more of a public lie reaches, the more devastating it can be. What acclaimed scientists, politicians and journalists put out there is based on trust and trust alone. And without that trust, society would not be able to progress; we would all be busy gaining the expertise and knowledge necessary to test the statements they provide us with for their truthfulness, or rather be busy applying that to *any* statement. Due to the impossibly large cost this procedure would entail, rendering any action impossible, we decide to take the risk.

However, that could become costly as well, as undoing a lie needs time, effort, and proof. But we bear such risks every day, because no matter how much lies are created and how imprecisely people talk about things, in most cases, the future profits of trusting our peers or others have proven to be higher than the costs. Societies where social trust does not exist tend to devolve into smaller, easier to assemble groups deceiving others for their group's benefit, while avoiding the deceit of other groups – because why would you invest in truth if that were to gain you a disadvantage? Hence, those norms must be defended from harm at all costs if one has an interest in relatively peaceful, easy lives.

In modern times, institutions of public trust and the common good of knowledge are under attack more than they have ever been. In earlier times, the price of spreading information was very high. That cost shrunk over the ages: paper, roads, the printing press, telegraphs. But our internet has done to information what industry did to production of most other goods, it has dramatically lowered the prices as never seen before. On all accounts, the cost of transmitting information in general, hence also lies went down and liar's profits hence went up. As creating truths takes more time and work

than lies, we need a defense mechanism before the tension arising from such lies results in costly, divisive or even violent conflicts.

If there is no way for groups in society to overcome their biases, come together on equal terms and agree on a goal somehow beneficial to both sides, the only other means of working together with another group is to dominate them. And dominance means that the dominated party tends to either get exploited, wherein their demands are not met, or they will revolt against the dominating party, which is costly and disrupts any productivity left for both groups.

If there is no inter-group way to enforce truth, judgments will not be recognized, rule of law cannot be enforced, and war and misery could ensue in the long run. Either this, or one group props up enough violence, status or wealth to dominate and exploit others until those get their chance to rule.

Both strategies are less beneficial to the parties participating than cooperation. And to secure cooperation, truth is the start.

Human storytelling and hence truth-telling has evolved over time. Myths were rich in images and room for interpretation, applicable to many situations and hence their truths have survived until this day; but they are hardly falsifiable for the same reason. Science is mostly applicable to specific scenarios, but hence aids making precise judgments more than myths ever could. As you will see later on, mythical truths do not qualify under testimonial standards because this applicability makes them apt to be abused by interpretation.

Society is conscious of the discoveries and uses of scientific language, and various segments of it have used it to deconstruct or extend a diverse set of social norms. What many groups interested in those norms have not managed yet is restating these norms according to scientific standards, making them more truthful and consistent with reality, but also securing them against critique that it would not be able to sufficiently counter in older, imprecise modes of language. That demand exists because views on morality, rituals or traditions of some groups have survived for hundreds or thousands of years, appearing in diverse regions and cultures; hence it follows that they ought to be approached with a proportional caution and a highly long-term outlook, even though they may seem strange or nonsensical at first.

What follows are all the tests necessary to produce a statement sufficiently truthful or testimonial. Accompanying them will be some thought up examples showing how to

mimic the process, even though we usually refrain from using castles in the sky instead of real-life evidence. If they do not suffice, try sensibly using these tests in your day-to-day life and see what comes from it.

Test 1: Logic (Categorical, Internal consistency: non-conflation of entities; relations consistent with rules)

This test deals with what people normally refer to as “logical”: all participating identities and their relations are defined and interact in accordance with these definitions; no separate identities are conflated into one.

Mathematics and programming languages are widely known examples of logic, two languages with certain rules and symbols that must be used accordingly. Those systems do not have to refer to any real-world circumstances in order to remain true; they are true or false apart from it. Math with its basic rule of keeping both sides equal and programming as a solution to effectively control machines have proven useful, but you will also find systems developed in those fields that are just concerned with the rules of the respective language and its potential and less so with tangible reality. This is because logical systems work according to certain axioms, which can be based in either observation or just pure thought. Either way, if these axioms prove faulty, the entire reasoning will fall apart.

Categorical consistency is what keeps the numbers and data dealt with free from conflation. This forces us to clearly define the differences between objects so that their assigned behaviour or properties will not change within our line of reasoning. Deceit by avoiding this can be seen in a plethora of deceptive debate tactics such as changing up definitions of terms all the time in a way that suits your line of argument best, even if you have already stated a contrary one.

Politically, conflation is the tool of ideological extremists: “If you’re not with us, you’re with them”. From this point of view, anyone who steps out of your political group’s purity standards is aiding the enemy of your ideology. This reduces the entire political spectrum of diverse incentives and goals to a black-and-white “us” vs “them”, skipping any attempt at compromise with outsiders. Because to compromise, one would have to find workable solutions instead of ways to successfully dominate.

Test 2: External correspondence

You can set up any system with all the rules and identities you like. But if you want to use that system for judging reality, you have to assemble and observe evidence of what you are suggesting. A rationalistic, clear cut, logical argument may never incorporate the infinite variables one has to calculate with when acting within reality. Axiomatic arguments are closed and deterministic: knowing all the starting conditions or principles makes it possible to accurately predict outcomes. In reality, it is not always possible to include or exclude influences on a system – they are open. Data analysis can also not incorporate all variables, but at least more than a rational deduction ever could.

Furthermore, some effects are so tiny on an individual level that they only emerge when observing a huge population. So-called “emergent phenomena” have important consequences, for example on national economies or ecosystems, but cannot be captured by logical deduction.

One can certainly argue about things that are not directly tied to reality. But that should not be part of the public fund of knowledge, and hence not affect law or politics, because such arguments promote conflicts both unnecessary and unsolvable.

Philosophers are often guilty of leaving this test out. Any system, any plan that aims to construct something within our reality with potential costs to others should *first* consider what is *possible and probable* within it, and then deduce their laws from that. An *ought* cannot be derived from an *is*, but in this world, what cannot even *exist* should be dismissed in the first place.

Test 3: Existential possibility

In its most boiled down form, Existential possibility tests for both realism and naturalism in a truth claim. Realism views reality and its effects as existing independent of our perception. The laws of nature will not change even if you strongly try to disregard them by shutting your eyes or talking yourself into delusion. Naturalism states that things only exist in conformity with the discovered natural, meaning physical and evolutionary, laws. I will provide a simple example: if someone claims to have learned to fly and disregard gravitation as a matter of his or his group’s beliefs, this perception will change nothing at all about his inevitable fall to the ground. We can either choose to conform as much as possible to these harsh and unforgiving realities or delude ourselves into thinking that it is possible to escape by any means.

We do not oppose belief in in that granting absolute truth, hope, vision or meaning, be it material or supernatural. However, in a public discussion of solutions between people with differing systems, conformity to the laws of nature has been the objectively most successful way to achieve a goal. Magic, miracles, wishful thinking – whatever seems to allow you to avoid the judgment of these laws is not reliable to plan with and falsification has not been on its side either.

This carries a new test with it: survivability.

Does the argument defeat itself? Does a policy incentivize effects that would render it impossible or futile in the long run?

The first question should already be dealt with in test 1, but the second one is a bit trickier. An easy example of this would be Anarcho-Capitalism, as it both fails this test and is obscure enough that few readers are going to be be offended by its falsification. If your demand is “Make everything voluntary”, this will sell to many people. But this entails that all people must have an interest in commons like private property, public decency and so on; people must believe in those to not rebel against rising disparities between rich and poor, or to voluntarily bear the consequences of every economic disaster as the Austrian school of economics dictates. Because there is no centralized violence anymore, people will not necessarily be taught to respect these principles, free riding on the back of those who do.

And we have not touched on the worst case: an Anarcho-Capitalist society prospers and exceeds all around it. What would stop another nation from invading it and stealing its prosperity? An anarcho-capitalist would pose that a market demand for defense would supply society with private militaries even better than public ones. But being a military company during peace time is not profitable; few would sign up for it and innovation in weapons would probably decline as well if AnCap society is as peaceful as it claims. You would need a militia that all voluntarily pay or contribute to for defense, and all who would not, would get excluded by their neighbours. What results would be a state with overcomplicated procedures that would not last in competition with other states regardless.

A system to secure ethics precedes any system of ethics. Existence and possibility precede *everything*.

The only way Anarcho-Capitalism would succeed policy-wise would be in a world where all people were firm believers in the system already, all other countries and militaries

disbanded. Suddenly, it seems that the actual *policies* of Anarcho-Capitalism would defeat the system's maintenance: it is not existentially possible. (And we have not touched yet that being born is highly involuntary.)

Our method of thinking discards all strategies that would lead to the group proposing them being unable to compete in this world of scarce resources and opposing preferences. The probability of being irrelevant to history is high enough already; if you are fighting against your own survival, then your descendants will either adapt or cease to matter at all.

Test 4: Operationalism

Testability creates trust, plain and simple. The possibility of testing a statement, even if not used, makes it more believable, because risking to be found out as a liar is something actual liars tend to avoid.

How do we ensure this testability? We make our entire statement an operation, a sequence of actions. The actions must be as precise as necessary to prevent any misunderstanding.

One easy way of ensuring "precise" actions would be getting rid of the word "to be" (*E-prime*). People often conflate a lot of different actions by using the word *to be*, which creates a big spectrum of possible miscommunication. For example, claiming that "Sarah is a bad person" could support two claims: one, that I *perceive* Sarah as a bad person because of past actions I observed, or past actions others have reported to me, or two, that Sarah will always exist as someone who hurts others in some way.

For our first statement of *perception*, there is a more precise way to express our view *and* the statement is not final: Sarah can change her ways and my *perception* of her will.

A statement of *existence* is final: Sarah cannot lay off her essential mode of being. Existence is an extremely complicated concept in philosophy that we just assume to understand, but few can define it in a way that a clear majority of people will agree.

Finally, we would have to add one or two sentences. *Me perceiving* Sarah as a bad person communicates next to nothing testable to others. If they share your moral compass, that might suffice. But testimonially, you should report behaviour and actions that led you to this conclusion, instead of positing your verdict on the matter as final. We will get to our way of testing actions for morality later. Conclusively, if you have a better word or stand-

in sentence for “to be”, use it, and your speech will be more truthful on the spot; if you do not, be mindful of the effects that could have.

A real-life example where we use operationalism is cooking according to recipes. A recipe is a promise: do these steps I describe with these ingredients, and your results will not be too far from my result. Scientists regularly use operationalism as well: repeat my study with these methods and your results will not falsify the results of my study.

Scientific studies often try to set *borders* for their claims: firstly, in which areas their hypothesis seems to be at work and in which it does not, secondly, at which point it will have to be abandoned as falsified. Those limits have a reason: one, that your argument cannot be wrongfully applied, two, that your opponent knows he has a chance at winning the discussion. If there is a possibility for infinite excuses by switching circumstances or scale of your argument, debate does not make any sense in the first place. Hence, it is an attempt at deceit.

Operationalism is already omnipresent in programming languages which completely consist of different sets of operations. That is also a way to observe and analyze strategies: what has to be true or taken into account for this outcome to be produced; what is done so that this product results. By assembling data on their actions and results rather than their self-professed beliefs, all kinds of methods and strategies can be more effectively displayed than by other grammars such as moralistic, supernatural or idealist ones.

The last layer of operationalism are units, states or intensities. There must be a scale of testable units, states, or intensities that participants can agree on measures the right thing. You must know *by what* you are measuring something.

One of our goals consists of discussing and adopting *operational definitions* for the important terms of socio-political discourse. One method we use for this is called “serializing a term”. You assemble a group of words that are connected by being almost synonymously used, then you say what distinguishes them in some sort of intensity and put them in ordered series, which the participants of a discussion can point to if a term is unclear.

e.g.

good < moral < ethical < right < |amoral| > wrong > unethical > immoral, > evil

- Good: when you do something that benefits others, at neutral or some cost to you.

- Moral: when you do something where you could cheat others indirectly and anonymously, but you don't.
- Ethical: when you do something where you could cheat the other person directly, but you don't.
- Right: when you do something that could affect others, but you ensure it doesn't.
- Amoral: when you do something that doesn't affect others because it can't.
- Wrong: when you do something that could affect others, but without ensuring it does.
- Unethical: when you do something where you can cheat the other person directly and you do.
- Immoral: when you do something where you could cheat others indirectly and anonymously and you do.
- Evil: when you do something that harms others, just to harm them even if it costs you.

By settling on several series and measuring instruments ahead of debate, misunderstanding is reduced, and definitions remain precise, truthful and decidable. *Debatable arguments fuel debates, decidable arguments fuel decisions.*

Test 5: Due diligence, Exhaustive accounting

Due diligence and exhaustive accounting are a warranty that the speaker has done truthful research on the topic he speaks about to satisfy the demand for infallibility.

Due diligence is produced by assembling data and trying to falsify a hypothesis, whilst exhaustive accounting requires you to list weaknesses of your own perception and includes necessary, unfalsified views on an issue without misrepresenting them. Also, it entails that you actively show the weaknesses of your hypothesis and your own judgment (e.g. "I perceive it as" instead of "It is"). People often talk about their solutions only naming the benefits, but no costs; or critique the solutions of others by only stating costs and minimizing the benefits. This is lying by omission and can be avoided by including more relevant perspectives into the argument.

If you do not disprove a theory but want to discard it because its costs are too high, due diligence entails that you develop a better way of solving the exact same problem that avoids the criticism you made.

The more costs your truth could entail, the higher the standards of warranty for your due diligence and exhaustive accounting are. Lying on a great scale with corresponding costs can even lead to demands of restitution towards those you have wronged.

Talking to your family, you might not need to prove that you have reviewed other research or actively looked for contrary evidence. If you are advising a politician's decision however, it would be wise to signal that you have included the strongest arguments from all sides and know about the possible failures of your own argument.

Test 6: Parsimony

We create models of the world around us to efficiently deal with it. This efficiency lies in reducing calculation cost so much that compared to the cost of resulting errors, we are still left with a clear profit.

We assign names and numbers; we draw lines where none exist. Creating such models, we can never account for all possible influences: that would unnecessarily complicate the model and one could not draw clear conclusions. We draw lines through bulks of data and then use them to calculate, although they only account for a relative tendency within the data rather than for individual data. A norm, in its very nature, does not inherently account for *most* of the data, depending on what was analyzed. That is why the "Naxalt"-argument is so tiring for anyone with a slight knowledge of statistics ("Not all x are like that"): pointing out that e. g. "I have encountered an exception to that rule" is often a statement about the necessary nature of many models and no counter argument towards it. Similar standards apply to all norms stated as part of this document. (To preemptively dismiss the "Naxalt"-response to this: Obviously, there are issues and models in which the tails of the curve matter more than usually.)

But models *do* need to sufficiently account for the data assembled; if a theory cannot account for a fact that can be consistently observed, it has been falsified in just that moment.

Justificationists who dislike discarding models would now try to incorporate that observation into their present model; but maintaining it has become way more complicated. Models getting more complicated the more facts you introduce to them is a bad trend; it slowly defeats the purpose of building a model in the first place. A good model should stay stable in its explanatory principle with increases in precision.

Critical Rationalists would obviously prefer discarding the theory in that moment and replacing it with a simpler one, instead of increasing complexity of the old model to maintain the bias.

Parsimony is the principle of always preferring the simpler hypothesis over the more complicated one when both account for the same amount of data. It is vital, because making anything in our world intelligible requires description; and our world is complex enough already that pride cannot be put against truth for long.

An historical example would be the debate over heliocentrism and geocentrism. Heliocentrism says that the Earth and other planets circle around the sun; geocentrism was the thesis that the sun and other planets circle around the Earth. For centuries, both models accounted for everything we could observe about celestial bodies and were hence truthful statements. But, building up to the 17th century, scientists discovered that the prevalent geocentric theory had exceeded the heliocentric in complexity by far. A paradigm shift took place; the calculations got more precise because of using the heliocentric model, and therefore we use it to this day.

Test 7: Reciprocity

A test of morality that is going to be explained in detail later. Just keep in mind that performing all the tests mentioned beforehand more or less makes this one redundant.

It could for example act as an insurance that the costs of speaking your truth are not unnecessarily high for others by the way you voice it. Obviously, naked truths are often hurtful regardless; and the long-term benefits of truths tend to exceed those of lies by far, even if they claim nobility. But in the end, refraining from stirring up unnecessary conflict, recognizing whom you are arguing with increases the probability of your personal statement becoming a generally accepted concept.

Summary

Test for

1. Logic
2. External correspondence
3. Existential possibility
4. Operationalism
5. Due diligence, Exhaustive accounting

6. Parsimony

7. Reciprocity

After applying all these tests to a statement, it is extremely hard to make an untruthful claim about the world. Try testing yourself: does what I intuit to be a lie fail one of these tests or does it just conflict with my bias? In the first case, try calmly applying the core principle of the failed test to keep someone from spreading a lie. Keep the context and severity of a failure in mind.

In an age where lies are the cheapest to create, Testimonial standards allow us to intuit and counter lies more effectively, which is vital to maintain our communities, nations and civilizations.

From Man to State: Cooperation, its limits and their consequences

Property-in-toto

If one tests the current theories of property out there, they quickly arrive at the conclusion that none of them hold up to the standards laid out above: most rest on axioms derived from thought instead of observation and hence fail the tests of external correspondence, exhaustive accounting and often operationalism. This leads to a reductionist view that does not account for actual human behaviour; for example, the Libertarian framework can only account for private, exclusive property and out of that it concludes that all common goods are inefficient and cause conflict. Socialists of all kinds often see it the opposite way from *their* fallacious axiom's perspective: private property must mostly lead to unjust hierarchies and less prosperity because one does not have to use his property well to have ownership rights, while common goods lead to a just and efficient allocation of resources. And, far from ideologies, state law treats property merely as titles handed out by governments, justified by their legitimate monopoly on violence.

Our organization uses a Testimonial, scientific definition of property free of debatable moral, legal or rationalist axioms: We define Property as "that which humans demonstrate a propensity to retaliate against the imposition of cost upon".

This is a highly inclusive modeling of property that accounts for observable human action: what you will not defend in case of attack or theft cannot be your property.

When Max Weber characterized the state as a legitimate monopoly of violence over a certain territory in his 1919 essay "Politics as a Vocation", or Popper coined falsifiability as the scientific principle, that was obviously reductive in some ways. A state for example

consists of a group of people with distinct titles, institutions, a bureaucracy, procedures, rituals and even land and buildings. But what Weber was looking for was the distinct “statist principle” that differentiated it from other associations of people with bureaucracies, land and procedures like companies, churches or clubs. This reduction to distinct, first principles is commonly used in sciences to characterize entities, and we are going to continuously apply such methods as well in this document.

Of course, people also do different things to display ownership of something: they invest in it, they maintain it. But if someone invests in something but does not even try to keep someone from treating it as his own – by regularly using or damaging it-, an outsider could not observe a property claim. Defense is what creates decidability, and, again, that is what a model should help you with: increase decidability, decrease discretion.

Why is this so useful?

Property-in-toto includes all kinds of property. It includes physically tangible property like a house or a car or your own body, it includes intangible property like honor, societal values, and norms. Claiming that these properties are illegitimate will not help a society when their owners sooner or later start defending them with violence. Either we account for all that people defend to mitigate unnecessary conflict, or we do not and face the consequences.

All these properties, private and common, were discovered by humans, and with it came ways to avoid conflict where it could be avoided and apply violence where it was needed. Private goods are those an individual invests in and can personally reap all the benefits of.

Common goods or commons are those that all members of a group invest into and reap benefits of.

Investments can be as varied as the kind of property they pertain to. These are some variants you might not have thought of:

Not acting on an opportunity for profit (e. g. not robbing whomever you encounter on the street, so you reap the benefits of a social order that respects personal property but let go of the profits of the robberies)

and

acting on an opportunity exhaustively (e.g. working better than explicitly demanded in your contract, wherein the profits you let go become the commons of conscientiousness) We developed morality and ethics as unspoken social contracts, trying to establish commons like fairness, decency, and a lot of other things.

We developed law and politics to compromise between different views of how much which commons need to be protected, because what you choose to protect how much depends on each individual's nature and nurture alike.

What all societies discovered was that defense by a group of people exceeded that of a single person in effect. Hence (surviving) societies developed social contracts and customs to mediate between the properties-in-toto of their members so that all capable of exercising or supporting defense could flourish optimally. What they also discovered was that this is a continuous struggle of trade-off and compromise because we can never fully account for all strategies and their properties. If someone reacts offended to a statement of yours, this is a response to such a failure of accounting. Try to help the person formulate a version of their property so that you can check whether you can tolerate it; and if so, leave the person alone with what you cannot understand. This novel model of property translates the mere liberal thesis of "My freedom ends where yours begins" into plannable actions within reality. Of course, suppressing certain statements like falsehoods can also add to the commons. In the case of falsehoods, the returns for a society are by necessity higher than the costs of protecting everyone's personal and conflicting models of the world.

We use economic language to describe human action because it is a morality free and precise way to account for it. But this only works because of our extended definition of property that accounts for **all** costs one could try to avoid on **all** properties to not generate a demand for retaliation or restitution. Avoidance of costs, seeking for benefits, cooperation for profit are widely used in biology or genetics to describe not only humans, but all kinds of organisms, even genes; and they work well to predict behaviour. The economy and its pricing system have also been highly successful at creating a relatively frictionless, universalized calculation of value across different countries and cultural borders.

All rights can be stated as property rights, and property as a social construct must be defended or else it ceases to exist.

Rights

We do not view any right as something you *have* by default. Rights are *constructed* within cooperative property norms, but the feelings these properties stem from can only be felt by individuals themselves – or not. Our claim of being scientific entails that our prescriptions and truths are independent from subjective sensibilities, which we achieve by describing rules in behaviour *between* them –*interaction*.

The notion of inviolable, human rights for example, is a noble one; it deems a certain set of property norms as untouchable. But the deciding factor in keeping all these rights extant is violence, not words on paper, not the people supporting it. As last resort to end a conflict, violence is the sole arbiter whether a right's violation will continue. And that violence must be organized, contractually regulated and paid for.

Demands of rights should always carry the reasons why your entire polity, all diverse people with vastly different properties and property perceptions, should come up for the cost of your right's maintenance and defense.

Only an operational right can take proper effect. "You cannot violate this right" is a mere signal of power. As we see with human rights, they can and will be violated if someone sees an opportunity to gain something from it; those hypotheses are easy to falsify. An operational, existentially possible definition would read something like: if you try to violate this right, I/my group will, by any means, impose so much cost onto you/your group that you will cease violating it. Constructing rights by objective realities like these is advantageous compared to the typical strategy of establishing rights: by appeals to subjective conscience and moralities which can gravely differ between individuals and groups.

So, if you demand a right from society, lay out what the costs to defend and maintain it will be, why all or some members of it should bear that cost for you and what profits it will generate for the polity. Otherwise, you will force people to pay for your lifestyle without a reason for them *why* those expenses must exist, which makes you reliant on their often inconsistent altruism.

A demand of rights always carries the obligation to reinvest into the commons that enable it to exist; if it is stated in such a way that its defense and maintenance are impossible, the costs you demand society to bear are infinite and they at least stop covering them.

Strategies

All people must act to survive, and to act, we must discern opportunity and danger within reality. To achieve that, we perceive the world by our fundamentally genetically determined sensory organs and brain structures, who carry our processing structures, instincts and hormone output and, additionally, imprinting in infancy, learnt life experience, knowledge about methods and facts and societally determined instruments like social roles, customs, manners and language. Primarily, language has a use in a social structure, to communicate your perception or coordinate action with others who share the same general anatomy as us: other humans who can understand our experience, seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, tasting, but also feelings of happiness, fear, love, envy, disgust, and hate; and who know which words we use to describe what.

Within this tight frame of perception that we cannot escape, there is room for unforeseeable decisions: humans have the capacity to overrule many instincts and societal concepts if they see a benefit from it, hence prediction of human behaviour needs to take diverse incentives into account. But only partially avoiding our frame of perception takes time and more energy than giving in, for example by using willpower and future goals to override destructive needs of pleasure in the moment. Generally, we do not have that time or energy. We cannot always act consciously, and even if we did, we would still generally align with the incentives our frame of perception provides us with.

This only grows harder over time: our brain develops in all moments we act, it sees what works for us, which routes and memories we use and which we do not. Important experiences form a material structure in your brain that it will re-use to save energy. This adds to the general brain structure you were born with.

Our core function is equal to many other organisms: seek calories to keep yourself running, try to seek as much as you can and simultaneously reproduce and supply your offspring as much as needed. We are a product of evolution as is every fungus, and the tautological truth about evolution is: all which did not survive *did not survive*. It has no effect on the present, whilst all that survived or procreated before death does. Our most basic frame is survival and the associated struggles, and from that many complex principles have evolved. The Red Queen law of evolution states that no species ever gains an evolutionary advantage that lets it rest; it must always continue to adapt, collect calories and reproduce or else, it will die off.

Man has, by competition within a multitude of environments against a multitude of other organisms and especially other people, achieved a state in which we have domesticated

ourselves and the world around us. Through sexual selection, technological innovation and organized violence we have turned into an animal that may rest from most of these struggles of survival.

But, because humans take a lot of time to develop before we reproduce, our brains have remained remarkably similar since our race branched out thousands of years ago.

And even today, we use these brain structures, hormone outputs and sensory organs to act. For example, the human brain is expertly adapted to analyzing tiny social clues in a person's look or expression, whereas scientific and economic calculation for manipulating the resources around us to our benefit is way less intuitive. We are not primarily driven by *survival*, but by *reproduction*, hence our minds are made to increase status in a group of preferred mates. Status can be defined as how much potential access a person has to trade opportunities and mates within a group. This explanation shows us why many people spend money on luxurious items with no apparent use except status rather than staying frugal or investing financially. It also reveals the problematic nature of our language: noticeably, it is less apt at precisely communicating about the world around us, about opportunities and risks, laws and necessities. Rather, it often leads to misunderstandings, is used for seduction, emotional manipulation, deception and fraud. Keep in mind that testimonial speech wants to narrow human speech down in such a way that this function is inhibited. And just as numerical prices make it possible to compare incomparable values such as hours worked and number of potatoes, to plan and decide with this information on a massive scale, testimonial language would bridge differences in moral instincts and cultures to inhibit unnecessary friction.

Because every human is, by the nature of sexual selection and reproduction, unique, and our environments are unique, and our experiences are unique, we all have developed diverse strategies to live. We have developed habits to keep us running, we have entered into groups and relationships, we have seized opportunities that align with our frame of perception. The multitude of groups humans live in have also adapted to continue serving the needs of their members or otherwise they have perished, being invaded or dissolving (obviously over a long time frame, as groups shape the desires of their members so that maintaining the group becomes one of them).

But these strategies, different as they are, display certain rules. And, as often is the case in reality, even though the theoretical amount of strategies is infinite, the actual amount can be fit into norms and categories. Depending on region, ethnicity, culture, religion, mode

of production, family type and social or economic class, distinct differences in action and perception are consistently measurable, for example in customs. The net of rules is complex because of the huge amounts of data one needs to consider with every individual; additionally, it is a moving target because our evolutionary strategies change a little every day. Therefore, researchers look at the group behaviour of similar evolutionary groups over time to discern strategies, because only with a great amount of data to analyze, unique strategic patterns will be validly observable.

Accounting for that reductionist aspect of stating norms, but also for the necessity of stating valid norms and categories, we conclude that, as we have evolved as social animals, individual strategies can be understood as subject to certain economic, cultural, and genetic incentives,

and individuals align in different social groups that serve their strategies best; these groups then align with other groups to cooperate, which creates a new strategical layer.

Property-in-toto is a vital part of all these strategies: they center around defending and maintaining innumerable private as well as common goods.

What will be discussed from now on are layers of these strategies, which patterns we have assembled from a diverse set of research and how that could be beneficial.

Grammars

There are large groups of people who use the same language, meaning they all use similar signals to communicate about the world around them. These will be used in sentences to convey a certain meaning, and how sentences will be structured, which words will be used aiming for which effect, makes up an individual's grammar.

To us, a grammar is the strategy of how you formulate an argument you deem persuasive, and it is one of the main causes of conflict in modern society. Depending on your frame of perception, certain arguments will be more or less understandable to you. A person appealing to your emotions or principles might exactly convey their feelings – or achieve the contrary. Thus, even within the same language, people's word base and reasoning can hugely differ depending on a multitude of factors.

This is because to communicate we must assume that our perception and interpretation of the world do not significantly differ, when in fact, perception of most people is very similar, but interpretation can widely diverge.

We like to be in groups of people of our native language because it takes way less effort to communicate your needs and demands precisely. For equal reasons we tend to flock together with those who share our strategy and grammar. Because societies have grown gigantic, it is harder to recognize that these differences exist as strongly as they do, because we can comfortably spend an entire life surrounded by those with our core strategy.

Grammars are a part of individual strategies and conflicts between them, but they are also part of group strategies and conflicts between them.

Some Grammars generally employ arguments that are in line with Testimonialism, some do not. Obviously, we are opposed to addressing the public with those Grammars that deviate from truthful standards, for example by only alluding to non-falsifiable or non-operational, idealistic or undermining narratives.

Some Natural Laws of interaction

There are three ways to act towards another individual or a group: cooperation, non-cooperation, and conflict. To make this more understandable, we will discuss the interactions of exactly two parties and their competitive strategies.

Cooperation may arise if both strategies can be aligned in a way that the benefits of working together exceed the benefits of leaving each other alone or fighting against each other. Both sides must be able to perceive such benefits themselves.

Non-Cooperation will likely arise if both strategies impose more costs than benefits on each other in cooperation. This might be because the language they are using to communicate with each other is prone to misunderstandings or involuntary deception.

Conflict may arise if both strategies want to use the same thing for different goals or if the reward of conflict is deemed greater than its cost.

If a group aims to engage in cooperation with another, it will need to demonstrate that cooperating will benefit both more than just leaving each other alone; it would also need to show that both groups would benefit from cooperation (for example by contract); and finally it would have to show that the gains of cooperation would be higher than those of one group coercively dominating the other (for example by keeping a defensive army that would fight back against domination).

For all of this to happen, both groups would need to communicate about their respective offers and demands in a way that the least possible misunderstanding ensues. This is what

Testimonialism seeks to accomplish: to construct a language that is as precise as it is testable, so that groups can state their demands and strategies as truthfully as possible. In that, we, lending from developments in evolutionary biology and psychology, found the only Natural Law between humans that decides whether conflict will or will not ensue, whether cooperation will or will not persist.

The Road to Reciprocity

Three ways to gain

As there are three ways to interact, there are three ways to gain from one another. These are found on every level of life (even genes have been shown to interact in the first and third way):

1. Trade
2. Predation
3. Parasitism

Trade refers to two entities exchanging goods or services so that both sides gain a profit from their strategy's point of view, whilst bearing similarly perceived costs.

Predation is the opposite: one side forces the other into producing a profit for them, in disregard for how much costs that entails for the other side. This openly goes against the other entity's strategy of cost avoidance, and, depending on the prey's fitness, costly conflict between both sides might ensue. Most often in nature, the predator just kills his prey and takes what he needs.

Parasitism lays between those two. Parasitic behaviour is when one entity benefits from another one more than the other entity would allow for if exhaustively informed about the consequences – it trades at an involuntary discount. Parasitism requires keeping the host in ignorance about the theft being done to them. Often, it happens under the guise of an equal trade.

Trade guarantees long term benefits but is costly to maintain for both sides in the long term. Still, the profit of non-parasitic trade often outweighs those costs by far.

Speaking generally and relatively, it can be stated that:

Predation promises a short-term benefit at a short-term expense.

Parasitism guarantees the long-term benefit of trade and partially avoids its cost.

Parasitism is also less easy to spot for the host than predation is for the prey.

Now let us enact these rules onto human interaction:

If one wants to ensure trade, he firstly needs to keep the predators in check. Predation is easy to discern from trade and hence that is a costly, but relatively easy task: organize enough violence so that a possible predator will have more costs than benefits from predation; organize institutions of defense and punishment.

But parasitism is harder to keep in check, as it is the most deceptive. Predators deceive to surprise their prey, prey fools predators. People in trading and dating often deceive a little to increase their chance of success. But parasites fundamentally rely on it.

You can put in place as many defensive laws and customs as you like, there will always be a little hole to be exploited in it. Worse, if you have finally managed to keep the predators of your society in check, parasites profit from the costs of that: a society based on trade is where parasitic behaviour can truly flourish. A society that tolerates parasitism will lose necessary resources without gain, and a strategy which undermines its own foundational commons is not existentially possible and should be abandoned before it is too late.

In natural cooperation, there is one iron law to ensure non-Parasitism that we have formulated as a set of tests. It is called **Reciprocity**.

The five criteria a trade must fulfill so that cooperation will not generate demands of restitution and retaliation are...

1: Voluntary

No trading party can be forced to participate in that trade. If someone would need to be forced to trade, it is obvious he does not view it as beneficial to his Property-in-toto, hence the profit would not be completely mutual. It would be parasitism or predation from one party onto the other.

This is not an idealistic definition of voluntary, however. It maintains your right to freely associate with whom to bargain over something but does not ensure anything else. One always has to invest to survive, and one always has scarce opportunities to do so which he *must* choose from.

However, someone aggressively exploiting another's situation of danger to rig the trade in his favour does not ensure that cooperation will continue for long; the other party will withdraw as quickly as it can, which imposes costs on the commons of cooperation. Had the saviour offered a fair prize, his opportunity costs would have been invested into the commons guaranteeing trade for a longer time.

Using the limits of freedom of association and avoidance of free riding, we can construct a workable commons of voluntary trades.

2: Exhaustively informed

As will be discussed later, trades rely on both sides profiting off them.

Hence, if one side knows anything that would substantially change the perceived value for the other (for example that the product is faulty or of no use to the situation) and withholds that knowledge, he is gaining a profit at the other's expense: committing fraud. "Exhaustively informed" is not some homo oeconomicus term presuming all participants need to know all available data concerning a transaction; that would not be existentially possible. Rather, the information about the trade should be as symmetrical as possible on both sides concerning potential costs and risks. Contracts should be worded in a manner that both sides roughly understand the terms used in them. By this, both sides' demands of information are satisfied sufficiently.

3: Warrantied

Those who produce a product know more things about the product than the people they sell it to, and a long-term vendor of a product will know more about a product than a potential customer.

There are two ways to deal with this asymmetry of information:

- 1) Whoever sells a product must ensure that the product will meet certain expectations and offer direct compensation to the customer if these are not met.
- 2) Whoever buys a product must do the research about as many offered products as possible on his own; if a product fails to meet his expectations, he has to bear the full cost.

In scenario one, the incentive of a producer is to manufacture a product that meets the customer's expectations. Also, there exists an incentive to precisely lay out in which situation the product should be used.

In scenario two, a producer who deceives the customer would face no negative consequence for it; a producer could profit off selling his product even when he knows it would not be particularly useful. People would only buy from companies they knew had produced well in the past, without certainty that would remain the case. Maybe they would produce more by themselves or only buy from family members.

Number 1 will create a high trust market where people are encouraged to trade and probably get exactly what they need.

Number 2 will create a low trust market where people are discouraged from trading with people or companies they do not know well or where people stop trading altogether.

4: Productive

Trades only function because both sides gain a profit from them. Both sides see a benefit from buying what the other side has to offer that the other side does not need as much (*asymmetric benefit*). The vendor needs the money to reinvest, the customer needs the product for direct use.

But if a transaction creates no unique, new benefit for both sides, there is no reason to participate. It would be a trade where one side benefits at the other's expense which requires some way of deceit or coercion. In short, it must be parasitism.

5: Free from negative externalities

A negative externality is a cost imposed on people not part of the transaction. Think of a company polluting the environment, which its clients may not have a direct disadvantage from, but the commons of clean air or drinkable water would; or of a company selling extremely unhealthy products to willing clients in a country with universal healthcare.

An example to demonstrate other dimensions of this test would be selling land to a punk rock commune in a strictly Christian, conservative neighbourhood. Let us also assume that both parties here completely fulfill the stereotypes.

The conservative neighborhood has invested in their preferred commons like a code of public decency and orderliness, low crime rates, silent nights, meeting at services on Sunday for decades. They all benefit from that, and as commons like these are attractive to people with a similar strategy, the estimated value of their houses went up. Selling land in this area must include respecting those investments: they are measurable and legitimate.

Obviously, the members of the punk rock commune have different commons: they omit their silent nights for concerts, they do not police conformity for the perceived profit of freedom. They also find it hard to understand why their Sunday morning sleep should be interrupted by bells or praying to what you see as fantasy.

If you were to sell your house in conservative-town trying to avoid conflict, you would need both the punks and yourself to warrant that this will have no uncompensated effect on the neighborhood's commons to the members of the neighborhood. Besides the potential for costly conflict, such an institution could also drive down house prices – a real economic threat.

If these costs on common and private goods are not avoided, the neighborhood would either merely be discontent, move away or bring the matter to a court. If that failed to produce a satisfactory solution, people might still defend their property-in-toto, which means that there is an increased risk of violence in the neighborhood.

Negative externalities on all Property-in-toto are the subtlest cases of parasitism. Most of the time, the people participating in a transaction do not even think of the properties they could be violating because their preferences differ from others. That is why non-participating parties ought to be conscious of and aggressive against externalities, which are easily measurable by using the definition of Property-in-toto. Still, it finally remains the responsibility of those acting first to perform due diligence on said action's costs.

One must understand as well that this does not imply getting rid of all externalities. Positive externalities are strongly encouraged. Engaging in reciprocal transactions for example invests opportunity costs into the vital commons of cooperation, property rights and honesty.

Society and preference

As we have established, a functioning society is an amalgamation of different, networked strategies with differing perceptions of the world calculating (meaning: finding solutions) and acting together to produce commons whilst being offered opportunities to fulfill desires for status and consumption.

Some differences are superficial and may be overwritten by nurture, for example fashion differences, customs of behaviour in public and private or, to choose an extreme case, psychosis due to trauma.

Others are very costly or impossible to override and hence society deems them as something you must accept as a given. Most of these areas society defends are emotional or subjective preferences – belief, art, taste in food, what is and is not disgusting, fascinating, arousing, the list goes on and on.

Sexuality serves as the strongest example: a majority has accepted the fact that they will not judge any difference in sexual preference as it is unchangeable by outsiders, a given constant where only the individual can or should make judgment about. This is because we realized that efforts to change these preferences has been futile, highly harmful to the “test subjects” or irrelevant for the larger scope of commons production.

The only line we draw in dealing with sexual preferences is that you cannot force others to participate, some sort of *consent* has to be established. This counts both for forcing those to participate who have not consented (rape, sexual harassment) or are unable to consent depending on our common definition (children, animals); but you may also be punished for exposing your sexual activities to the world (public indecency).

The careful reader might have already observed that this aligns strongly with Reciprocity: we accept anything that does not impose involuntary costs onto others.

We have realized that, because of the differing Strategies and Properties-in-toto present in society, sexual preference is not the only preference that should be dealt with in such a way. The biosocial frame pertaining to a strategy contains things such as how an individual would like his social groups to be organized, what defines status to them, what they deem beautiful and what gives them meaning, but also what is viewed as abhorrent, disgusting or evil.

People do not judge their preferences by drawing up a map of their objective morality that is totally coherent; they act within their biosocial frame, which is largely a given, and make up value systems possible within this frame when interacting with others. Conscience and morality would be abandoned if they were completely counterintuitive, and intuition arises through collection of experience and processing it through structures already present.

We come back to absolute truths: individuals hold absolute truths on the nature of the world, on how to find meaning, and live prosperous lives doing that. But, as these are largely undebatable, untestable and loaded with an excessive amount of emotion or property interest, discussion of those value systems between groups with different ones is unnecessarily costly and will either lead to one group dominating the others with their axioms, principles or faith or both groups abandoning one another.

Our societies have developed from small, familial, homogenous tribes to nation states and companies governing over millions of people with highly different interests, often living

in relatively isolated peer groups with similar economic, political, cultural and moral biases.

Small tribal societies could manage their resource allocation by familial sharing and barter, but for larger economies, these systems had to be replaced by a system of less personal market institutions like money and prices. Similarly, the impossibility of sufficient personal contact between large groups in modern nations leads to the fact that institutions of personal persuasion and empathy are needlessly inefficient at regulating cooperation towards harmony, productivity and stability. While political institutions to serve this need already exist, they are still stuck in the functions of older forms of government, leading to the facilitation of unnecessary conflict in the long run. And as group size has increased, the potential for violence and harm have done the same.

But, as anyone may observe, fruitful cooperation between men and women, young and old people and different economic classes, political convictions, religions, cultures, and ethnic groups is possible – and largely the only way to survive and prosper as a group in modernity. All groups where men and women would abandon each other would be erased from history quickly, same for those groups where parents would just abandon their children. Equally, most modern nation states have an incentive to persist in some sort of unity, as they compete on a field of equally structured societies.

Intertemporal division of perception

We hypothesize that all people and groups that are part of a community add a different frame of perception to the larger group: their instincts, their accumulated customs over time, their feelings and their way of processing impressions of the world. This is a result of our species *evolving* as groups of kin and not as atomized individuals. The distribution of traits across a society accommodates this circumstance. We call this “intertemporal division of perception”.

The base example of this comes from economics, where we talk about a spectrum from High-Time-Preference (HTP) to Low-Time-Preference (LTP).

A High-Time-Preference individual prefers a small, secure profit in the present over a potentially greater, riskier profit in the future. A Low-Time-Preference individual prefers a riskier profit in the future over a small profit in the present.

The time preference of individuals is influenced by many traits influenced by both nature and nurture. People can train their willpower to, for example, go against their instinct to eat something delicious, but unhealthy *right now*, leading to a healthier life in total.

Both ends of the spectrum have benefits in one situation and detriments in another. A mother has the instinct to feed her toddler immediately when he screams, and that is sensible, as the toddler will not be malnourished as a result. Let that toddler grow a few years and acting similarly would be bad for the child: he must learn to acquire food on his own, which food to choose etc. because he will probably outlive his mum by far (or she has different projects or new toddlers to direct attention towards). Parents have to raise him with the far future in mind, their time preference shifts.

Different conceptions of individualism can be put on this spectrum as well: HTP individualism always strives for as much private gain as possible, disregarding all groups and all commons; medium term individualism is concerned with living a good life and hence participates in constructing commons that will serve him in this timeframe, whilst also gaining in private (probably the most common form); LTP individualism invests into making the individual eternal in some way: either by heroic contribution to the commons in science, social work, art or war, or by getting children and hence ensuring survival of his bloodline and humanity at large. Both will have an effect after his lifetime, but we see people doing exactly this when they have children because of the largest interest there is: survival of your kin.

Complete high time preference individualism is impossible to maintain; medium time preference individualism is what most people might naturally aim towards; and without those who instinctively choose some variant of LTP individualism at least partially, humanity would not have survived for long, and if it had, then with proportional detriments to prosperity.

We also find time preference in both management and politics: do we save an amount of money for the future or spend it on something nice? Do we address a problem right now with all our funding or do we solve it steadily over time? Do we expand the welfare state to help those who are poor right now or do we invest the money in education, defense, infrastructure so there will be fewer poor people in the future?

We compromise between total consumption of goods (consumption: using something that cannot be used anymore afterwards) and total investment of goods (investment: delaying present consumption for future discounts in consumption).

Politics, or the production of commons, is a little bit different from private matters in this regard: private goods may or may not be consumed, which then directly benefits one party and one party only.

Commons are created and maintained by all people of a group who take the risk of investing into them. Those people must sacrifice opportunities for private gain and must be able to trust that most others will do the same. The moment commons are consumed it has ceased to exist. What you permit when you allow consumption of a commons is most of the time parasitic; tolerance towards that strategy would lead to total privatization, which would allow for total consumption, which would render commons impossible, which would render cooperation too costly.

We will come back to this later.

Markets-in-toto

“Markets in everything” follow from the aforementioned, truthful observations about human behaviour and organization.

A market may be described as a system of institutions, procedures, social structures and infrastructure in which actors continuously communicate signals of value (prices) to test their validity (“Will one buy this thing at that price”) and hence, through trial-and-error, satisfy their needs by voluntary association.

As should be obvious by now, the scope of these trades is far greater than money, tools, and consumables. Individuals and groups demonstrate differing preferences for what commons to invest in, what cultural norms to uphold, which artists to pay for creating what they deem beautiful, which people to have a family with.

We call this societal system of diverse individuals and groups trading genes and memes, private and common goods to survive and reproduce “Markets-in-toto”. It is the most highly adaptable and pluralistic way of organization: offering new information, associating with different properties of different groups are all cheap. There is a high focus on particularism and on satisfaction of individual demands. Centralized systems might attempt to be fairer by trying to apply equal principles to all human interaction but applying too many equal principles to diverse strategies leads to dissatisfaction. In a well-regulated market setting, competitors have an interest in keeping the morality of their opponents in check because parasitism and predation grant unfair advantages. In this, demand for profit becomes a more reliable basis than demand for ideological purity.

Markets increase conflict where it is needed – between different groups trying to make their product desirable so the quality of their offers must increase – and decrease it where it is unnecessary – when one strategy alone decides what is “good” and “bad” and all others have to pay for it with no alternative. This way, groups within society can produce their commons without interference from others, resulting in less political conflict and more productivity.

Acceptance of a political order is granted by legitimacy, which may not only be given by voting, as becomes visible by all the accepted, but unelected institutional leaders even in democratic countries. In a land of sovereigns, citizens would not have to grant legitimacy to all groups of their policy in government, only to their leaders and their trade contracts with other communities.

We extremely differ from Anarcho-Capitalists on the prerequisites of markets: without certain commons, Markets will eat themselves over time. Hence, the optimum strategy is to legalize consumption, undermining or attack of these commons and institute defenses. Our project has discovered several, of which many are already in place in society and only need to be named.

Some of them I have already explained: Reciprocity to ensure ongoing cooperation and trade by inhibiting parasitism, Testimonialism to support it in the field of knowledge. Some of them are going to be detailed in the following.

Sovereignty & Self Determination

To act in a market means that groups and individuals can be exclusive owners, primary defenders and investors of something. Only then will they perceive something as costly or beneficial to that property and will seize responsibility for it – which means that from that point on, others will hold them accountable for costs that property may impose.

Property norms as we know them always entail a group effort: not only will I *accept* your property, but I will also *defend* yours as if it was mine. This is a call-back to Property-in-toto: the final factor is not *refraining to consume or attack* but *defending from outside consumption and attack*. As markets require the common good of distributed and exclusive control of certain properties, group sovereignty by group defense of each other's properties needs to be established.

A typical example for sovereignty is the nation state: a state being sovereign does not mean that it is not allowed to trade with other countries: it may enter treaties; it may

share defenses against other forces. But if one of those states abuses this relationship parasitically, states can drop out of those treaties very easily, impose diplomatic and economic sanctions, or declare war to compensate their damages. If a state forces another to pay its bills or adopt its culture, those allied with none generally choose the side of the offended party (although this is hugely influenced by the political and military power of both players). This investment into the commons of national self-determination, a preservation of a cultural strategy, makes sense as most native populations have huge genetic and memetic ties to the land they inhabit and are thus the best at acting out and maintaining their country's strategy, satisfying demands other cultures would be unable to perceive or to deal with.

The complete opposite to sovereign states would be a centrally planned world state that would coordinate all countries from above. It would certainly *carry out* less conflicts because, by necessity, it would account worse for the preferences of the national groups. But what caused these conflicts beforehand, the self-interest of culturally or genetically associated tribes, would not. Many people work for their family and pay taxes for their country because they feel an innate, instinctive, natural affection towards them; this affection would fall away if the fruits of their work could just be sent to some place far away.

The smallest sovereign unit would be a family, what kind of family depends on the culture obviously. In the relatively young Western nuclear model, it consists of a father, a mother and two to three children. Familial sovereignty and its boundaries are inherently recognized in most of Western society: family issues are first and foremost dealt with at the family level. Parents oversee a huge number of duties regarding their children, feeding them, civilizing them, which means teaching them a core system of values to act by. Other families as well as the state will not intervene with this, except for the reason of defending certain commons of the intact family.

Hence, the space is certainly violable, by forced school attendance or public services in case of abuse, but society puts an incredibly huge burden on families, so it seems: to bear the cost of bringing up a new functioning citizen, to not kill or hurt or otherwise impose unnecessary cost unto him, but also to insure society against later costs – and most of that self-sufficiently. There is a lot of room for abuse of power and for failure here, and people could call that system extremely unfair and unequal.

On the other hand, the children are the parents' kin, and kinship is one of the strongest, most intuitive bonds that exist. That innate, instinctive sense of care of both mothers and fathers, the possibility for both to positively (or rather: not too negatively) influence the child is what we trust in – and for that trust, our society lets go of the opportunities of equalizing, centralizing child access to education, food, or protection from abuse which the state *could* provide. Families can live anything if it does not impede on the commons or on other families' sovereign spaces. They can have different rules for each child, different parent-child-relationships. The family-model accounts for information in a decentralized way where self-interest is in focus, mitigated by the instinctive altruism parents share with their children.

In a context of Markets-in-everything, sovereigns must compete: in production this provides innovation, in the sexual market it provides maintaining health, beauty and other desirable traits like being self-sufficient, educated or displaying good manners, in commons this provides healthy intensities of investment across the board. But this requires acceptance of both victory and failure to secure the general commons and will result in unequal, but not unjust distributions of wealth and power.

Sovereignty maintains the “voluntary” branch of the tests of reciprocity: any group or individual can organize the abandonment of their polity, withdrawing their commons from the cooperative effort. But from then on, they will be dealt with like a foreign nation would. They will not be able to live in the country and enjoy being “left alone in self-sufficiency” when the entire rest of the country needs to come up with the cost of providing the commons of public order, respect of property and peace. To make it short, members of society always have a right to secede or leave, but only if they from then on do not cost the polity a cent. Exiling and finding another polity or completely abandoned land or gathering enough support of other groups to fund and defend your own country would be ways of achieving this.

And this is what sovereignty means: people with aligning interests, commons and strategies forming an alliance to defend, discuss and contain matters of their in-group, control their destiny and prosper – as long as their actions are kept to themselves and do not impose costs on commons of other sovereign groups. This would trigger retaliation by the offended, or punishment if both parties are controlled by another, greater power. Sovereignty extends the right of kings over their country to anyone able to bear the responsibilities over their sphere, making them last, work productively and not

externalize costs. With it comes the obligation to all other sovereign groups of your polity to promote, defend and uphold their sovereignty, to watch trades between others and aggressively defend their rights from parasitism and predation by just trial and persecution. It entails a respect for value systems and views of the world different from yours, but also a desire to punish those who want to violate the commons.

Organization of violence & Rule of Law

The first question of natural ethics is: Why do I not kill you and take your stuff?

This extends to any other level (“Why should my group/state/country/civilization not...”) and it needs to be answered.

Without a great amount of organized violence, rights and responsibilities in a society cannot be fundamentally insured. The greatest deal of work – public infrastructure, bureaucracy, culture, social security - comes after it, but you need a group of people with the desire and ability to hurt others who “try to kill us and take our stuff”, otherwise, views on that topic will not be able to persist. The question of defense is the primary one, because building a prosperous society will invite conquerors otherwise. Again, Property-in-toto proves useful because it completely recognizes that fact as its core.

When people form an organization of defense, it is important that they coordinate their violence. They have to ask themselves: what do we want to punish and how intensely? Strategically similar groups develop mores and moral convictions, communicated by upbringing, rituals and social signals. Rule over larger groups is done by more universal laws.

However, Rule of Law does not form in every situation. Just look around the world: many times, you have illegitimate rulers, no just law, or you have people enriching themselves by *creating* artificial legislation instead of *abiding* by law. Nonetheless, we can test for strategies which tend to succeed at creating a stable basis for it.

Now, I am going to describe Rule of Law in a society of sovereigns as our project would envision it. That body of Law would keep basic, Western norms like private property, division of powers or equal standing before the law. But due to the application of natural law, these would have to be constructed in a Testimonial, Operational manner.

Two dualities are relevant in this context: firstly, *via-positiva* and *via-negativa*. *Via-positiva*-legislation prescribes what you *should* do. That works well in a group with the same strategy and interests, a family or a small tribe maybe, where certain preferences,

customs and commons are set in stone. But you cannot prescribe all good behaviour because that will certainly be very biased and you might not be able to perceive what damage you could do by that – or the prescriptions would get as vague as possible, which would defeat the core purpose of legislation, to simplify decisions in cases of conflict. Via-positiva legislation also mandates one way of doing good, which stifles innovation in good deeds and commons one might discover.

Our focus lies on via-negativa law: outlawing what all non-parasitic, non-predatory sovereigns of our polity desire to outlaw, what we *do not want*. This ensures that all law will be applied reciprocally, and that people may invent new ways to do good at a low cost. The second duality is constructed versus discovered law. Constructed Law means that you create a system of law based on certain principles and rationalistically try to predict conflicts. Even though one can adapt his system of law to new cases, this is a heavy-handed approach of guessing and it largely depends on the principles used to make predictions. Also, it can easily be used to violate reciprocity if it got into power-hungry hands, which would undermine the commons of cooperation.

Discovered law is that Law which is derived from observations of human behaviour and hence excludes everything that might be idealistically interesting, but impossible. This aligns perfectly with Testimonial principles.

Hence, our project seeks a process of jurisdiction where law is discovered for every case like truth and what you are *not* allowed to do is judged.

The Jury & Common Law

Law fundamentally increases decidability in cases of conflict. It gives us ways to decide without having to think of all possible costs and consequences every time.

But it is people who enact the judgments, and in this lies a possibility for interpretation. If law leaves enough possibility for it, interpretations may deviate so strongly from case to case that political activism becomes possible for a judge, although that is not his domain. His domain is application of the law, not the discovery of new means of commons production or opportunities for his group to seize like a politician.

Our proposed courts would only test for violations in reciprocity and would only allow for cases to be formulated testimonially. This ensures that such judge activism can hardly take place.

But Testimony and Law are both always group related. Science is always reported to a group in peer review, law should be as well, and it should be contestable.

If you ensure **the Jury** consists of people committed to truthfulness with investments in the polity's commons, it offers a way of combining differing perspectives on an issue, hence minimizing bias. Amongst many other benefits, it also severely inhibits bribery when you must pay several judges instead of one or you do not even know their identities. We discover Law scientifically: we state our case about the world and then construct a commons of truth by creating commensurability with others.

This is one aspect of the unification of Law, Philosophy and Science: all three are a way to increase our certainty in uncertain decisions. Philosophy gives us our foundational thoughts; Science brings them in accordance with possibility within the Laws of Nature (frees them of deceit); Law brings them in accordance with the Natural Law of Human Interaction.

Common Law confronts Law with Markets-in-toto, Testimonialism and Parasitism: parasitism continuously competes against law enforcement to find holes where it can thrive. No matter how many laws you will enact, parasites will continue to find ways to go around them and survive. How can one counter this problem?

In a Common Law system, which is the basic type in most Anglo-Saxon countries, each new case brought before court is weighed against a similar judgment made before.

The contrary version of this is Continental Civil Law, where, after every judgment, one tries to abstract the judgment into a norm, which will then be applied in the future. This reduces the accessible amount of data about a decision, which reduces precision and nuance in judgment.

The strict division I have made is of course not an accurate depiction of reality, where Anglo-Saxons codify law, Continental systems still use precedents to judge and diverse regional or religious practices muddy the water even further. Hence, the reader should see this more as a heavily simplified model necessary to understand what follows next.

In a Common Law system all discovered violations of reciprocity could be brought before court and jury and would be considered or not depending on Testimonial and Reciprocal standards. If deemed a crime, the details of the reciprocity violation would be filed in and the case would be added to a catalogue serving as law in the future. This allows for quick legal innovation in response to innovation in parasitism and would make the legal process faster than it has ever been, accelerated by the fact that testimonial and reciprocal tests

would make the judgment almost algorithmic. Furthermore, if knowledge expands in the future in a way that affects decisions on reciprocity, older precedents can be falsified by newer ones.

Furthermore, due to our overhauled Property definition, a very wide array of cases would become distinctly decidable that were not before, like enrichment by public lying, disruptive provocation or exploitation of commons.

Market Government: finalizing Societal Division of Labour

Single parliament democracy rests on a faulty idea: that all citizens of a polity are and should be equal in regard to decisions on the commons.

This is based on enlightenment values, which was the epoch that really brought about our modern conception of citizenship. But back then, we had less knowledge of the relative immutability of certain characteristics or the wide array of behavioural and political analysis we have today.

I am going to start the comparison of differing governmental models off with monarchy, because the average reader will probably know the least about serious, modern pro- and contra-arguments on this matter. Furthermore, I will only discuss absolute, hereditary monarchy and republican democracy, because most relevant principles to be discussed - as well as their counterparts - are present in them.

Monarchy was derived from the divine right of kings to rule: they were chosen by God's priests to rule, which means that only they could handle legitimacy of an heir (that and his pedigree).

Abstaining from supernatural terms one could justify the superiority of monarchy by the claim that ruling is a distinct ability that should be trained from a young age on in multiple areas; and that inheritance and personal ownership of a country has the better economic incentives to making debts, starting wars and other things than the legislative periods of democracies. Furthermore, in a democracy, you can promise and lie yourself into office, and then either do not hold your promises because of "mechanisms outside of their influence" or pay way too much to keep them. Kings on the other hand will more likely have to pay the costs of bad policy themselves, the country is their "private company" after all; secondly, the "suckers" who will pay for it in the future will be their children. Hence, one could argue that a monarchy incentivizes long term rule and should be chosen as a system of government.

Democracy can make the case for itself that it more directly accounts for the wishes of the people on government and that it gives an easier possibility to change the leader than the civil war a monarchy would require. Additionally, monarchies are known for hilariously disregarding the needs of other classes, both the Middle and Lower one, in favour of wars or degeneracy like inbreeding and excessive luxury, which checks and balances manage to inhibit. One could point to the fact that Western democracies are by far the best places to live in worldwide at the moment, and that countries like Germany have *voted* for long term rule and avoidance of debt and gotten exactly that.

There exist many further arguments for both sides, but generally, we recognize both systems' advantages and failures. It especially focuses on the fact that an absolute monarchy has no consistent mechanism apart from the monarch's judgment of insuring interclass-reciprocity, which would lead to avoidable conflicts. On the other hand, democratic parties require rule over the entire polity although they represent only a limited set of strategies of constructing commons. This almost necessitates deception, which is even more accelerated when they enter coalitions.

We envision reciprocal trades between communities in commons construction, wherein sovereign actors contribute their respective commons to the polity in accordance with others doing the same reciprocally, without telling the others how to structure their organization or how to deal with in-group issues. This process ensures that in-group struggles are dealt with *in group*, like the male-female or young-old-debate inside of the family, or in court and only processes that affect the trade of commons between classes get the chance to be carried over into parliament. Instead of vague, not binding promises between ideological camps, there would be political contracts with measurable conditions to solve societal problems in united exchange. Every strategy could bring its benefits to the table, whilst not being able to turn its perception into a common truth and order. As people already act in and associate with larger groups to defend their general interests, the structures do already exist for this – they merely need to be formalized.

Elites, Agency and Discretionary rule

We recognize from three perspectives that Elite formation within societies is mostly a natural process, even if you exclude effects of inheritance of wealth or power over time.

Due to different strategies, different people will be good at different work. Already, a hierarchy forms regarding each form of work, wherein some produce better and some worse output with the same instruments and resources.

Secondly, it is observable in most productive processes of any shape or form that a version of the Pareto-principle applies: 20% of people are responsible for 80% of the output. Out of these 20%, we would again have a 20 to 80% distribution of productivity and so on. Thus, societies that would leave men a recognition for their amount of labour to incentivize highly productive work would show a natural, unequal distribution of rewards in status and other capital. (It should be noted that the 20/80% of the Pareto-distribution do not represent exact data, but a particular trend, that a minority of a work process/employees is responsible for a majority of the final result.)

Secondly, what we call **agency** is not equally distributed either. Agency is the human capacity of identifying opportunities and *acting* towards them despite natural limitations outside and within. There are people more likely to seize responsibility or opportunity, let go of safety and take risks than others.

You can certainly observe this in your daily life: many processes need someone to seize control, to start doing things. Only after that person or those people have started, others are going to follow. This ability is a fundamental character trait that can be taught, but some have better biological incentives in assertiveness or time preference. The first one always finds themselves in a position of higher responsibility and hence of higher risk – a leadership position, in which their actions will serve as an example to others. This may all happen relatively subconsciously, as people tend to just mimic successful action without second thought. But within this distribution of differing agencies, the ones who firstly seek opportunity will always have the ability to shape and control what the group does, but without their action, group movement would most likely be uncoordinated, slow or not even existent. High agency people become good leaders. Leading itself is a required social function that can be integrated into a reciprocal division of labour. But leaders will reap benefits from that: being the person who “speaks [first]”, a “dictator” (from lat. dicere=to speak), is a fundamentally necessary privilege that should be compensated by the group profiting from it.

Thirdly, decision requires discretion, and ruling a group is nothing different than taking the risk of being wrong onto yourself. We never have enough facts to be 100% certain that an action or a solution will solve a problem; hence, in every decision, discretion is present.

Leaders perform the function of acting and coordinating *despite* that uncertainty, which, in all areas of life, is necessary for prosperity. Speaking truth is such a process, but guiding a group into unknown territory, creating a new company strategy, or judging in a legal dispute fall under the same category. Only one single person can make a *final* decision, a decision that cannot be argued about. Hence, saying that the leader of a country is ruling discretionarily is missing the point: acting where action is required but the decision is sparsely informed is the most important function of a leadership.

We take from all of this that the notion of “hierarchy” and “elites” being something evil, inherently exploitative, or merely memetically constructed does not align with what we can observe in reality.

But hierarchies and elites offer a great deal of opportunities for parasitism. A leader maintains a reciprocal relationship to the group he leads, wherein he should serve the group as well as they serve him. Mistakenness in leaders is something to be expected, but if they do not signal humility or fulfill the promise to decide well in a majority of cases, or if they ignore truth in any way, if they fail their duty to the commons and still extract profits, they are parasites or predators and should be done away with.

A sovereign society would still require a highest sovereign, who supplies final decisions. Hence, to limit discretion and keep him in check, we would focus on supplying high agency people to act as some sort of aristocracy, a group of citizens engaged in controlling the leader based on their sovereign group’s interests and taking responsibility when he fails. Some modern, western elites engage in parasitism by moving their systems of rule out of the public eye, because their low time preference solutions would not be popular in a democratic system or because they see the opportunity to get rid of accountability. Unaccountable rule does not have to be parasitic, but why should it not be?

Upper classes around the world have, contrary to Marxist analysis which expects a two-class-war solely based on means of production, often employed underclass movements against uprising middle classes demanding reciprocity. They see their safe position of power threatened and hence use their capital to fund disruption, which shall distract the middle class from them. In the current political landscape, we seem to observe similar process, wherein a tiny minority of super rich people profits worldwide, benefitting commons solely on own conditions, whilst the Middle classes shrink and the underclasses grow more and more discontent, often directing that anger at the conceivable, often national elites of the middle instead of the obscure, small, and often globally acting elite

of higher class. To be clear: They certainly do not lead some kind of diabolical shadow government set out to do evil; they just use opportunities to profit like anyone else. Still, we must limit the access to those destructive opportunities like we do for every other class. Reacting too harshly would spawn unnecessary conflicts and cycles of revenge and destruction; reacting not harsh enough might result in way stronger reactions in the future.

As we build on middle-class values like private property, constitutional, decentralized law and sovereign citizenry, undermining of Middle-class commons by whatever means will have to be addressed. Then we can return to “serving those who serve us”. A great majority elites are not more destructive than your average person, but destructive behaviour needs to be fought regardless. And money from corruption and free riding is rarely going to be used productively, which entails less prosperity and progress for all.

Every movement needs support of people who can fund it, who can offer valuable insight and experience on leadership. The only thing we will force onto any citizen enjoying the commons of a polity is that they work with the rest of society, not against it, as all members of it should.

Dealing with GSRRM

Every group strategy has a way to coerce others into doing their will. These strategies are strongly influenced by biological, given traits. Someone lacking a certain trait for one mean of coercion will either have a higher rate of success at another that fits his traits or have a high chance to be dominated.

Coercion is always an avoidance of debate; it tries to impose so many costs onto your position that you will not continue holding it.

Two general branches of **means of coercion** are observable: the masculine and the feminine. The masculine one does not only apply to men but is generally more accessible to people with traits that are more prominent in males: aggression, body strength, appreciation of a dominance-based group hierarchy, proclivity to use violence. Masculine traits incentivize using violence against those less masculine to gain an advantage. Violence is hence the masculine means of coercion, and it is observable that men as the majority of masculine people are most keen to participate in violence, whether in law enforcement, defense or domestic abuse, murder and other criminal activity. This does not imply that all men always use violence to get their will, but that violence is by

observation a distinctly masculine way to do so. Violence tends to be an incredibly costly affair for at least one party or even both parties engaged in it. The harms to both the body and social status are great and, if wrongfully applied, violence causes infinite cycles of retaliation that hinder society from achieving prosperity by unity. Violence can also be used to enact tyranny or uphold lies. Hence, we organized violence and strongly domesticated ourselves; warmongering, public dueling, lynching, vigilantism are frowned upon in most Western countries today.

Violence is, when organized in a just way, the most effective method of suppressing parasitism and predation via-negativa. It is neither good nor bad but should only be used for enforcing standards where its costs are compensated by its benefits to the commons. The feminine means of coercion has developed to counter these means of coercion, to minimize the advantage of the masculine, and to coerce it towards own purposes. It suits people that do *not* exceed in masculine traits and is a bit more complex.

We call it **GSSRM**, a list of strategies that aim to exclude someone from his social in-group or lower his social status, to *undermine*. The less of a standing someone has in a social group, the less he will be able to gain societal influence, business partners, friends, love interests and hence, the more likely other men will apply their male means of coercion to them. All of these are social, communicative means to gain support against someone or to signal to someone that he is losing it.

Especially in a society like ours, where actual violence is rarely used to solve conflicts, this withdrawal of potential protection can force someone to stop their behaviour just as efficiently as a punch to the face.

The core parts of GSSRM are **Gossiping**, **Shaming**, **Rallying**, **Ridicule** and **Moralizing**. The only one of these that might need further explanation before I go on is Moralizing. Moralizing is when you assert your in-group value system or individual value system as final to get a discount from society. All political groups are guilty of this: “You have to ensure my right to x” is a very common statement, from “You have to ensure my company’s property rights” (Libertarians) to “You have to ensure my rights to my labour’s surplus value” (Socialists) to “You have to ensure my religious view of morality” (Conservatives). All of these offer no truthful, operational, falsifiable thesis one can test for *why* other groups with other interests must bear these costs. Your company was parasitic, you did not read your contract well, nobody can be forced into your system of belief – so why should others pay for it? You must offer a trade, something that you give

back for the service all others will have to provide for you, otherwise you act as a parasite, and parasitism destroys the cooperative structure we all feed from.

Moralizing is way less costly than trading or debating because in-group truths are way less costly to construct than intergroup truths. You may achieve great profits by it without even publicly challenging your opponent, without having to debate him or without offering a compromise. A mum scolding her child into stopping misbehaviour can very well result in productive consequences, same goes for publicly calling out immoral behaviour, but a public official scolding a group into paying for another group's strategy is unproductive. Truthfully showing if a group is acting parasitically is not.

All strategies of GSRRM are prone to use lies, misrepresentations, and a myriad of other untestimonial arguments like obfuscation, over-complication, using emotionally loaded terms to sabotage peaceful discussion... They undermine one's opponent and seldom produce common gains, but instead private ones. And at a time when information can be produced and distributed cheaper than ever before in history over the internet, lies and demands with a GSRRM-basis are spread more than ever (*Industrialization of lying*).

Rule of Law has led us to a relative equilibrium of violence in society: we know what amount is necessary to ensure the survival of our commons and what amount would lead to their destruction.

But there are almost no laws to counter the feminine means of coercion: GSRRM as the avoidance of truthful argument, catering towards the value system of a select group, is incredibly widespread and becomes more rampant every day in all groups.

This disrupts informational commons and leads to a fractioning of society, which increases feelings of entitlement towards the production of commons. GSRRM signals a loss of status and hence fuels potential violence because people will defend their property eventually. And at a certain point, this potential violence will actualize; and at that point, you should be safe to have enough allies to defend against it.

We could solve this issue by limiting political speech to standardized testimony with easy-to-follow tests, separating what needs to be separate, uniting what needs to be united.

Conclusion

Our project offers all groups within society several innovations to understand their relations, their conflicts, what they can be proud of and what makes them unique. It offers the ability to control your in-groups, your own destiny and to align that destiny with

others so it is achievable, but it would also force us to enact changes in our society, which would cost effort and time.

We believe that for fixing many issues of modern societies, humble observation, truthful speech, and according reciprocal, but decisive action would be enough. We are radical advocates of truth, regardless of how much it costs those who construct it.

What this healthy revolution needs now are high agency, intelligent people with a strong sense of justice, but also openness for new ideas. We need to build a platform to offer our message to all of society, but firstly to those who will understand it and to those who will fund our efforts to reach more and more people.

Our system is not something to build your entire identity around: it only provides the borders to live a productive, protected life according to a non-parasitic, non-predatory value system of your choice.

And to secure this,

Truth will be enough.