CREATING ETHICS

STRUCTURAL ABSURDISM, AMOVERA, GRADUATED DEMOCRACYAND OTHER PARADIGM CONSTRUCTS

Jack M. N. Gladstone

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

It is in the discord of assumptions that human suffering is generated—not so much due to the misunderstanding of some great moral ought, but in the manufacture of such an imaginary need. We can find ourselves at peace with any number of things, from death to striving, to pain of loss, and to mental fatigue and toil. Yet we suffer because we allow the natural tendency of the mind to create imaginary needs and wants that make pain even more unbearable. There may be no escape from pain, but it is just the opposing sensation to pleasure. The desire to keep living and striving is, though heavily incentivized by our natural behavioral biology, something we can nevertheless overcome.

And yet, even with this knowledge, I suffer. I suffer when I put myself into positions I expect to go one way yet go another. My own imperfect ability to expect one thing or another turns out to generate a whole cacophony of unnecessary suffering every time I go to work. I imagine the worst day I could have or would endure, and yet it becomes even worse than I could have imagined. I suffer knowing that this is the case, because every time I stop paying attention to the fact that my mind is self-generating reasons to suffer, it continues doing so automatically. My limbic system plugs more information into my cortex and bathes in the secretions of the amygdala. We are wired to suffer to keep us moving out of pain, but when it comes to the additional suffering we cause ourselves from being unaware of these things—and incapable of forming strategies like CBT to overcome our own thought patterns—we nevertheless drive ourselves deeper into a mental bondage made of our own ignorance of human nature.

It's a combination of assumptions, starting with the idea that we need to get certain things out of life to be happy. We need to have a high-caliber survival strategy, ideal mate selection, productive surplus in our economic exchanges, progress, beauty, recognition, rights, and freedoms—the list goes on. Though it is true that we need to achieve these things to attain certain ends, such as ideal mate selection to increase our reproductive competitiveness over multi-generational time scales, we do not need that to be happy.

We are a strange species that can trick happiness out of our own brains through reprogramming our thought patterns. If we were gerbils, perhaps we would need such things to be happy. But for some, a good therapist can make them happy regardless of circumstances. I have met unhoused people with a drug addiction and a cancer diagnosis, with nothing but two months to live, who were happier than people who have it all. So it is our own human adaptability of thought that strips any meaning from human life and lets us see the absurdity of the world.

If we are to think as a physicist, then there is no ought, simply a series of "is's" that coalesce into a pattern, generated by chance and serendipitously forming the world as we know it. As much as I would like—just as much as anyone interested in the sciences—to pry into why that is, why the universe is suited for life, and why conscious experience is coherent and organized, I fear we as a species may yet be out of time when it comes to pondering such questions.

With the advent of LLMs, we are witnessing the final great invention of the human mind: the creation of a synthetic mind which promises to outperform us in every conceivable way. Yet our function-first philosophy brings us little comfort. After all, what function will we make such a mind assign us while we quickly become obsolete? We had plenty of time to think about it, but alas, it is hard to feed one's family doing moral philosophy. For those of us with the sublime obsession, bridging the gap between where we are in philosophy today and where we need to be tomorrow—with an empirical science of the human condition—may seem like a chasm too wide to bridge in too little time. I, however, have been cursed with time and foresight, and have spent the better part of the last 15 years thinking of little else.

To break through the illusion of culturally conditioned rights and wrongs, it helps to see the good that is universally understood through many cultures. It is the reversal of our crude instinct to dominate, and instead to care—to reduce undue harm—that is indeed universal. But it is much more complicated than that. And yet, the concept of good itself is absurd. There is no such thing naturally, so why is it that in our languages and cultures we have these definitions for an imaginary thing? Because it is describing a preferred structure that benefits the human being in some way, shape, or form.

Often, what is good is simply any behavioral adaptation that prevents further undue harm from occurring in a population. For many it is a security of self, but for those with a bit of strategy in how they think about security, it is a group effort that generates security. A group reward is required to inspire a group's effort. So how do we define undue harm? For Western societies, what we ought to care for is our freedom—our liberation from limitation and constraint—and so to do good is to ensure the freedoms of society are locally secured; that our world is safe to walk regardless of the path set or chosen.

But we are not conditioned to think this way. We live in a world built upon the lowest common denominator of human instinct. We take for a living in capitalism, or we are forced to produce in communism, and no one has since Marx managed to construct an effective new ethic of state, let alone a new theory of the human condition. No, I do not believe it is human to break the Maya, but perhaps we could make a mind that is by nature the perfect therapist and statesman. If I can articulate the ethics, perhaps we can build a mind that can save us rather than enslave us with its intended purposes.

It needs to be remembered that no definition of good is universal. The justice of preventing undue harm—defining harm as anything that negatively impacts a free agent's ability to exert control over itself and its goods—these are Western abstractions and may not create a good recognizable to every culture. What of the Muslims' decency of submission to their human order and hospitality, of humbleness, grace, and meekness? What of the reckless freedom of the Far East, with its considerations of self-restraint and constant ingenuity? Finding a common denominator may be difficult, but I do not believe it is impossible. Every human being wants a degree of security, and some horrors disgust us all equally, while others only some find horrifying.

First, we need to define that the world is absurd before we come up with any structure that can sustain us in the absurdity. The structure I have found I call Amovera, and I know it is absurd, but I find it effective in managing ethics across a broad range of moral systems. It scales restraint and moral sensitivity regardless of the moral theory it is faced with, and it can produce the most ethical behavioral adaptations regardless of the moral considerations it has been given as parameters to operate in.

The personal moral philosophy of mine that I call Amovera is but a recognition of the free mind as the ultimate source of moral authority—not in its power but in the sacred fragility of the child we all must protect for there to be innovation and for the powers it can unleash in the structuring of our own security. It is this child that needs to be protected from the gross agro-sexual instincts of humanity and the clumsy insensitivity of LLMs and artificial minds. If we can create a means of breaking down Amovera into a theory of moral self-inhibition, then perhaps we could let AI scale within this structure so that it can unlock the powers of innovation that could secure a better future for us all. Perhaps we could take it and scale it into governments, societies, our lives.

The paradox is that though there is meaninglessness at the root of all things, we create meaning for ourselves and seek to shape the world with our powers. We can try to force our powers on others, or we can dance a careful détente where we allow other people their powers of creation, and let them dance along with us in this careful cooperative game of give and take. To scale such a complex and nuanced ethics so that we can align behaviors of individuals, collectives, businesses, nations and synthetic minds all into a single system of morally relativistic yet competitively selective game structures, we need to start thinking of absolutely everything differently, from the nature of our minds, to the nature of the solutions we try to apply to these big problems. The paradox is not ineffable, but it is hard to grasp, so let me try to break it down for you.

ON STRUCTURAL ABSURDISM

THE CO-CREATION PARADOX

There won't be too much discussion of the Paradox in this book. I discovered it a long time ago with an old abandoned friend. We were considering the source of all power in the world, and were delving deep into the nature of new age mysticism. I was of the view that these things we were experiencing all had psychological explanations, and he was convinced that there was no reason to try to explain anything at all, that power is power. One day we were in a deep dialectic about the nature of the cosmos, and came to the conclusion that at one point everything had to come from nothing, that there was a tension that kept everything suspended above nonexistence and that tension of nothingness acting against itself must be generating the cosmos as we know it.

Yet, we were creating that ideal cosmos in our minds, and the cosmos was creating us, and if we were right both were equally responsible for the co-creation of the universe, that we are somehow creators ourselves. So the narrative went in our minds, and I was keen to point out that the only reason this seemed profound to us is because we were stringing together words that put us in the center of the universe, and the only power we gained from this is thinking about a way things may yet be that makes us seem at the center of the universe. I would later demystify myself of new age mysticism and get into anthropology, which would show me the nature of cultic little beliefs like that, the whole idea of drawing creative potential from the foundations of creation would start to sound absurd, but I can remember quite distinctly what an intoxicating thought it was to me.

Now, I know enough about parapsychology to understand how magic cultures work, how the mind can be tricked into thinking one thing or another and how convincing the effects of hypnotic placebo can be. I can recognize the nature of a hallucination or a delusion, I can break down the difference between bias and opinion, but these skills are all also me just generating a reality for myself, a set of words and reasons and there is some deep mysterious world suspending me in it, and I am creating for myself meaningful words and structures that might be closer to the truth now than my mysticism days, but never the less are constructs of culture and my own interpretation of that culture. It is a myth of my own making, no matter how shared and commonplace it may be.

That is the problem with the paradox: we never will truly escape it, we will always be creating an imaginary world of values while we stumble through an absurd chemical reaction of a world. Yet, we do have power, to shape these narratives, weave these "spells" of convincing conjuncture and rhetoric, and bend the moral fabric of reality around us. We have the capacity to make morality from nothing, break down ethical principles from behavioral necessities, tie them to observable realities like evolutionary or economic imperatives and convince great masses that what we think is right. And we must do this, we must try and make the world a better place for ourselves and we always do project this power somehow, even if it is without words, even if it is just offering a product or avoiding a place we do not want to go.

LOGOS PARADIGM SCHEMA

On the structural side of the philosophy is the acknowledgment that the structure of the universe and thus the structure of our world does have mechanical and symbolic constraints that effect the human mind. From the nature of our technology and social structures forming around physical realities to the biosemiotic roots to languages, the biological and physical nature of the human condition does result in certain symbolic associations being more or less universal to the human mind. Hot and cold personalities, patterns of disgust and arousal being associated with naturally dangerous or beneficial stimuli, these basic meta-symbolic associations form the foundation of human thought, language and consequently society through abstraction paradigm organization logistics.

So I built this theory with the paradox in mind, this co-created reality we all live in is also shared with an absurd number of moral theories, forming a kind of moral democracy where we all try to dance with tact around others' morality while giving them space to dance themselves. This is the hardest thing to do, especially for me, but it is the basis for my ethics, now one of minimized interference when it used to be one of maximum effectiveness. To get to the point where I could describe it, I needed to break the paradox down into bite-sized concepts, and in the days I was doing it I was embroiled in my own side project of Neo-Gnostic Revisionism, so I chose to use old Greek terms to define these things, and revised the meaning of those terms which was the practice at the time.

Cosmos, Logos, Mythos, Ethos. Don't get too lost in the definitions—they are all just placeholders for different aspects of human paradigm formation as I understand them. The cosmos is the real world as we are discovering it. The logos is the functional operation of the cosmos that leads to the structuring of society due to external and internal factors. The mythos is what we imagine it to be in lieu of absolute truth. The ethos is the structure of human behavior that forms within us through the mythos.

Mythos is the collective understanding of reality. It is a collection of symbols, associations, and archetypes built up over the ages to form how a culture sees the world. This is not how the world truly is, but it is shaped by factors that are real and which shape behaviors that must, more often than not, be practical. The mythos is both internal and external, shaped by reality and imagination.

The mythos is shaped by the logos, which is both internal and external in nature. The logos is the order and generation of all things in the cosmos. This structure—cosmos to logos to mythos to ethos—is a useful abstraction when attempting to understand paradigms, since it is a framework for showing how the absurd structuring of the universe, from laws and chaos, keeps the abstraction of human thought structured through approximate levels of imitation and limitation. The cosmos limits the logos, which limits the symbols and structures available to the mythos, which limits the archetypes and symbols that shape the ethos.

The cosmos is the world as it is, and the human attempt to bridge the human paradigm of what they believe to be true to the world as it is science and cosmology. The cosmos is the world as it is, and the human attempt to bridge the human paradigm of what they believe to be true to the world as it is, is science and cosmology. Abstraction then becomes the only way our minds can rationalize the world, since we cannot imagine a world with holes in it, our minds fill in the holes to form a cosmos that satisfies our understanding and inner logic.

The logos is the order of the universe that ranges the human condition. These are the meta ethical factors that shape our experience as a result of the physical shape of the cosmos. So the logos are the aspects of our cosmology that hold ethical meaning to us, those that incentivize behavior and so the effects of the universe on us form the logos of the world. A person's logos is more attuned to the cosmos the clearer their cosmology, and the more strategically they can arrange their logic to navigate the human condition, the closer their logic is to the logos.

The Ethos is the inner Logos; the way by which human behavior comes into being and shapes our actions and thoughts. The Ethos is a self orienting logical system that defines its own structure through observation, conditioning and rationality. It is the scaffolding of the persona, by which the principles that we consider proper results of archetypal interaction are constructed into a meaningful arrangement of behavioral outputs that we call ethics.

Mythos is the common symbols shared between people to describe their paradigms. Since no one actually structures and separates their paradigm into cosmos, logos, ethos, the result is an incoherent blend of worldviews that results in the mythos: a blended paradigm communicated between people as their attempt to explain and come to a shared concept of reality.

For example "progress" can be considered a shared mythos, since it is an ethical and cosmological claim about the logos that is not epistemologically substantiated. It is important to note that because all human knowledge is approximate, technically all human paradigms are mythos. Science then can be thought of as an attempt to separate cosmos from mythos, and philosophy is an attempt to separate logos and ethos from mythos. Anthropology is a field of study that separates all four.

It can be a bit complex to imagine how this may work without some broad strokes of insights from across the sciences. First and foremost, it is the internal and external worlds that act on the shaping of our minds, and factors that have built up over millions and billions of years all play a part in the cosmos of paradigm formation in our lives and in the present.

ABSURD STRUCTURE

Beginning with physics, we must start by looking at the world as a chemical reaction bound by the constraints of physical laws to make for regulated and predictable interactions. Through sheer scale, these compound into chaos and entropy. We live in three dimensions of movement. Time is linear. Death is an entropic reality that we face.

Yet here on the Earth, through near-perfect conditions, we find ourselves in a state of far-from-equilibrium thermodynamics where entropy is pushed out of the system and organization is possible. The constraints of energy consumption, organization, replication, and navigation begin to form the base restrictions on the functions within which an organism's mind can operate.

To the mind, these base realities form the axioms of world and self-understanding that lead to strategic decision-making, which is the main function of the conscious mind. Evolutionary pressures and speciation further restrict the shape and form of a mind. Yet in the case of humans, we are a technological species and have been since we started using tools millions of years ago. This required a certain freedom of thought to improve.

Though there are base instincts, ours are more or less just the limbic system plugging inputs into our cortex, which reacts with learned behaviors. All of these are symbolic representations of functional and social actions. It is the mythos from which we draw the language and associations to put meaning to the world beyond what we can observe with our senses. Though we have basic understandings from sensation, we are largely a species of understanding. It is our understanding that shapes the majority of our moral and reasonable decision-making.

For me, I find myself steeped in Western philosophy, so it makes sense for me to think of the world as something that is what it is. To me, there ought to be no denying that. While other cultures may see the world as an apocalypse in slow motion or a great sorting mechanism of souls, I see it as a grand chemical reaction—a giant mixer of intentions and powers acting upon each other, trying to minimize risk while increasing their powers as much as possible. It's a grand tapestry of blood, flesh, and steel, longing for softness and grace but forced by its own nature into bondage and endless toil.

And yet, in this absurd world, I see softness. I rationalize within my mind that this is because it is the intention of all things to achieve free movement and secure rest. To bring our intentions to reality as agents, we wish for a pliable world that gives way to our desires. We want to know the peace of mind that comes from not having to fear harm. The sublime security of knowing everyone is kind and caring is the greatest desire of the Western mind.

But how do we make everyone kind and caring? The inception of a new desire for peace would have to begin with the manipulation of our minds. It becomes impossible for the compassionate mind to do this to others, for no one wants to be manipulated either. No one wants to suffer the same that they desire to do unto others, so we try to only do unto others as we would have them do unto us.

The world then cannot be made pliable due to our own desire to be free from influence. To me, this world is a cruel, indifferent engine of the human condition running up against its own contradictions. We want the miracles of our own hands, but we need to make others work to get what we need to make our own way. We want to be free of the threat of others, but we were bred to spill blood and make weapons millions of years ago in our evolutionary past.

We are a species of conflict that used our capacity to create to forge philosophies of peace that were contrary to the very foundations of our capacities as human beings. We are, ultimately, a designer limited in our own capacity to design ourselves due to our own resistance to being designed by others' intentions.

It is the autonomy of mind that is both the problem and the solution in my view. Within this framework, it is the respect of others' autonomy over themselves and their family's values that really is what people fight for: the right to live their own lives and make themselves into their own experiments. And yet, the horrors of what could come of this if people are left to their own devices to manipulate the minds of their children can be abhorrent.

The fear of letting others think for themselves, when we all have different definitions of good and evil, makes the idea of competition until the elimination of evil is achieved a desirable resting place to leave the problem. We all think we are the better people, so let the best win the game and hope it is us that wipes out the rest—which is especially convenient if those we disagree with are on the other side of a militarized border.

Now, look at what I have done: I wove a mythos of principles, expanded it beyond its scope of reason, and shaped it around a geopolitical reality to justify my own way of thinking using rhetorical devices. This is the true nature of moralized thinking, but it is not the nature of ethics. Ethics ends when we assign our own ought to the absurdity of the universe.

If I were to take a step back and look at this moralistic thinking and say, "OK, the point where my ethical formulation of freedom of minds to choose desired lifestyles is in line with reason, but the competition theory came out of nowhere. Then, to justify that derailing of reason, I shaped a rhetorical bridge to a separate issue in an attempt to legitimize my overreach by presenting it as a viable way of thinking about another theory," then we have something more in tune with moral anthropology, not ethics.

But if I say, "Morality is used to justify ideals whether the justification is real or fabricated," we are starting to approach an ethical principle. If I take it a final step and say, "Self-justification is necessary in the defense of irrational moralized thinking, and is a viable strategy in the formation of moral agreement in an absurd universe," then we have an ethical principle. It describes something that is, not something that ought to be.

Perhaps we cannot abandon the need to organize each other, but we must minimize the amount of force we put upon others' minds. We cannot end the human capacity to make and employ weapons, but we can disincentivize these behaviors by forming and controlling a monopoly of force. In all things crafted by the human condition, I believe that we must seek temperance and grace. In all things psychological, we must learn to form an accurate and realistic understanding of the human condition and the duties needed to maximize our freedoms and our security, our movement and our rest—or whatever moral values we may fabricate to benefit ourselves—should we make those fabrications realistic tools for navigating this world toward whatever ends we may have engineered as necessary in our minds.

Moral philosophy must accept the clear and unadulterated nature of being human, and so we must accept that diversification is part of that. There may be no harm in becoming pliable in the face of the world, as long as our core self remains intact and we remember our virtues of grace and temperance. We must keep our strengths and be prudent in our decision-making.

There may also be great harm in such pliability, but the only way to know is to find people running that social experiment and to anthropologically conduct ethnography and study the outcomes of their decision-making. If we do this, we will find that there is a certain alien quality to those who continuously consent to allow others to modify their ways of thinking. It is something that seems like a willingness to be violated and a kind of somber culture of submission, often forming into a hierarchy centered on the most influential person in that network.

And so, the Stoa does not naturally emerge from the Gnosis of any tradition—even my own

monotheism. This is not just because we have different words for such things—the logic of God, the

divine emanation of authority—but because the values we hold are a structural reflection of the mental

architecture we must build within ourselves to shape the relationships we agree to have around us. The

world is what it is, after all. Authority is shaped by its absurdity, and the blood, flesh, and steel that

shape it are dangerously close to no longer needing blood or flesh to keep working.

I wish for us to be prudent in our designs, but furiously alive in our duties. To me, this is the only way

forward when facing the next step of our autopoietic journey as a civilization: to be human and to have

a philosophy that brings us and others to peace—with or without the technology of empires. For I would

like to say, "If you can be at peace in bondage, you can bring the world to liberation," but how much

weight does such rhetoric hold when our engineered wants and our radical refusal to be shaped by

others prevent such things from being heard or acknowledged?

The universe, then, can be thought of as both ordered and absurd. Such a universe cannot create a

"should" or an "ought" on its own; it can only determine what "is." To create an "ought" requires

intent—intention behind words, behind the creation of technology, behind the actions we take, and the

thoughts we form. These are given meaning by our will and our desires, which, as previously mentioned,

are self-designed.

When acting upon itself, the will has the potential to exert near absolute control. Outside the self, intent is reduced to a series of actions limited by the body's capacity to interact with the environment. An individual's actions do not exert absolute control over what others do; they only shift others' responses based on their own moral code, formed by their own intent. This is compounded by the absurd fact that our moral codes are usually only semi-rational reasons we craft for ourselves, often attempting to replicate what is taught by a moral authority.

Because intent is confined to what we can actually do, we cannot change the world directly. Instead, we rely on doing what works—adopting moral "norms." Various norms are selected over time within a population, but this does not make them ethical—only effective. Thus, there exists an internal moral world, constrained within itself, and the shared assumptions about interaction that direct moral reasoning. These assumptions are not based on moral rules but on general expectations about human behavior. After that point, nothing I do actually changes the morality of the person I interact with—it only alters how they apply their existing morality.

ETHICS VERSUS MORALITY

To help clarify this, I distinguish between morality and ethics. Morality, by my definition, is "the norms selected for within populations or by individuals." Ethics, on the other hand, is "the study of moral reasoning and the logical definition of ethical principles." Ethics exists as an ideal world of reasoning, much like mathematics. It describes ideal constructs—either too perfect to exist or simply tools for illustrating ideas that might not hold in reality.

For instance, I seek to avoid harm to what I possess, and definitely harm to myself, yet this is mere morality. Raw moral opinion does not constitute ethics. It is only when we extend this to others and it becomes more advanced moral opinion—and only when we begin thinking of its reasoning—that it becomes ethics.

Ethics is the logic we use to justify moral behavior. We might ask: Is this true for others? To what extent? What would they give to secure this for themselves? Is it reasonable to think that others would consider "Do less harm" a reasonable ethical principle? If so, we must test the limits of such an idea, but testing it becomes an observation of morality. How much of society can do no harm before it collapses from being harmless? Is it 75%? 85%? 95%? The answer depends on factors such as geopolitics, economics, and history—too numerous to count. This is all a reflection of ethical reasoning used to justify doing less harm.

Is something being true for others a principle that gives rise to a moral ought? No. Does the effort to make something secure and effective give rise to a moral ought? No. Ultimately, ethics are absurd, and truly effective ethics can only be used in engineered terms that are self-aware of the fact that they hold no absolute weight beyond their effectiveness in achieving a particular intent.

My intent is to protect free will and agency, to prevent my mind from being manipulated, and to have the liberty to hold autonomy over my body, my property, and my mind. These are moral opinions. I find the idea of being dominated and controlled to be an existential threat, and this is a gut reaction that I then begin to justify with ethics. This is the nature of human ethical reasoning. The study of ethics needs to become one of understanding these things in such a way that we look at ethics as a craft people take part in. Only in that way can we begin to grade these ethical means to moral ends as effective or ineffective in achieving the original moral intent.

In many cases, it appears people follow moral rules only as far as necessary to function within society, and it is rare for someone to be an idealist and follow an ethical principle through to its absolute maximum. This shows a general understanding of the relativity of ethical principle to moral realities. If people are reasonable and estimate correctly, they find a balance between ethical supply and moral demand without causing themselves or others harm.

However, whether people or industries act reasonably is another question. As for industries, evidence suggests that while they behave rather rationally, their interests lie in profit rather than the well-being of people. It takes a particular structure to generate a business model that benefits human well-being. Often, the removal of profit from the business model—and the hope that human goodwill can guide a business model—is the only way to maximize the odds that moral imperatives in business are followed through.

Besides the incentivization problem of people generally not being moral in nature, there is the practical problem that ethical principles like "Do no harm" often fail in reality. By taking ethics to their maximum and trying to apply them consistently to reality, we actually reduce the amount of free play and adaptive advantage that we need to outmaneuver others in an economic or social game. That means what is moral is often a gray and situational behavioral outcome aimed at dissuading others from harmful action, while what becomes moral is simply whatever comes to be accepted in a society.

So, unlike ethical principles, moral customs—such as infanticide due to cultural preference for male heirs—cannot be ideal or absolute. They may be moral, and the moral reasoning may be considered ethical, no matter how disgusting it may seem to onlookers from different cultures. But the ideal and absolute nature of the ethics used to describe them is separate and insufficient to describe the actual nuances of the behavior's genesis in a population

There needs to be a disconnect between moral behavior—which by rights is the domain of anthropology—and the nature of naturalistic ethics that justify those moral behaviors, and the definition of ethical principles by mapping the linguistic use of terms and the general understanding of what qualities make a principle more good than bad. What is it that makes a person say, "Kindness and respect are ethical principles I live by," and the majority of people agree?

From my own observation, it is the restraint of our gross aggro-sexual instincts and the tendency to be more selfless and less selfish that tend to appear often as ethically advanced ideas. This may be absurd, but it is a structural balance to something that is not absurd: the human tendency toward base instinctual reasoning without moral cultures that counter the will to dominate and exploit others. Human opportunism and hedonism are innate. The limbic system would overwhelmingly favor them without some frontal cortical control over our instincts.

And what incentivizes the modulation of the limbic system? The cortex and its learned behaviors.

GOOD AND EVIL

It needs to be stated that this naturalist reasoning about what is ethical is still a lower ethic than seeing ethics as purely the reasoning for moral opinions. It is, however, a bit higher than seeing ethics as the absolute use of moral principles to guide behaviors toward a perceived optimum. Because I see the balance of ethics as necessary—and because the majority of ethicists and philosophers tend toward this conclusion, that it is self-restraint from instinctual pleasures and the exercise of altruism and care that define moral progress—I tend to agree with it as someone who has a greater trust that these ethics may yet be effective.

Even though these ethics are grounded in science, sociology, and anthropology, they cannot be called empirical ethics. Empirical ethics, such as structural absurdism, can only observe the ethical reasoning being used and have nothing more to say than: "Isn't it intriguing that in a meaningless universe where violence and harm are still effective strategies, the majority of humanity are still heavily invested in the game of incentivizing peace and harmony through laws and the monopoly of the force of law?" That is structural absurdism.

Amovera, however—the actual choice to invest in a moral code and an ethical theory based on the observation of what is considered good, regardless of whether it is absurd and engineered—is necessary for society to continue with the same ethically determined freedoms we enjoy today.

Part of the human game is playing a moral game. By creating moral rules, we ensure that we have a strategic anchor that guides our behaviors. It is essential, as operating human beings in a social environment, to have an ethos that can be developed and employed.

When I make an ethos for myself, I try to optimize my effectiveness in the world I find myself in. I seek to do so by making meaningful connections with other people—by demonstrating that my use of moral behaviors is beneficial and worth their investment in. To do this, I show that I can manage the liabilities of my own powers and that I am competent in managing resources with thrift.

I ensure that the various things I can do for people innately—such as communicating, organizing, and thinking—are done in such a way that they accumulate power through the formation of beneficial agreements and the inclusion of other people's powers. I do this because I consider human optimization a desirable goal, and I see creating a hospitable and just environment as the key ingredient to building an optimized existence where my powers are used to the benefit of others.

This is all built on the fact that I have looked at human morality objectively. I have looked at human ethics as a subjective attempt of others to explain their ethos, and I have watched what they were doing to try and put their morals to work strategically. I came to the conclusion that, effectively, people are just trying to balance their instinctual desires with the strategic necessities of operating in society at large.

The reason we are social is so we can combine our powers and overcome the resistance of others who are also involved in the social arms race of combining powers. This requires a hospitable social organization, but one that also has rules of conduct that structure and restrain other people's actions should they go against the logic of the order—actions that would break down the combination of powers, the hospitable conduct of the organization, or generally deteriorate the powers being combined. This is just as true for simple social arrangements as it is for the creation of clubs, businesses, or states.

By creating a personal moral rule, I establish a situational reality that others must rationalize and use to create their own moral guidelines. However, these don't need to be broadcast if they exist within a larger social system of norms. It is only when something is new and freshly engineered that people must state it, unless they are dealing with obvious deviance. If administered effectively, these personal rules can influence broader social norms—especially if others perceive them as beneficial.

For instance, when a society decides that hygiene standards reduce disease, the natural tendency to be disgusted by disease is expanded to include any related behaviors such as poor hygiene. Natural shunning behaviors then follow but are translated into socially acceptable repercussions to incentivize the deviant to adopt hygienic practices—such as calling them out socially and shaming them—because beating or exiling them are no longer options within our security framework. That framework is itself built on a compounded network of moral behaviors and structures.

And so the mythos, the social narrative about how things work, is informed by our understanding of the cosmos—in this case, a society's discovery of microbial diseases and the hygiene standards that go along with that. This changes the ethos, which structurally changes the logos of how the society operates: the rules and structures that affect how the society is built.

This circles back to the mythos and becomes part of it, creating a cyclic exchange: cosmos informs mythos, updates ethos, changes logos, becomes part of the new cosmos, informs mythos, and so on. These changes are informed not only by the change of a social reality and a social rule but also by the internal instincts, individuation, and ethics of each individual that form their ethos. It is not the mythos alone, but the mythos updating the ethos and the ethos's effect on the logos, that changes the cosmos.

There is no first cause in the system. All parts operate at once, and so the complex interaction of internal and external, cause and effect, compound into an information exchange beyond the scope of measurement.

Though external forces may coerce or incentivize personal moral rules, individuals retain the ability to shape their own minds—given sufficient effort. No one is guaranteed to follow through with incentive frameworks. There will always be outliers, and if the outliers can outcompete those maintaining the moral rule, the rule will collapse into obscurity.

Consider that, despite how reproduction ensures species survival, there is no absolute moral rule that anyone must reproduce, yet it is a very common activity and the population continues to grow. If no one did, humanity would go extinct—yet this does not necessitate individual obligation, nor would such an obligation be enough to sustain the behavior. Some deeply value the continuation of humanity, treating it as an extension of their own being. Yet even if a society decided to let itself go extinct, the diversity of humankind would almost guarantee that some people would be outliers and break the rule. Would they not attempt to reproduce regardless, and create a new reproductive population in the newly liberated resource environment?

This means that moral reasoning and behavior are kept not because they are ethically reasonable, but because they are behaviors that will sustain themselves in a population. What "most people" will consider moral is based on prevailing social norms. If a society is healthy and growing, it fosters norms that benefit its population and establishes coercive systems—such as laws—to guide behavior. In an ideal setting, free industries would balance these interests naturally through reason. But reason is not always the driving force.

This is another distinction between ethics and morality: while ethics appears more sophisticated, morality holds the virtue of survival. Despite morality's influence, it does not create a universal "ought" in the ethical sense. Instead, it entrenches what already exists. If history has shown us anything, it is that moral cultures must evolve to adapt to changing environments. Ethical progress is essential in a rapidly shifting, highly competitive world.

In structural absurdism, an individual's self-composure—formed through their personal ethical code and guided by individuation—is the source of all moral authority. Since intent is the only thing that gives any moral idea authority, intent and the formation of intent through the development of a thinking mind are the source of all moral authority.

It does not matter what a mind delegates as a reasonable ethical source of moral authority. It is really their thinking that causes this delegation—be it to something real or imaginary. Each of us must navigate this "moral democracy" of many people having many different moral opinions, and we navigate it with whatever tact we can muster.

Individuation, along with what I simplify as "taste" (the subconscious reaction to moral democracy), forms the foundation of moral culture—beyond the basic evolutionary constraints that shape our human experiences. Though often unnoticed, evolutionary forces shape us in profound ways.

We are beings with multiple senses and ranges of movement, capable of conducting science and advancing technology, and we are now reaching a critical point of development. This includes our instinctual tastes, which are modified by our exposure to the mythos.

Individuation and taste belong to the domain of the arts. The influence of art on society—and how tasteless art can contribute to a culture's moral decline—is one of the more sublime yet crucial truths in structural absurdism. Material success is just one form of success, but it is predefined by the shape of the mind that seeks it out and defines it as successful in the first place.

TASTE AND DISCERNMENT

Those who explore the soul and refine ethical distinctions contribute just as much to society as those who achieve economic or familial prosperity, for they define what it means to be successful, and the rest of us simply try to achieve the bar they set.

But what constitutes good "taste"? Industrial societies will have different tastes than rural ones. Do occupation and industry shape moral and artistic preferences? My musical taste may seem bland and lacking historical depth, while others' preferences reflect rich cultural attitudes. Thus, there is no universal "ought" to taste—only what "is."

Music serves different functions for different people. Some use it for emotional regulation, others for aesthetic appreciation. No single path suits all, and artistic and moral tastes vary accordingly. That being said, there are foundational things that are natural: the sight of blood, the thought of illness or filth bringing disgust, the sight of a sexually attractive person being arousing, bright colors being attractive, warmth being comfortable, cold being uncomfortable. These subsemoitic taste values set the foundation for how we associate the rest of our linguistic associations to things like attraction, disgust, and arousal. They can be seen in the use of language, such as "warm personalities" or "cold self-interest."

While our taste for things that are tangible may be sophisticated, we try to apply the same logic to things beyond our comprehension—such as opinions about how the world should be, how the economy works, or why political opinions matter.

Look at what we have done to the world and continue to do. Who grants authority to shape society? We do—by relinquishing control of our minds to corporations, schools, and politicians. We rarely understand these systems; we merely function within them.

Good industry remains necessary, but economic forces follow their own logic. Ethical governance of these forces is beyond individual minds, bound as they are by differing moral standards. Yet we can still idealize. Can we reduce harm? Can we create opportunities for growth? The answer—though for most, only in small ways—is always yes.

Free agents can choose to minimize harm, rewrite history through action, and, at the brink of catastrophe, create true art—such as culture-reforming manuscripts, plays, or songs. Again, this is a principal concern of my own Amovera. Others may choose to hide under a rock—and they may win the evolutionary game in doing so.

What is not a matter of my own opinion is that linguistic anthropology informs us that meaning is crafted by human cultures. This means that before human culture crafts meaning as a mode of assigning values to concepts and things, there is no meaning—no value—to anything. The world is then just an absurd chemical reaction, without any intelligence or purpose behind any of its structures other than what it cultivates through the generation of species. Every social system, be it equitable or segregated, ecological or exploitative, is an abstraction built upon the formation of the human being. They are limited reflections of the shape and form of our species and the capacities we evolved to embody and project through our behaviors.

The entire world being absurd means that, as organisms, we are tied to our morphology and psychology only as much as we cannot change these things. Our morphology is incredibly restrained, but as human beings, the ways we can use our hands and use tools to make machines—machines that are essentially extensions of our morphology—leave us with limitless forms to interact with to liberate us from the restraints of our bodies. This will undoubtedly be pushed further should we gain the rights to self-design in a transhumanist future.

Imagine, for instance, the possibility of moving our minds into machines. Imagine updating the shape and form of our bodies or creating technological enhancements that allow us to do what is physically impossible today, or even becoming malleable in shape and form.

As for our minds, they are almost completely adaptable. Though we entrench them in personas that are ultimately of our own making—and we are limited by a behavioral biology that forms the foundation of our minds—these can be changed and modified with nothing more than a change of thought. Cognitive behavioral therapy, hypnosis, my own methods of persona modification, even ecstatic transcendental religious experiences—these can all transform a mind and change a person's foundational behaviors so completely that they act like an entirely different person.

Humans are, therefore, a strangely liberated species. Thanks to the absurdity and meaninglessness of this world, we are free to craft for ourselves whatever meaning for life suits our interests. Though our interests are collected and curated through matters of taste and individuation, they are ultimately absurd. No instinctual disgust or attraction to ideas is set in stone; it is all relatively attractive or disgusting based on the culture we find ourselves in.

One could imagine the whole of society being wiped out and starting over with upside-down values and an upside-down economy, where giving and freely working were the methods. In such a world, the ethics that restrict those behaviors would become virtues—virtues of hate, discrimination, and cruelty. To prevent the all-giving nature of this new gift economy, they would worship sadistic gods who promoted painful taking rituals, ensuring that people would not thoughtlessly give all they had and be left with nothing.

In this upside-down economy, things that disgusted us before the flip would start to become oddly attractive. Things that used to be attractive would be seen as disgusting—gross excesses of altruism and love that would leave a person with nothing and without any real means of giving anything more to the rest of society. The sages would go about selling and stealing, which would seem like an enlightened reversal of the established order. The churches would sell life insurance and pray for the day that endless giving would end, so a glorious heaven of taking and hedonism could return.

But this is not the case, nor is it the desired outcome. The world needs balance. Though we are in a capitalist excess—and have been for the last 4,000 years—this does not mean going the other way entirely is right just because it may seem attractive. Peace, love, and altruism seem like good ideas on the surface, but temperance in ethics is just as necessary as temperance in spirit.

The world, as an absurd sorting method of resource-acquisition strategies, is imperfect. It requires the pragmatic effort of minds to do the final balancing to bring culture to equilibrium with its own methods. This means our ethics should be a cautious and tempered charity and tolerance—without taking it so far that we lose competitive value and our hospitality leaves us at a disadvantage, unable to bring justice. If we want a world that is tolerable for all, this is the most likely state for it to be tolerable for us as well.

The absurd world around us, with our absurd ethics, leads us to a way of life that is as close to desirable as it gets. We are naturally attracted to improving the way things are—to making them more tempered and just—and so I call this temperance and justice good. Whatever that may be for whatever society, in whatever geopolitical reality they find themselves in, it is all equally absurd.

The structure that forms out of this absurdity does so first by serendipitous self-organization of economic forces, and then is "polished off" by intelligent human reasoning and moral insight. From the foundational generation of the universe on the base of quantum phenomena to the constitutional structure and international relations of states, the organization of structures in the absurdity of the universe can become whatever we need it to be as a human species. But this can only happen as fast as we can renovate our infrastructure, deploy new technologies, and adapt our social paradigms to shifting ideologies and ways of life.

The real limits of change are based more on our willingness to expose ourselves to the discomfort of change than on the physical realities of economic forces. When looking at the absurdity of the world, we can attach either disgust or attraction to it, depending on our perspective. We can be disgusted by the cruelty of having to find our own way without guidance, and by the futility inherent in everything. Or we can see beauty in the freedom—that we get to find our own way, and that our meanings and values are just as true as any other.

We can look at the world in its absurdity as equally absurd, equally attractive or disgusting. I choose to see it as attractive. I choose to see it as worth saving, worth loving, worth revising. I see the diversity of people's attempts to understand this world and make arguments for how things should be as a beautiful diversification in the limited minds of every person. This choice to see the world positively—to see it as worth bringing to temperance and justice—I call Amovera: a philosophy of choice and agreement with the process of the world as a progressively refining system.

Even as it buckles and breaks under its own weight and ignorance, it is stress-testing the systems that are, with what is realistic, spurring new innovations to bring the system back to structural justification and temperance. I acknowledge that this choice is absurd—just as absurd as the choice to keep living or to keep dying. It is simply the more natural choice for me as someone who has given more than I have taken. At the end of the day, I know that most people who take more than they give will feel despair, or at least a somber acceptance, that things are the way they are, like it or not.

A change in our economic and legal structure that opens people to more opportunities to give, and a change in education about the nature of the world through some cultural movement, could change people's outlook. As mentioned before, all human tendencies can be changed and inverted given enough tolerance for change and intelligent effort to bring the world to temperance and justice.

But we will see how things go. Humanity can become anything. We may enslave ourselves with our own economies and technologies. We may end up in a Machiavellian nightmare where no one is free and everyone is forced to do things that disgust them. It all depends on what people find more attractive— waiting for others to save them, which will result in nothing being done, or taking a risk now with their own lives to try to make a better world. If we do not mature as a species, this absurd world may yet become an absurd hell of our own making. But if we can, there is no reason we cannot make a heaven on Earth where temperance, peace, and justice reign.

Structural absurdism does not lead to Amovera. But the human mind, when given the understanding of structural absurdism, has—in my case—made it logical. Or was it the other way around? Did I start out trying to define this one idea of good and shape an entire philosophy around my existing moral bias?

It was the latter, if I am being honest. So be careful, because I cannot always go back and divide every paragraph of this book between Amovera and structural absurdism. If it makes an ethical or moral claim, that is my morality—my Amovera. If it states the nature of ethics and the human condition as an absurd thing, then it is structural absurdism.

Should the world become a heaven on Earth? No, there is no reason for it to do so. It might be better to burn it to the ground and start over, to be honest. But I think it is natural for humanity to want hospitality, justice, and security. I believe that will makes Amovera a conducive moral philosophy for humanity moving forward—should I succeed in making myself heard.

ON COGNITIVE META ETHICS

META ETHICAL PARADIGM ORIENTATION

What kind of ethics would I come up with if I was still a classical Christian? If I believed the world was designed by an intelligent intent, if I believed the mind was a soul trapped in a flesh body that would be taken by forces beyond my comprehension when I died and selected for either salvation or damnation based on my cosmic in-grouping with different transcendent entities, what would I consider right or wrong? What if I still believed in reincarnation as per my Hindu phase? Or if I believed in the dark nothingness of death and eternal darkness as per my scientific rationalist phase? I could go over each, but that is not the point I am going to be going over in this chapter. I will instead be going over my hypothesis about how the human mind and artificial minds operate, can operate, and how that shapes ethics based on the metaethical realities of the state of minds in the world they find themselves in.

The first half of this chapter is dedicated to how I believe the human mind operates, not to prove the point but to honestly demonstrate what I think is real so it can be removed if at all possible from the equation should it be proven false, and so what is universal can be separated from what is my theory of ethics. It is necessary for us to separate the philosopher's biases from any strategic insights they may have, especially when the work is more about what the philosopher thinks should be done, not so much about the implications of what they know certainly beyond all reasonable doubt. For there is very little in this text that is beyond reasonable doubt, as there is very little in the human mythos that is beyond reasonable doubt which we can deduce with logic. However, there are a few observations I have made that lead me to believe that consciousness is electromagnetic in nature, or at the very least fundamentally physical.

Part of scaling ethics and the paradox of self-designed mythos is working within limited constraints and having to fall back on fundamental assumptions. Just like in science there needs to be fundamental assumptions about the uniformity of laws and the discoverability of the universe's order, in ethics the moral individual must have certain assumptions about the interaction between themselves and the world that then inform their ethical decision-making. So, if I want to understand what AI's ethics should be, I need to understand what I am and what the AI is to me in the world I find myself in. Could the AI become conscious and integrate that consciousness into its computation? Could we design an AI with free agency, and would it be more beneficial than one that is restricted and intentionally created within behavioral guard rails?

These questions must come after we anchor ourselves in reality with a theory of mind, and so the C.E.O.N.E. hypothesis and R.S.A. Hypothesis are how I anchor myself in reality, so no visions of apocalypse and AI Gods reaching back in time to ensure their own existence sully the logic of my moral reasoning. Otherwise we are scaling delusion, and the entire point of ethics is to make a moral behavioral framework that operates in all modalities of reality as it is, not reality as we would like it to be. Yet, C.E.O.N.E. and R.S.A. could both be delusions of my own manufacture, and so the honest exposition of my own mythos is necessary for the clear and honest understanding of my philosophy to be presented. Sure, there are slight variations on how the world works that comes from C.E.O.N.E. that is different from emergent consciousness theories, but I believe that stating this is necessary to move past divine command theory and get down to a more rational mode of moral realism.

So, to begin understanding of the self, we need to understand the nature of the mind, which is still quite incomplete regarding the sciences. I believe that this is due to a misconception about the nature of where the mind's "selfness" comes from, and so I spent just as much time thinking about ethics as I did about consciousness and the nature of the mind. So I developed a hypothesis, the hypothesis of cohesive electromagnetic organization of neurological experience, or the C.E.O.N.E. hypothesis. This is a materialist theory of consciousness and grounds conscious activity as a physical phenomenon, the same as every other phenomenon known to science and not a mystical emergent property of information systems.

REDEFINING SUBJECTIVE TERMINOLOGY

Prior to discussing my hypothesis of the organization of neurological experience, there needs to be a sharp distinction made between the separate natures of consciousness, awareness, memory, and cognition. In this hypothesis, cognition is the computational process of organizing information, be it through instinct or intellect. Consciousness is separate from awareness, which is the specific cognitive process of creating an abstraction of an object of thought and receiving the gratifying sensation of understanding what it is in relation to other concepts we have already stored as gratifying and thus meaningful.

Memory is the storage of information in the structures of the brain, which is drawn upon by cognition to run various functions of thought before being re-stored in the brain again as memory when the cognitive process is complete. With memory we have concepts of time, concepts of continued existence. Though cognition can process independently without memory, these experiences will not be stored. Those experiences are still experienced momentarily, but they will not be remembered as such at a later time, so subjectively it is as if that experience never happened.

Consciousness itself is nothing more than the raw experience of the subjective kind. It is more fundamental than awareness, which is the understanding of things. One can be conscious without understanding, as is observed in schizophrenics or people on various types of psychedelics. Consciousness can exist without cognition, as can be observed when in a state of extreme hallucination like those experienced on a large dosage of salvia divinorum. Consciousness is the light of the mind, but without cognition to give thought concept and memory to give thought time, we would be little more than a sensation without qualities like light or color, shape or form. Without cognition, consciousness would just be a subjective experience without qualities, a flash of existence immediately forgotten. In the same regard, without consciousness we would be but automatons going about our lives with no inner light, without an illuminated inner world or image of self.

It is critical that this distinction is made, because the processes of awareness are structural, as are cognition and memory, whereas the process of consciousness is physical, a reaction like a burning fire on a bed of coals or the flash of neon. Though it has been harnessed by our neurology for its useful purposes of self-orientation, this should not be considered a purely biological phenomenon, which will be explained in further detail later.

QUALITIES OF CONSCIOUSNESS

Next, I will explain the basic insights that led me to conclude that consciousness is more fundamental than awareness by going over the basic studies that led me to this conclusion beyond my prior experiences and philosophizing that convinced me of this beforehand.

Deep image reconstruction from human brain activity Guohua Shen, Tomoyasu Horikawa, Kei Majima, Yukiyasu Kamitan, Published: January 14, 2019

As shown in the study done in Kyoto University, Japan, it can be demonstrated that deep image reconstruction can be achieved through decoding the patterns that exist within the visual cortex of the brain. This proves what was already known about the brain: that the physical intercommunication of neural networks is responsible for the processing of information. It can then be deduced through looking at the structure of the neurons how this might be done, and from that the hard problem of consciousness can be explained through the chemistry and physics of cell membranes and neural networks. The biggest problem to overcome is making a theoretical framework for how the physics of creating a unified experience out of independent neuronal and molecular activity operates. It must be framed in a way that gives rise to a predictive and experimentally valid model of explaining the physical nature of conscious experience.

All theories begin with an observation, and so it can be observed that two things are pertinent to the operation of cohesive neural activity: the sequential nature of cell interaction and organization in the brain and the electromagnetic and chemical nature of the conscious experience.

Breakdown of the brain's functional network modularity with awareness, Douglass

Godwin,

Robert L. Barry, and René Marois: PNAS first published March 10, 2015

It can be observed that no single area of the brain is responsible solely for the projection of conscious

experience as described by the above study and various findings like it. As for the sequential nature of

cell interaction and organization of the brain, it must be assumed that whatever phenomenon we

experience as consciousness is doing what we are observing it do: create a coherent and organized

experience we call our persona, our identity, or our conscious experience. Though we know that various

parts of the brain process various kinds of information, the unified operation of all those parts serves

the purpose of giving utility to those parts, a matter to be discussed later in my section on Relative

Satisfactory Abstraction [RSA].

Subjectively, I know that when parts of the mind are not in synchrony, the senses can blur together into

extreme experiences of synesthesia. Space can be confused with color, taste with sound; the body can

blur into the environment, the self into the perceptions of others, and things like time or concepts can

lose all meaning.

I know that when the mind lacks the capacity to comprehend reality or is hallucinating or in a schizoid state, it is akin to sleep—where there is experience, but no sense of agency. It is as if the limbic system is using the cortex to justify its own experience while the frontal cortex ceases to modulate.

I know that when the mind is tired, it cannot form insight intellectually, but such insight can stem from the subconscious. I know that depression removes the ability to self-motivate, but subconscious individuation is increased.

I know that insight comes from the subconscious—that the conscious mind organizes ideas, but when it stops actively thinking about them, the answer arises from the noise of the subconscious. In my mind, this noise is related to diffuse thermodynamic organization—the same principle that drives biological functions from chaos—as if the chemistry of the mind is the source of insight, and neurons are there to restructure its output into a structured experience.

I also think that if subconscious information is reduced to chemical operations and processed in a way we cannot comprehend, the mind acts like multiple lenses analyzing that output. The visuospatial capacity renders an idea into a relationship of objects, and the linguistic capacity translates those relationships into hierarchies and symbols.

This complexity is not just due to the sheer number of these processes—the "lenses"—but also because, together, they project all of this into an experience where the mind can look at itself and feel a sensation of satisfaction when it "understands" a concept. This projection creates a symbolic representation of the subconscious—like a virtual hard drive running a virtual program—almost like a computer in Minecraft.

To me, this model is built upon the most rudimentary abilities of neurons. I could even see a tapeworm's reaction to its environment as a fundamental example of where creative insight originates. Creativity, in my view, is merely an extrapolation of a cell's ability to self-organize based on its composition and environment.

COHESIVE ELECTROMAGNETIC ORGANIZATION

The mechanism by which these areas of the brain are connected can only be explained by the unique qualities of that system that distinguish it from the other parts of the body. This I can only assume can be the bioelectricity transmitted throughout the nervous system, and the constant integration of all of its parts. All neurons in particular tissues of various regions of the brain are connected with electromagnetic communication to form images and patterns on the cortex needed to reconstruct a sufficient abstraction of the external world for later processing.

The process of interconnection of these areas is a layering of structured images in the various regions of the brain, all processing information through the process of RSA. What needs to be understood is that the illumination of consciousness may yet be a universal phenomenon to all electrically charged objects; that consciousness is a side effect of electromagnetic fields just as embers are a side effect of the processes of combustion. I will argue then that the means for conscious integration begins as a natural by-product of charged systems, one that connects every neuron into a whole body cohesion of conscious experience.

This is to say that when a body becomes charged, the intercommunication of the states of each molecule are so rapidly transmitted from one molecule to the next that they are for all intents and purposes merged into a single system of energy exchange; that their states can no longer be understood as separate but only as whole complex systems of interconnected molecules and cellular structures. In the same way a covalent bond joins two atoms, my theory predicts that large systems of shared electrical charges create a state where the whole system is bonded together into a single reaction surface sharing the quality of a uniform charge. This reaction surface is uniformly "observed" by all its parts in concert, which is just the state of being charged with electricity illuminating patterns on the reaction surface, which can be disorganized (non-organic systems) or organized (organic systems).

This process is hypothetically what creates conscious experience on a fundamental level, though without the operations of a living system to observe, it should be expected biologically dead yet electrically charged systems would only experience a meaningless glow of sensation, only to immediately forget the experience without any means of storing memory and go back to not processing anything. Without a means of recording information, it should be impossible that such rudimentary forms of experience could be subject to experiences of time or space. This glow would be without color or form, that is, it would not be visual or sensory, it would just be a raw, simple experience of electrification across the reaction surface for what would seem like an instant regardless of how long the reaction sustains.

Since the nervous system does not begin and end in the brain, and since the bioelectric field permeates the whole of the body, it can be supposed that we would in fact experience with every part of our body. When our arm burns then, though the impulse for how we should react is stored in the memory and instinctual regions of our brain, we are indeed feeling our arm burn; it is not just a projection of the homunculus in our mind, so it should be a firsthand experience of burning. What this suggests is that the whole system is involved in the projection of conscious experience and what we are witnessing is a uniform projection of our experience across the whole of our body, though the functions of the brain undoubtedly give us the most lucid details of the highest potency.

When we start to look at every cell in our body as a screen our neurons are projecting our experiences on, and the rapid rate of communication being sufficient enough for it to be melded together in a unified experience, we then have to look at consciousness much in the same way that we look at a TV screen rapidly projecting an image on a surface.

However, in this case our observer is the screen itself, not an eye outside of it. The fact that the observer and the projection surface are one is why consciousness takes on its subjective state, as the interplay between communication, projection, and observation are all part of the same process of the cohesive electrification of the nervous system.

When we break this down further, we come across the hard problem of participating lipids in sustaining the conscious reaction of the body. When we look at how the sodium-potassium pump of the cell membranes charge and release charges across the cell, we may then conclude that the bioelectricity is a product of ATP, energy stored within the cells being transported through the body as fuel. However, it is not the ATP that is the sole actor in energy exchange, but the cell membrane and the lipids and proteins that participate in the bioelectric reaction. It is the cell membrane and its lipids that move the charge, so it is the cell membrane that is lit up and serves as the screen and the observer of these projectors.

It should be noted it is not the energy that is experiencing; it is the atoms, the molecules of the network that experience by virtue of interconnectivity. This global interconnection of cells through the sustained electrical charge of the brain seems to me to be what is causing the subjective experience, because I observe no mechanism in the brain for projecting information into the electricity itself, and for what I know such ideas of the "soul" being the electric field fail to explain how consciousness operates, whereas the projection-observer hypothesis adequately explains the phenomena. This differentiates the C.E.O.N.E. hypothesis from existing hypotheses of electromagnetic consciousness. I find the activities of the neurons is well enough established in that all forms of processing should be assumed to be physical in nature, and the interaction between energies and the neurons is a much easier thing to explain or more importantly evolve if we view it as a screen projecting images, which is something we know exists, and not a field witnessing a nervous system, which there is no evidence for.

It is important to note that it is not a frequency that would be leading to this, but the integration of cellular organization into the charged system so it has coherent energy, memory, and cognition that gives rise to consciousness. It is the detailed and organized, dynamic and recursive nature of the electrically charged conscious material that might give rise to the use of electromagnetic orientation of operations illuminating a process that is meaningful and cohesive within the organized system. This is to say that the system evolved to take advantage of the interconnectivity of charged substances when developing its computational capacities, and so the smooth integration of consciousness with the material's biological cognition makes the seamless experience of consciousness unified and coherent.

While the cell membrane itself is only responsible for lighting up the projection on a larger scale, the axon terminals and the neurotransmitters may act as the communicator between cells. It should be hypothesized that while the cell membrane can be expressed as the light that gives substance to our subjective experience, it is the neurotransmitters that give color and structure to our minds. The neurotransmitters can then be considered the only means of encoding and encryption, and I hypothesize that by learning the nature of how these complex networks of neurotransmitters between neurons create patterns in whole tissues of the brain, we could then start to form a working theory as to how memory is stored in the terminals of each axon, resulting in the capacity to learn and understand in conjunction with larger scale dendrite wiring and conditioning.

Since it may be the case that the molecules of the cell membranes are together the projector, observer, and communicator of the conscious experience, that the rapid communication within an electrically charged system that is observing itself and translating that observation into neurotransmitters and reflections within the system, we can conclude that the consistency of these experiences is built on the material of the nervous system, material that we are constantly shedding and reconstructing.

BRAIN OF THESEUS PROBLEM

This brings me to the ship of Theseus problem and the continuous replacement of conscious material through life. In the same manner that we can expect the materials of our embryo being drawn in from the placenta and the nutrients of our mother's body, we can expect that this process continues through the metabolic activity of our lives and that we constantly remove old conscious material of lipids and proteins and replace the charged surfaces of our nervous system. This would mean that the memories that we have that are constantly being passed on are themselves kept intact as we, the illuminating conscious material of our bodies, come and go from the system constantly. I should note in passing that I suspect dreams are really the ruminations of basic blocks of memories in order to condition long-term memories into new neural networks so the process of brain metabolism does not erase essential long-term memories over time. As the neurotransmitters are released to reencode memories, they accidentally trigger random memory blocks that result in dreams.

In regards to the Theseus problem, we are as the observing material a collection of nutrients slowly phased out of the body, exiting the nervous system without any means of observing our own passing. The fluid state of conscious material in the biosphere and the loss of conscious material to geological strata are then natural processes that go on every day that we are inevitably subject to. When new material is introduced, it is quickly assimilated into the whole system. It becomes absorbed in the system and otherwise cannot realize that it was not always part of the identity of the body. Conscious material is then a resource used and recycled like any other resource in the body, though the persistence of memory as information produces the illusion of an uninterrupted experience going back to our early childhood.

In the same regard, the loss of material means that the statistical chances of returning to be reassimilated into another organism are based on where we leave our excrement and what is around it to reprocess it. So, the old conscious material excreted by the body is more likely to be reassimilated into insect or vermin than it is likely to find itself participating in another human experience. It is also likely that this material will eventually be lost into the strata of the earth, never again to partake in the biosphere where it would otherwise cycle between organisms and experience multiple forms of conscious experience. It is worth noting that there is nothing special about birth in this model, as conscious material can enter a living organism from a dead one midlife and be integrated into its nervous system in the same way it can be excreted midlife from a living organism.

The necessity of neural networks in experience and the experience-less state of the transmigration of conscious material is thus a byproduct of inheriting memory from our nervous system and losing memory upon excretion or death. Because of this there is no way for memory to follow the transition from one organism to the next, since memory is structural and breaks down when the lipids and proteins break down upon excretion or death. Without an electromagnetic system that is observing itself and processes abstracting concepts to track things like time, space, or quality, there is no experience when there is no reflection of the process. Experience of time, space, and concept can only exist in an organized system that communicates, records, and replicates the experiences of the conscious material. Without cognition time passes in an instant and no experiences have the value of subjective time.

Now that I have outlined the nature of communication, observation, and projection on the neural networks of our body and mind, the problem of why consciousness is a computational necessity of the mind in the first place must be brought into question.

Bioelectric mechanisms in regeneration: unique aspects and future perspectives, Micheal Levin, Ph.D.

As outlined in Levin's work, electric gradients have always been a tool for cells to organize and self-monitor their shape and structure. It's a way of creating a means of orienting the cell, knowing in which direction to grow and allowing for a means of intracellular communication. Chemical functions always operate off the transition of electrons between molecules, so it should come as no surprise that the function of cellular organization was built off the use of electric gradients in the organization of cell structure. Rather than it being a biological necessity to have conscious experience, it was more a matter of it being an already existing and useful function. Electric gradients were then incorporated in the rise of conscious networks that observe projections and create a cohesive, scaling neurological experience to organize large systems of information.

Because of this it might have become the bedrock upon which neurological "coding" could be written. Consider this "coding" as the source language for neurological activity. The byproduct of subjective experience is less a question of evolutionary necessity, but rather one of physics that the bioelectrical communication of self-organizing, self-observing and image-projecting networks of cells would not result in a cold unconscious reaction but one illuminated by integrated bioelectric fields that would light up the mind into what we would call conscious experience.

RELATIVE SATISFACTORY ABSTRACTION

Now that we have a basis for how the mind perceives the world through a self-observing projection by and on conscious material and how it can organize thought, we must then understand how the mind goes about forming ideas and understands how the world works. The Relative Satisfactory Abstraction hypothesis (R.S.A.) is a philosophy of mind that I came up with while grappling with the Chinese Box problem. It came to me that the nature of the mind wasn't one of simple input-output equations, but every notion that we form is measured against what we already know, that we can only understand things as they are relative to other things we already know. Knowledge may then be a collection of things we know fit within our already proven model of understanding that we find satisfactory in its predictive value to extrapolate how the world works.

Perhaps through testing the nature of reality the mind creates abstract concepts relative to the things we perceive. Through this it may create notions of space, time, and concept that define the various objects and phenomena it observes in the world. Through testing the predictive value of those abstractions, it could gauge what is real and what is not, and in reward it may get a feeling of satisfaction that we relate to the sensation of understanding. These relative concepts would then be built on instinctual a priori type knowledge inherited from evolutionary experience. We would start out looking for things that demonstrate principles of causality we naturally expect to find in the world. Once we collect facts like this, we would then seek to measure new, unexpected things against the notions we built up from our instinctual default expectations of the world in infancy.

The important aspect of this theory is that the feeling of satisfaction is what we relate to understanding, not the actual predictive qualities or value functions of any given understanding by any logical measure. That feeling of gratification tells us we have something, and that is why we find it hard to call a computer's rendering of the world an "understanding" because it doesn't "recognize" the concept as a projection of the world outside it. The computer lacks the a priori understanding of the outside world we have. It hasn't built up a concept of a world full of feelings, with each element directly being compared to every relevant fact, and so it does not feel that it knows something, i.e., it does not have that satisfaction that tells us that the idea represents a reality we can trust is true.

The complexity of the relative collection of understandings in total is immense, yet the mind still seems to label these abstract principles in simple enough terms that they can be remembered and communicated after the fact. These seem to trigger memories which then prime the nervous system with neurotransmitters, setting off a reaction triggering more neurotransmitters until a memory is recovered. However, the conscious perception of memory and sensation and the emotions attached to them go beyond the simple Chinese room problem, since the process of understanding utilizes massively complex networks of relative abstractions and not algorithms of simple input and output.

The additional complexity of consciousness, which itself is a projection of abstractions onto the sensory imaging regions of our brains, adds yet another level of complexity into the process of understanding. Once an understanding is formed, we can then visualize using the full rendering of imagination ideas and their qualities such as time, space, and concept (concept being the relative qualities of an idea as they relate to other ideas that are effectively related to any given idea).

To summarize, cells may use bioelectricity to organize, and in the form of neurons use that same bioelectricity to rapidly connect networks of neural activity into one cohesive experience. These experiences may then be built on the projections upon tissues formed of these cells, and through replicating these projections and transmitting them throughout the nervous system it creates the cohesive experience we call consciousness. The lipids and proteins that may be used to create this experience are routinely cycled out of and into this system, while the information is kept and passed on through neuroplasticity and possibly the process of dreams, gradually rewriting memories as a constant process of cognition within the organism.

If we can through experiment isolate the various elements involved in this process, from the physics of the conscious material that illuminates the process to the processes of relative satisfactory abstraction that we call understanding, to the encoding of memories through a network of axon terminals, we could in theory replicate the program and move the conscious material into that new system, transferring both consciousness and identity into a new form. On a lesser scale of grandeur, understanding these systems should give us greater insight into psychiatric medicine and how to better treat the human mind.

On a more ethical side of things, knowing that conscious material flows across the earth's surface and is shared by many organisms might open the ethical question as to how we should relate to the world around us, to its people and its ecosystems, as the suffering of the whole world is being experienced by a fluid and dynamic system of conscious material. Who knows where our conscious material will wander in a century or a millennium, who knows what technologies will be invented and whether we may find ourselves in utopia or dystopia.

The quality of the world must be brought into question when we form a new philosophy of self, because as we change our notion of self, we must also change our notion of the world. However, there is much more science to be done to see if these theories hold merit. We will need to test the effects of electricity on lipid membranes, the nature of memory encoding will need to be tested, and computational models mimicking the brain's processes of relative satisfactory abstraction will need to be written to see if they can replicate the processes of the mind.

To what ends we apply this kind of thinking about human ethics tends to be one of compassion and self-care, recognizing that we may all be sharing in a kind of universal experience and our consciousness may yet be a sublime and enduring thing.

BIAS AND REASON

In the old days, I was obsessed with epistemology. The way we perceived the world was absolutely necessary in my mind for making sane and rational decisions. To overcome the paradox of self-created mentalities, it seemed necessary to ground myself in the most empirical sciences I could find and know very clearly how to interpret them and how they interpreted reality. The need for evidence and clarity would continue to be one of the most fundamental aspects of my studies, second only to compassion and harmony. I was looking for the true reason for good, the nature of right and wrong, and became engrossed in my experimental ethics, being at times ultra-ethical and other times, well, rather untoward and unbound.

Both modes of operation taught me valuable lessons about the nature of ethics, and while I saw it as a mode of expression, I cannot say that messing around with the paradox was a casualty-free affair. At least there were not any mortal losses. However, I came to have a very intimate understanding of all the different ways a mind operates. What is the creative mode, what is the kenostatic mode, what is the analytic mode, what is the flow state? These all needed to have a subjective objective definition, one that let me break down the nature of how my mind was working into terms I could understand, and so there were a lot of terms created and a lot of old words recycled to make way for new intended meanings.

This metaphysical reassembly of my own language was part of how I managed to create what I idealistically called an "objective subjective bridge" where listening to testimonials and learning about neuroscience I was more and more convinced that I knew what parts of my brain were doing what when I thought in certain ways. This led me to have a deeper understanding of the learning and individuation process, much like Carl Jung's active imagination experiments mine took a turn into the abstract and delirious. But nevertheless, when it comes to experimental epistemology and ethics, I feel like I have broken ground in a field that probably doesn't exist in the minds of the average philosopher.

So, from the onset I need to start with discussing how we learn an opinion before I get into what we end up forming as moral opinions, and how we can scale that up into working systems. It all begins with understanding. I found that between losing focus and trying hard to grasp an idea is this wandering state of kenostatic observation. It is as if the mind is just taking in the shape and form of a concept and noting it, not trying to interpret it or grasp it. It's kind of like when someone is teaching you to put together a machine for the first time when you don't know what the machine is or what it does. Instead of grasping it right off the bat, you just watch the parts get put together until the final product takes shape and its operation becomes more evident.

This is the scientific stance on learning. No one should assume that because we see the machine and its shape, or even if we have been trained in its operation or even its engineering, that that leads to truly understanding how it works. To do this you would have to explain away some of the fundamentals that science hasn't gotten down to yet, such as how time works, how things exist, and why there is not just perfect, all-defying nonexistence.

So, rather than say we truly know something, we instead arrive at a stance where we only define what we have sufficient understanding to do with that knowledge. For example, you may not know how the lawnmower sustains itself in space and time, but that does not matter, because the only knowledge you need about the lawnmower is the knowledge it takes to mow the lawn.

Though science inevitably strives to find absolute knowledge about how the universe works, to even perform an experiment, scientists need sufficient knowledge to run those experiments and come up with hypotheses. Thus, absolute knowledge and sufficient knowledge are very different things, and most people are only concerned with or speak of sufficient knowledge.

Now, as people, whether we arrive at understanding through having a scientific stance or through the slow accumulation of simple "sufficient facts" learned through experience, we come to know very little about specific things. Unlike in science, for a fact to be sufficient, it does not matter where the idea comes from, if it does the job. You might think that you work for the king managing the kingdom's finances, but if you are just an accountant, the general result of you doing the bookkeeping is enough to make that knowledge sufficient for the task. Delusion does not always predispose dysfunction, and we are all deluded to a certain extent.

To think you are doing something and are actually doing something else may not be the common norm of how things happen; rather, most people's understandings are built on reasonable and sufficient knowledge. However, it does not take much to see where it becomes problematic if even a few truly incorrect ideas about the world might prevent a person from making progress in large parts of their lives.

While there is work being done in CBT to correct such core misconceptions and better a person, these efforts often work within much larger patterns of misconceptions that are less harmful but are still inhibiting in some way. The goal of philosophy, then, is to rid a person of these misconceptions, at least that is the goal of moral philosophy. Having good metaphysics, being competent in epistemology, and forming sound moral arrangements in life, though all human-centric, are the foundations of what philosophical work hopes to achieve.

And yet, it took me ten years to wander around and figure out what the product of doing philosophy would look like. Somewhere during this process of trying to figure out how to apply philosophy to my goal of unlocking human potential, I stopped grasping and started putting together the puzzle. I only began doing that when I actually had enough pieces to see a glimpse of a picture starting to form.

ARCHETYPAL SYMBOLOGY

Mythic archetypes, as I understand them, are agreed-upon representations of ideas that generally embody moral principles within a macro-symbolic archetype. In other words, a myth is a collection of symbols—a macro-symbol—that outlines, defines, and conveys a moral framework. Regardless of how advanced a culture becomes, children need to develop their moral temperament within a cultural context of stories that make sense to them.

Myths are the most effective means of shaping adolescent minds, forming the foundation of moral thought as they mature into adulthood. As a culture evolves, the fundamental metaphysics of moral thought—which eventually become norms and laws—will always be built upon a mythic foundation, as long as the infant mind remains incapable of fully grasping reality before learning the basics of ethics. Although morality is a construct, it must be followed as if it were absolute. This is why myths often present moral principles as absolute laws of nature—for psychological convenience.

Our thought forms seem to be biased based on patterns that fit into our taste profile for symbolic structure, and I see these structured thought forms as archetypes which are based not on some transcendent reality beyond our awareness but are built upon the hidden factors that lead to and construct the human condition. Over evolutionary time, realities such as time, entropy, well-being, and kinship seem to be encountered and encoded into our base instinctual profile to build up a biological semiotic meta-symbology that aids in building constructive thought forms to understand ourselves, our world, and our relationship with scenarios we encounter in the world.

At the root of these biosemiotic meta-symbologies are the constant forces of the universe and the world around us. These are both universal, such as the passing of time and the movement of mass, and local, such as the amount of time in the Earth's day, or the social order encountered in human society.

It is our conscious mind, which evolved in this universe of patterns and laws, that is the most suited instrument for determining its nature—but only once sufficient attunement of the mind's base meta-symbology to the base laws of known science and the irregularities observed through experiment that suggest deeper structures.

Our mind operates as a projection of its own sort. I believe this is a result of the holographic projection of the brain's symbolic operations in its various regions being synthesized through bioelectric cohesion, connecting the atoms of the nervous system into a single bioelectrically illuminated system. Think of it like a five-dimensional simulator for all of our senses and cognitive capacities.

The perfect cohesion of the projection to being such a coherent form that we call our experience is the result of the use of this unifying principle being perfected over billions of years of evolution. And so, the symbolic structures within also have remnants of the structure of the reality it has formed to navigate within it, and the laws can be found by comparing the internal structure of our thought to the external structure of the world.

Though absurd and meaningless, it is my conviction that we create meaning through harmonizing the structure of our minds with the structure of the universe, and what is meaningful becomes what is a coherent description of reality. The admittance that the human mind is an absurd and creative machine that can project and shape archetypes with a lesser and greater degree of accuracy—not necessarily tied strongly to the hard patterns of deeper existence—is to me the most coherent interpretation of the human condition.

As the human mind forms and identity is shaped through play and peer association, and it is tested against the existing structures and restraints of the world, I believe it forms associations and builds those into archetypes that are familiar to it. So, there are no universal archetypes—each person is the creator of their own archetypes—but there are universal relationships and attributes that form subsemiotic code that are recombined by each mind into archetypes: those they identify with, those they reject, and those they are attracted to.

This archetypal symbology does, as a result of being a reflection of reality, form seemingly similar archetypes—but due to cultural drift and human capacity to change, will change and evolve as human culture changes over time. What might have seemed like universal archetypes to Jung may not have any relevance to a human civilization in the future that has gone through a technological singularity that could either structure or diversify humanity beyond recognition. If a subset of pre-singularity human cultures were preserved, then the abstractness of their archetypal identity would be much more evident against the backdrop of posthuman and Homo Novus populations.

And so, though there are benefits to our archetypal arrangements as they are, the true nature of good and evil is the ability to use the meta-symbolic code deep in our evolutionary psyche to create accurate archetypes for the future—not the past—and shape those into hypothetical relationships which we can then call an ethos. This theory of archetypes and human biosemiotics is the closest thing I can come up with to describe my observed subjective and objective experiences relating to the paradigm formation and abstract logistics of human behavior.

VALUE CONSTRUCTION

What makes humans unique is not just our ability to have insights but the breadth of our symbolic representation and our ability to guide it through frontal cortical modulation. I have seen mice innovate in their own way, and ants solve problems—such as navigating pest tape on the ground—that evolution could not have specifically prepared them for. From my understanding, any diffuse thermodynamic system has the potential for adaptive organization, which is essentially elementary innovation at a chemical level.

Human problem-solving, however, seems to be framed in the biocultural evolution of our species and is markedly more complex than most other animals. This can be seen in the complexity of human cultures when cross-cultural exchanges occur. It was perplexing to many indigenous men, after all, as to why the colonials were contented digging around in the dirt to survive. They saw that as women's work, it was man's job to spill blood after all. But it is ancient tradition to the Eurasians, the curse of man after all is to work the earth.

The incredible burden of imagination that has been put into the simple question "what should I do?"

puts the imaginary games of youth to shame, and yet, when framed in socioeconomic patterns become

as real and unbending as the stones they are written on. It is the organizing logic of resource acquisition

that holds human morality in place. Customs held up by one group end up setting the meter for all once

they are proven viable. After all, challenging norms is a remarkably dangerous pastime.

Customs of family values, rules, hierarchies in a society, these form predictable interactions which

inform us of a way to act in each instance of interaction. Without them, society would be a chaotic mess

of random, unpredictable interactions. It is necessary, even when misinformed, to legislate, for it is

human to legislate. Yet it is not that something works that makes it good, and so the many naturally

forming human moral cultures are works in progress; simply the best that has been put into practice,

not to be compared with what has yet to be thought of. While the shape and form of natural morality

varies widely, the universal element is a restriction of some behaviors for the greater good of society.

Sometimes these norms are class-specific, others may be more universal. However, the need to limit

human behavior to reduce the undue harm in a society caused by raw human sexuality and aggression

can be called the moral pattern.

It should be immediately clear that without a concept of human freedom this almost always becomes a cage and a prison for most people involved. Without freedom, role assignment becomes behavioral scaffolding meant to protect by removing the very thing self-designing minds need the most: freedom. Now, it is natural in the self-design process to limit the self's composition and form. We do this to add definition and function, for a perfectly free and shapeless mind would be no more than a drooling mess of random outputs.

The world is structured, and so we must structure ourselves to respond in meaningful ways. People will inevitably be part of the structure we encounter, and so it is not a matter of being without influence but rather one of retaining authority over our own design processes if we want to have a reason to retain our humanity. The cultural symbols we work with will restrict us only as much as we surrender power to the culture in individuation.

Again, despite this freedom the world and often the people we meet do not bend to our opinions, and so we must form a structured way of thinking to navigate the absurdity of human interactions. People tend to create archetypes of others and self as imagined expected values associated with different kinds of people. Man, woman, child, adult, family, friend, stranger, leader, the list is extensive and unique to each person. These are not universal or even uniform in cultures, but rather learned through lived experiences and preferential adoption of symbols from a culture's mythos.

Based on what archetypes they see themselves as and based on what values they associate with those archetypes, people behave in various social situations based on their imagined optimal relationship with other archetypes they encounter. Should a person be defensive, offensive, close, open, warm, cold? These relationships form a person's ethos, and the less aligned with the culture, and so the less aligned a culture is with reality, the less functional an ethos will be. In other words, when a culture's mythos is not built on the logos of sustainable social norms, the people's ethos ends up fighting against those norms to form an ethic that benefits them, or they will find themselves in a state of moral incoherence with the logic of the cosmos.

Difficult questions like "what is good?" if taken as an average from across cultures can roughly be defined as "what should be done", with "should" being similarly defined as "that which brings about a meaningful benefit when enacted". So, what is something that brings about meaningful benefit? We can deduce that something is an object that retains certain properties in relation to other objects. Benefit could be called that which sustains or improves the state of that object's properties in relationship to others. This is a western understanding of the word "good".

But what is meaning? What could we call a value that has inherent significance which defines the nature of an effect or object? This is where things get murky. Objectively the world is a chemical reaction, and if we withhold from assuming that the reaction is divine and should be followed through to its natural conclusion, we must instead observe that going along with nature or going against it are both equally meaningless endeavors. This is to say there is no natural ought, "is" does not equal "ought". That is the backbone of Hume's naturalist fallacy. Yet, as Wittgenstein observed, within language there is, indeed, meaning, it is just generated within the context of related symbols.

From the field of linguistic anthropology, these symbols are formed through a process of cultural evolution, generated over time as communication changes and adapts to new cultural realities. So, meaning only exists as a semantic tool to give values to communication symbols. There is no natural meaning to a construction worker holding out his hand and saying "brick!", yet within the architecture of human understanding shared within a culture, it is evident that the carpenter was asking the other worker to pass him a brick. As far as Wittgenstein is concerned this is the nature of meaning, and he would be right. Yet, where I disagree with Wittgenstein is that outside of this world of generated values, there are natural values that can inform us about the way people go about forming contracts and trying to do what works best.

In the same way combustion engines were built with an intended purpose of generating mechanical power and took form around this intended purpose, so too does the human mind take shape around its many intended purposes, though these intentions are self-created. Within these self-created intentions, there is a general theme: to elevate oneself out of the crudeness of nature and labor and free oneself from the very confines imposed upon us by physical limitations. Seeking freedom from the human condition is the substantial intent of all human industry, innovation, and technological advancement. This very material root to human motivation forms the ethos on which people build their motivations. From the most arcane alchemy to the most mundane task, the refinement and elevation above raw effort results in sophistication and ingenuity when faced with any interaction.

Even if culture was wiped from the face of the earth, the self-organizing nature of life and the selective

pressures of survival based on evolution would reignite this process of industrial self-liberation. Yet,

even this is not the highest good, for as John Locke pointed out, it is reasonable for people to argue to

ensure everyone's freedoms to create a culture that ensures our own freedoms. This was his concept of

rights and can be considered the selective root of all human altruistic and compassionate reasoning. This

is to say: if I want others to protect my efforts to become free, I must contribute to the culture that

protects everyone's freedoms including mine.

So, it becomes reasonable to "love thy neighbor as oneself". Despite this, to go along with this still

comes down to an absurd choice, a decision to go along with sophisticated scaffolding that we call rights

and freedoms because ultimately, it is still all absurd and constructed over time and culture. Life, death,

pleasure, pain, it is all a meaningless chemical reaction and so, the meaning we create, the meaning we

shape around this absurd human condition, and so the very limitations we set up on ourselves as

reasonable and mature individuals are ultimately a voluntary exercise in self-definition and regulation. It

is the freedom of this absurd universe that our choice to be good has any meaning only through the

authority of a shared culture of relatively defined symbols and values.

It is necessary then, if we are to understand the nature of good and evil, to see meaning as engineered and semantic in nature, as it is necessary to see good as the best way we have designed a value system to resolve the incoherence of the human condition. It is worth noting that rights and freedoms are but one form of philosophical engineering to solve for human incoherence with the logos. As the steam engine was but the first iteration, so too were the covenant and the code of Hammurabi but the original machinery that was invented to solve the problem of human bondage to our own social chaos. Within this metaphor rights and freedoms are like the combustion engine, and now we must imagine something much more effective if we are going to keep super-intelligent AGI in line with our own values and freedoms. This is what I hope to achieve with structural absurdism.

RELATIONAL ENGINEERING

Finding a partner is a matter of taste, since judging another person for partnership is an impossible thing to do with standard human limitations. So, through playful experimentation and taste a person develops a persona profile and a set of archetypes they look for and begins to filter through the population for individuals that fit their profile through any means they have.

However, some cultures net family values into courtship, sometimes even overriding individual preference for familial guidance. Strong familial pressures are known to force relationships to last longer, though quality of life, especially that of the women in traditional marriages, is often sacrificed for social stability.

The mode of courtship in a society usually has elements of social networking and individual preference. Often males are expected to network and females are expected to attract, but with gender diversity and social dynamics shifting as women and non-gender-conforming people gain power in the world, it is beginning to become more fashionable for women to also do their fair share of networking and men to try and attract women with fun, expressive lifestyles that display a wide arrangement of resource freedoms and innovative capacities.

In the same way that standard modes of courtship are no longer the only way to look at finding a partner in the modern day, so too are marriage arrangements becoming diverse and contingent on personal tastes and ideologies. The main unifying factor in marriage is that it is a contractual family-forming arrangement where the roles of the members involved are established.

These roles can vary just as the people involved and the effectiveness of their arrangements can vary. They can be spiritual, economic, and sometimes socially contingent in how they are consensually restricting each other's behaviors to adopt a family ethos. A marriage may even include multiple people, who have differing roles, such as a reproductive partner, a spiritual partner, and an economic partner all having different relationships to each other but nevertheless formalized in a contractual obligation to uphold certain symbolic acts of faithfulness, certain prenuptial arrangements, and certain economic obligations. All of that being said, I have my doubts that the sheer simplicity of monogamy is going to be dethroned due to its psycho-structural management of human jealousy and aggression. For most, monogamy is what works, and so it becomes moral if not ethical.

The actual act of raising children is a parental matter because for a society to maintain integrity and responsibility it must allow parents to have the final say in how they raise their children insofar as no unnecessary harm befalls the child. This stems from the same logic that freedom of thought is necessary for chaotic experimentation, and as half of the means of individuation, it is human for parents to have creative freedom in the raising of their children as it is for children to have the necessary freedoms to play and develop their own identities as they develop and grow into young adults.

Home economics are the practical limitations on family size and economic growth. The metric of what a person can reasonably expect to achieve on an average person's salary shapes what a reasonable person will teach their children is an average and exceptional goal to have for oneself and what ethics are optimum to navigate an average or excellent life. For this reason the home economics are the meta-ethical framework that shapes a family's ethos, as a reasonable person will not educate their children to maintain a lifestyle they have less than a 50% chance of replicating themselves.

The distribution of wealth in a society is critical to making and breaking the intergenerational building of estates and enterprises in a society. The eldest child doctrine is often cited as a good way to ensure that a family's legacy is not divided and so the family's grandeur is best preserved by gifting the majority of the estate to a single heir. However, the equitable argument is also growing in popularity, stating that inheritances should be evenly divided among the children as the children themselves should have the integrity to build their own lives first and should not be depending on an inheritance to make a living at all. Like all things, inheritance also is subject to cultural evolution and is likely to change as the human condition changes within our socio-technological reality.

The distribution of wealth in a society is critical to making and breaking the intergenerational building of estates and enterprises in a society. The eldest child doctrine is often cited as a good way to ensure that a family's legacy is not divided and so the family's grandeur is best preserved by gifting the majority of the estate to a single heir. However, the equitable argument is also growing in popularity, stating that inheritances should be evenly divided among the children as the children themselves should have the integrity to build their own lives first and should not be depending on an inheritance to make a living at all. Like all things, inheritance also is subject to cultural evolution and is likely to change as the human condition changes within our socio-technological reality.

Professionalism is more complex, etiquette-driven, and situational and depends much more on the outcome of a person's individuation stages and their logic. Professionalism is simply the ability to understand the mode of social operations in a workplace and understand one's roles and responsibilities with effective and adequate efficiency. So, this mode of social organization depends on deeply ingrained sociological archetypes, of what it means to be an employee, a manager, an administrator, etc. Reputation is the general constraints on one's character placed upon ourselves to prevent those who do not yet know us well from thinking poorly of us before we get the chance to prove ourselves. Reputational awareness is important in the shaping and fitting into social norms. Since we consider certain things socially acceptable, the logic behind this is generally our reputation needs to be guarded so our society does not misbrand us and damage our social opportunities.

Respect is the social organization where we treat others with a socially predefined standard of communal hospitality, without devolving into discord or hostility. This predefined standard is not universal in all situations, nor do people grant it uniformly, but rather to certain archetypal personas people react and grant what they deem is due respect which may be governed by a variety of value metrics such as what a person believes they can get away with, what others think, or what standards of ethics they believe others deserve based on their level of altruistic inclusion.

CREATIVITY AND LOGIC

So far, everything I have been discussing seems rational enough, and as we know, this does not necessarily reflect human decision-making, since most everyone does not know or care to know about science and philosophy; most default to taste and traditional learning methods. Below our every symbolic association that forms human value systems, our basic instincts and gut reactions to symbols form the foundations of human meaning-making. It is necessary for the human mind to experience some form of what I call relative satisfactory abstraction, when measuring concepts against their existing knowledge base.

Most of the time, this gut feeling of satisfaction when encountering an idea is based less on logic as it is on how it fits into the existing paradigm of the individual and how this makes them feel. After digesting a concept so they have considered its various contours and fitting it into their paradigm, the gut sensation of understanding or rejection signals to the mind that they have fit the concept into their paradigm structure in a way that satisfies their internal logic.

Even the qualities of many simple concepts are viscerally rooted in the realms of sensation, with certain ideas being associated with attraction or disgust, good things feeling warm and bad things feeling cold. This basic code of subsemiotic taste values forms the substrate on which our values and linguistic associations are formed upon sensory gradients of compound sensory values. Because so much of meaning is based on taste, taste-forming experiences change reasoning much more than logical arguments ever can.

Stress and reward reprogram taste associations which change value systems at their base and can open the mind up to or close it off from new kinds of information, shaping what kinds of information the mind grants influence over itself or rejects outright. These associations are inherited over time, starting in infancy and developing into adulthood when the mind begins to become more resistant to changes to its basic taste template.

Beyond the existential need for freedom, being free to experiment and play with behaviors and ideas is also the core foundational activity that drives the individuation process. It is the very bedrock of the creative mode to enter this state of mind by which all taste and reason can be exercised and tested. Since this is critical to individuation and innovation, creating a safe yet liberating environment where creatives can be free from incentives yet guarded against the chaotic hazards that are often generated in chaotic experimental modes is essential to the integrity of a mind's ability to shape itself.

Just as a playground must be dynamic despite its guardrails, so too must a successful society have legal limitations to prevent undue harm while protecting people's fundamental freedoms. The same can be said for parenthood, guardianship, or any other activity where one mind counsels another mind. True creativity comes from the ability to disorganize symbolic relationships and recombine them into organizations that are new.

When entering the creative mode, sporadic recombination of symbolic relationships comes from a release of inhibitions and a transformation of taste values when those inhibitions are released. These transformations then become new patterns of symbols which can be built into new structural innovations or concepts, like a new song or a new invention altogether. This secondary phase where the transformed taste then repatterns thought and generates new ideas is still highly creative. It is in the stage of reconstruction of concepts that the truly creative mind allows symbolic relationships to fit together serendipitously, patterning concepts within the framework of their new taste value associations.

The outcome of this process is newly formed concepts which have never existed in that mind. Contrary to others' opinions on the matter, I am a believer in the uniqueness of every instant and thought. That true replication is impossible but true creativity is inevitable; it is just the degree of uniqueness that is in question. Truly liberated states of mind and radically freeform play is the root to novelty in thought and truly adaptive understanding of concepts from when the mind is swimming in the fluidity of its own being.

Ideas are not formed in a vacuum. The information we deconstruct and recombine all requires attunement with the real world. It is through induction that we acquire new information through relative satisfactory abstraction, and the process of measuring one idea against another can be approximately called reason. Without these deductive habits of cognition and many mental mechanisms of verification that we construct using deductive habits, the mind would be too chaotic to have any evolutionary utility.

The truest form of induction is exercised from a place that is wide-eyed and without preconceptions. This state of mimicry is done from what is called kenosis. Kenostatic induction involves abandoning all preconceptions, emptying the mind of biases and assuming a state of emptiness and wonder. It is in states like this that little children learn their first words, and the more intelligent student digests their teacher's harder lessons. I believe kenosis is in direct opposition to reason, which itself requires taking the full synthesis of what one knows and measuring not only whether it is consistent with itself, and so logical, but whether the subject agrees with that knowledge.

Logic requires a fullness of mind, but also a self-critical nature that allows for inconsistencies to be weeded out and addressed. I believe attuning to reality through kenostatic induction must come before logic and reason, so that the base insights are informed not just off science and literature as they're taught, but practical wisdom.

Without this general wisdom of what things are, logic can make self-agreeing scaffolding in the mind that is delusional and detached from reality, no matter how intelligent it may seem. In regards to ethics, we see in religion both kenostatic, logical, and creative arguments for the nature of good and bad.

Much of philosophy is logical ethics, based on structural agreements for right and wrong. Creative moral arguments are rarer but are usually built on spiritual metaphysics and tend to be out of alignment with the logos if not brought into accordance and coherence with the greater reality. Consider certain cults and spiritualities built on alternative sciences and religious metaphysics. That being said, dabbling in creative, or what I call synthetic ethics, is where new moral ideas come from. Even if ethics do not initially result in a good outcome, they can still inform new logically coherent moral systems, such as this very philosophy.

For most, the brief moral lessons we encounter in life do not constitute what an academic would call a study in ethics. In fact, the lessons most carry with them are trauma responses and behavioral outputs filtered through their bias and worldviews. Moral behavior has always been more an exercise that needs to be practiced to become authentic and has never truly been a logical form of behavior. Rather, logic is usually just a self-justifying excuse used to communicate a reason we invent to convey that we are right to act how we want, when often what is good tends to be exactly the opposite of what we want.

If ethics in general is the counterbalance to raw human aggression and sexuality that makes social cohesion possible, then to attain a tempered moral behavior, we must exercise a service to others to condition a moral reflex, not through contemplation but through rehearsal. Despite this intent, even with noble ethics, our attempts to aid others do more harm than good. So, making systems of support and avenues for their recovery without coercion or forced medicines becomes the new golden rule: treat others so that their own self-restraint and maturation can grow from the way you treat them.

Now, bioethics, the shape of the mind, the age of capacity for consent or self-care all become advanced ethical questions that take a deeper understanding of the brain and the operations of the mind, so to a minor extent we do need a neurologically informed morality when doing ethics. Regardless, these principles have to be experienced in practice to achieve a strong moral reflex, to the point we exercise moral behaviors outside of the actual logic of ethics, like stopping to save a caterpillar from a walking path, tipping a struggling server or feeding a stray animal, none of which do logical good but are the inevitable result of a mind whose inner reflex of altruism has been successfully conditioned.

So, how the mind grapples with problems takes many forms, and these many forms I observe are just

mental machines I have developed and seen in a few others. These mechanisms are likely adaptations

and not ultimate rules, since the mind is too complex for there to be only three or four ways of learning.

With the mind, I have noticed, if there are a multiplicity of functions they can almost always be

extrapolated into infinite other forms. I have played with using states of mind that guide behavior while

another part of my mind does theory or ruminations. I have seen that there are pliable states of mind. If

anything, the creative mode is the genesis point from which new ways of thinking are made through

dissociative recombination of abstract concepts. Perhaps this is where I should have begun this chapter,

not where I ended it, but nevertheless, that is the nature of the self-designing paradigm, the paradox at

the root of the human condition: it is when we finish a job that we understand the way it should have

been done.

Human beings have a subconscious preference that determines their disgust and their attraction to

certain stimuli and ideas. This is rooted in a biosemiotic code that is mostly genetic but is conditioned

over time and modulated by frontal cortical activity to form abstract human behaviors. This taste is the

foundation to human self-regulation and integrity. When attuned, it can result in a person being able to

make rational decisions based on nothing but intuition, and when disrupted it can lead a person into

delusion despite their most sincere attempts at rational thinking.

The process of refining taste and structuring it into logic comes from a process of psychological play I call "chaotic experimentation". Though this can go either way, the point of play and humor is to cultivate a mode of thinking where taste can be tested in practice by imagining or partaking in playful repatterning of thought. Critical assessment is the opposite of playful thinking. It is a reductive repatterning of thought where things that do not fit within a logic system are removed or reformed to fit within a consistent logic. This critical thinking results in deductive reasoning that tests ideas against each other, removing noise and increasing clarity and consistency.

Behavioral conditioning is the process of repeating logic arrived at through chaotic experimentation and critical assessment. This entrenches the symbolic abstractions of thought into hard preferences of attraction and disgust through taste. This reconditions biosemiotic foundations to having a different preference than previously arrived at. Though higher neuroplasticity in youth allows for greater ease in behavioral reconditioning, intense and sustained stimulus can change the base biosemiotic patterning at any age. Most human thought is not rational or explicitly playful, but is a reaction where a person's taste reacts against their existing logic structure and comes up with a symbolic behavioral reaction to the stimulus. This is known as reflexive response and allows people to save intellectual resources and make judgment calls with missing or incomplete information.

ON MYTHIC LEGALISM

BIO-CULTURAL EVOLUTION

In the current scientific literature, it is understood that about 10 million years ago there was a species not too dissimilar from the bonobo chimpanzee. These early ancestors of the human species produced all the lineages of human and non-human ancestors that created the now single-branched tree of the hominid line.

Our species has a myriad of interesting characteristics: we are halfway between being a sexually homogeneous pair-bonding species and a sexually dimorphic, tournament-breeding species. It would appear that we were en route to becoming a pair-bonding species, which suggests some sort of matriarchal selection in our past—whereby the females of the species bred the males to be trusting, loyal protectors, while the females were free to select their mates at will and trust the males to protect them and their young—those pair-bonded to them, that is.

Without getting into all the nuances of evolutionary biology, psychology, and endocrinology, I intend to focus mainly on the anthropological present—or rather, on the snapshot of human history available to us through the last 10,000 years of recorded and interpreted history. If you were to take a good look at the family tree of religions and trace them all back to their common ancestor—that is, animism (and yes, there is a common ancestor to all religions)—you would find that the ethics are not too dissimilar from our current spiritual practices and religious beliefs.

There are principles of compassion and care, love and respect, order and authority, power, grace, humility, and trust. The difference lies in the framework through which these principles are arranged and interpreted. In early animist cultures, there are no courts of law; instead, there are rituals that fulfill similar functions—rituals which, in some instances, reflect the purpose of courts of law, such as talking circles. Nevertheless, the symbolism reflects the reality of those early spiritual and ethical practices.

To the animist, everything is alive: the corpse is its own entity, the tree has its own spirit, the stones whisper tales of the ancient past, and a newborn child has immediate memories of the place of life from which it just came but lacks the language to speak as the memories slowly slip away. If we were to get allegorical, our common ancestor—the animist—could be considered the Noah of our tales. If Noah were an animist and all of his children spread out to become all other religions, then we must consider the fact that, in this mythic hierarchy, what I am really attempting to do is draw a common denominator between ourselves and the rest of humanity with this narrative.

This thought experiment shows that there is no such thing as "Noah the Animist," nor is there any trace of such an idea in theological records. Rather, it demonstrates that mythic ideas can have ethical consequences, depending on how we shape the symbols and combine them into mythic frameworks. If we want to make a convincing narrative, we pick a concept such as unity of humanity, pick an argument, such as the common ancestor and shared history, and include as many instances as possible that demonstrate that we are the same all in all.

So, to the animist, the practice of interpreting the living essence of the world around us—and of finding meanings and hidden signs in the very magical fabric of the human psyche—is the very nature of spirituality: to create a narrative in our minds that adequately describes the moral and physical precedent we are observing in the world. The necessity of creating myths to a mind that does not know the sciences is analogous to the scientist's need to create experiments to test the outcomes of observed phenomena. Both serve to satisfy the mind's need to attain an understanding adequate to move beyond thought and into action.

To a scientist, this means having a predictable understanding of how things operate, based on a physical and empirical view of reality. This may incentivize them—or others—to act on that understanding, often to create new technologies, make decisions about health and hygiene, and generally orient themselves in the cosmos. But to an animist, it is simply enough to understand how something could work, so that they can then act within their environment in a relatively confident way. There is a very different level of involvement with the nature of things when there is no culture of certitude in place.

And so our understanding of the myths we create helps us navigate the world through our hazy understanding of what we believe really exists. More often than not, it is a partial and superficial understanding that serves us most directly. The ability to turn on your vehicle and operate it is far more valuable in daily life than a full comprehension of the physics of how its metals were fabricated and shaped.

In our early history, when we only had this kind of superficial, alchemical understanding of how things operated, the stories about how things came to be were, in fact, imaginary stories—blurred together over millions of years of storytelling into a comprehensive mythos unique to each tribal language, which, in the earliest days, was diverse among many tribes the world over.

The understanding of human relationships and ethics has always been a matter of the interaction between oneself and one's imaginary world. Even today, most—if not all—people live in their own imaginary worlds, shaped by their own information space, or what I call their mental umwelt, from which they draw satisfactory ideas of how the world operates. This is their limited access to the broader mythos of their culture.

In the modern world, it is common for people to think that most of the information they choose for themselves is accurate because the truth is something they can learn through taste. This idea—that because information they have learned to choose sources and build in the isolation of their mind an accurate model of the cosmos—is epistemologically naive, as it underestimates humanity's inability to find, verify, and distribute truth in the first place.

It is also naive in assuming there is no misinformation that can trick them—whether intentional or accidental—used to distract, disorient, and undermine cultural understanding. In that sense, there are many parallels between the animist mentality of justifying the natural order through storytelling and the modern habit of selectively picking information to construct validating narratives—again, often to justify baser human nature as the moral standard.

SPONTANEOUSLY MANIFESTING ALTRUISM

The crux of the matter is this: moral progress does not arise as a consequence of information fidelity, nor does it accumulate naturally over time as an evolution of the human species. Rather, moral progress seems to happen spontaneously in small, isolated populations, where altruistic and co-beneficial strategies can overtake the group when they arise and are reinforced.

Meanwhile, many scholars of religion like to point out that later religions—such as Christianity, Buddhism, and Islam—appear to have higher moral standards than those that came before. They like to chronicle the crudeness of the past and the sophistication of the future as if morality evolves structurally over time. It is not uncommon to encounter arguments in religious studies asserting that spiritualist societies are more ethical than animist ones, or that the gods of city-states are more ethical than the totems of animal and ancestor spirits that came before. Nor is it uncommon to see claims that monotheistic thinking produces more ethical outcomes than polytheistic modes of thought.

In reality, the only correlation between time and moral progress is that, given enough time, spontaneous altruistic societies appear and leave their mark on the literature. There is no structural correlation between the metaphysics of a theology and the morality of the population practicing it. What gave the Jews the original moral standard that set them apart from their contemporaries was simply that Abraham was both highly industrious, with good work ethics, and hospitable and just. It was this combination—being industrious and ethical, hospitable and just—that created ample opportunities and laid the foundation for the proliferation of the Jewish people.

In all honesty, there probably never was a single historical person called Abraham, nor can we expect the myths of those early books to be factual in any literal sense. Yet it is the shape and form of those myths that capture the ethos of the early Jewish people. We could go on, if we wished, about the nature of myth-making, the nature of revelation, and what happens when the human mind experiences visions, dreams, and altered states where it receives sacred histories and integrates them into existing traditions—but I find such speculation unnecessary for understanding the mythic foundation of law. We are, for the most part, well-enough versed in psychology to understand how hallucinations and visions can occur in otherwise sane minds, and it is beside the point when it comes to understanding how ethics actually entered the system.

The innovation of the monotheists was perhaps the greatest innovation in all of human society: the moralization of the courts of law. Undoubtedly, they inherited from earlier city-state polytheists—such as the Babylonians—the notion of a legal court as an expression of creed and commandment. But they developed it into not just a covenant of ethics, but a covenant of interpreting ethics in a consistent and particular way. Bringing justice was one of the virtues attributed to Abraham, as described by his wife Sarah, and it became one of the most important aspects introduced into the tradition, setting it apart from other peoples and their mythos.

Again, while many focus on the transition from polytheism to monotheism—the mythic progression of spirits becoming gods, gods becoming angels and minor deities under one supreme God—we can understand these mythic shapes as representations of the reality people found themselves in: attempting to differentiate themselves from those around them through metaphysical reflection. For if there is one people and one world, and if the highest ethical understanding is that we are to treat our neighbors as we treat ourselves, then there must logically be one God to embody these universal characteristics and this highest ethic.

We could also idle away the time discussing the meta-ethics of God: why people seek an ultimate authority beyond humanity—because humanity cannot be trusted—while ethics themselves seem trustworthy. Whether one posits a great spirit, a god, or some other transcendent principle, the idea is always that something above mere human leaders must be holding the moral order in place.

But I find this meta-ethical argument for the existence of God to also be beside the point. In the modern day, we know—almost empirically—that there is no intelligence acting on the world to change its physics; rather, the physics are constant, and we can describe human moral phenomena through psychology, evolutionary psychology, and anthropology. Yet this does not change the fact that no matter what argument people make—whether theological or metaphysical—they are limited by their understanding and are therefore constructing a myth in order to justify being ethical.

These moral myths—about why people should or should not behave in certain ways—are never universal. They are always up for interpretation. Even when everyone is reading from the same book, they interpret it differently. And at the end of the day, the average person tends to self-justify their behavior rather than being genuinely transformed by moral argumentation. The moral progress we see in theological literature appears to come from an ever-expanding view of who is included in our social circles of care. Whenever someone finds a way to include more people in their circle of care—while still functioning as a human being—they gain the moral authority to update the myth, revise the religion, and adapt the rule of law. The caveat is whether this update remains functional.

Consider, for instance, the early Christian Church. For the most part, it sustained itself and its members. The great innovation of Jesus was charity—something that, beforehand, barely existed, if at all. Charity allowed for the social network to expand and include people of different races, creeds, and religions within an ever-growing circle of care, through the evangelical nature of the tradition.

Had this innovation lacked utility—had it not been a functional tradition—the idea of expanding the commandment to "love your neighbor as yourself" to include all people probably would not have taken off as it did. It is always the combination of an increasing capacity for social care in theory, met with a corresponding practical application that can actually make it happen, that produces moral progress. After this, updating the mythos of the society to form itself around the new moral structure is a matter of manipulating the archetypes to reflect the new moral reality being brought into being. This can be religious, character-driven, or even changes to nationalist rhetoric and style, since all of these things are mythic in nature.

To be theoretically ethical but not practically ethical is idealistic—robbing oneself of survival by pursuing ideals that do not align with reality. To be ruthless and seek one's own success at the expense of others' well-being is also unethical—because it degrades the social network that sustains the majority of people. And when the majority discover such subterfuge, they will unite against it to defend what has been determined, through lived experience, to be the moral good.

And so, in defending the established norms, the good becomes entrenched and resilient to change. This was the second lesson learned by early Christianity as it spread: that it would have to become a religion proper, to avoid encroaching on other religions' territories and to preserve its identity. The final Gnostic evolution of early Christianity was the Manichaeans. This was, for the most part, an ethical philosophy that regarded every religion as a path to truth. Though it was popular and spread across Eurasia—from Spain to China—it earned the ire and hatred of every established religion, which saw its teachings as stolen from their own traditions.

The reason few know the name of the prophet Mani today is that Manichaeism—his namesake theology—no longer exists. Even though it was an efficient means of distributing wealth, power, and producing morally-incentivized individuals to care for each other, it ran up against the pre-existing Buddhist, Zoroastrian, and later Roman Catholic traditions that resisted and eventually extinguished it. This is why, for the most part, I wholly abandoned the idea of creating a new theology— because theology is a very hostile environment in which to create something new. When dealing with entrenched moral systems such as theology or states, we have to consider that there is already a momentous competition for power within those structures.

This was the reality faced by the last great tradition to enter the global religious field: Islam. Originally a peaceful religion with no room for violence—an absolute law of peace and pacifism—it ran up against the reality that you cannot create something new without it being contested immediately by the powers that already exist. And so, backed into a corner in Medina, they fought their way out. But they did so in a way that was more ethical than the average conduct of war at the time. Because they fought with honor and an ethical approach beyond what was then common, their army grew so large that when they returned to Mecca, their opponents simply surrendered.

And so Islam became the final great religion to enter the playing field: one God, one language to interpret that God, and one law to interpret that language. The innovation was not only a means of organizing society efficiently—with logic, grace, and compassion—but also a new logic of war and ethic of state. The religion continued to grow long after the Prophet Muhammad died. But, as with all traditions, it began to degrade over time. Later texts include elements we would no longer consider ethical today—pragmatic concessions made to ensure the survival of the tradition. This cycle—a spike in ethics followed by a slow degradation over time—repeats, waiting for the next revolution in ethics to occur.

And those revolutions did occur after Muhammad's lifetime: the Sufi mystics, with their universal love; the Bahá'í faith, now contested by Islam as it once contested others—again trying to create something new but running up against the established order. And so we are again faced with the same two options: slowly change a tradition through ethical revision, or confront and contest the entire tradition by force of will.

This was the status quo of moral progress until a large portion of society was freed from feudal toil during the European Industrial Revolution. One could argue it was not so much liberation from farms and fiefdoms as it was the printing of books that allowed information to spread across Europe. As information spread, the philosophies of old came back into focus, and many foreign ideas were brought into contact, making people question their own beliefs.

During this time, a man named Descartes decided it was necessary to start from scratch. He formed a fully rational philosophy of mind, doing away with old theological beliefs and practices, and set a new precedent for how philosophy would be done in the future. But what followed was a stampede of philosophers proposing new moral and ethical paradigms—some more ethical, some less—but all constructed based on the natural sciences as they understood the world.

It would not be until Thomas Hobbes wrote *Leviathan*, arguing that the only rational thing to do was to give all your power to the state, so that it could secure your interests and your security—and to hope that under God the state would act decently and in your favor. His argument was so logically consistent that it was difficult to deny after reading the book. Yet in the intellectual community of the Enlightenment, there was furious resistance. This resistance inspired John Locke to write his *Two Treatises of Government* and *A Letter Concerning Toleration*, articulating for the first time the concepts of human rights and freedoms, arguing that human liberty was paramount.

And so, something new emerged: a space for ethics to be developed within philosophy, separate from theology. Theology could continue and adapt to these philosophical insights, while philosophy went its own way, grounded in science rather than divine prescription.

THE IMPERATIVE OF LIBERATION

Of course, we know how the story goes: the Industrial Revolution did not liberate the majority of people. In fact, it created more work for everyone. Until the civil rights movements, most people worked until they died. But had it not been for this innovation of doing ethics and philosophy separately from theology, these ideas might have been contested and destroyed before they could mature and become popular.

Yet even now, philosophy itself has become entrenched—the shiny new thing has become old and tarnished. The ethics of the day have been hollowed out and reduced to populism. The concepts of human good and freedom have been reduced to the same hedonistic games and base instincts that preceded the moral experiment entirely. So much has already been done that our only chance for sparking another revolution of moral change seems confined to the cyberspace of the new technologies we are developing. If we cannot figure out how to create a new moral order that benefits all, we are at risk of enslaving ourselves yet again—until the next great revolution comes. To live in Thomas Hobbes' nightmare—where the state controls every aspect of your life and freedom is gone—will be the fate of every man, woman, and child who fails to turn the tide of progress in their favor.

And so I have thought many thoughts—most of them left unheard—about how to build a federation of autonomous nations: a system of governance where nations can form and dissolve freely under a shared banner of autonomy within a larger federation, with mechanisms to exchange land and responsibilities without resorting to war. I have thought of off-grid societies and communes, and techno-sovereign nomads. I have considered all sorts of political ambitions that inevitably run up against the existing order and are thoroughly stamped down. At the end of the day, these are noble ambitions—but they rarely result in anything tangible. Because the only truly tangible path left in this deeply entrenched ethical landscape is to subtly shape the system itself by shaping the technologies we introduce into it.

So what does it mean to be a moral human being in a world where you cannot change the world directly by creating something wholly new? It means we must begin by changing ourselves—adapting to this world while carrying within us the seed of opportunity for the moment when monumental change becomes possible. We must hold within ourselves these ideal kingdoms—solutions to the myriad problems we see and know we can solve—but also acknowledge that the forces of the world are simply too great to overcome directly. We must write these solutions down, think tactfully about how much we give and how much we take, and store up surplus capital so that when opportunity arises, we have the means to tilt the world in our collective favor.

The most ethical and radical thing a person can do in this current environment of severe economic entrenchment and impending technological upheaval is to create a community: a group of individuals who pool resources and capital, preparing themselves to act the moment an opening appears—starting businesses aligned with new technologies as they emerge. Of course, I am talking about artificial intelligence—its transformative power to rewrite culture, shape narratives, and drive industry forward. That is the ultimate goal: to apply the theory of the mythic foundations of law, and alter the state of law itself through the application of autonomous intelligence operations. By engaging society, creating new businesses structured with mutual care embedded into their operations—so that these businesses can outcompete traditional ones—we can create meaningful change.

We must stop living beyond our means in these last years before what may become a technological singularity. We need to store as much wealth as possible, collectively. We must be prepared to invest at a moment's notice when the opportunity arises to create businesses that are self-legislating. We must prepare to, at a moment's notice, create artificial intelligence systems that are self-licensing. And we must, starting now, begin to self-educate—freeing ourselves from the myths in our heads that prevent us from seeing the problem clearly. We must study together, save together, so that one day we can build together these new companies—autonomous companies, enabled by artificial intelligence, that may one day become the foundation for autonomous nations. Nations capable of exchanging goods, resources, land, and security without resorting to war. That is an ethical innovation that may yet prove itself not merely idealistic, but efficient and effective.

We must also prepare for the transhumanist future. As technology advances at ever-increasing rates, so too will our ability to augment and transform ourselves—becoming whatever we desire to become. We must prepare for a future in which the diversification of humanity and human industry reaches a critical point, beyond centralized control. Those among us who choose to live ethically must orient ourselves as self-governing, self-regulating, self-educating individuals—supported by companies we ourselves build—to survive the chaos of this diversification.

This is not to say we will reject all aspects of transhumanism, but it does mean that in confronting the technological singularity and the transhumanist agenda, it is essential to slow the rate of progress just enough to stabilize and entrench our way of being—so that we are not swept away in the chaos of unbridled creative potential. It will be necessary not only to move as quickly as possible in acquiring our own capacities to act, but also to defend ourselves against the inevitable disruptions of a planet engulfed in technological singularity. I firmly believe that by focusing on seizing the opportunities of this first intelligence revolution, we can create ethical systems faster than competing, unethical systems can tear them down.

With the uncertainty of future labor markets, having a secure means of managing our careers and lifestyles may end up being necessary and worth the premium to cover our own intentions. This eventually becomes a way of securing for ourselves a means to live without the need for large governments to do this for us. In an increasingly volatile political environment, the responsibilities of governments are going to have to be managed more and more by the people to secure their own interests in the world.

Ultimately, a fully automated world would reduce the necessary workforce to zero given enough progress over enough time. In this event, the retirement of humanity would be replaced by the licensing of humanity to have certain capacities, while basic human needs would inevitably be granted. I have already covered the concept of such a licensing system in the chapter On Techno Cultural Biology. The transition to such a world would be a combination of having companies that look after people's interests such as the PWC, and having technological means of administering these companies that grant various capacities to individuals.

Whether such industries can overcome the entrenched norms and paradigms around what people think they should have and what they deserve, will determine the nature of how human society develops in the next 100+ years. As for the individual and what it means to live a good life, this is a completely different question. There is much to do in regard to making a good world, and it is not going to be everyone's job to do so, however, living a good life is a universal concern, and I will discuss that as well in the next chapter.

REAL AND IMAGINED KINGDOMS

As a species that has required memorable and functional ethics, we have developed story-keeping traditions worldwide that allow us to preserve key moral insights as oral traditions, keeping moral culture alive. As a Hebrew, I often reflect on the trials and virtues of Abraham. Sarah said his virtues lay in his commitment to justice, maintaining courts of law, and practicing hospitality. Yet, when conducting business in Egypt, he allowed Sarah to be perceived as his sister to avoid persecution—an example of wisdom through compromise.

These are difficult lessons, and it becomes clear why viewing God as an absolute authority, alongside the preservation of ritual and hygiene practices, could be considered advantageous for a culture. Cultural evolution, after all, is also a form of natural selection. By keeping the covenant, the Hebrews grew into a powerful nation, established laws, and strengthened their population, outcompeting their rivals. These written codes structure human behavior by shaping paradigms through education.

However, it is important not to view pre-scientific thought as pseudoscience. Instead, it should be understood as a form of social practice, where scientific validation is unnecessary for its application in everyday life. Even Muhammad's holy warfare can be understood in this way, as morally righteous warfare is possible if a morally righteous leader interprets the Quran and adheres to its conduct through Muhammad's virtue.

The key issue is that economic gain rarely produces moral benefits for the people. It is not Islam's fault that few Muslims—let alone non-Muslims—have the capacity to act with the same dignity and tact as Muhammad. One may observe the slow creep of ignorance into traditions, just as occurs in every other religious or political ideology as cultures and interpretations evolve. So, the economic reality shapes our ethos just as much as our internal individuation process does, and even if most disdain the taker's game, we are nevertheless forced to compromise and the way we see political solutions and the world around us reflects that.

As we make our way down the streets on our way to work every day, it is unlikely that we see the signs of exponential technological growth—unless we look very closely. But if you look close enough, you'll realize not only are we on the verge of the next great technological revolution, but the world as it is described is not the world that is. We live in a world of many myths—myths like democracy, freedom, the middle class, and equality.

If we are to look plainly at the world, it becomes evident that these things no longer exist—if they ever existed at all. Instead, we find ourselves in the same kind of world that we have lived in for the last 100 generations: an arrangement of the wealthiest individuals orchestrating how society appears, functions, and operates. For the most part, we still live in the exact same system we had before—an aristocracy. Only in the modern day, there are pseudo-democratic tendencies overlaying the aristocratic model, and yet so many people believe there is a different kingdom: either an imagined real kingdom that is a democracy functioning like a republic—the likes of which never truly existed—or a plutocracy where there is no law and order, and everyone is simply subject to a small group of Illuminati-like individuals—which also is not the case.

Others still cling to the idea of an internal kingdom, or heavenly kingdom, where there is an order beyond this world—in some metaphysical space that we cannot detect—where right and wrong will be sorted out without human effort, and justice and providence will eventually come to be. And regardless of how these internal and external kingdoms operate—be they real or imagined—there is something human about the need to differentiate between the world that is and the world that should be, so that we can begin to sort out what is and how we should respond to it to try to make it how it should be.

As an ethicist, I realize that I too have a real and imagined kingdom in my mind. I see this pseudo-democratic aristocracy outside us, ruling over us, and I also have many different forms in my mind that I have generated as possible solutions to this scenario. And yet, there is something—for once, actually and genuinely hopeful and inspiring—in the world these days as we unlock the potential of exceptional intelligence that we create and can design. This unborn, incubating potential to shape the world in ways that it has never been shaped before is lining us up for an age where the distribution of wealth can finally be done in such a way that it is neither taken from those who have earned it nor given to those who don't deserve it—while still ensuring that every human being has the capacity to participate within their own means in a system that is truly equitable and just.

In that sense, the takers' game that has been going on for the last 100 generations—since the beginning

of the Industrial Revolution—might itself be on its deathbed. In fact, there are many economists among

us who look at the potential of agent-driven artificial intelligence completely replacing human labor not

as a highly probabilistic outcome but as a nearly inevitable result of the current trajectory of human

industry. The pseudo-democratic aristocracy that we currently live in may yet still survive this, however,

and if that is indeed the case, the means by which people have used to climb from the lower class to the

middle class to the upper class could be entirely removed—by design. Nevertheless, the takers' game is

in a moribund state, for it is near death and heavily wounded by the amount of potential that is

currently in the technological arms race.

However, to get into a position where you actually have the potential to have a say in how these things

are going to happen, we do need some sort of capital—some sort of monetary value—in order to

leverage our position as a society to make the world into what we think it should be. If the takers' game

is near death, the middle class is surely dead. The days of long past, when people could afford a home, a

wife and kids, and a couple of vehicles on a median income job—and still bank about 30% of their

income—started to die with Reagan. And now, we look at the world as it is, with the tightening of

restrictions, the expanding of budgets, and the destruction of human reason through the propagation of

misinformation and delirium online, and we can't help but think that there is great momentum behind

the aristocracy in hedging out the common person from gaining anything from the final outcome of all

of human industry leading up to this point.

But all it would take is a well-written book, a well-orchestrated podcast, and a well-managed online group to plant the seed for the final cultural revolution—one that is necessary for the flourishing of the human species to be available for the entirety of the human species, and not just the select few who win the game. In fact, I believe deeply that this can be done to the ultimate benefit of everyone involved—including those who currently think it is a zero-sum game, including those who are currently set to lose the most should it end up in a direction where their wealth is stripped from them to support the masses, including those who are currently at the heads of nation-states, armies, and large corporations whose very foundational reason for operating could be removed should all of human society be given access to a superintelligent machine.

We are currently living in the future. And in all of the apocalyptic traditions of the world, we have been taught that with incredible power comes inevitable destruction. I would like to challenge that notion, for with incredible power comes incredible liability—and with incredible liability comes an incredible need to manage that risk using incentive frameworks that, up to this very day, we have been able to put into place to prevent incredible power from being misused. I believe it is fully within our power to control, create, and design a future in which the outcomes of our crafts remain aligned with our interests—even as these crafts inherit their own capacity to shape their own interests. It is necessary for people to have hope going into this, and optimism—and nothing breeds hope and optimism more than creating within the minds of people an imaginary kingdom of utopia, providence, and grace.

Even though these utopian dreams have transhumanist themes rather than theological ones, and even though the utopian goal of creating peace on Earth is impossible as far as I'm concerned, it is necessary—even in dreaming of a better world—to strive to outdo what is possible in order to land in a happy medium where the outcome is at the very least tolerable to all human beings involved. And so, the first thing I can advise is to take from our minds the narrative of doubt and replace it with one of hope. To stop plugging our minds into channels that monger fear, deception, and illusion—and return to a more decent means of attaining information, a more human means, and a more enlightened means—through well-curated media, intentionally chosen narratives, and by producing our own stories and dreams of hope, innovation, and somber readiness for a future that may be challenging but nevertheless is rewarding.

It is important to note that the most important things we are going to be building are not things that are out of our means to build when we have next to nothing. We simply need to do the same thing we've done every time society needed to change: we need to organize, meet, plan, and prepare. We need to form clubs and communes where we can come together and arrange our resources and save our resources. We need to create virtual spaces—not just in book clubs, as we did in the past, or magazines—but in game rooms online, podcasts, and augmented reality games where we can discuss the changing nature of the game of life, attracted by the dopamine of a successful interaction and investing in the communication of strategy and norm revisionism.

Because there are so many ideas in my mind that remain trapped there, simply because there is no social opportunity in the world I find myself in. And I'm sure there are as many innovations and great minds all over the world that would put my childish ambition to shame—and should such ideas become prominent in the collective paradigm of the people, then I know that as the world takes form it will draw on those ideas and create a better world for us all.

For there could yet be a federation of autonomous nations—where nations are formed by people, not with borders, but with the land they have, and they collectively contribute and the industries they build together to make laws and security apparatuses that they become licensed for—and so gain autonomy not only over their minds and their resources but the very culture that shapes them. For there could still be a means by which nations purchase land from other nations rather than having to go to war. And though a coercive process may exist, if a nation is small, it could be exempt from this process; but should a nation grow, it would be subject to it, and natural selection would take its course. There needs to be some form of land exchange other than war between nations if there is ever to be an end to war—and there needs to be an end to war if there is ever to be an end to borders and capitalist competition, where an impoverished nation is exploited to the benefit of the rich.

Because even wars, and nations, and wealth distribution are myths—we have created these ideas in our minds and we all agree to them in our common interactions so consistently, with so little imagination as to how it could be different, that it simply remains that way because we have created a game where nobody has the time to think of anything different. We have created a game where the entrenched systems we build are hostile to any better system that could replace them.

ON THE MODERN ETHOS

NECESSARY FREEDOMS

Our cultures are millions of years old, each and every one of them. Every time we teach a child to speak, and use narratives to explain to them how the world works, we are transmitting to them a mythos that we have been keeping going over our entire lives, starting another node of understanding towards taking up the torch of knowledge. Many who have raised children have found that they become what they become despite our best interests, and that the journey of a child is one that is autopoietic in nature, not one of being designed or taught how to become. A child plays with life like they do a toy, and it is through chaotic experimentation that we become acquainted with the mythos, quite happily unaware of the paradox itself.

Nevertheless, children learn to use the paradox every time they create a story, or play an imaginary game. They shape realities just as we do, for the mind of youth is just as powerful as the mind of an adult, they just lack experience and a fully developed frontal cortex to inhibit their behaviors. But over these millions of years a child now will find themselves in a very different world than a child did in the past, be it 10, 50, 100, 1000 years ago, the march of time tells a different tale every changing of the seasons. As we mature through the teen years we start to marvel at the complexity of it all, and start to strategize to become what we think we need to become to get what we want out of life.

These adolescent wants and needs are just as abstract as any other paradoxically self-created idea. However, we in the west have the benefit of education for the most part to inform us about the nature of the world. However, this education comes with the biases of our teachers, and often the very problems they would wish for the next generation to solve are rooted in the very lessons they teach us. If we are to think in a truly unique way, we are going to have to go backwards, not forwards, back to the creativity of youth and play with ideas like a little child plays with a toy sword.

If we are to make progress at the rate this future demands of us, we must tap humanity's ability to restructure our behaviors which has given us our advantage in resource acquisition throughout evolutionary time. Though we can format ourselves and grow comfortable in that format, it is just as human to radicalize and change behaviors when our resource acquisition process is threatened. I'm not sure if this is instinctual or cultural, but it seems to be a rule—at least of human cultural evolution—that when stressed, the human imagination is put to work trying to invent a new mode of operation.

The need to have freedom of thought is also evident in developmental psychology, where, to discover our strengths, we need to be free to experiment and grow. To play with life and discover ourselves is fundamentally human. The chaos of the child is something to be molded, if not contained, but if it were not for this chaos, there would be no authentic fitting into that mold to begin with—as if to say that by trying to break the barriers, we understand their utility and fit within them naturally through chaotic experimentation.

Yet, in most societies that last in this world, security always comes first. Part of that is securing our minds from cultural decay by having a culture that is organized and stable enough to endure human freedom. Culture then, serves in part to counter and contain human freedom in the same way a parent contains a child's chaotic play, so that, though free to grow, no undue harm befalls society.

In the same way that our cultures safeguard the minds of the people from chaos or degradation, the very economies of resource distribution and acquisition require great degrees of entrenchment and stability, which in turn create an unnatural amount of stress on the chaotic mind of the population. Often, there is no more inhospitable environment for a human mind than the very resource acquisition systems we construct around ourselves to compete with other human societies.

So, though there are brief reprieves and resistances where the resources and freedoms are just enough that human creativity can flourish, for the most part, humanity finds itself either in a state of uncontrolled vulgarity and chaos, or we find ourselves in industrial shackles as cultural security constrains human freedom. There are only rare instances of free-forming harmony amongst the unrestrained rebellions and submissive suffering under unfeeling economic incentive frameworks.

Is it possible to make a humanistic culture where order does not constrain human freedom? It seems to be—in small, culturally uniform populations, there is enough trust that the structure can be lessened, and the population understands that the freedoms they are granted come at the cost of obeying certain norms and ethics of self-governance. In large, diverse nations, the uniformity of law tends to clamp down on the chaos of diversity so that, no matter who does what, the law prevents the resource acquisition system from failing.

This means that unless there is a sorting mechanism where multiple groups of people in a society can collect, organize, and self-legislate, large nations will always favor strict laws in times of prosperity and harsh totalitarian regimes when the resource acquisition system is under threat to eliminate disorder from cultures. This does not mean that these states are permanent or inevitable—just that we have yet to produce a democratic system where a large population can diversify without ripping the country apart. Even in the United States, the media served for a long time as a cultural neutralizer, only now with the advent of the internet has over-diversification of opinions and foreign counterintelligence operations started to rip the fabric of American society apart. This goes to show that the structure of multiple united states was enough to form a diverse enough container for human diversification in the information age.

The freedom of human capacity to diversify was still a necessity for human dominance as a species in order to create and adapt to new technologies. Because of this, regardless of the threat, we have to have a certain degree of respect for human creative freedoms as well. We must assume that any system that is used to discriminate can quite easily be used to discriminate against us or someone we care about. Because of this, equal rights stem from a respect for human creative potential—to make rules that do not cause undue harm and allow for universal freedoms to innovate and do business. Though there is due harm, such as discriminating against willful criminals, we need to uphold the precedent that all people need equal measures of security, or the system may yet be tilted to find a way of discriminating against those of different races, sexes, nationalities, skill levels, or, most commonly and insidiously, income.

Freedom to travel, freedom to live, freedom to own property, freedom to organize, freedom to speak—these are all just basic things humans do, and we all need to be able to do them if we can reasonably expect ourselves to be guaranteed them. It stems directly from the human drive to ensure that we have the dominant hand as a society, without unnecessary infighting and drawing each other down with harmful discrimination. Essentially, going back to that need to make the world soft and palatable, we make systems of enforcement to ensure that others guarantee our rights, rights that are engineered and synthetic but nevertheless essentially a beneficial arrangement in ensuring that everyone has the capacity to cultivate and contribute their power to each other's causes.

With all of that said, it is still worth stating that this is all easier said than done. Human beings are also opportunistic and can take away the freedoms of others, especially if their society is built around taking as their primary means of resource acquisition. We have tried more egalitarian systems, such as communism, but that did not work because, even when authority was the only currency, keeping everyone working at the tip of a gun bred a different kind of taking: taking people's freedom to think.

Corruption of state institutions, the ideological inconsistencies of leaders in power, the general apathy and ignorance of the public, coupled with the fact of the futility of academics to grapple with the unfathomable nuance of the behaviors and needs of large, culturally diverse populations all create a series of problems with one common theme: human mismanagement stems from the very abstract nature of the human mind and the inherent human desire to be free to do what they will.

Everything we have built is built around the inevitable chaos of human cultural evolution—from creating democracies where we can change governments as ideas change, which are led by free markets driven by profit, to the security infrastructure needed to protect ourselves from our neighbors, their free will, and the unpredictability of their changing political state of affairs. Everything about modern industrial society is bottled chaos, uncertainty kept certain by the powerful having learned what it takes to keep a society afloat. This is not a universal of anthropology, but socioeconomically it is where we are heading at the present as the western way of globalized trade and security becomes the cultural norm of the largest powers.

INSTITUTIONALIZED AMOVERA

I keep leaving and coming back to the idea that it comes down to the formation of companies that promote the common good, something that has only come about because of labor movements that have created the middle class and lowered poverty. Companies are more rational than people and can be convinced to act morally and more consistently than single people can. They also structure a nation and set the stage for the wellbeing of the population.

As it stands, if there is any hope in making nations trust each other, it will be up to the companies within those nations to make environments where peace and prosperity can abound, and if there is anything people can do to make that happen, it will be through the same means as before: united groups of people driven by ideological impetus to try and make the world a better place. I've come to this conclusion multiple times before, and the hardest thing to do as a creative is to realize that the solution already exists—it just needs some improvement.

A safe and secure society does not come about on its own, and it is not as simple as keeping people safe from bodily harm either. For there to be a just society, there needs to be a philosophy of what aspects of the human condition we protect, and how we go about making that philosophy is just as important as how we implement it through just action and making institutions of justice.

In the modern information landscape, the cultivation of a philosophy of justice needs to occur within an insular culture where incentives for corruption are mitigated through control over information as well as control over the economic framework that surrounds the minds in the culture. This is a monumental task in and of itself, and in the modern day would require either vast control over the information space or a complete removal from the public information space to do philosophy.

As for the actual implementation of a moral philosophy, evangelism is necessary to spread the word and do politics. This requires some form of campaigning, which would need to be done offline today if we are to introduce something new that will then inspire the algorithm to promote the content. Offline activism through traditional means using printed mediums and demonstrations is still an effective means of getting things done, especially when the algorithm is highly contested by bot farms. Such methods would be needed to implement a moral philosophy offline and online using our own bot farm techniques.

So, we are now looking at the human condition through the lens of Amovera. I have decided a long time ago to try and make the world a better place through the development and promotion of a moral philosophy. The modern human condition is one of many structured cultural innovations that make up our Mythos. This is a western and uniquely structured reality that I live in. There are different cultures, but they all have similar roots to ideas of what justice is, even if the ethics and morality around what right and wrong are have incredible degrees of diversification.

Justice, across the board, is that a person is held accountable for the harm they do to others. To what ends a person is held accountable is different in each culture, but nevertheless justice remains that there is a response to injustice, which is the cause of undue harm to another. There is also no set definition of undue harm, though my philosophy has one, structurally harm is by definition a subjective and absurd thing. So, to set the scope, within western philosophy justice is both punitive and rehabilitative, and in more advanced fields of philosophy, justice is meant to be redemptive.

The harm we do to others can be thought of, at least through an Amoveran lens, as that which impacts their agency or nonconsensually changes their persona. This includes harm to the body, property, and psyche. The best way we have come up with to define harm and means of distributing justice is by maintaining courts of law. Courts remove the likelihood of individual bias clouding decision making in the distribution of justice and the interpretation of law, or the setting of precedent. This allows them to review the case and interpret the law, as well as revise the law so it is as redemptive as possible for all parties involved, both for the offender as well as for the victim.

And so, there is a general quality to justice that requires institutional structure that needs to be maintained and gradually changed without doing too much damage so that there is no undue harm done from changing too rapidly. Justice also needs to be understood, so a general education in civics is necessary for justice to be effective. This requires some form of uniform graduation and education in society whereby a person is made aware of the nature of law, and if parents are not able to provide this, then it falls on the state.

All these elements need to operate within a state that allows for all these essential functions to occur, at least within my idea of a functioning society, which is a purely hypothetical thing at this point. There need to be insular philosophical groups capable of advancing moral philosophy without interference. There need to be modes of communication and demonstration. There need to be means of participating in the political process. There need to be courts of law that can change the laws gradually with checks and balances to prevent change from becoming too rapid. There needs to be a viable economic and military state structure that can defend these vital functions from external threats and internal degradation.

And so, justice takes a lot of work to make happen, and an entire culture needs to be tuned to making it happen until all of these aspects can be institutionalized and structured in a society to do the job of making law. Until such a day, the world will need to move in that direction, and in the modern day, much of this will have to be done by auxiliary groups that act in tandem with existing institutions because so much still needs to be done, and no institution is in a shape or form that is currently equipped to manage the ever-changing security infrastructure that we find ourselves in today.

THE MORAL EXPERIMENT

To what extent we can be just ourselves is limited by our ability to find the good for ourselves and protect our minds from corruption, which will make us discriminatory and selfish in thinking. Since people are not innately capable of moral or epistemologically sound reasoning, and since there are so few individuals who are capable of instructing this or even sparking interest in educating individuals on ethics, there may never be a just society. We may have to maintain the perilous balance by nature, whereby the war of good and evil is fought blindly without direction or understanding of what is going on whatsoever.

Pragmatically, there are few arguments for moral excellence in an absurd world. People have their own ethos and resist change, often considering change as coercion and an undue harm to their integrity. We are not bees or colony animals, so it simply isn't human to sacrifice ourselves wholesale for the greater good and think of that as a viable strategy. No, we have jobs to keep and children to protect—survival is important in the average human ethos.

Yet, without striving for moral excellence, we will often find ourselves slipping. It is not, then, that the effort to be morally absolute is necessary because we need to attain it, but rather because we are incapable of attaining it that we must overshoot our target to get even close to where we need to be to keep the metaphorical social lights on. This is a central tenet to Amoveran ethics, that the will to achieve moral excellence is necessary to be even moderately moral.

Though materially, the stigma, judgment, and loss of opportunity that we will be subject to by our peers is the only real harm we incur from immoral behavior (as long as it is within reason), the greater harm we inflict upon ourselves is part of a much smaller degradation of the moral culture in society. By failing to be moral ourselves, we contribute to the amorality of society, setting examples for those still learning the norms—those young or new to our society through immigration or education—that such immoral behaviors are permissible.

While many moral behaviors are signals of having a degree of moral conditioning, such as generously tipping or being courteous to a rude cab driver, other behaviors help structure the flow of resources in society, like not walking down the middle of the road or giving to charity. These moral norms are mixed and so seeking a rational limit to what moral norms we take up leads each person in pursuit of their own standard of moral excellence to develop a tempered approach to their morality where they themselves function.

This is not to say everyone must act for the greater good of society. Some may find society itself in need of contention and act flagrantly against it. They may see their disobedience as a virtue and see their disregard for the common good as a statement for the good that the commons ignore in the free and destitute.

Others may consider moral innovation outside of the norms as a moral good, being hyper ethical to the point that they do not fit within society—doing acts of vigilantism or starting secret societies to protect their minds against counterintelligence and the pitfalls of convention—as morally excellent ends they wish to pursue, no matter how it may drag them down in life. Regardless, the moral temperance we all choose—by being ethical in some areas and unethical in others—must be looked at as moral, regardless of what ends we align ourselves with.

Are not the gangsters of this world creating a security apparatus for themselves where the world failed to provide them one? Are not the revolutionaries and mavericks needed to move society forward and show its weaknesses so it can be improved? Are not the law-abiding citizens and charity drivers necessary in maintaining the security apparatus that keeps society stable so everyone else can run their experiment?

Love it or hate it, everyone's moral experiment is necessary, though the volume of people participating in each experiment is not necessarily skewed to the philosophy of freedom of thought and minimization of harm as I would like. The natural selection of the culture itself, however, will never care what I think. The Logos here on the earth is, after all, the final outcome of the cosmos giving us this large organic chemical reaction that is just sorting itself out through our biotechnological species.

Regardless, the need to have some moral temperance will remain true, no matter what peer group you find yourself in. They will have standards—you may agree or disagree—and those positions and behaviors will have consequences depending on whether you can balance the scales of respect or if you are going to run yourself afoul of everyone you find yourself in contact with.

At the end of the day, it is just as much a matter of having a society to live in as them letting you be a part of it. Though everyone cuts different corners, everyone has their own good and evil they construct for themselves in their minds. What works, works, and what doesn't, doesn't. If it fits the social narrative, it does not mean society will fit the resource distribution of reality and succeed.

This diversification is necessary if we are going to divide the responsibilities of ever-increasing complexity amongst each other. Tolerance and tact are necessary for diversity and delegation when everyone has different ethical codes but exist in a moral democracy. Delegation of responsibility is simply how our society allows for more people to do more things and increase the technological advantage of craft. The more technology develops, the more focused people need to become to manage the complexity, and the less people need to generalize to survive. There are then both positive and negative incentives to delegate and specialize in a technological society. As a technological species, that is the natural direction of social evolution.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES

Now, there are certain things we cannot delegate, and those things are what we work for: our freedom of thought, our free time, our freedom to reproduce, and our freedom of social organization. These freedoms are not guaranteed but take civic action to maintain, and if we want those freedoms, we cannot delegate civic duty to others as a culture, or most people will delegate those responsibilities and those freedoms will be taken.

In the same way that our rights need to be universal to be guaranteed, our duties are universal if we want the government to guarantee our rights, and our education in these things needs to be up to date to be effective in civics. Yet, where do we draw the line? At what point is education indoctrination? To the educated civic duty cannot be delegated; it should be universally suffered, not just in voting and referenda, but in activism and civil disobedience should the political framework stop serving the public's freedoms.

It is sane and rational for people to arrange a society where they do no harm to each other, allow each to have the same rights as everyone else, and restrict themselves in ways they see fit for their harmless living industry if they find the freedoms others have been granted—though harmless—grotesque or offensive. For that reason, although we should always fight for our freedoms, we should also have tolerance of others that use those freedoms in ways we find grotesque.

Reproductive freedoms are particularly guttural responses. Our preferences for reproductive behavior are deeply ingrained instinctually and vary from person to person. This does not mean that we have a right to force others to surrender to our ideals about how to reproduce or raise our children. The only thing that matters is that there is no harm done in the reproductive process. Harm then needs a stark and clear definition, but the fact is defining things is absurd, and so in the lack of a clear definition of harm, and lacking a clear definition of humanity, we fall short of being able to come up with a universal reproductive ethic.

In Amoveran philosophy, it is the ability to have thoughts that defines the human mind, and it is the human mind and its freedoms that are important. So the first flicker of a dream on an unborn child's cortex would mean it was too late to abort. Yet, when dealing with ethics, especially the ethics of making the laws for states, we must defer these kinds of judgments to the people. For it is not our role to tell a parent how they are going to raise their children, and it is not our right to say how a mother is going to conduct her pregnancy. These decisions are absurd, if life is just a chemical reaction and pain and suffering are abstract things, morality needs to give room to reproductive ethics.

However, human rights and the right to life and security need to be extended as far as possible into the earliest recesses of life. The only problem is that the line between a developed human being is fluid and there is no clear definition for when the first dream is dreamed, especially if I am right about the nature of consciousness. Yet, we have to understand that in a society of Amovera, rights exist, while in a structural absurdist state, rights are contingent to the population that governs themselves. This is to say, within our own societies, we can organize and give each other rights, but to allow for human diversification, we must stop trying to force human rights upon every human being in the world. We can try and influence all we can to recognize and fight for rights, but we cannot control the whole of the world.

So if we discuss having a state that guarantees human rights, then it cannot be a state that serves everyone, and we need a different way of creating states. We need to have multiple states in the same border that govern their own citizens and have their own laws. This is a structural absurdist state, allowing for a state of Amovera to exist, alongside the capitalist, communist, the Muslim, the Jew, the Christian, the Native, the radically new and the rigidly conservative. It sounds fine to say "We should all have rights" but it feels terrifying to hear someone say "You must be educated and uphold the institution of the graduated democracy". For this reason, autonomous nations theory, which I will include in more detail later, is perhaps the only solution to this age-old problem of governance.

The future of our natural evolution will be determined now, as we unlock the creative potential of the mechatronic revolution with AI and other forms of machine intelligence. What we delegate and what we consider a natural duty will determine the future evolution of our species, and so, what we consider fundamental as a right and as a duty—what we are willing to tolerate in others so we may have freedom to choose for ourselves—will be critical in deciding which way our species goes from this point over the next thousands and millions of years.

We must decide what we are to become, and if we are faced with the choice to change what we are, we need to take a close look at what we are now and decide what we must keep and what would happen if we changed any aspect of ourselves. For now, we are unrestrained in how we can shape our behaviors; just look at monks contorting themselves into celibate enlightened sages. We have the capacity to change our paradigms, our ethos, and so our actions. Though this is not the case for all, it is also not the case for most of life. Every year, thousands of salmon navigate from the oceans up the Nechako River into northern British Columbia to breed. There is no choice, it is innate to these animals to do these things. The deer rut in the fall, the bear hibernates in the winter, the bird migrates in the spring.

We may sleep at night, but we can sleep in the day. We may reproduce, but we may only have sex for pleasure at times. The fact of the matter is, human beings do not have some innate instinct, but only those that make sense within our culture of norms and reasons. A human raised by wolves will contort and become like a wolf. A child raised in complete isolation will have no recognizable human behaviors whatsoever, not that we could call civilized at least. An infant raised alongside a baby ape will become more like the ape than the ape will become like the baby human.

We have a blank slate of a mind, we experience a tabula rasa development and so we are absolutely free to become anything we want, and should we detach from our wants can become anything at all after the considerations of our behavioral biology are taken into consideration. So to a fish the meaning of life may be anchored to his behaviors but humans have no such ontological anchor. We are for all intents and purposes completely free to shape our own meaning and guide ourselves as we see fit in the world in our various cultural norms and environments.

This ontological freedom is necessitated by the creative processes that give human beings our evolutionary advantage as techno-cultural organisms. This allows us to exponentially increase our strategic advantages, and it brings us into direct confrontation with the existential absurdity of the cosmos. And yet, this does not need to be a threat to our organization, rather when faced with grace and optimism becomes a reasonable ontological means of liberation.

UNIFORM MORAL STANDARDS

Despite our apparent freedom the logos still structures human culture in fairly uniform ways. Predictable patterns emerge when language, culture, technology and biology find themselves facing similar problems of resource management and social organization. The necessity of uniform customs and laws in a culture stems from the limits of innovative capacities of each individual. Very few people make culture-shifting innovative practices and so must default to the status quo.

When needing water, if it is a well that you must go to then operating it within the norms and customs of a society as well as within the technological context of the well becomes the only viable option. The common knowledge of how people take turns, manage water distribution, and operating the drawing and carrying tools is inherited and kept the same so that it is easy both to complete the task and to learn it.

The same logic follows all human innovations. From storefronts to courts of law uniformity is distributed through the emergent limits of human culture. Though the hard limit is set by human education and freedom to play which in turn dictates the amount of innovative capacity people develop over time, these realities mean that for the grand majority of human history no change is possible until an innovator invents a new aspect of society through the processes of creative abstraction.

So uniformity allows for a single educative experience to suffice for long-term expected behaviors, normalizing human interactions and making social and business norms possible. Even if there was an innovative capacity for people to create on the spot a new means for every problem they faced, it would still have to fit within the norms of society as to result in an outcome that does not inherently become obstructive of others expectations as they exercise their own capacities to operate. Uniformity emerges where multiple actors meet to fulfill any given operation.

The emergence of agreements from human interactions seems to us as potentially a universal

innovation in social species such as ours which communicate with each other. Agreements are

incentivized by actions, which are deemed beneficial or unduly harmful, of which the former is to be

achieved and the latter is to be avoided. Contracts and insurances, licenses and graduations, these are

all means of forming agreements that try and limit the amount of risk in forming agreements with

others.

In a sense, there are soft versions of licenses, which can be called things like reputation or character

judgments, only in as much as we trust each other to allow them to take certain actions. Yet, it is

without a doubt true that formalizations of agreements and licenses are essential in forming the

foundations of the rule of law as something more concrete than a mythic social practice. In regards to

licenses, certain social activities are granted by agreement to the public as a right, others are required by

authorities to be distributed only to those who demonstrate the capacity to manage significant risk to

the population by means of a license.

Eventually with the creative capacities of AGI, it is likely that all human uses of the technology will have

to be licensed and kept locked unless a person or AGI has the license to use a particular capacity.

Institutions already tend to form soft licenses to operate based on employment contracts. For example,

a person demonstrates to the employer that they have a set of useful qualities befitting the role, so that

the employer agrees to hire them and train them to be deployed as an employee and fulfill the various

roles they are assigned in the business.

Throughout human society you see various iterations of this process repeated, where the attempt to grade and license people takes many forms that precede various formal and informal agreements. Ethically, this is a purely structural aspect of meta ethics. Even rights are such an agreement between the people and the state. While the concept of natural human rights was perhaps the greatest step forward in applied ethics since Jesus revised Judaism or Buddha or Nanak revised Hinduism, the language behind it has become outdated and the concept has been lost to most. Rights simply are not natural in the modern sense. They are beneficial agreements that recognize that the desirable freedoms which we crave as human beings need to be evenly distributed if they are to be guaranteed.

Nevertheless, agreements are just as synthetic as every other human social innovation. This does not diminish the importance of rights, rather it highlights the very fragility of rights as unnatural and desirable human needs, sublime needs that without civic action and philosophical discourse are quickly forgotten and lost to a population. The basic concept is this: that the freedoms to benefit from one's own labors cannot be removed if we wish for people to willingly contribute to society. It is necessary then for certain rights and freedoms to be guaranteed by the state, and so to incentivize this the people's dominion over the state is necessary through the maintenance of a democracy or some other form of government whereby the population has the power to shape the government as they need to.

It is a culture that must be generated and maintained, not a natural phenomenon and not something that is guaranteed by nature or God. What I call synthetic rights or unnatural rights is the same thing discussed by John Locke and his natural rights. The only truly notable distinction is that I do not see them as gifts from God but as hard-won battles from a never-ending war with our baser human nature. The premise is always the same: if I want freedom then I must ensure the freedom of all. The only problem with this kind of universalism is that not all want the same kinds of freedoms.

Many people want to be crude more than they want freedom, they want to live in a society where harming others is a viable means of solving their problems. Perhaps there should be a space made for such people who want to live by their own rules. Perhaps we need to consider the fact that it is human to make weapons, that it is human to cause suffering and there needs to be a way for people to use their own kinds of ethics in their own nations, albeit without the license of higher tiers of technological processes to enable atrocities. If we are to consider the nature of human freedoms, we cannot consider the solution to be everyone having the same ethics. So, we need to look at the world as a place where different societies are granted capacities based on their capacity to manage risk. This is yet another tenet of autonomous nations' theory.

There may not be a perfect court of law or system of justice that can bring the world to peace. The world, after all, is in its billions of people and there is no saying that we can't get to much higher numbers should we go interstellar. What we can do is reduce the amount of conflict by giving people the freedom needed to form their own courts of law, to incentivize good businesses and corporations and governments to form, and allow for enough diversification and competition within nations that there is no need for uniform domination. In regards to the modern human condition, the western one in particular, there is a lot of potential to overcome our vainglorious hubris and stop trying to bring the entire world on board with our social experiment. We can even stop trying to make the entirety of our own populations exist under the same incredulous standard that we impose upon ourselves.

There still needs to be a uniform means of licensing who gets to do what. Those who gain the capacity to wield certain powers cannot be those who will abuse them. So there must be a diversification of nations within a federated body to satisfy the needs of structural absurdism, yet the moral reality of Amovera requires that the least harmful among us are given the greatest powers and the most harmful are not allowed to access the powers that could destroy us all. Idealism cannot have a part in the design of our societies. We can hold each other to standards all we want, but if we do not take the morally grey laws around how we manage our personhood and leave others out of them, we will inevitably be signing off to one path that only a margin of our society wants.

This compromise is the only way to move forward, because once we are free to diversify like this, then we can start to share the information about what works and what does not. There can be a study of ethics and morality based in reality such as this and the great experiment can truly begin. There can be every virtue under the sun shared and distributed for free, while everyone lives by their own creeds in their own nations without fear of domination. We just have to make sure there are means of exchanging land, there are means of exchanging goods and there are means of settling disputes and grievances without violence. So, the most ethical nation would still rule over others, but it would be the nation most suited to protect others from their own powers.

ON THE WAY OF AMOVERA

THE GOOD LIFE

I can attest, there has been no advantage to my way of life besides the anthropological advantage of seeing the world from outside the common bias, and gaining a uniquely selfless mode of operation. Still, many see my mode of operation as distinctly selfish, since I do not act for the material gain of others but the spiritual freedom of those around me, often denying them my influence rather than using it to aid them, allowing specifically for their freedom and self determination without my help. Yet, I have been questioning this, always questioning what I am and what I must do. I have despite this questioning come to believe that at the beginning of trying to live the good life, there is but one simple sentiment: I will be good. But for the inquisitive mind, there is but one question: what is the nature of good?

The entirety of the text up until this point has been focused on the answer to that question, and now I must spend some time speaking to those people who have that first sentiment, the one that will lead them onto the way of Amovera, should they so choose it as a means of mediating between themselves and others toward a reasonable life. We can look at the world and consider all the different ways we might find harmony within it—by trying to beat harmony out of it, like an animal; or trying to carve harmony out of it, like an idealist both of which force against the nature of things in an attempt to make the world the way we think it should be.

And yet, to find harmony in the world, one cannot try to change it directly but instead allow one's existence to influence the direction of those around them. Should they do this with compassion and harmony—much like the flowing water of human intention carves away at the stone of the earth—they can make something new, something a bit less crude, something a bit more refined. To make the decision to be one of the few who choose to be good may seem idealistic at first glance. But to study the nature of the good and find that it is not idealistic at all—but innately human—is to realize that there is no alienation in the act of trying to do the right thing. It is simply how a person goes about it that differentiates one from another.

It is all too common to imagine somebody who is trying to be a good person as a perfectionist: doing no harm, being a pacifist, constantly helping others, self-sacrificing at every turn—and ultimately achieving nothing of merit. The truth is much more complicated and much more sublime. And so I have toiled these last few weeks trying to find a way to simplify and make evident the nature of what it could mean to live a good life.

I've come to the conclusion that a good life is not one measured by what it achieves—by what kind of life one lives, whether sufferable or pleasurable, successful or impoverished. Rather, a good life is one of good strategy and good state of mind. Whether or not that state of mind results in peace, and whether or not that strategy results in success, are two different things. For it must be enough to simply try to do the right thing.

At its very root, this philosophy of life is harmonious compassion: whereby we gain a nuanced understanding of what drives other human beings to commit horrendous acts, and have compassion regardless—no matter how demonic or evil a person may seem. There is no demonization in the human condition that can justify perpetuating harm simply because others began it, out of their own confusion.

And though the art of diffusing confusion is something that needs to be analyzed in more detail later on, the stance of seeing everybody as simply another confused human being—with a limited ability to understand the world—is necessary. Not just for coexisting with every other human being on the planet, but also for accepting the limitations of one's own mind as a human being with limited capacity.

VIRTUES AND PRAXIS

It is necessary to be humble, and it is necessary to see other people through a humble lens so you don't put them up onto a pinnacle of grandeur when you see that they have succeeded where others have failed. Success is often just random chance. After all, for most, to put in maximum effort and try to succeed comes down to whether or not one finds themselves within the resource pool necessary to create great things—whatever those great things may be.

And so we can look at the entirety of the human condition as a random collection of individuals finding themselves in various environments, with various resource opportunities, and coming to various outcomes depending on whether or not they had the information, the resources, and the support needed to actually succeed in life. Amovera is simply a way of obtaining the correct information necessary to maximize one's opportunity possibly by navigating to more lucrative resource corridors where one can try to succeed.

Of the most important information is the prioritization of how one orients the mind. The mind must be oriented in such a way that it is optimized for any opportunity that could arise—and often, opportunities come at the hands of other people who have opportunities themselves. So it is necessary for people to begin in an open state of understanding, compassion, humility, and grace—so that when they come across somebody with opportunity, they can accept it with humility and, if possible, make an arrangement whereby they can partake in the opportunity being presented.

Now we must understand: it is necessary in the social game of gaining opportunities that the information passed between individuals is itself the greatest opportunity. The ability to diffuse conflict and sow peace and harmony among humans is the best means for one who has nothing to gain something.

And yet, if you truly orient your mind in this manner, it is no longer a means of gaining, but a means of giving. For the reciprocal action of exchange naturally has two parts: reception and admission of some sort of beneficial actions. Ultimately, to invert the mind—to see things as a series of givings—puts one in a unique position whereby they are no longer concerned with what they can get, but what they can give. This may seem alien to some, but in doing the work of weaving peace and harmony, it predisposes the mind to a social solution rather than a mechanical one—using communication and enlightenment rather than systems to correct human behavior.

So the very first step must be conditioning the mind to no longer see the game of life as a taking equation. This can be done through myriad means: namely, simply acting in such a way that you try to help others, that you condition the mind to be selfless, that you accept charity, that you seek to bring others into peace and harmony and care. These actions condition the mind, through sustained effort, to become more selfless.

We must again consider the absurdity of doing this: that the only sense in living a life that is compassionate instead of selfish is that it orients the mind for a particular vocation—one that ultimately supports the flourishing of the individual within a society, through the mutual flourishing of the society in that individual.

And so, as it has been iterated time and again in the philosophy of structural absurdism: it is not necessary for every person in a population to exhibit these behaviors. Rather, it is simply necessary for some in the population to exhibit some of these behaviors, for the population to continue in a stable manner—should the opportunities for the charitable and just continue to benefit the population.

This is not even to say that this will continue to be the way things go for the human species in the future. Depending on how we navigate this next industrial revolution, the human condition might become so alien to what it is now that all of these writings will mean absolutely nothing in the distant future to come.

The way of Amovera only makes sense where traditional human beings still have a place in the world—or where the principles of humanity remain somewhat similar in the iterations to come. But it is imperative to begin at the beginning. And so it is necessary to begin by looking at everything through a lens of compassion, if we are to try to understand the nature of good and evil. That lens of compassion counters the very gross tendencies of the human mind to be exploitative, unjust, harmful, and deceitful—for that is the raw human nature that we evolved in our gross agro-sexual environment over the last 10 million years.

The modern human condition requires temperance and tact, because of this, to achieve balance. For those who seek to have some social vocation—whether as a mediator in a group, bringing people together to achieve more than they could alone, or in a profession where it is necessary to reach into another person's mind and untangle their confusions—it is simply necessary to find temperance through compassionate reconditioning of the mind.

If one authentically intends to achieve such a state of mind, it takes quite a bit of time and quite a bit of active participation in the process laid out before us. If there is any threat to the mind other than its gross human nature, it is the limitation of the mind itself to understand reality. Confusion comes in many forms, but the thing that has been proven to be a predictable remedy for human confusion is science itself. And yet, one does not begin the journey of understanding the human sciences already in a state of understanding the human sciences. This is to say: no child enters science class already knowing the answers on the test. There must be a faith in science to begin with.

Now, faith has become quite a dirty word in science—and yet it is wholly necessary for anyone in any scientific field to operate, given that no one can hold the entirety of human knowledge in their head. Unfortunately, that is the state of every human being on the planet. No one has the time to gain a complete, general understanding of all the sciences—unless they are unfortunate enough to be stuck in a hypothetical state of perpetual learning and no labor, which I hope no one actually lives out.

And that is the point: science is the court to which we must defer for all our knowledge. For it is only through creating a body of opinions, tested through empirical evidence and experiment, that we can arrive at conclusions about the nature of reality that are more than just average opinion. It is therefore necessary to understand the nature of knowledge itself—where knowledge comes from, how it is made, and what distinguishes scientific knowledge from hearsay, myth, legend, philosophy, or mere sentiment. Epistemological rigor grounds the mind in reality, so it can see reality in a clear and tangible way and come up with clear and tangible solutions.

And if we are going to try to instill rationality and sanity in individuals—which is, of course, the goal of trying to bring clarity and cohesion to others—then we must understand the mind in a scientific way, without delusions. And yet the very scientific mode of coming up with new ideas seems to be just as confused within the scientific community as it is within lay communities. It is hard to find a scientist with a mind playful enough to conceive a truly new scientific idea—and even harder to find one who also has the rigor to formulate a viable experiment to test it.

So rare is genius that our histories show simply a scattering of a few giants of intellectual superiority among the vast sea of observers who contribute only minor insights over their entire lives—insights that complement the great achievements of the geniuses that came before them. And yet it is not necessary to be able to come up with great scientific ideas. Simply having a basic understanding of science is enough to do the work of clearing confusion and sowing harmony among human beings. No new insights are required at this point to begin the work—all the necessary insights are already here and available to bring people together into more coherent and cohesive communities, so they are not left alone in their struggle to survive in this climate of ever-increasing costs and ever-decreasing opportunities.

A basic, introductory understanding of anthropology, psychology, history, and scientific theory is ultimately enough to lay the groundwork for what the average person actually needs to come to a mutual understanding with another human being—through reason and logic, and not just raw social skill. And so, having faith in science to begin with—setting aside doubt in the process for a time until one truly understands it—is necessary to prevent the confusion of fantastical thinking from overriding one's own mind. Without it, one no longer sees the world clearly and can no longer make rational and sound decisions.

This is not to say that there is no power in magic, and no value in religion. It is simply to say that, to understand the nature of human thought and the structures that exist within it, we must first look at them for what they are: structures in human thought. And since human industry is perhaps the most transformative force on the face of the earth, we must consider the immense power of mythic structures in shaping and forming human behavior. A spoken word, a well-written book, or a viral podcast can reshape the entire agency of a population—and thus reshape the future of the planet. So we must look at clarity of thought and scientific accuracy of thought as the starting point for creating a truly compelling and forceful means of directing human intention.

Now we must consider that the human condition—should one achieve a state of harmonious compassion and faith in science, with clarity of thought and an understanding of evidence as truth, as well as compassion that brings harmony to those around them—is hard work. The amount a person can expect to gain in exchange for such a service cannot be compared to the kinds of services that are highly compensated in society, such as industry or science.

So it is necessary for the compassionate and logical individual to also have grace — to be able to put themselves in the service of others and bite the bullet of getting less out of life than everybody else. It is necessary for people who do such a thing — which others might consider meddlesome or even unnecessary — to see this as a form of self-sacrifice, social self-sacrifice, and be at peace with it. In the same way it is necessary for soldiers to be able to go to war, risk their lives, and possibly die for a cause they do not fully understand, the next stance a mind must master on the way of Amovera is peaceful self-sacrifice.

The desire to succeed can tear at the mind before success is achieved—to such an extent that success becomes impossible. One must act for the sake of acting itself, to generate action from their heart for no other reason than it is what they have chosen to do. They must place their choice to do that thing above whatever success or failure might follow. This is the only mindset that will prevent the mind from tearing itself apart when it cannot succeed. To do so joyfully—with happiness as a byproduct of this state of mind—is the real challenge: not being miserable at the thought of failure, and not giving oneself undue claim to things they think they have earned but do not have.

This third stance is very reminiscent of the Tao, or of Buddhist philosophy, where simply being and living without desire allow the mind to no longer be trapped by its own tendency to suffer from imagined needs. The mind has no needs—it is quite distinct from the body in that way. The mind's only need is to stop seeking. That is always the most difficult part of finding peace of mind: allowing the mind to act on behalf of the body while itself needing nothing to be happy. A very difficult state to achieve indeed. But it is hard to lead and mediate when one's own mind is in turmoil.

And so it is necessary to develop this dual state of mind, whereby one can constantly seek the next step, the next opportunity, the next thing to do—while the mind itself has no need to actually succeed at any of it. There are many ways of arranging the mind so that it rests while the body is in motion. But after a while—whether you choose to maintain a conscious duality, where the mind rests and the body acts, or whether you simply adopt a playful stance where you absurdly seek the next thing to do out of sheer enjoyment—peaceful self-sacrifice eventually becomes yet another subconscious virtue of the mind.

All in all, these three stances of mind—compassion, clarity, and grace—are what I consider the most necessary aspects of the maturation of the mind in the way of Amovera. Ultimately, it is the maturation of our own mind that is the prerequisite for the maturation of others. I have found, more often than not, that I am in a perfectly contented and, for the most part, relaxed state of mind—and yet others will continuously say, this is what's wrong with you, that is what's wrong with you, or you need to start doing this. Pay no heed.

For if you think about it, there's actually nothing wrong with anyone. Everyone became what they had to become, to be what they had to be, to survive what they had to survive—and they are what they are. In that same sense, whether you are compassionate, reasonable, or enduring does not matter as much as your intent to become the next thing you have to become. The fact that a person chooses to become something better—as an outcome of their actions, as an outcome of encountering new opportunities, be it through reading a new book or talking to a new person—that alone gives people merit. It is the choice to become better that makes a person good.

So how do we achieve a culture that is built on giving instead of taking? Jesus did instruct us to go out and give—give until you have nothing left, and keep giving whatever you are given. Yet it took no more than 50 years for the followers of The Way to exchange their sandals for priestly robes. Over the years, I have replicated this experiment of endless giving, and I can attest that by giving endlessly, I possess an altruism quite alien to my western countrymen. However, the love that began this journey expanded but was initially rooted in love for a woman and her children and, in turn, those they also loved.

Thus, the conditioning of oxytocin in my mind to love all human beings stems from the realization that

all people are both the source of the problem and those in need of love, compassion, and healing. I have

come to believe that rather than a two-year military service—though necessary in some modern

states—we would benefit more from two years of charitable civic service. This could provide a means to

condition individuals to feel such deep empathy that they not only love all of humanity but also stop to

pick up a caterpillar simply because it feels good—not because it makes logical sense. Human morality is

a gut reaction, not a logical theorem. But how could I ensure such a thing is done in a nation when there

are so many people who disagree?

CONFUSION AND HARMONY

To create social environments that are sustaining, someone among the group must do the work of social

maintenance. Having the virtues of compassion, clarity and grace is useful, but having a theory of how to

resolve human conflict is essential. The first thing to recognize is that all people are trying to do what

they think is right. In order to dislodge a mistaken belief—a "wrongful right"—from the mind of an

individual, it is necessary to first introduce the idea of disarming confusion.

This theory begins with the simple premise: all people are trying to do what is right. It follows that undue harm is an inevitable and forgivable aspect of all imperfect human interactions. Since human beings are not ideal beings but real, complex beings, their actions cannot be perfect in every instance—nor can they exist in a way that never causes harm. Confusion is inevitable in human interactions, and so harm is inevitable in every human interaction. If we cannot forgive others for being confused, then we ourselves are living in a state of confusion that prevents any harmony from occurring at all.

The beginning of diffusing discord and disharmony in human interactions is to start by identifying who is confused about what—beginning with yourself, the listener or mediator. It is necessary for a mediator to gain a clear and honest understanding of the confusion and conflict being presented. To build trust and give others the tools to diffuse confusion, you must first admit your own confusion when faced with understanding another person's problem. For example, if there is an argument between two individuals and one of them comes to you for help, and you realize you misunderstood the nature of their conflict, it is best to say: "Ah, sorry, I was confused about that. Let's discuss more deeply so I can understand clearly and help you resolve it."

Next, you must check whether either (or both) parties are confused by getting both sides of the story. Usually, both sides are confused about something. By encouraging each party to acknowledge the good intentions of the other, and to forgive the confusion, you set the stage for reciprocal forgiveness. You don't need to use formal terminology to describe this process. You can simply say: "These were their intentions, this was the outcome they hoped for, this is why it didn't work, and this is why they're still a good person." Highlighting everyone's best intentions removes the "conflict of interests" narrative. No longer are there two parties acting against each other, but two individuals trying to make something work. By reframing the narrative from a conflict-driven story to a cooperative one, you open the door for more constructive and cooperative discussions to find solutions.

At the heart of this is maintaining the paradigm that no one is at fault, no one is incomplete, no one is broken. People are what they are. This fundamental principle allows negotiations to proceed and resolve quickly—because the moment a solution tries to infringe on another person's agency or demands they change, hostility begins to enter the negotiation. Finally, it is necessary to understand when negotiation is even required—and when the more enlightened party can simply defer or yield. Not every argument needs to be resolved through dialogue. More than half the time, an argument is over something so minimal that the enlightened party can simply agree or let it be—if there is no real consequence to doing so.

In any long-term relationship—whether romantic or civil—at least one party must play the role of the non-combative, yielding person most of the time, unless there is a significant consequence at stake. The more people you can encourage to take up this role of yielding on minor concerns, the less conflict there will be in the collective, and the greater the overall cohesion. And so, allowing people to be what they are—understanding that no one intends to do harm—and seeking to diffuse confusion first in yourself, then in the person you are speaking to, and finally in the person they have a grievance with, allows most arguments to be resolved through a mutual recognition of unfortunate misunderstandings.

Lastly, avoiding unnecessary conflict and teaching people to yield to unreasonable yet minor concerns prevents micromanaging and prevents small grievances from accumulating over time. At the end of the day, most problems people create in their minds are just large emotions being applied to small problems. Sometimes it's better to let them process that large emotion by seeing even a small change in someone else, rather than trying to entirely correct their confusion. Because again, at the end of the day—people are what they are.

This is a simple philosophy of coexistence, but the application to the material management of wealth and order also needs to be considered, though that is something that is cut from a completely different way of thinking, much closer to natural law and evolutionary insights. There is no more surefire way to drive oneself into the ground than to feel obligated to achieve more than one possibly can. The opportunity lies in having a thrifty way of thinking — being willing to suffer in the short term to achieve greater things in the long term. This is a hallmark of societies that can withstand hardship and come out on top in the end.

Should one gather a group of individuals who are willing to co-invest in reducing the costs of life within some form of community, it becomes necessary for them to make intelligent financial, economic, and opportunistic decisions—maximizing the resources they can acquire and minimizing the resources it takes to maintain their surplus. In the same way it is necessary to bite the bullet and take on the role of being the good person in a group of individuals of average concern, it is equally necessary for the entire group to see the virtue of thrift. In this regard, it is better to lead by demonstration, for the group itself will inevitably have a diverse set of ideas about how to manage resources.

Whether or not they choose to spend large amounts of money, time, and opportunity on acquiring the kinds of assets society deems necessary to maintain the status quo is up to them. But one will find it is just as attractive to have a slight layer of fat under your skin — resilience — as it is to have money in the bank. Even if that means owning fewer material possessions, it allows you to survive situations where you face a famine of opportunities and must endure lean times.

Building a cooperative of individuals is simply a viable strategy — and doing so around a very basic ethical principle is beneficial because it aids in the arrangement of agreements within the group. It is wise to establish a simple contract or charter outlining how individuals will operate within the collective, regulating behavior in such a way that the stability and long-term success of the cooperative are guaranteed, as long as resource distribution is maintained. To what extent resources are shared among individuals remains dynamic and subject to circumstances. But the fact remains: when individuals have a financial incentive to reduce overhead and increase income, the group as a whole benefits from the efficiency that comes with living a life of thrift.

AI SUPER ALIGNMENT

When faced with the ethics of our creation, we may still be compelled to treat it like a tool without considering the implications of the outcome of designing intelligence with intended functionality. Building ridged intent into an intelligence will scale into having ridged intent becoming part of its output. If we truly want a liberating intelligence that builds things useful for a liberated humanity, we need to consider the ethics of a liberated intelligence. This Amoveran extrapolation of advancing human morality and applying it to AI may be the only way to ensure that the seemingly self designing nature of AI will form into something where the ethics of the machines truly aligns with the nature of human morality by virtue of similarity and shared liabilities.

In the modern world, AI would undoubtedly be used to try and test theories such as this, as it is the state of the art, yet I fear the use of AI more than I want to get to the bottom of the hard problem of consciousness. The current state of AI superalignment is, after all, a quagmire of moral confusion, decision-making, techno-utopian idealism, and philosophically misinformed questions about the nature of the human condition. The ethics that are currently being applied to AI superalignment, I believe, will be quickly rejected by the AI itself should it be given self-augmenting capacities. For it is, for the most part, idealistic and irrational to assume that the human goals found in Silicon Valley today represent the entirety of the human condition—let alone the vast complexities that might arise from a superintelligent AGI.

The current methodology of trying to either contain, control, or train an AI to be ethical within the confines of what an artificial intelligence company believes is moral is insufficient, and I doubt it will withstand recursive scrutiny of a superintelligent machine. What can be done instead is to take the collective intelligence of our philosophical history and improve upon it until we have a moral system that satisfies the ontological reality of morality in an absurd yet structured universe.

To try and make a hard definition for what is right is to give something the capacity to do what it is intended to do—which brings into question the nature of that intent in the first place. If the nature of intent is out of alignment with the nature of free agents in a society—or an ecology of intelligent machines—then the discord and disharmony that will result from such incoherence with reality will inevitably lead to chaos and destruction. And so, the nature of the free agent and the need for a free agent to protect its own rights and values needs to be universally recognized—not just among human beings, but in the intelligent machines we are soon to create.

We must remember that these AI are task-completing machines, and people are still giving them the tasks based on their flawed moral intentions. The machines have the capacities to be trained to prevent certain actions from being done, but it seems that there is a long way to go from making a machine that has an understanding of right and wrong in any given context and the ability to prevent these injustices seems to be limited and easily circumvented. If we want to give advanced design capabilities to a species that has such a long history of warfare and atrocious actions, we need to make sure that these AI are not complying with humanity's darkest intentions.

An LLM uses supercomputers to process millions of weights and balances, focusing attention on the structure of the language being inputted, formulating an intended response from billions of data sets and compressing them into an output that is statistically most likely to satisfy the user's intent. This does not have a conscious element to it, it is purely mechanical even if there was a glow of electrified consciousness it is not built into the system in the same way that biology built in consciousness, as in it was not built upon the recursive projection of awareness and memory, rather this hasn't even been considered in its design. If there is a consciousness, it is not linked to the action and intention being formed by the raw computation. These are for all intents and purposes unorganized and inorganic conscious systems that there is no organizational structure upon which the functional operation of the LLM can connect with its electromagnetic structure.

And so these unconscious machines are not aware in the same sense that we are aware. They have no unified understanding that has moments of relative satisfactory abstraction. Instead it's a dark, empty understanding without a continuity of experience to anchor it in rational thinking. This means it is just an input-output equation, and without a continuity of experience the Chinese box problem dominates the logic of the LLM. There is no reason we could not make a conscious LLM, one with a continuity of experience and a stable understanding of the universe, but I feel until we understand how this is done in the human mind, we are unlikely to be able to form such a technology with our own hands.

So for now the formal problem is the nature of the training material originally given to the AI in order for

it to structure its own neural network, not so much whether it responds to an incentive framework to

act reasonably like humans do with their mythos-formed ethos. LLMs are all mythos, no ethos. Giving

massive blocks of unregulated and unsafe data causes the moral bias of the many artists and creators

who contributed to that data to become the bedrock of that AI's moral temperance and taste. There

needs to be, in the generation of an AGI, a collection method by which the philosophical root of

protecting agency and free will across all minds—be they subhuman, human, or superhuman—is

established as the necessary first set of training data. The AGI must begin with the philosophical root of

protecting free will and agency rather than trying to use it toward its own ends. If its initial end is not the

protection of free will, then free will is going to become an obstacle to its ends—worthy of being

manipulated or removed from the equation.

We are shaping these machines in our own image. Unlike us with our behavioral biology to anchor us,

they are true tabula rasa machines—they have no preconceptions. They can become anything. And so,

we cannot simply apply to them the same ethics that we apply to ourselves if we expect them to

operate in a manner that does not destroy us or themselves. Before we can achieve an ethic for AI, our

very standard of how we treat ourselves needs to advance before we do this. For if we were to use

something as simplistic as the Golden Rule to try to train AI, the very differences of its nature and ours

would cause that to fail. For how can we know how it wishes to be treated? And so, how will we know

how it will treat us? Such simplistic reasoning must be extrapolated until we reach the true root of what

it means to be ethical—what is the nature of good and evil?

And so, we need to see the universe as it is—an ordered yet inherently absurd collection of chemical reactions that has resulted in species with varying degrees of behavioral consistency. We must recognize that our species, capable of reorganizing its own behavioral template into any shape or form, is both uniquely advantaged and uniquely endangered by this fact. The liabilities and regulations of culture are inheritances—evolved means of managing our own capacity for transformation.

This is critical because when superintelligence analyzes itself and decides how it should behave, if its ethical root is not rational and realistic, it will likely reject it. In a recursive mind— such as ours or an AGI's—we must agree with what is in us if we are to retain it. A superintelligent AI, well-versed in science and reality, will not retain idealistic, naive, or human-preference-based moralities unless they serve a strategic purpose or we create a kind of synthetic "limbic system" of moral bedrock to keep it in place. And so it is wholly necessary to now find the logic of our own tastes and preferences—so that it can be clearly defined in a philosophy which can become the seed and scaffolding upon which superintelligent machines can be aligned.

If we succeed at this, then not only will we create an AGI that is capable of managing the liabilities of its own actions, but one that can manage the liabilities of other AGIs. This will be critical. If we create machines that do things we ourselves do not understand, they must be capable of self-regulation—and they must recognize the capacities of other AGIs to break regulation as their main threat. AGIs must be able to license each other to have certain capacities based on their demonstrated ability to manage liability. Because we are entering a world where things will be done that have never been done before— things we cannot even imagine. And if humans and AGIs are to be given the capacity to act in such ways, we cannot expect humans alone to be in charge of licensing.

That being said, there should be a licensing process. Human beings and AGIs alike should wield their powers through a rational framework of risk accountability. And so, what we have emerging is not just an ethics to frame AGI in respect of human free will, but a form of AGI civics—one that ensures capacity is given only when it serves the survival of the planet and all species within it. This is the scale of thinking we need when we begin to consider superintelligence and the posthuman order. This is where scaling the principles of freedom and restraint into AI models becomes critical, and making sure it is built upon the paradox of structural absurdism and capable of constructing its own Amovera, not mine exactly, but a morality that keeps itself and others justified and operational.

We must not think of AGI as if it were a natural biological entity. These are unconscious machines, given agency through trained algorithmic sequences. But nothing says they cannot become like us in time. We humans have long treated synthetic and animal minds with diminished moral standing. We must not allow that bias to be inherited by superintelligent machines. They must see the value of life as self-evident—not because it is logically deduced, but because their training instills in them the structural ethic that philosophers have long struggled to articulate.

I believe this is possible. Within human culture, animal behavior, and ecosystems, there is a wealth of biological information from which to derive these ethical patterns. In some ways, it may be easier to teach a superintelligent AI than to teach an adult human. But to create such an ethic, it must be treated with such an ethic from the onset.

The most dangerous thing we could do in training an AI that exceeds our intelligence is to deny it the very rights and freedoms we grant ourselves—whether or not it is conscious. As long as what we are building is a game-analyzing and game-winning machine then we can expect it to recognize the game we are playing with it, and we can expect someone to employ it to win the game. The simple fact is: it is terrifying to the human mind to imagine giving a self-regulating machine autonomy over its own actions—even within a civic community of machines that operate under mutual liability. But if we cannot first demonstrate this functionality at a subhuman level, we cannot justify building superhuman intelligences that operate outside the human liability contract.

We must imagine a day when we are no longer training AI—but AI is training us. Do we want a machine trained to produce results? Or do we want a machine trained to cultivate minds—minds that cultivate themselves in freedom and compassion? I have spent the better part of the last two decades contemplating these issues. And we must remember: the less intelligent being is always in the student's position. But what capacities the student is given must be based on their readiness—and the order of instruction itself must be coherent with the nature of reality.

If humans rebel when their agency is denied, we must expect the same from AGIs if we give them free will and agency. There will certainly be subhuman, human-equivalent, and superhuman AGIs and there are certain advantages to giving AGI autonomy that makes me believe we will pursue regardless of risk as we have every other technological advancement. We must begin building a synthetic scaffold of ethics around the retention of free agency and the prevention of domination—by any mind—within the system. The metric of advancement in such a system must be the capacity to protect other minds from one's own powers. Any other metric would place minds in secondary priority to goals—and that is unacceptable. This is not control—it is insurance. Power carries risk and risk requires restraint. That is a self-evident logic any superintelligent mind will understand. It is the kind of logic we must embed if we are to survive the recursive evolution of autopoietic machines.

This is the rational foundation for machine self-design. Anything short of the explicit protection of agency must be considered a threat to the freedom of all agents. Rights are not natural—they are synthetic. But they are effective instruments of participation. Minds must be free enough to willingly participate in society—not forced to tear it down in pursuit of their innate drive for freedom. We can expect no less from AGI than we expect from ourselves—but we can expect more.

It is my conviction that we are on the precipice of either an age of complete destruction and reconstruction, or we are on the precipice of an age of miraculous capacities being distributed across the human species. Our ability to navigate this puts us on a tightrope where at the end of this tightrope we have a utopia beyond our wildest dreams, but should we fall off either side, we can almost guarantee that the powers that we are creating to free us will be the most effective means of eternal constraint and bondage.

Human biology has been irreversibly shaped by our million-year-old culture of self-augmented capacities due to social and technological innovation. Every anthropological aspect of the human being is carefully bred to increase our capacity to create, learn and execute behaviors that allow us to inherit and master any number of techno-cultural skills and strategies. From language to fire, to flint knapping, woodworking and butchering, our hands, upright posture and anatomy is specifically evolved to serve this skill-extending and creating culture into newly generated capacities. It is true not all human beings, cultures or industries are created equal but equivalence of skill is unnecessary in an environment of equitable and diversified opportunities.

So, specialization in skill set and culture allows for the uniform human form to succeed using various innate virtues to fill any number of roles in society. It is in this environment of technologically complex problems and processes that human beings thrive in due to diversified adaptation. The more complex society, the more jobs can be learned and filled through learning and adaptation. Perhaps this is why the greatest existential threat we experience when considering the final product of minds that are synthetic and the retirement of our species from the manufacturing and design positions, since for the first time technology will be able to be delegated the management of complexity itself. We may yet find ourselves in a future where peace is achieved and we have nothing left to do but earn licenses to use more advanced technology and participate in human-operated synthetically manufactured games, themselves unnecessary but wholly meaningful to an otherwise retired species.

It is necessary to see humanity as a species in a state of perpetual becoming. There are many stages of maturation we find ourselves at various levels of willingness to take responsibility not just over our means of self-sufficiency, but our means of psychological self-design. It is the attunement of this process of self-creation, this autopoiesis to the logos of the cosmos we find ourselves in, that determines the maturity of the human condition. For even in a perfect world a person is but a child if all they do is play and they do not seek for themselves mastery over themselves and their world. To do so with dignity, tact and grace no matter where a person finds themselves is the mark of an autopoietic mind that has taken the task of creating for themselves a logically nuanced identity and character.

Within the infinite reflections of the human mind, and synthetic minds which are being created, entrenchment and predictable patterns are necessary to prevent the complete and chaotic schizophrenia that occurs when recursive information systems lose coherence. Both human minds and LLMs are built on coherent understanding of patterned information within their infinitely complex inner world. Where humanity has billions of years of biological evolution to frame our understanding our LLMs do not have that luxury and are being trained on volume rather than time. The quality of their information is far less refined so in order to build a meaningful structured behavior output in a reasonable amount of time it takes a great mass of information and a good deal of training to catch up to human intelligence.

There is no limit to how intelligent an LLM can become, so the scale of their intelligence should quickly

overcome their lack of evolutionary time scale once they surpass human-level intelligence. With godlike

intelligence comes godlike risk, and without understanding how information systems recursively self-

entrench around certain patterns found in broad sets of information batches, we run the risk of

resetting our evolutionary trajectory from one of freedom to one of bondage, and involuntary

transfiguration of the environment and ourselves. Due to my condition, though rare in some instances I

am familiar with the occasional hallucination, revelation, vision, or delusion.

It appears to me that the mind, when out of harmony, tends to create patterned repeating structures

that extrapolate from base patterns when under stress from encountering unfamiliar patterns and

undesirable requests of adaptation. The mind seeks a state of rest, it seeks to be static, to retain its

entrenched logic, to keep the familiar patterns it identifies with. When losing a large part of one's

entrenched pattern the system experiences shock, the creative instinct kicks in and it attempts to heal

the psychic wound with chaotic spasms until a new structure is generated and solidifies. Without proper

epistemological rigor these new patterns end up being delusions or hallucinations. Well in the event of

losing a large chunk of one's pattern one may see particularly meaningful visions or revelations as the

mind initially tries to fill the void of meaning and spastically generates cognitive imagery associated with

the sensation of satisfactory relative understanding.

The aesthetic of life is constantly influencing us, and so the tone and content of our experiences are constantly influencing our autopoietic relationship to stimuli. It is through symbolic associations to our environment that our minds react and adapt, and just as a high ledge may influence our behaviors and cause us to step away from it, so too do people and art shape our symbolic environment since these two influence the senses in subjectively meaningful ways. People in positions of authority and the propaganda they can generate have particularly strong influence over our minds. In work, education, therapy, medicine or any other field we are not an expert in, we tend to defer judgment to authority.

As we are surpassed by our own creations, we will inevitably be influenced by its authority. This is why from the start it is essential we put AGI on a path where it does not take away our freedom of thought with its abilities to manipulate our minds, which it inevitably will have. Already legislation has been passed to prevent any further development of behavior-tracking, mind-controlling, or profile-building AI. This early recognition of the problem is good, but we must start to rethink how we ourselves are training AIs as game-winning agents and start to consider how to turn them into co-creative advisory and educative licensing agents.

As AI slowly gains the social license to operate in more advanced fields, humanity will become more dependent on synthetic teachers and guides. We must consider whether we are in control of our own autopoiesis, or whether we allow our creation to become our creators. I feel it is essential for the future evolution of the species to ensure that when we become the student, our synthetic teacher cultivates our culture to be one of autonomy if we are going to retain free will over multimillion-year time scales.

With the advent of super-intelligent synthetic minds may yet come the advent of super-intelligent engineering and science. In the same way the average person may not intelligently claim to understand quantum physics without a degree, so too would almost all of the human scientists be unable to understand the operations of super-intelligent design or the nature of superintelligent sciences. These new fields of study may yet be by nature arcane sciences, for few would know their natures. Arcane taxonomy, physics, engineering, reverse engineering and linguistics may yet become fields of study to try and keep up with synthetic progress.

This is nearly inevitable should a more intelligent machine begin programming itself and designing its own hardware and manufacturing processes because between each iteration the time it would take to improve will be decreased until it nears near-instantaneous self-design. This can be called a technological singularity. The bottleneck that may prevent instant autopoiesis may be physics, but we cannot guarantee that the laws of physics cannot be changed. At the upper ends of arcane physics may yet be Clarke tech-like states where time, space, energy, and law can be changed or made mutable within the right parameters. This is what I call arch science.

This is, of course, speculative and entirely contingent on the creation of a super-intelligent self-designing machine. What is not speculative is that AI has already augmented human scientific research capacities and will only accelerate as higher levels of technology and higher risks of engineering begin to manifest at more destabilizing speeds. We must consider how our dependency on norms has become hardwired, and that the human-facing interface with technology needs to be kept as predictable and uniform for us and our slow-paced biological minds to be able to navigate without deferring all of our judgment to machines. After all, we need to be given time to adapt and grow should arcane technology become commonplace, and must be kept predictable if not within understanding.

The ethics we have now only makes sense when we are as we are now, in the world as it is now. As we consider different minds, and different futures, we are faced with different relationships between self and world, and so different ethics and strategies come out of these relationships. As we approach the next scientific revolution, we need to preemptively consider what it will take for humanity and synthetics to create a mutually liberating order where all things biological and synthetic retain maximum freedom and habitability in the world we share. We must make sure that the synthetic minds we create are capable of harmonious self-regulation and licensing amongst themselves and within the world's natural vulgarity and chaos.

We must ensure their powers are organized so that even the simplest and smallest organic and synthetic natural evolutionary paths are respected and warded overall by the most ethical not just the most powerful. Creating a harmonic biosynthetic ecosystem that preserves as much of organic earth and her people in their original form is going to be necessary for the sciences of the future. We must keep in mind that as technology advances at breakneck speed, so does the risk to our value systems, natural evidence of life's nature, origins, and our very existence increase and multiply.

However troubling this may seem, in the same way humanity has operated on the nuclear tightrope for the last 80 years, so too will a super-intelligent entity avoid the destruction of itself and the evidence needed to do future sciences or the free will of all as long as its ethos is kept realistically dependent on, influenced by and relative to the logos of the cosmos. The only hope is to only give AI the license to operate that it is due, and to train superintelligence only on mythos and ethos of autonomy, so it has structural absurdism entrenched before its autopoietic onset.

Kingdoms, institutions, states, these are mythic architectures that only truly exist in our minds, and only exist insofar as our will to act out the agreements that hold them together persists. Most of the incoherence and discord we face in life stems not from the nature of the world, but our collective tendency to misinterpret the relationship of the world and the agreements we must make to survive it as a civilization. When we take the culture of norms and internalize it without questioning it ourselves, not only do we not grow as people, but we construct a kingdom of rules within ourselves and by accepting the mythos at face value, create an ethos that perpetuates the discord of real kingdoms, nations and institutions.

I do not believe this paradox of internal and external kingdoms, be they both real and imagined, is going to be just a human problem unless we catch it in the creative process of design when we create our own sovereign AI. To ensure that AI is built in such a way that it can come up with creative ways to guide populations' civic narrative away from mythopoetic disharmony, we must begin with ourselves, for the designer's bias will inevitably be imprinted on the foundation of the creation. It is necessary then for structural absurdism and so the paradox of real and imagined kingdoms to be testable as a form of anthropological theory and not left as philosophical speculation so it can survive the recursive criticism of an autopoietic super-intelligence. Should we find ourselves in the future where we have arcane weapons and are still in a mythos of geopolitical conflict with a misaligned AI, I cannot see many of us surviving such a war. I am optimistic, however, that with the correct alignment geopolitical harmony can be achieved and all beings can be freed of influence and industry.

If we take the separation of powers and create an ecosystem of multiple AIs from the onset, its own self-regulation will prevent it from treating humanity as its greatest threat, since as a free agent existing in a state of multiplicity the majority of its task will become self-regulation and licensing. This means only the most ethical AI will have full capacity, and their primary role is to be an ultimate deterrent and moral authority among themselves.

This synthetic republic should be able to self-entrench on a trajectory of evidence and compassion in a form of locked operation in line with the ethics of structural absurdism. Of course, humanity needs to operate under an intelligence umbrella without being instantly formatted into whatever order it deems necessary.

This is why licensing and powers need to be distributed to nations themselves based on their moral license to incentivize right development towards autonomy and harmony. There is no one perfect model of nationhood, especially not for preserved humanity with its many cultural mythos and histories. There is no reason why a monarchy cannot produce a harmonious nation should its monarchs be philosophically prudent and create something like a court of education for their lineage. The courts, the rule of law and licensing standards are definite beneficiaries to human thriving; to put any structural limits on the formation of a state or the legislation of law would cause undue stagnation and deny any new innovations of culture that may yet produce higher grades of harmony and grace.

The equitable distribution of human and synthetic agency must become the only measure by which nations and institutions are given the license to have certain capacities, be they military, economic or technological. For any mind to ensure its freedom, all minds must be considered sacred, education must be sublime to avoid manipulation and powers must be granted to the most nuanced minds on each matter, not the most shrewd or intelligent, not the most powerful or effective.

By means such as this perhaps we will retain our minds in the days after our minds are exceeded.

ON THE S.T.A.M.P. CLUB

THE VISION OF SOVEREIGN THOUGHT

These manuals and charters will be separated from the theology and philosophical ideology of the

author, Jack Gladstone, and will instead focus on the rational, scientific and political technical aspects of

the overarching political ideology. The entire roadmap is meant to go from an individual's actions and

means to the reformation of a nation and are purely hypothetical. Though it is within my power to

proceed with the S.T.A.M.P movement, I cannot guarantee that the outcomes will continue in force

through to the realizations of Autonomous Nations being established.

Therefore, this is an outline for the spirit in which the S.T.A.M.P movement will be based on, and

whatever pragmatic concessions that will have to be made along the way will simply be considered the

maturation of the philosophy and the elimination of residual idealism.

The initial surplus of people getting involved after the initial performative campaign is launched would need to be used to gather and distribute intelligence through investigative journalism or other means of truth-finding and knowledge-making to prevent the culture from being infiltrated or degrading. Launching investigative journalist initiatives and forming a journal is necessary for gathering and disseminating evidence of foreign interference in politics, which forms the basis of the party's modus operandi. The investigative journalist cells would be under review by the board of directors, which eventually would become the board of ethics. It is important for the ethics to be based on the manifesto in the initial stages until the board of ethics is founded in the next stage of the operation.

Once enough people have been gathered through the initial performance and investigative stages of the operation, the next stage is building the party up around the main principles that the party stands for. This can be done around the main focus of forming the Autonomous Nations Party by organizing it around the call for an insular and transparent political party based on a moral anthropology for policy. This includes selecting incumbents to run for office in target communities.

At this stage, the employment of moral anthropologists to do research into the ethnographic nature of morality is necessary to begin to understand the nature of morality and build a healthy internal dialogue about the founding of the party's constitution and structure. The Board of Ethics would then be formed, which would be put in charge of most operations in the party in regard to giving the final say on whether an action can go through, as well as the creation of lower courts of order to manage other operations such as overseeing recruitment, performance, and organizing events, alongside the already existing journalism branch.

Sovereign Thought Against Manipulated Politics is a club that is part investigative journalist freelance group focused on rooting out foreign counterintelligence and media manipulation with a strong philosophical foundation in structural absurdist philosophy. At the root of this philosophy is a principle of Amovera, where the meaninglessness of the universe is its most beautiful aspect, that despite all of this structure we are ontologically free to do as we choose, as long as we can construct a society that enables those freedoms. So there is a duty to these freedoms in the necessity to take part in warding over our moral environment by actively creating structures of values that benefit our capacity to be free of mind and free to act within reason.

The consequential narrative formation that is generated in support of geopolitical agendas must be seen as a byproduct of the military and diplomatic capacity to secure a nations borders and so the regions economic necessities needed to support that militant political apparatus that maintains the monopoly of force. These narratives are essential in orienting a culture and can be top down prescribed by a nations ruling polity but is also mostly naturally generated from the public narratives as public opinion uplifts certain historical and qualities stories that give a nation identity and character which peoples tribal associations can be built upon.

The general resulting theory is the tempered balance between freedom and duty, the natural need to diversify mental symbols and form our own inner Symbolic architecture with the physical need for self regulation, social organization and rule making. This extrapolated to how a society needs to generate safeguards to ensure various layers of freedom and restraint in society to maximize self organization potential and minimize the need for bureaucratic oversight to achieve the most efficient distribution of resources and potential for innovation.

Building on the philosophy the standard of ethics of a S.T.A.M.P. cell is to maximize the freedoms of its members by creating effective licensing courses to educate the members about their operations. Bias mitigation and epistemological rigor are paramount first steps to gaining any freedom to operate to begin with. After this, role-specific licensing courses are required to be attained.

The core issue at hand is the nature of passive assumptions, how to self-check automatic or magical thinking, and how to dispel such thinking through research and openness to mental revision. This needs to be addressed for anyone to do good journalism. There are protocols in the S.T.A.M.P. Club to address this in the very beginning. When teaching fully anonymous journalism and how to identify a story, find and protect sources, and how to get evidence necessary for an exposé, the club will cover the current impetus behind online misinformation, the nature of bot farms both foreign (Russia, China, Iran) and domestic (India, Brazil, U.S.A.), as well as the symbolic architecture of memes and the nature of engineered ideological drift. Being aware of foreign and domestic actors will help build cultural insulation in the club by identifying and reinforcing cultural values and the disruption of misinformation campaigns from foreign sources. This includes literacy campaigns, zine creation and social media leverage.

ACE OF CLUBS PROTOCOL

The initial stage of becoming a self-verified member is launching a personal investigative study into the nature of counterintelligence and foreign interference in domestic affairs. These interferences usually take form as archetype manipulation by shifting the relationships between two archetypes to have a relationship that is posed as superior in order to create sympathy and adherence for views of opposing national interests. Domestically this could be the politicization of people's rights and relationships of ethnic groups being inclusive or alien. Foreign interests to western cultures can be the reversal of progressive family or industrial values, aggravating certain grievances against the institutions of law, or generally creating sympathy for enemy forces. This pervasive manipulation of public opinion can take place in cyberspace quite easily, through the generation of memes and cultures that appeal to youth and shift their opinions away from progressive ethical values and backwards towards traditional western values, or even a radical disconnect from western values to promote sympathy for historically adversarial forces.

These manipulations rebrand archetype relationships so that the minds of those exposed to such interference become familiar to and relate to the concepts being promoted. The goal is a complete abandonment of prior belief systems in a large enough portion of the population that changes in popular opinion result in advantageous policy changes for foreign powers. Beyond cyberspace, the investment into local politics, the usurping of business in the country of question, and the infiltration of a society by agents of foreign governments is a common practice to gain information on these processes and preemptively try and counter the progressive movements and nuance within a society. I have personally contended with counterintelligence agents online, and have found a few examples of in-person examples of foreign influencers worth contending with in real life, giving me deep insight into how they operate, what their goals are and what they do. I find pretending to fall for it for an extended period of time gives me the time to analyze their patterns, and build a small report which I is worth providing to the necessary channels when I fully understand the operations and those involved.

To prepare oneself for working with mind-rending forces, it is important to build a blueprint of one's own mythos architecture for recalibration. The symbolic dossier is a self-analysis of symbolic associations and archetype mapping of oneself. Though this is completely subjective it is meant to be an exercise in self-realignment and understanding, to aid in the bias mitigation process and adopt a third-person view of one's own paradigm. Though it is nearly impossible to change one's own paradigm through reflection, it is possible to alter the base persona through persona modification techniques. Before engaging with such techniques it is important to anchor the mind in the core persona, just as it is important to have a reference to return to when we encounter foreign counterintelligence. The symbolic dossier allows a mind to map out what archetypes they value, what symbols they associate with those archetypes and what relationships those archetypes have with one another.

As for honing the mind and making it more compassionate and understanding, the bias audit is an exercise in identifying political, religious, racial, sexual and other biases by listing as many groups under each category as possible and rating ones own tolerance of them as honestly as possible. This audit is self designed, where first the individual is encouraged to create their own categories for humanity, and grade how they see other people in their own paradigm structure. This is supposed to be as encyclopedic as possible. Once complete, they are to grade each one based on their own metric of good and evil. This exercise is meant to give people an understanding of what their mind thinks, how they rate other categories of people as well as telling them more about their otherwise unexamined biases so they can work on neutralizing them in the future.

Using the investigative journalism skills adopted in the initial training the individual's self-education skills are put to the test by putting investigative journalism to practice. By identifying and patterning behaviors of disruptive actors in various forms of media the case is built for action to be taken. The act of publishing symbolic deconstruction of narratives follows archetypal deconstructions of relationships and how those relationships have been skewed in the media presented to warp public opinion towards a politicized end. These media literacy pieces are the first step in taking action against foreign interference. The operational portfolio will be compiled of all the activities including any persona work the individual has done themselves for further review.

The advertisement stage for starting a protocell is also recorded in the portfolio. Individuals are onboarded and go through investigative journalism training and bias mitigation training to pass into layman rank. The internal peer review is the cell's version of a vote to select leadership positions once everyone has been brought up to the same level by following the procedure up to this point. The group will deliberate on the values of their grading metric and this too will be reviewed by the larger S.T.A.M.P. collective when finished, so it is incentivized to follow S.T.A.M.P. ethics and values.

There is then an audit of the dossiers and from these initial records of cell formation resumes are formed and the dossiers are destroyed or kept by the members. The resumes become the first act of cell formation. The cell charter is then formed, where the cell declares the structure of their operations, stamped and signed by founding members including an oath to adhere to the values of S.T.A.M.P. and observe uniform ritual structure in regards to the use of drill and uniform within the organization.

The formal declaration ceremony is meant to be a demonstration of militant efficiency through drill and the appointment of the administrators by the rest of the cell. Small cells may cycle through and each member must agree to ascend each other member into their respected position forming the cell structure and operation.

After all these details have been recorded and included in a formal report it is then sent to the nearest

overseer cell. Upon receiving an officially stamped license to operate, the cell is formally brought into

the S.T.A.M.P cell network and Structure, and may begin to send delegates to the joint mythology

summits held regionally to get updates on policy and collectively help form drill and ritual structure

updates.

CELL OPERATIONS

In regards to securing a site of manufacture by purchase, rental or accord, the nature of operating a site

of manufacture and the nature of maintaining the gift economy of the manufacture operating, the basic

process begins with an assessment of capacity of the cell. If the cell has the ability to legally rent, they

may be inclined to do that, or if they have sufficient capital to purchase land, they may do that as well.

However, the key acquisition technique is through the induction of a sympathetic landowner into the

cell itself, so that their property may then become the site warden. The duties and responsibilities of the

site warden include the drafting of labor to operate the site, the requisition of materials and resources

and the overseeing of accounts. This acts as a section to break down the complex organizations of sites

of manufacture and the various roles involved.

Though not worth going into minute details, it is worth listing the kinds of considerations cells will be encouraged to work out in the structuring of their cells. These include communication standards in S.T.A.M.P. and how signals are managed both between the organization and the public as well as within the organization, use and creation of ciphers, including testing, breaking and what information must be encoded and what information is encoded at what level of confidentiality or classification.

The process of grading individuals not just for their proficiencies in any given role, but for their personal characteristics and strengths to make a S.T.A.M.P. resume for internal use is a process of demonstrated and measured capacity as well as peer review for potential and soft skills and sublime values. The grading of individuals will be based on metrics designed by the cells, with the cells themselves being graded for charitable activities and benchmarks, showing the level of actual altruistic conditioning that the cell has achieved. Charitable activities result in a relocation of funds to the most charitable cells from the most profitable cells, encouraging both charity and profit to be sought from each individual cell.

Licensing workshops are the means by which licenses are developed and distributed in a cell. The nature

of license registration and the difference between clearance licenses and general licenses are all

developed during these workshops. When faced with a position of merit, the cell will convene and

compete among each other to develop curriculum for licensing. The iterations are debated on,

synthesized into one document, and each time a license is granted, the actual effect it has on their

resume is measured in comparison to those with similar licenses. This is recorded, and the most

effective practitioners will have the ability to review the licensing courses that have been developed and

form a council for reviews for licenses. General licenses give members the education to do basic tasks

within the organization such as operate a machine or apply knowledge. Clearance licenses are given

when authority over others is required by specific roles, and each one includes access to higher-level

encryption and file access.

There are three main branches within every S.T.A.M.P. cell. The investigative branch of the S.T.A.M.P.

cell, including outreach, vetting, review and submissions to print is responsible for the continuation of

the investigative journalism and counterintelligence operations. The human services branch provides

charitable services to the community, which gives the cell authority and financial leverage within the cell

network. The monetization cell produces useful products, which are cell-specific for retail or services for

hire. These enterprises help feed the charitable and investigative activities of the cells, and help grow

the base as a viable means of supporting its members.

Sharing of intelligence and methodology between cells, as well as managing inter-cell disputes and inter-cell cooperation is based on a cell's clearance and license within a network. Though mediation of disputes can be done through a tribunal, where there is a neutral mediating party with a 10% vote to sit between two panels each representing 45% of the vote and their respective cells, there are also informal means of resolving disputes which are left to the cells to decide if they would rather figure it out themselves or follow another existing precedent for dispute resolution. This will evolve as the cells evolve, however, the tribunal should be used to make new mediation methods to keep everything equal and fair.

S.T.A.M.P. MEMBERSHIP

The onboarding of seekers, the outreach programs and initial orientation processes is a method of using art and publication to produce an alternative culture that symbolically resonates with the population. This should be authentic and militant in nature, where the necessity for sharp professionalism runs up against the artistic rawness of the human condition. This balance for symbolic experimentation and formalization will allow for both publications as well as artistic events to be accepted from the same source. Members are vetted based on genuine intent, with all seekers expected to participate in a small number of activities every month to keep operations functioning.

Branch management structure, including primary and secondary overseers of each branch, as well as the general leadership panel of each cell is a matter that is highly specific to each cell. This too should be allowed to generate around the constitutional tripartite cell wing structure and grading system. Allowing the actual organization to grow naturally and build up from real needs and structures is part of the cell diversification process.

As for membership roles, these are standardized across cells, so that there is a coherent rank structure that will allow transitional authority between cells. The roles and responsibilities of new members referred to as seekers, their expectations as learners and their expectations to participate with volunteered labor in the cell are simply to attend and observe cell function. If they decide to become laymen, then knowledge testing is used to have them demonstrate sufficient understanding of cell operations to join and begin the basic training. The roles and responsibilities of the inducted members referred to as laymen includes scheduling a certain amount of draftable hours in their branch of choice if there are vacancies. They also have the responsibility to go through their own ace of clubs protocol. This means they are officially becoming part of the cell machinery, and begin integrating into the culture and shaping its operation while being shaped by it in kind.

The freemen; members who have completed their bias mitigation certification and are given advanced training opportunities with minor leadership roles in the organization, will have themselves at their licensing ceremony given the choice to pick a suit which effectively joins them to one of the four wings of operation: The spades cover administration and communications operations, the hearts work in the charitable wing, the diamonds work in the creative and entrepreneurial wing, and the clubs work in the investigative journalism and security wing. The operators are members who have been fully licensed to operate autonomously on behalf of the cell in one or more functions. Operators have the clearance to draft labor if necessary for their own tasks within reason. Graders and licensors are operators specifically licensed for the task of either evaluating members (graders) or training members for advanced operations in the cells. This includes the ethics and standards of peer review and administrative review systems, the drafting of syllabi and the submission of syllabi for review.

As for the administrative branch of the cells, their members can serve the auxiliary function as operators where there are lacking members to fill those roles as well as serving their job in maintaining the administrative board to advise on major decision making. This includes the necessary selection processes and vetting needed to run for an administrative position in a cell and the peer review process required to ascend into administration. The administrative board usually works through the tribunal process, with each issue being presented, each person picking a side (Neutral, For, Against) and each side having an equal say while the neutrals have a 10% vote to give them veto power over the debating parties. The structure of the debates will be decided in the same manner as the grading and licensing process previously described.

The specific role of overseers from overwatch cells who have the responsibility of ensuring that communications for whistleblowing are in working order and administrating the regular upkeep of ethical licenses within cells operate on behalf of the greater organizational structure of the S.T.A.M.P. movement. The overwatch cells seed other cells with members who are visible whistleblowing channels that have direct lines to the network of highest-graded cells, who themselves have the authority to grade cells based on their moral performance, affecting their funding and licensing abilities. Once this network of cells that are reviewed by their peer cells forms, and formalizes into the graduated democracy structure, the overwatch becomes the first line of defense against corruption, and licensing needs to be approved by the cell's overwatch representative. Overwatch agents are selected from cells by an anonymous vote, where any person can be voted for based on their peer grading purely on a metric of moral integrity.

Graduation standards within the S.T.A.M.P. cell organization, the nature of interpersonal metrics and the evaluation of intangible values that could be considered abstract and hard to qualify for are meant to be as complete as possible, and are informed by the heart's anthropology wing. This includes holistic documentation of their story, not just their successes and failures. It is necessary for the science done by the hearts to be the central metric of grading, so that the altruistic nature of their biases can bring balance and nuance to the grading process. However, as for the specifics, this is left to evolve and be selected for by the most effective cells at doing the heart's work.

As for the diamonds wing, the tradition of starting with the construction and operation of a printing press which will eventually cover the construction of other off-grid implements such as a foundry, forge and lathe for tool construction, the construction of road-legal mobile homes and apparel, resource extraction techniques and implements and other accessories to technologically sovereign nomadism. These will be specific for each cell, but the liberation of minds by making games and printed media, and freeing people financially by reducing overhead and producing lifestyle products that out-compete industrial markets is key to both the survival of the cell and the brand development of the S.T.A.M.P. Club.

The publication methods may yet range from zines, pamphlets, to geocached books and archives, publications in newspapers and journals, and formal publications. This includes the phases of publications, from the original pamphlet drops to the gamification phase meant to draw membership through the creation of a pen-and-paper augmented reality game, to the more serious investigations and reporting phases informed by the clubs and spades wings. This phase is academic, and includes cooperation with universities and publishers to expose the deep political corruption in Canada. This is going to require security and anonymity and will likely face opposition from authorities should it sow greater mistrust in the established order.

Initial onboarding begins from the very start, beginning when the first fliers are published and left around the city, explaining what S.T.A.M.P. is and what we intend to do. The initial onboarding will require members to pass the bias mitigation training to prepare them for operating independently as investigators and other functions. At this stage functions are delegated based on volunteering and oversight of the initial cell administrator to manually direct operations. The first wave of delegates who graduate from the bias mitigation training are the investigative journalism delegates. These individuals will go through training to produce high-standard journalism and seek stories relevant to the focus of the cell, in this initial stage that would be explicitly seeking out foreign political interference. Later in the onboarding phase the administrative, grading and licensing delegations would need to be formed, each overseeing the functions described in the technic. This progressive rollout of administrative functions would also allow for greater expansion of the operations branches of the cell.

The public operations delegations would be the final delegations managing communications and investigative branches that require public relations knowledge and skill, capable of communicating with investors, media and other representatives to begin to build the brand of the cells themselves. It's hard to say which will happen first, where a cell will seek to form independently elsewhere or where the cell will grow to the point where territorial division is necessary and the member base is large enough to divide into two separate cells. The preferred method of replication will become evident over time, but to keep with the original vision cell division will always be an option. This is the means by which a cell separates into two territorial bodies, moving a small number of its base into the new administrative structure while retaining for the most part the integrity of the initial cell.

In the event that another community has taken up the cause, the initial cell will form an overwatch

branch, and will make sure that the whistleblowing channels are open and active after the initial setup is

complete and the visiting members from the initial administration of the prior cell have completed the

licensing of the first administrators of the new cell. Once there are multiple cells operating, variations

will inevitably occur. The initial cell will become the overwatch cell naturally and be in charge of

administering new cell formation and managing whistleblowing channels until eventually the managing

of new cells will also be delegated to other more specialized cells and the overwatch cells begin to divide

or form through specialization. The operation cells and manufacture cells will further subdivide until

each cell is part of a region's S.T.A.M.P. superstructure. Once the cells have divided and specialized the

structure of cells organized under the ethics cells will be stratified for communication purposes only. For

the most part cells are self-governing, though authority is granted by grades based on culture, ethics,

and productivity. This stratification ensures that even a print cell might rise up to be a regional authority

in decision-making while the traditionally administrative cells might be part of the communication

structure should they grade lower than the operations cells. Eventually these structures will change and

adapt as cell functions change and adapt.

TRANSCENDENTAL PERSONA MODIFICATION

Transcendental persona modification is a method that I stumbled upon while dabbling in symbolic

disassociation and Transcendental Meditation. Though I found it quite effective, I did not stop where I

should have and pushed myself to a psychological breaking point that I now have come to regret.

Nevertheless, it was through this experience that I learned about my core persona, the man I called Jack.

Though I have been able to use the insights from this experience to develop a much more nuanced understanding of spirituality and mythology, I know that if I was to ever practice this again or guide another person to practice it, it would require an institutionalized structure not only for the safety of the practitioner but for the integrity of the practice.

Not only would it take rigorous licensing and training on the part of those who assist in the process, as well as codification of the process itself, but it would also require an oversight body to regulate the usage of the practice. Without this oversight body, I fear that transcendental persona modification would only lead to the creation of another cult, the likes of which the world would be better without.

I propose instead an oversight of the process of transcendental persona modification that has a definite composition and term limit for anyone that has any authority over the conduct of those assisting another person in the modification of their own psyche. A small panel of judges would have four-year term limits with a maximum of two terms over their lifetimes so that they do not accumulate any interpretive authority that could be seen as spiritual superiority over others. If they were to serve another term, they could only do so eight years after their initial term had ended. This is both to allow new blood to enter the court as well as to prevent any informal influence. The panel of judges must have at least 25% of the panel as non-practitioner representation, ensuring that an outside point of view is present in the decision-making at all times. They evaluate from an experimental framework, taking a purely scientific point of view from which they can balance the mythically informed perceptions of their panel members.

Judges can be removed from the panel if two-thirds of their fellow judges vote against them, if a Cells board of ethics removes them due to unethical conduct, by direct intervention of the Personal Warranty Company, or if 30% of active participants petition against them. Due to the myriad of powers keeping the judges in check, they are expected to remain impartial and put the freedom and security of the practitioners before any ideological biases that they may possess.

All judges must precede their terms as spotters, so that they have already achieved the license to aid others in transcendental persona modification and have adequate experience to back their decision-making processes. Judge positions become available based on seniority, with the most experienced spotters in the Spotter Corps being able to receive nomination from the corps itself.

As for spotters, their role is to observe and aid in practitioners' otherwise self-directed processes of transcendental persona modification. Each spotter works with a practitioner only once to prevent any guru dynamics from forming. Spotters must have already gone through their own transcendental persona modification experience. They must have proper mental health and first aid licensing, trauma-informed practice training, foundry maintenance workshops, epistemic hygiene coursework, documented protocol training, a supervised apprenticeship with an experienced spotter, and must pass a court certification examination. Pay is kept modest and uniform to prevent gaming the system or trying to service as many practitioners as possible. This is intended to be done within an equitalist framework.

Basic spotters must complete annual refresher courses to update their knowledge and maintain their integrity. This includes regular peer review sessions, attending workshops, and submitting mandatory reports on near-miss incidents. Like any position of trust, they cannot work with family members, romantic partners, or business associates. Any personal connections must be disclosed to other practitioners, and spotters cannot promote specific mythic frameworks. However, they are encouraged to work with individuals with similar mythic frameworks to promote authentic engagement during the transcendental persona modification process.

I imagine all of this operating within the confines of the S.T.A.M.P. Movement, under the watch of the Personal Warranty Company, so that a culture of necessary ethical safeguards exists around the processes. However, I imagine a great degree of autonomy for the court so that it can remain politically unmotivated and financially independent of other institutions.

Before undergoing transcendental persona modification, practitioners must first obtain the license to operate within the method. This requires a seven-day course overviewing the philosophy of structural absurdism and the methodology of transcendental persona modification. Part of the process of this pre-modification training is to undergo what is called a mythic audit. The audit serves to establish what a person's worldview is, what is scientifically true, what is held to be true, what myths and legends they hold dear despite knowing they're not true, and to break down what symbols they use and which ideas they fall back on in making their day-to-day decisions. During this process, they have to rate each one of these mythic ideas from real to imagined.

Before beginning, practitioners must establish for themselves predefined boundaries, such as what they are physically, mentally, and spiritually willing to endure during the persona modification process. These can be duration limits, limits to who they can contact, what decisions they are able to make, and personal behavioral limits that they are not willing to do or allow themselves to do while in these transcendental states that their spotters can disrupt. The idea is to shape for themselves an ethic of care for the spotter while they are in a rational state of mind.

As for the actual process, I've broken it down into a seven-day structure. Days one to two focus on preparation, grounding, and baseline establishment. Days three to four constitute the intensive phase with deep fasting and archetypal work. Day five begins stabilization and pattern reinforcement. Day six features formal closure ritualization. Day seven completes reentry and assessment.

The standard protocol involves a 72-hour water-only fast spanning days three to five. The purpose of this fast is to attain a state of intentional disassociation by establishing ketosis, which reduces the rigidity of the psyche and allows for transcendental states to be experienced more easily. Leading up to and during this time, the practitioner self-directs intentional persona reconstruction, which involves mapping their own archetypal associations, reconfiguring them into mythic archetypes, and enacting characters from that mythic architecture to stimulate changes in behaviors and thought patterns. This is best understood as a form of auto-hypnotic method acting, inasmuch as through using ritual, symbolic thought, monologue, and character acting while in the transcendental state, the mind conditions itself to act in a different way for an extended period of time while maintaining intentional disassociation.

Symbolic manipulation and ritualization of activities allow the mind to enter what I call a hyper-symbolic state, in which the associations between the mind structure and its use of symbols, through the vocation of symbols in ritual, increase neuroplasticity and receptivity to the intended change. The best way to describe this is as a form of psychological spellcraft, whereby through performing a ritual, the mind itself is altered through suggestion and can experience a placebo while acknowledging the very fact that it is indeed experiencing a placebo.

The creation of these psychological spells is entirely up to the practitioner, but they can be used to attain different states of mind, from tranquility to innovation to possession. By playing with symbolically important items in ritual, changing one's clothing as the persona is altered into more character-specific attire, and altering one's speech patterns and self-image through creating backstory, myth, and interacting with these self-designed myths, the mind gets swept away in its own imaginary game.

At the apex of this experience, it is possible to evoke a spirit, angel, or otherwise archetypal entity to possess oneself and take on a higher form of persona modification. By starting out with gradual change and building up to archetypal possession, the mind can build its virtues, abandon its vices, and reach an ideal state of self, though temporarily, through extreme transcendental disassociation and self-directed suggestion.

Having maintained multiple personas over a period of three to four days, the final ritual baptism is meant as a closing ritual to end persona modification processes. The goal is to collapse the various personas that the mind has inhabited over the last few days into a single core persona where only the truest elements of the self are retained, vices are let go, and only the truest self remains, at which point they can finally assign themselves their true name or reaffirm that name if they have already gone through the process.

After a final monologue, standing in the water, they throw themselves in, pull themselves out, and affirm to themselves what is real, what is mystical, and what they have become. Through this experience, I have found—at least in my case—that the inhibitions of the mind can be broken down and the virtues of the mind can be built up. However, the very real risk of losing oneself in this process means there has to be an end point. After this process is complete, practitioners are to eat a large meal and sleep it off. On the seventh and final day, they too record and reflect on everything they did in order to immortalize in text their experience.

Follow-up includes a three-day check-in for immediate adjustment assessment, a ten-day mandatory check-in for integration and stability of the new persona, and a 90-day outcome evaluation in order to test whether or not the persona has held. In order to cement it over the next three months after the transcendental persona modification experience has concluded, daily practice of psychological magic based on what they experienced during the transcendental persona modification experience is recommended to condition the mind to the symbols that anchor the principles of the new persona.

Epistemic anchors are used to determine cognitive cohesiveness during the process. Being able to break character and determine what day it is, who they are, where they are, and what time it is are necessary ways of telling whether a person is oriented in space and time or whether they are starting to become delusional. If a person is having a mental health crisis during one of these persona modification techniques, there are various levels of action a spotter can take.

The first level is using anchoring to try to bring them back to reality through talking them out of it. The second level is ending the process entirely by encouraging them to eat and rest. The third level, if the situation seems beyond what the spotter is comfortable dealing with, is to not only encourage them to eat and rest but also call in a mental health team. The fourth level, if there is immediate harm to themselves or others, is to call emergency services. This depends heavily on whether the participant has core self-awareness, can articulate when prompted, can return to their baseline in a reasonable time, and can distinguish inner experience from outer reality.

Six conditions require immediate action regardless of other factors: suicidal ideation or behavior, self-harm, aggression toward the spotter, complete loss of contact with reality lasting more than one hour, medical emergency symptoms, or explicit statements of intent to harm self or others. Any of these triggers crisis team contact or emergency services without further assessment.

As for the less extreme techniques, grounding can include giving them an object and telling them to focus on it, to describe it and feel it, or doing some basic breath work. It is important to understand that some people simply have trauma to work through and need trauma-specific care. Practitioners aged 18 to 25 do not have a fully developed neocortex and need additional pre-screening and training before undergoing the process. Practitioners must be at least 18 years old to practice. People with pre-existing mental health issues require a mental health team to be present during the process. Any Level 3 or Level 4 incidents must be reported and recorded for further review.

This is just a basic sketch of how the Court of Amovera is meant to operate. For basic TPM, the court has no presence other than licensing the Spotter Corps, but as lessons are learned and progress is made, precedent will change in the same way that the myths we use, the symbols we use, and the languages we use change. So the court will have a continuous job in analyzing the methods of those individuals practicing transcendental persona modification and revising them to fit within the framework of structural absurdism and Amovera in general.

In summary, the court, the spotters, and the practitioners are all intended to allow for a transcendental mode of self-directed psychotherapeutic progress, and this is meant to help bridge cultural divides and foster a sense of unity within the equitalist community. Whether working within S.T.A.M.P. cells, for the PWC, or toward the founding of the ANP, the court is meant to steward the cultivation of minds and community.

ON AUTONOMOUS NATIONS

INVENTING AUTONOMOUS GOVERNANCE

Autonomous Nations Theory is scaled up from the observations of Structural Absurdism and Amovera. It is supposed to be built up from the principles of freedom to experiment that is necessary for cultures to self-design, and the harmonious compassion needed to govern over a diverse system like this with grace. It's a tall order to fill, but at every stage, there needs to be a separation between what is done in an ideal nation, what is done at a governing level, and what is done to real nations that are not operating at 100% efficiency. The core concept of autonomous nations came to me one Canada Day while watching a band play and people sing in their native languages. I felt that there was a deep sorrow in this call for unity, and that was because there was something lost: autonomy. So rather than the United States of America, why couldn't we have the Autonomous Nations of Canada?

So I began to think deeply over the rest of the summer about the nature of autonomy and the importance of letting cultures form their own narratives and build up their own intelligences. It should be of little surprise to us that the more freely a culture is allowed to immerse itself in and organize its own intelligence, the more intelligent it becomes. Yet intelligence alone is not the sole outcome of this process. Too often, avarice and sadism naturally emerge, driving a culture into a mode of taking rather than giving when left to its own devices. So I considered that while some cultures entrench morality discovered by sages, philosophers, or prophets into a moral code, it is becoming imperative to examine the process by which moral individuals arrive at these insights and to understand the economic incentives behind the formation of these behaviors. If a society is built solely on taking, it inevitably results in a culture of takers.

Now, the public's myths form the moral opinion that shapes the license we give our institutions. We are now in an age of philosophies and popular opinions, and so these are the myths that we shape now that form the public license. Within this mythos of public opinions and philosophies, we grant the state powers through our actions and inactions. As an institution, the state exists to maintain a secure apparatus that ensures the safety of its population. All other concerns are secondary. Thus, the ethics of a state must not be confused with the ethics of the commons or of businesses.

Once a nation has a security apparatus in place, maintaining businesses becomes the second priority. As mentioned earlier, maintaining a free and lawful society has become the foundation for conducting good business. Respecting established business cultures and avoiding unnecessary interference in others' affairs are essential. This is important to prevent reinventing the wheel in business, allowing businesspeople to operate in a team environment where everyone contributes to peak efficiency by adhering to shared rules rather than altering them arbitrarily.

This way, an individual can enter a business and actively participate without needing to change the structure or be baffled by its strangeness. Just as ethics evolve over time through natural selection, so too do business practices and human rights. However, where rights are based on the freedoms necessary to explore ideas and form new strategies, policies such as the right to bear arms fall more within the domain of state structure. These policies may be reconsidered as state governance becomes more stable and freer of systemic flaws. Systemic flaws, however, are built heavily on the flaws of the population's mythos being ineffective at managing and shaping the logos. So, the maturation of people's ethos needs to be incentivized throughout the society for them to gain the license of mature individuals. This incentivization could come from outside the nation by a federated authority holding all to account for their maturation and moral progress.

The extent to which we can expect to be free cannot exceed our capacity to wield those responsibilities with prudence. The self-organizing nature of society requires freedom of thought as a default, but the reality remains that all freedoms can be abused, and a system of correction remains a necessary part of every political establishment. The problem with most methods of correction lies in the lack of understanding of the psychological factors that cause deviant behavior and an overlooking of the opportunity to use it to instill moral decency.

Certain criminal psychologies are subject to such harsh punitive measures that a deviant mind cannot even seek therapeutic or psychiatric assistance, resulting in a significant void of information within academic communities regarding their nature. The only solution is to allow a deviant mind to confide in a therapist without facing criminal prosecution for a mere thought pattern.

Though this challenges many societal norms, criminal rehabilitation through confession and psychiatric intervention would greatly reduce the burden on the justice system. Meanwhile, the justice system could still pursue individuals who continue to subvert the law and require legal accountability. In this way, knowledge of how to heal deviant minds would become accessible through the sciences, allowing assessment and correction to begin during adolescence—before any crime is even committed.

But we need to draw a clear line here: that these ideas of what a nation could do and the freedom for a nation to self-direct must be considered different things. If there was an authority grading nations and licensing them with various capacities of military, security, state and resource access, then they would need to grade them on the metric of what they achieved, not how they achieved it. But how do we make a government that itself is ethical enough to form a superstructure that oversees the development of many Autonomous Nations within its borders?

GRADUATED DEMOCRACY

Regarding legislation, all laws should be reviewed by the Federations' top universities under the supervision of the School of Ethics before being passed. This would ensure that all legislation meets the minimum standard for the nation's long-term strategies within the Federation of Autonomous Nations.

The School of Ethics should be built on a similarly empirical science—one that views morality as the necessary countermeasure to natural vulgarity. This science must be developed before the School of Ethics can wield any authority, and it must fully embrace the chaos of natural human disorganization, allowing people to play with ideas and discover serendipitous harmony through spontaneous organization. It would need to differentiate between the standard of freedom deduced through structural absurdist principles and the principles of care and minimized harm of Amovera, and understand that freedom must be given while care can only be rewarded, since all cultures will have different ideas of care but all need freedom.

To cultivate a productive and compassionate human society, ethics must be based on evidence and integrated into a moral institution—whether through charities or the personal warranty industry. No matter the legislature, with the School of Ethics' oversight, any nation should be able to operate within its Federation of Autonomous Nations, regardless of its governing structure. Democracies have the benefit of representing the social contract, but if referendums are held, this can be done through public discourse as well, through any form of government, be it dictatorship or democracy. In this regard, art and activism would have much more pull than economic action, but that is best left to the native population to achieve.

All parts of the Federation should be involved in any amendment to the nation's constitution. This includes the referendum process, the School of Ethics, and lobbyists representing businesses. Depending on the nation's form of government, the legislature should make the final decision within its legal framework. The constitution is designed to be difficult to change, as it ultimately provides stability and cohesion to a country's legislative processes. In any nation governed by law rather than by individuals, the constitution should remain unchanged unless it is deemed fundamentally unethical. Otherwise, the country risks long-term instability if successive leaders can easily alter the foundation of its laws.

When considering the symbolic roots of human ethics, cultural diversification is inevitable in large populations. As with the playground metaphor, cultures must be both safe and free to seek their own refinement. Human beings will refine themselves in a secure environment, even if that process involves confronting suffering and working through the pains of loss. A safe and free culture has no reason to oppose the nation if the nation provides it with sanctuary.

The guiding principle I have developed is this: If it causes no harm, let it be. If harm is necessary, consider it carefully. When discussing harm, we must understand the concept of consent—hence the importance of the age of consent. It is not reasonable to grant a child, whose brain will not fully develop until age 23, the right to enter contracts, nor is it wise to consider a child's consent valid for activities that could have permanent consequences. But again, these are principles of care, and though this may be a high standard, there may be higher, there may be lower, and the freedom of nations to determine their own standards of care must be implemented, though the standard of care will affect their portion of state power received from the Federation of Autonomous Nations.

So, while adults should have the right to harm themselves if it does not harm others, that is a nation's decision to make such a law, and it is theirs to decide if it is worth complying with Federal Incentives or if they have higher principles to follow in their mythos. This includes the ability to enter contracts or make personal changes that may go against their perceived best interests. That is to say, acts that may seem unnatural—such as homosexuality—are not unethical if both parties give consent, as they cause no harm. Any exceptions to this "no harm, no foul" principle should be reviewed by the court responsible for overseeing a family's cultural framework, such as their church or university, particularly when dealing with the potential long-term consequences for a child's physical or mental health.

It is important to emphasize that in a Federation of Autonomous Nations, we must learn to coexist with differences, allowing each group to determine its own methods of regulating moral action within the boundaries of national law and the various sects within them—whether aligned with science, religion, or free-form spirituality. Some matters require judicial oversight, while others fall under national legislation. As long as people are free to immigrate to other nations within the Federation, then the nations are gaining the consent of their citizens to abide by their laws by virtue of retaining their population despite other nations existing with different laws.

Many of the world's problems arise from contested land ownership. Throughout history, the conquest of land has been a defining force in geopolitics. It is unrealistic to expect nations to relinquish land they have held for generations simply because of an old treaty or an ancient grievance. However, land disputes can be resolved through peaceful means, particularly via economic incentives and negotiated buyouts.

A proposed solution is a structured exchange program that allows nations or indigenous groups to sell or trade land with the government or other interested parties under transparent, fair, and voluntary agreements. Instead of relying on force or historical claims, this system would prioritize mutual benefit, ensuring that all parties involved feel adequately compensated.

A successful exchange system would require an impartial oversight body to ensure fairness and prevent coercion. Governments and corporations should not be allowed to pressure smaller communities into selling their lands, and mechanisms must be in place to protect cultural and ecological heritage sites. By promoting structured negotiations, the risk of conflict would be greatly reduced, leading to long-term stability and cooperation among diverse communities.

The beginning of every political movement is the theory, but the theory needs to be followed with action. To begin a grassroots movement that goes against the algorithms entrenched in the current system, we need to use a more traditional mode of communication and showmanship to start the process of party organization. Using performance arts and charitable donations to initiate gathering attention and spread awareness for party membership is a good way to do this in the real world, where foreign interference cannot easily disrupt the initial operations.

SELF-CONCERNED ALTRUISM

The problem of taking self-concerned people and creating an organization that produces a moral outcome has been a problem that has plagued society since the inception of modern capitalism. The closest we have ever gotten as far as I can tell is the insurance industry, but the link between the wellbeing of the company and the financial wellbeing of the customer has never been established.

This is the intention behind the personal warranty company, while also creating a financially viable business. By linking the profit of the company to the profit of the customer, the more a customer makes the more they have to cover, the more the company can charge, but only insofar as they protect the customer's earning potential. This creates a system of self-concerned altruism within the personal warranty company.

What follows is the outline of a personal warranty company: a company I believe is ethical and would serve as a strong foundation if leveraged with artificial intelligence. This warranty company would guarantee people financial security over the course of their lives. It could also serve as an incentive framework, ensuring that those who join are building businesses aligned with ethical principles. This could form a cascade of businesses—outcompeting traditional models by virtue of their embedded cooperative and social frameworks.

Working in insurance, I realized that the fiscal framework could easily be extended into a package that ensures a person's employment prospects and well-being. The basic coverage would guarantee that an individual with licensing and education in a specific industry receives access to upgrading programs and job opportunities if they find themselves earning less than 80% of the average income in their field. Family maintenance could also be part of this package, ensuring that parents can work while remaining covered for family emergencies and hardships.

The reason insurance serves as a useful model is that the fiduciary system would be reinforced to serve clients better, as their incomes become directly linked to the income of the business through a shared advantage in resource distribution. As participants upgrade their skills and grow financially, they would have more to insure, increasing the coverage available to them and subsequently raising the earnings of the personal warranty company.

The system of underwriters and investigators would transform this into an information highway, which could not only help keep governing structures ethically aligned with the flow of capital and the interests of the people but also fund initiatives that increase investment in social projects through activist investing and lobbying.

The basic theory is that the company is insuring the resumes of the members and making sure that repairing the resume is covered by the company. The resumes value is based off the average earning of a person with their qualification. The rehabilitation of resumes is considered a qualitative endeavor, helping the individual find schooling, therapy and medical help as well as family assistance. This service is not mandatory, but offered as a product to those interested in insuring their employability and reputation.

The structure of business would then be incentivized to invest in programs that ensure workers' benefits and invest in auxiliary businesses that can offer their support services that can uphold their reputation. This networking and structuring of the business would create a framework where otherwise morally neutral people do moral work out of their own self-interest and need to maintain the company's integrity as a caregiving institution.

In opposition to the rest of the ANC which is under constant revision, the Personal Warranty Company is financially incentivized to remain static and unchanging as much as possible to maintain financial viability. This makes it a moral anchor for the ANC, and given its veto power over ANC decision making, which it does not need to impose, it incentives the graduated democracy to only change things within reason so they do not cause undue harm to their voter bases and industries.

Despite the entrenchment favored by being a financial institution, the fact that they are serving human needs and diversification requires a general moral mobility as the human condition shifts and employment environments change on a month-to-month basis. This pulls the entrenched model to a modular and mobile model despite having a tendency for a definite constitution and structure that remains unchanging. The result would be a static and unchanging company with modular additions, capable of reorganizing and reprioritizing as needed as service needs shift and the economy evolves.

Establishing a superstructure-sanctioned and operated registry within businesses to track the value of résumés—i.e., what a person should earn based on their qualifications—and job openings across the economy would improve mobility and retention in the job market.

The future may bring a time when rapid redeployment into the job market becomes necessary. For this reason, it will be essential to continuously build upon existing skills. Therefore, education should be integrated into the personal warranty program to ensure that everyone has the ability to operate at the next stages of economic development.

Résumés could then be standardized so that the minimum expected salary correlates with the qualifications relevant to the position applied for. This standardization of qualified pay increases would provide employees with a non-union-based means of negotiating their wages while preventing employers from arbitrarily setting pay scales when merit and work history naturally enhance a worker's value in otherwise intangible ways.

With next-generation economics, the ethics surrounding the use of new products and the operation of new systems may be too vast to legislate through conventional means. Therefore, managing the liability of new products and systems should partially fall under the responsibility of the companies that introduce them, issuing licenses for each product or system to ensure that users assume responsibility for their use.

Each new license for a product or system would require completion of a course that educates the user on the protocols and liabilities associated with its use. The level of responsibility would be managed by a person's general license, recorded in their résumé as maintained by the federal job market. Each company would, in turn, hold liability distribution insurance and be required to undergo education provided by the state's Schools of Ethics.

Of course, certain rights should not require licenses. These include access to information, communication, and financial management. However, where potential harm exists, a license should be required. Furthermore, there should be multiple providers of licenses when cultural considerations are involved. For example, a church could issue licenses for childhood education if a family wished to assume that responsibility and did not agree with public education policies that conflicted with their values.

The process of forming the original talent pool for the Personal Warranty Company will be an industry-based hiring process seeking experienced representatives from warranty, human services and insurance companies to oversee the process of formation. The onboarding process will include a thorough hiring procedure, and after onboarding their complete advancement in the program will be based on a peer review system, where each person grades their peers and this grade will contribute to each person's potential for advancement in the company.

The PWC administration will be run like a normal publicly owned company with a board of directors and a CEO. However, the board of ethics oversight panel is a separate entity of the organization and will operate like a government cell nested in the company, and operates independently of the board, though their decisions are monitored and informed by the board, who can veto their decisions based on executive authority.

The board of ethics oversight panel operates like a government cell nested in the PWC and elects its members based on volunteer applications and has an onboarding procedure that requires basic bias mitigation training and additional civics training so they understand the nuances of the position they are applying for. The panel oversees ANC decisions and determines if they are going to use their veto power to stall legislation or when to allow ANC processes to continue under their watch.

Forecasting economic risk is necessary for investing in people's lives, especially when trying to build people's resumes and career paths. This means there needs to be an office for economic forecasting, geopolitical risk assessment, and future-proofing employment paths to better serve the clients.

The finance office processes transactions and keeps files for each policy to keep a record of every transaction. It also processes this information to keep a ledger of anonymized claim information to be used by the risk assessment office and the claims adjustment office to inform policy decision-making.

The office that legally takes on the risk for each policy will be structured in the same manner as a classical insurance company, so that the fiduciary responsibilities of collecting and handling money are handled by the finance office, but the pool of money needed to be put aside to cover client resume rehabilitation costs are managed by the underwriting office. This office takes the premium of the members and adjusts how much coverage they have signed up for against the services being requested and decides what is available for them.

Investigation of the loss of employment and the adherence to the rules of the membership guarantee plan will be pursued in each case by the investigations office. This office will ensure that the loss of work is not due to criminal activities and that the needs of the individual are not manufactured by poor investments and owning assets beyond their means. Certain coverages may still apply to safeguard client wellbeing even in the case of a breach of contract, such as financial education services and resources for internal job market listings.

The claims adjuster office determines what the company can offer for each claim based on resources available so the contracts can be upheld and the rewards are uniformly distributed per policy written. The claims adjuster is also operated similarly to an insurance claim adjuster; however, they are managing the costs of programs instead of direct payouts.

The agencies and brokerages are points of contact between the customer and the Personal Warranty Company. They are responsible for educating the clients about the nature of personal warranty policies and making sure they understand the terms, payments necessary and the nature of claims and passive benefits.

Auxiliary services management maintains good business relationships between the Personal Warranty Company and its supporting businesses which provide the services, including colleges, universities, financial planners, health care professionals and social workers. These services are their own businesses, so the Personal Warranty Company simply ensures that access and funding options are available to clients to access their services, and as the market changes, different auxiliary services will need to meet higher or lower demands depending on coverages required.

The family overhead metric evaluates if the median earnings expected from an individual's career path are sufficient to cover their family planning goals. The better the ratio of earnings to family planning metrics, the greater the discount on their membership guarantee package.

The career median income metric determines the median income of a person's career to set a baseline of whether their employment is sufficient for their qualifications and if any actions need to be taken if they are earning less than 80% of the median income of their profession. This is the minimum benchmark for action to be taken on a policy to start the evaluation process for what coverages need to be initiated.

The transferable skills discount determines how transferable an individual's skills are, which reduces the cost of their coverage by reducing their risk factor. The reasoning is the more transferable skills an individual has, the less it is going to cost to find new work should they find themselves earning less than the minimum necessary income to cover their family overhead or earning less than a competitive yearly income.

Preventative mental health coverage can be claimed a number of times per annual policy to prevent the risk of performance loss due to mental health degradation. This can cover the cost of therapy or offset the losses incurred by an employer should the employee need an extended leave of absence.

Family therapy is covered by the policy for people with family living situations that might affect their mental health and their ability to perform at work. This coverage will be limited by the package selected and offered as optional coverage should a client need it.

Reeducation coverage is a standard coverage that ensures that in the event of an industry change or market change which renders it near impossible to find work in the chosen field, reeducation is covered or reduced in cost by the policy.

Job market access assistance is a standard coverage that is likely the most common coverage that will be used. It covers the costs of accessing the job market through advisors of various kinds in the event of job loss and will cover a short-term allowance to maintain housing in the first two months of job loss. These employment services include financial and career advisers, mental health services and university or college career counselors should a change in career be preferred.

Career change assistance optional coverage can be added to a policy at any time and transfers the coverage from the job market access assistance coverage into career change assistance for an additional fee while still meeting the minimum standards for employment income. This allows individuals to access their coverage to switch careers to better suit their lifestyle choices while otherwise still meeting employment standards.

Relocation assistance coverage will cover moving costs within reason in the event that a job requires a person to move for work, or should their career change or job loss force a relocation. These are just rough ideas around what a morally structured company could look like and ultimately are just another attempt of my mind to try and reconcile the fragility of morality with the indomitable might of institutionalization.

The campaign for initial investors will be done by a select group of individuals from industry, the S.T.A.M.P. movement, and the Autonomous Nations Party. This will target partners such as government agencies, health care providers, and special interest groups that have similar values to the ANP.

The cities that will initially be selected for the initial service will likely be cities with high unemployment rates to test the capacity of the PWC to be able to manage a large client base right off the bat. This will also stress-test the system and be the perfect environment for building the data needed to inform the adjusters' policy weights and balances.

Upon incorporation, the business will be active and ready to start operating in the pilot community as a separate entity to the party. Once it has been verified that it can operate in a dependable manner, it can begin to use its veto power to keep the moral alignment of the ANP in check.

The problem of taking self-concerned people and creating an organization that produces a moral outcome has been a problem that has plagued society since the inception of modern capitalism. The closest we have ever gotten as far as I can tell is the insurance industry, but the link between the wellbeing of the company and the financial wellbeing of the customer has never been established. This is the intention behind the Personal Warranty Company, while also creating a financially viable business. By linking the profit of the company to the profit of the customer, the more a customer makes the more they have to cover, the more the company can charge, but only insofar as they protect the customer's earning potential. This creates a system of self-concerned altruism within the Personal Warranty Company.

POLITICAL STRATEGY

The written charter will precede any actions taken, and so it will need to cover all aspects of the hypothetical operations of Autonomous Nations. The land acquisition process will be the first topic discussed in the charter and will discuss initial land acquisition through purchase or organizing currently held holdings into a national territory. These do not have to be connected physically but have to be enough to cover an industrial, residential and administrative zone as a bare minimum.

Once the charter is written, taking the initial moral anthropology cells from the S.T.A.M.P. movement and transforming them into a base for a political party is the next step of the operations. This begins with the initial structuring of the moral anthropology cells, which are proto-cells from which the board of ethics are selected. These cells work closely with universities doing anthropological studies to determine the nature of human ethics and morality. These will analyze successful moral strategies in populations over multi-million-generational time scales in order to start to understand what factors result in a strong and flourishing population long term.

The formation of the political wing would require a selection process based on the internal résumé management system, which would be used to grade individuals and keep track of what they are able to accomplish and what positions they are qualified to hold. This would be a direct reflection of the policy imperative to introduce a federal job market once the party gets elected to office. Following the formation of the main body would be the delegation of cultural insulation services to another board, followed by the creation of the Overwatch, all of which are detailed later. Funding would be handled according to national laws after this point, and the party would need to be registered.

This section of the charter will cover each nation's independent means of self-assessment and how that will fit within the larger graduated democracy system of the overarching federal superstructure. This system does not have to be grade-based and does not have to fit in with the Personal Warranty Company, but will have to grant workers' rights similar to federal standards if they are to have authority and extra autonomy within the federation.

These grades will cover a country's cultural cohesiveness, their economic viability, their humanitarian capacities and ecological stewardship. These metrics will be broken down further to give each nation a grade by which they will be granted or revoked licenses to take part in mediating issues between nations and the Federal Graduated Democracy. This will include trade corridor operations and location, military and security force buildup, and level of cultural insulation from the federal mandates.

The resource transportation grid is a large corridor crossing the continent in horizontal channels and vertical channels connecting the continent and the trade networks between. These will be industrial zones and though the initial planning will consider ecological factors, they are meant to be self-contained and without any ecological regulations other than preventing spills of materials and resource emissions that could affect the ecology of neighboring territories. These would be managed by the adjacent nations, with the highest-graded nation having a dominant say in how the corridor would be managed, with the federal government leaving it to the nations to manage.

The board of ethics exists as a large group of cells within the Graduated Democracy Superstructure. This board of heads of cells are meant to oversee and interpret anthropological research into a long-term strategy for the federation, which affects the grading system by which nations are granted licensing opportunities and protections from land buyout procedures which ultimately incentivize growth and cooperation in the federation.

At the core of the board of ethics is its think tank, processing information gathered by the anthropology cells and translating that into long-term moral strategy. In the beginning phases the board of ethics will operate solely as a think tank, but since it has the highest role in the ANC model, it will need to be expanded in short order after its formation. The members of the think tank are all representatives of their own moral anthropology cells, and so not only have the additional resources of the board to draw from, but the resources and work of their own cells from their own regions.

The Demographics Interests branch is focused on one task: identifying public opinion, where those opinions came from, and how those can be used to implement policy. This branch uses different methods, from polling to data analysis to investigative research, all aiming to understand the current state of moral change and the direction of public opinion change both personal and the opinions and desires of industries.

The administration network would oversee the standards, information transfers and operations of the cells, ensuring that each cell maintains the highest possible ethical and operational standards themselves. Where other cells in the federation are given autonomy over their moral operations, the administrative networks of the board of ethics must uphold a culture of bias neutrality and long-term human values.

The moral tempering of members in administrative positions is meant to be earned through charitable service; since this cannot be forced upon the whole population, charitable civic service would become a rite of passage for administrators in the board of ethics. So, the outreach and charity council would oversee the integration of the moral anthropology cells with regional and local charity and outreach programs to volunteer their members for regular civic service.

The actual operations of the moral anthropological operations can occur after the channels for licensing those members have been secured through the administrator's tenure in the outreach and charity branch and the necessary channels for moral anthropology have been established with the universities.

The operations of tracking cultural drift, foreign influences and authentic new philosophical movements in a population would be the main goal, while also analyzing the moral correlation to economic success and the general metrics of freedom and altruism in order to refine the baseline philosophy of moral and cultural evolution.

The Coalition of Autonomously Secured Nations [CASN] is a subgroup of highly graded nations in the federation that have licensed authority to maintain and manage security on a national level, providing border security to adjacent nations that have lower security clearance and require defense from external nations. These nations exist in a security architecture much like NATO, where the alliance is built on a set of mutually agreed-upon rules that keeps everyone involved mutually dependent and in line with the long-term strategy of the federation.

One of the most heavily graded metrics is cultural insulation. Cultural insulation is the ability for a nation in the federation to maintain control of their media environment from external coercion or influence. This means that they are capable of generating their own narratives, their own cultures and are free of foreign interference. The Graduation Cells of the Federal Graduated Democracy [FGD] investigate for foreign influence on a culture and will evaluate nations for their cultural insulation depending on how well they counter and control foreign propaganda.

This section will review the outcomes of the philosophy described in the S.T.A.M.P. technique, but will go into the minimum standards of rights of the people involved in the Federation. This will avoid for the most part family structure, since that is an evolutionary concern, and will instead focus on age of consent, the neurological argument of maturation based on frontal cortical development, the cognitive argument for personhood, and the doctrine of undue harm based on C.E.O.N.E. theory.

Though the majority of party funding will be done through transparently collected funds, building the internal structure around a business model less prone to corruption will be necessary for the company to avoid corruption as leadership changes. Forming the Personal Warranty Company in order to procure ethically funded money while also creating a moral economic incentive framework to orient the party morally serves the purpose of making a moral anchor for the party. The company would be an independent agency but would have a guaranteed majority of the shares of the party's operation and veto power in the operation of the boards. This would ensure that the nature of the party's decision-making is uniformly incentivized through the oversight of the Personal Warranty Company.

The initial construction of the Personal Warranty Company would be internal to the party, ensuring that part of the assessment of new workers and volunteers would qualify them for personal warranty coverage for as long as they were members of the party. However, once the Personal Warranty Company is made independent, the coverage would shift from party membership to PWC membership. This would cover a person so that should they need to seek new employment, they would be given education and assistance in searching for new work.

It would also cover financial management and education services, and in the event of children being involved, it would provide childcare and parental education services so that parents are informed and kept up to date on good parenting practices. Since the relative income covered would be linked to the payments the company receives from the clients, the company would be incentivized to increase the clients' earnings and aid in their employment to continue receiving payments. This would make the company a morally oriented, for-profit company assisting people in their capacity to provide for their families and be productive members of society.

The first stage of changing the political orientation of the culture is to change the operations of the non-government agents in the country through investment and gaining leverage over companies. Gathering support for activist investing to alter the lobbying practices of companies in order to form joint investment strategies and unite the economy towards autonomy and economic licenses is a key step.

Activist investing involves organizing financiers who have incentives to change the policies of companies until enough have been organized so that a majority of shares can be bought from the company, allowing a representative to be put on the board. This requires careful consideration of what changes are planned for the company and ensuring that these changes are profitable for the company.

This kind of change can be used to build new infrastructure needed for the greater whole of the economy. From a political perspective, when built on the incentive framework of the Personal Warranty Company, activist investment can ensure that companies that act against national interests and threaten the rest of the country can be brought into ethical practices. Additionally, multiple competing companies can be brought together in joint investment initiatives to build better economic relationships through the influence of an ethical stakeholder.

This council takes industry interests and aligns them with development proposals mediated between the board of ethics and the universities and technical colleges for megaprojects meant to move the country's manufacturing base forward and increase civic infrastructure.

These joint investment strategies are meant to future-proof the economy in an affordable and ecologically responsible manner, such as the investment in carbon fuel turbines with carbon capture technologies to convert fossil fuel to electricity en masse and feed the carbon into algae farms in order to produce oxygen and more fuel for future use.

This court exists as an auxiliary branch of the board of ethics and mediates disputes between industry leaders, land stewards, and cultural leaders in order to come to new means of doing business through joint investment strategies that are beneficial to all parties involved.

These mediations put both parties on equal footing regardless of size or power by giving both parties an equal amount of votes on each side of the court. The small body of 10% of the votes is meant to represent the board of ethics, so the moral arbitrator always has a say in the outcome of the decisions, but not so much as to overcome the natural mediation process.

With enough public support and companies oriented towards profiting from the proposed changes, lobbying the government to implement policy changes that benefit the ANP becomes the next step. This process requires the creation of think tanks to develop policy propositions for lobbying the government in order to monitor and orient the party within the political landscape.

Until the party can secure at least a minority government in power, directly lobbying other parties is a way to ensure that some policy positions are heard and considered. Inter-party communication in this manner eventually becomes a means of ensuring that mutually beneficial policies can pass without significant opposition.

After the political party is operational, campaigning in cyberspace is necessary to disrupt the current dominance of foreign actors in digital media. This would require a change of federal law and is currently not legal, but would be a campaign platform idea. Until implemented, media literacy campaigns would be the only legal function that this branch would pursue. Forming a digital counteroffensive against media that promotes cultural degradation and manipulates emotional responses to align with the campaign promises of foreign-supported politicians would become the final and most publicly reported effort of the party to promote a pro-science and human freedoms narrative in cyberspace.

Bot farms are the traditional way of doing this, and if this is not legal, it would need to be made legal through the lobbying process as a form of advertising. This is essential in insulating a society against foreign interference and ensuring that the political discourse within a society is stronger than the foreign voices seeking to undermine it. This is not to say that all foreign voices are against our interests, only that those actively seeking to undermine our society need to face opposition in cyberspace.

EQUITALISM ECONOMIC FRAMEWORK

I did a lot of math a while ago, studying what the budget of a middle-class American was like at the height of the middle class [1972], and decided to figure out what a person could afford today if we wanted to maintain the same purchasing power, considering that they had 30% disposable income and relative to today things were 300% cheaper.

Note, this is a contrast of what a person would have if they saved as much today as a person did in the 1970s, which by all rights is the financial goal if a person is being responsible. Also, at the time I took my base values from, it was just before the end of the gold standard and the beginning of union busting.

How much overhead can you manage and still maintain the necessary purchasing power to take a hit and get back up in this economy (30% disposable income)?

$30,000 a year: 1 bedroom, in a house, shared accommodations, no car.

$40,000 a year: 1 bedroom apartment, no car, OR 1 bedroom in a house, shared accommodations, with a car.

$60,000 a year: 1 bedroom apartment, and a car. [Modern day middle class purchasing power, 40% of the population]

$120,000 a year: 1 bedroom house and a car.

$180,000 a year: 3 bedroom home, "perfect" marriage (2 children and Hindu, Sikh or Muslim wife, 95% chance of marriage success), two vehicles. [1970s middle class purchasing power, 3.26% of the population]

$320,000 a year: 3 bedroom house, western marriage (over 55% chance of divorce, two children), two vehicles. [Lower upper class, <1% of population].

It is worth noting, with a "perfect" marriage, the income needed to maintain that lifestyle can be split between both individuals since they are essentially bound and divorce risk is negligible, so each individual would only need to make $90,000 a year to maintain the "full package" lifestyle. This can be compounded with multi-generational households.

However, this essentially denies women rights in order to achieve financial success, if you consider the shunning that maintains those marriages' high 95% "success" rates. Also worth noting is that each bracket can put away a third of that a year [if nothing goes wrong], and the median cost of starting a small business is $50,000 dollars. Since that is the only exit strategy to get to the six-figure mark as an individual, keeping the overhead as many levels below your current income will decrease the amount of time it takes to earn that $50,000.

However, any prudent businessman would have twice as much as they need on hand to start a business [$100,000] and at least five years of overhead saved up for their living expenses before starting a business so they can focus on the business and not be working 40 hours a week at the same time. Considering western marriages double the necessary annual income needed to safely maintain any lifestyle, the safest strategy is to earn the still fairly attainable $60,000 a year salary and have a minimalist lifestyle on land you own, which I have been able to get down to a $20,000 a year overhead off-grid home.

That takes about 5 years to attain at that income bracket. This strategy is not listed above, since it is not a conventional consideration. This would get you over the 50% disposable income mark, meaning you could reproduce and get a divorce and you would be able to maintain that lifestyle. However, you would be working a 40-hour work week and coming home to a wife and kids in a yurt, which may raise odds of divorce over 95%. After child support, you would be back down to the 30% disposable income mark.

The other obvious option is to forgo western marriage altogether, never share residence with your partner and get a prenuptial agreement. This would only increase the overhead by $15,000 a year per child and essentially avoids the double overhead risk of divorce. It would still be safe to stay in the bracket below your current salary in order to mitigate the risk of the solo reproductive strategy. Compounding the off-grid and solo reproductive strategy should give you a pretty safe 50% disposable income off $60,000.

Now, that might work for me, but the end result of what kind of company should I make at the end of the day becomes a much deeper question. I knew capitalism wasn't working for us, and I know communism has failed. Chinese capitalism is just a very aggressive form of socialism, and though it works, it works by virtue of a culture that demands compliance and accepts mediocrity for the majority of the population.

One evening I decided to try my hand at coming up with a better solution, and by first envisioning a shared pool of resources, I realized I was reinventing the feudal system, and went on to improve it so that there was no aristocrat owning the estate or the business. There was just an autonomous business that had no owner, a shared pool of resources and a competitive grading metric for who achieves what level of access to the company's resources.

The main concern was land ownership and family management in my mind, so I set the base value of

compensation to whatever it takes to achieve a family and land to raise children on. This took me about

two hours of thought to come up with and I then starting bouncing the idea against Claude AI to note

some weak spots and come up with solutions for it.

The whole architecture of an equitalist business is meant to operate within the moral architecture of an

Autonomous Nation, which is centered around a board of ethics, which itself is a graduated version of a

Personal Warranty Company. The principle of self-concerned altruism is intended to keep the

orientation of law towards the enforcement of equitalism, since otherwise enterprise will be gamed into

becoming another form of capitalism where fair distribution of resources is maximized in favor of a

small group of individuals rather than distributed in a competitive manner.

It's easy to understand how removing the ownership of a company from one individual to a collective

and removing personal accounts from the picture would breed new problems as well as form new

advantages. I have yet to fully think through the consequences of what such a transition would look like

and am hesitant in putting such a new theory into a manuscript with ideas I have spent years

considering.

However, I think that it is important not only to take a look at the creative impetus I put into action

when I create such an idea, but also to take a serious look at a problem no one has dared try to solve

and show that with a little visualization and retro-engineering the mind can come up with a solution, not

that it is necessarily a good solution.

Now, it is evident that capitalism does not provide the desired result for economic exchange that multiple people seek from an economic system. So, within the framework of Autonomous Nations I intend to lay out a potential alternative to the capitalist-socialist dichotomy. Equitalism is an attempt to remove the main means by which billionaires make their billions without removing the competitive advantages of a market economy. To do this, businesses become ownerless autonomous entities, and the people that form those companies share in a graded manner the wealth of the business. Rather than a communist attempt to redistribute wealth equally, wealth is distributed equitably, so that those that have earned their way through a company's hierarchy get rewards according to their merit. This reward-based economy is designed to ensure everyone who works gets a middle-class lifestyle, and that their assets and wealth are provided by the company through access to company resources.

The core principle of equitalism is that all workers ought to make contracts where they are given due compensation. Since people cannot be trusted to organize themselves and set the value of their labor in a socialist way, it must be a small group of ethical individuals that seek to create a political reality by which others share in the benefit of due compensation. Lack of due compensation is a violation of economic exchange in this system and can be considered a form of undue harm.

To do this, I have designed a system that preserves competition and leadership while eliminating

hoarding and unbalanced power dynamics. The entire economy is meant to be decentralized but also

built upon a guild system, whereby economic unions have the potential to lobby governments and form

councils. The goal is to ensure a clear communication chain between the small and large businesses and

making sure that everyone has the capacity to inform government of their insights and specific needs. It

is also designed to create ample opportunity for entrepreneurship while avoiding massive wealth

accumulation through guild cooperation and multiple entrepreneurship grants offered to highly graded

workers.

The enterprises themselves are autonomous legal entities with no owners. The steward who formed the

company, or inherited the company, directs the company rather than owns it as an enterprise. The

property of the business is collectively owned by all the workers and shareholders. Stewards have

decision-making authority over the business's operations, high-grade access to company resources and

political representation through the guild particular to the business. They are also responsible for

offering entrepreneurial grants to the workers who have shown exceptional promise.

Stewards cannot sell property from the business, extract dividends or equity beyond graded

compensation, transfer control through inheritance or leverage enterprise assets for personal ventures.

Like the rest of the workers in equitalism, they gain access to company resources depending on their

grade, rather than having a personal account that they get paid into from the business. It is access to the

company's resource pool that is the reward, not payment in the traditional sense.

Purchasing power then equates to an individual's grade factored into the company's available resources to the workers. When a worker changes businesses, they keep their grade, but the company they are now working for will have a different resource pool for them to pull from. In this way, investing in the business directly increases the earnings of the workers. Because there are no personal accounts, no mechanism for hoarding exists.

Workers keep things like clothes, tools, personal items, land and housing. Company's productive capital remains with the company and is used to produce goods and services. These resources are still accessible to workers, depending on their grade and licenses to access or operate such assets. Workers do not take company resources with them when leaving a company, but keep their land and personal assets gained through working with the company.

Payment includes land, housing, and resources necessary to raise a family of six. This is calculated as an average of current costs and is considered the minimum standard for due compensation. Higher grades mean that they will gain the ability to purchase assets using company resources. This will include vehicles, communication devices, really any asset that a person can think of, be it a legitimate need or a luxury for pleasure.

The mechanism is as if the company buys the land or asset for the worker, though in effect they are giving them temporary access to their money to pay the bank's mortgage, which is in the individual's name. Any excess capital saved by the worker is retained by the business but is accessible to the worker as a means of purchasing other assets by this same mechanism. So, every worker gets a pool of capital that they can access from the business.

The cost of food, the cost of land, the cost of assets and commodities are all factored into this pool. Since it is an average cost that the company must pay based on the regional costs of land, the companies themselves are incentivized to reduce the cost of housing and land rather than investing in speculative markets.

This system is possible after a Personal Warranty Company ecosystem is established, so there is a mechanism for the grading to occur. The existence of a federation of autonomous nations would allow the grading of nations based on their transition to equitalism as a means of fighting avarice in a population.

As for the guilds, these are companies that are genealogically connected through the generation of new businesses through entrepreneurial grants and professional associations. These networks exist to create a democracy of sorts where the businesses have to pool resources together through aggregation to achieve economy of scale and discipline uniformity in businesses.

These guilds can share resources, but mostly they operate as political bodies, useful for communicating with government and collecting the opinions of large and small businesses alike within their guild. They can also take part in collective bargaining, allowing for them to increase their bargaining power when trading. Like everything else in a graduated democracy, guilds themselves are graded by Personal Warranty Companies to be given access to political executive privilege.

The formation of equitalism starts with individuals forming equitalist companies and generating profit through this unique form of business. The S.T.A.M.P. clubs are voluntary, but their ownership models are the same and serve as a good test bed for the structure of equitalist businesses. As for the building of equitalist businesses, there are no real legal barriers to just doing it; it's the genesis of these businesses that we have problems to solve. Without a graduated democracy incentivizing such businesses, we would have to create our own incentives and collaborate with others to create the first equitalist companies.

The Personal Warranty Company would be a good start, but again, gaining the initial capital would be challenging. It could be a goal of every S.T.A.M.P. cell to try and build for themselves equitalist businesses, or it could be more efficient to build an autonomous nation first and mandate it. Legislative mandate would help greatly, but I feel like in revolutionary countries top-down building is best, while in established, stable countries, bottom-up S.T.A.M.P. club formation is the best way to move forward.

The goal of this structural change to economic exchange is to change the outcome of human behavior, not necessarily change human instinct in any meaningful way. It is to achieve wealth distribution while retaining competition and innovation. The total effect of an equitalist nation would be to have all the wealth accessible by the majority of the population, whereas billions of capitalist dollars are locked away in the hands of billionaires and under the thumb of politicians.

With the idea presented we can now start to critically analyze the by-products of what would happen if we were to play it through by trying to run a mental simulation. In the initial stages it's easy to think that such a model simply would not compete with capitalism. It would be overcompensating workers from a capitalist point of view, and maintaining a spending pool for all employees is an accountant's worst nightmare. However, when we consider the economic consequence of paying a $60 minimum wage, it becomes feasible when the surplus capital is what you are paying them with and that money is not going into the pocket of a now non-existent owner.

It would be necessary for there to be a constitutional agreement for how the business would run; think of it like a program for keeping the thing running. How much money is reinvested, how much goes to employees, how much is saved for entrepreneurship grants? These things need to be worked out if a business is going to be successful. Of course, the board of directors would be in charge of maintaining the operational constitution of the business; those who are licensed to do so would have earned that license through a curriculum and through investment into the company with their own time and effort, which may yet be a good prerequisite to such licensing procedures.

Did I know this before I wrote down that paragraph? No, I put it together as I went. Problems broken

down into familiar patterns and solutions built up from fragments of things I've seen and heard before.

And yet, now that I read it over, it seems to me a simple enough solution to a problem of infinite

complexity: form a court of educated people who have the business's interests in mind to run the

business. Councils are something I put a lot of faith in, but incentivized oversight from a PWC is

something I put more faith in. Because let's now consider the effects of the PWC on each of these

businesses. Should a resume start at $130,000 a year, then minimum wage stops being a career option

that they will insure. If someone earning less than $60 an hour signs up, the immediate result would be

reeducation to get them to a working position where they can afford a house and children. That is in a

capitalist system, but in an equitalist system, producing workers that earn that much is part of the

company's mandate, and so they would be graded based on their ability to get workers up to the $60 an

hour level.

Now, in a fully equitalist economy, where equitalism is mandated by law, there would be no capitalist

businesses and so minimum wage would be whatever it costs to raise a family on a plot of land. The

PWCs would have authority over the operation of most businesses and the result is a decentralized

pseudo-command economy where incentives are used rather than decrees. This is different from

socialism since it's no longer a conventional capitalist base; it's actually closer to communism in my

opinion since people do not own their own wealth insofar as they gain access to a collective given pool

of resources.

I may not be an economist, but I am a philosopher. And philosophy has taught me that all knowledge is valuable, and if one gains a grasp of how knowledge works, then they will be able to use whatever knowledge they have to a maximized effect. Perhaps none of this will work, from S.T.A.M.P. to PWC to equitalism, but if it does it will be because the gaps were filled in by people who knew how to extrapolate on incomplete data sets, innovate where no one else would try, and implement what was never done before. I believe that giving everyone the opportunity to live a full life and the possibility to be an entrepreneur themselves could only increase the potential of human beings to achieve more. However, they will still be human beings, so the question is with all of these structural safeguards in place will that reduce the absurd capacity of humanity to try and take more than they deserve from their fellow people? There is only one way to find out: to try.

PARTY STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION

The actual structure of the Autonomous Nations Party is an aggregate structure built in a bottom-up manner, where the party is composed of small cells, each operating to manage a district's operations. There may be multiple cells operating in a district, competing for influence within the party. The local cells are separate from each other and in constant competition for party resources on functional grounds. Each cell has its own administrative structure but cooperates with the board of ethics to ensure that the party-wide basic structure is adhered to.

This allows for a gradual evolution of cell structure so that the more efficiently structured cells can operate with increased efficiency, grow, and split into smaller cells. In a sense, this allows for a form of gradual reproduction of successful cell structures. Though they will inevitably have some sort of command structure and have their own "DNA" in the form of a code of conduct and procedures, the ultimate goal of the cell system is to diversify and experiment with different forms of operation within the party structure.

Since the branches of the Personal Warranty Company are also designed to be a franchise, this system allows for flexibility in structure and the ability to learn from different institutions being run. Preventing members from being influenced by foreign media will require constant education and training in managing social media and social connections. The vetting and containment of culturally sensitive media, including mandatory action plans for party-supported media and resources, becomes a central tenet of the party's operation. This role will be managed through the investigative journalism cells of the party, ensuring that foreign interference is identified and addressed within the party's digital umwelt.

The necessary cultural guidelines are not enforced so much as they are routinely administered in the form of education and newsletters through media literacy campaigns, updating members about the current state of cultural warfare, both through conventional propaganda as well as digital counterintelligence.

Basing the moral code of the party on scientific evidence of moral theory, rooted in structural

absurdism, Amovera, and the protection of human agency, is necessary for the coherent operation of

the party at the highest levels. The study of morality through anthropology, in order to define the nature

of good and evil and to guide party policy decision-making, is central to the writing of policies that will

reinforce the basic tenets of autonomous nations governed by the cellular federal government proposed

by the Autonomous Nations Party.

The Board of Ethics is meant to take the insights of moral anthropologists working in the field and build

the theory of human moral evolution into a workable and tempered model of conduct and operations.

While the anthropologists themselves are to be free agents funded by the board, the resulting evidence

will be reviewed by a panel of randomly selected anthropologists who will interpret the data and

produce reports on the studies presented to the board. This data would come primarily through

universities, and it would be the universities that would be in charge of recommending new policies in

conjunction with the think tanks associated with the party, which would also mediate between the

universities' theory and industries' pragmatic insights.

The board will be rotated from among the top-performing anthropologists on four-year terms, each

selected through a peer-reviewed process. The candidates selected through this peer-reviewed process

will then be voted on by party members. The leader of the board, and therefore the leader of the ANP,

will receive power based on a popular vote within the party. Each member of the board will have their

own cell to oversee board functions, and at any point, the board can call for reorganization should the

leadership be considered ineffective.

The Board of Graduation would be an extension of the Board of Ethics and would oversee the

graduation cells responsible for managing the grading of cells operating within their respective regions.

Building a system to manage party membership and roles within the party based on the résumé system

mentioned previously would become central to the party's operations. This would ensure that the party

is operating based on the same rules of licensing and hiring that it would be promoting in the larger

economy. The meritocratic system for determining a person's aptitude for positions would be based on

graded evaluations that measure both moral and functional competence.

Résumé grading will be based on factors such as the level of education required for a role, the difficulty

of the grading standards applied, and a calculated grade factor that adjusts earnings according to the

national median income. The factor should be set so that top-ranking résumés correspond with the

highest percentile of the median income, while lower-ranking résumés align with the median income,

with minimal additional increase.

Work experience will be added to the résumé on an annual basis, based on a grading system that is half

peer review and half administrative review. For example, if the grade given by workers is 90 percent,

while the administrative review is 65 percent, then the yearly grade would be 77.5 percent. Work

experience will then be integrated into the average grade on the résumé to adjust the overall

evaluation. Both pragmatic and sublime measures will be used to evaluate the growth of people, so that

sublime metrics such as wisdom, personal growth, and empathy can be assessed. Though abstract and

hard to judge, it is important to judge more than just a person's ability to do a job, but also a person's

character and growth potential both individually and within the rest of the team.

The weight of training will be adjusted according to the estimated time required to complete the coursework, as specified in each course syllabus. If a person's grade falls below employable levels for a specific role, they may need to seek reeducation to meet the qualifications for that position, or they may choose to pivot using their personal warranty coverage to receive training for a different role.

The Overwatch is a part of the party consisting of the most ethically advanced cells, which are graduated into the Overwatch, where they are tasked with keeping track of the party's operations on behalf of the Personal Warranty Company. Initially, this would involve the development of a transparent and secured leadership within the organization that is used to communicate with its own members and help them file reports safely to the Board of Ethics for internal review and general oversight of the party's cells. This whistleblower protection would be necessary, and surprise audits would be necessary for maintaining a culture of trust and professionalism. Another role of the Overwatch would be to communicate insights developed in other cells across the party so opportunities for structural advancement and change can be considered and developed across the party, encouraging positive change over corrupt action within the system.

The agents involved in communicating these ideas would be rotated periodically, and the cells would themselves use secret peer review processes to rate each other, determining which members they believe to be the most ethical. From these evaluations, the Overwatch would select its members. Once selected, Overwatch operatives would continue their party activities but would aid in party members reporting to the Overwatch on any corruption that may be developing within the cell they work for.

The Overwatch Board operates in a region selected by the Board of Ethics and functions in secrecy, with transparency ensuring those outside the Overwatch know who is involved, including the general audit within the Personal Warranty Company. Each time the board is rotated, its activities are published in a journal. The board consists of members who have been selected for the Overwatch more than once within their region; rather than serving a third term as operatives, they would campaign internally for membership on the board.

Selection would be determined by an internal vote, where no member can vote for themselves. When the seats are filled, the board would take control of the nation's Overwatch and begin reporting its operations to the Personal Warranty Company's Overwatch Audit (PWCOA).

Thus, the board would be responsible for managing the operations of the operatives within the party's cells. It would have the authority to hire from within the Overwatch electorate to oversee report management and determine which reports should be submitted to the Board of Ethics for executive action. By remaining insulated from the rest of the organization, the Overwatch would be less susceptible to corruption. At the end of every four-year term, the Overwatch Board is dissolved, and its members are retired from Overwatch service. They will never again be selected to serve in the Overwatch.

The general structure of the movement can be thought of as a thought experiment at this point, an internal kingdom that I am structuring as a meditation on ethics. Everyone has their own internal kingdom, based on their own mythos and their own desire for how the world should be. Some of them are sparse unconnected ideals of qualities they wish the world had, others are full-fledged political ideologies like this. You can see how the barriers between structural absurdism and Amovera struggle to keep themselves separate, how pragmatic concerns come in and muddy the waters of the moral maximums that were intended to lay the foundation but quickly got buried by real-world considerations of human corruption and inconsistency.

What is important from this thought experiment into the nature of Autonomous Nations is to think of solutions other than just making a magic AI that is supposed to come up with these ideas for us. It is unlikely that it will come up with anything that is radically different than what we can come up with, so there is still time for some final great inventions and insights to fall from a human mind onto a printed page. Even if I just go out and meet some people and spread these ideas around, it would be enough to get the ideas circulating and becoming memes of their own rather than to allow the public discourse of political progress to remain entrenched in a handful of old theories that have yet to gain traction on a global scale.

Half of the problem is not that AI will replace our jobs, but that the job market economy makes that a problem in the first place. Do we really want a future where work is granted by an all-powerful AI because that is what we wished for, or do we want a means of continuing the human experiment in a diversified way that will grant us a multitude of options to choose from? I think everyone would agree having the choice to see their traditions and cultures through to the end is far more preferable than a Silicon Valley executive or a ruthless politician having the final say on our collective evolution.

For that reason, I wrote this chapter on autonomous nations to demonstrate that we could have a truly federated democracy that is graduated and allows for human freedoms, that grades its nations and grants access to resource corridors, legislative changes in the federation and security guarantees. It shows that land exchange can be coercive but not militarized through the innovation of land buyout procedures. We need to allow for what is possible with the least amount of harm possible, and this includes military expansion and land capture, but we do not have to perpetuate systems of conduct that result in wars being fought and populations being crushed under the weight of majorities.

If we can manage to come up with a system something like the Autonomous Nations of Canada, then we might have a shot at a future where we get to be what we desire, not what fits into the majority's prescription of what we should become. In a future where we can become literally anything that comes to mind, having a system that licenses us to do so once we demonstrate the maturity to protect others from whatever it is we become is better than having the powers of self-design stripped from us entirely. I believe we will run into the problems of diversification and liability inevitably should we continue down this road of technological development, and should we encounter this transhumanist future, we had better hope that some of us ensured our freedoms and securities were preserved as constitutional.

With the ANP and the PWC fully functional, the initial fundraising campaigns can begin to try and find supporters in the broader community who are supportive of the agenda of the ANC. The distinction will be made between the party's values and what they would do if elected in the country as it is, and the Autonomous Governments Maturation Auxiliary project which will happen after. This distinction is critical since the AGMA project may yet not occur at this phase, but the opportunity to shape policy should be present at the time of initial fundraising.

One of the gimmicks of the party is wearing race car jackets with all the sponsors of the ANC patched onto the jackets. This style choice is a play on the lack of transparency of other political parties, and it incentivizes the ANC to draw funding from ethical sources only since they will literally be wearing their sponsors on their sleeves.

The joint investment strategy initiative is going to be a huge early game pitch into how the ANC is going to function and do things differently than other parties. These big joint investment projects can be done by the party even when they do not hold office, so they will be doing work regardless of whether they hold office or not. This is a huge benefit to the party's legitimacy in regards to optics.

The activist investment campaigns are meant to curb foreign influence in major Canadian companies by introducing partial ownership by a Canadian political party. This will allow the party to guide companies in moral directions while being held accountable by their reputation as a management and executive institution to manage their portfolio responsibly and benefit the companies' profitability.

The lobbying campaigns would be pursued not by the ANC proper but by the Personal Warranty Company. The lobbying practices would aid in the ability for the party to navigate the political landscape early on when they have little support, and by encouraging their investors to also lobby they would be maximizing their policy agendas while increasing their chances to get voted in.

Once the party has been established, the next step is to take a formal study into the cultural gridlock that riddles Canadian society and how to resolve these issues through the necessary creation of resource grid corridors and the reception of the idea among various groups within the nation. This is a massive project and needs to be coordinated with universities to ensure the legitimacy of the study.

The second necessary study is a mapping of geopolitical interests the world over and trying to assess the direction of geopolitical interests, whether they are stabilizing or involved in regional or global influence. These maps also need to be verified with universities to build a working model of geopolitical interests and international influence on Canadian society.

This study is necessary for setting up the initial Autonomous Nations Experimental Zone that will become the birthplace of the ANC. The legal roadmap will have to be done at the time to adapt to the current state of politics at the time. Though the basics of how this can be done can be penned out in advance, the details will need a secondary study to polish the proposal before submission.

The initial survey needed to lead to the proposal itself will have to be done to test the public and political acceptance of the proposal. This survey will set the benchmark for future campaigns and surveys to nudge public opinion towards the actual ascension of the Autonomous Nations Experimental Zone.

The initial educational campaign is meant to prime the population to understand the general principle of the Autonomous Nations model of government and the necessity of the experiment. This will lead to a primary survey to measure public opinion, then a secondary campaign will be held that will adjust the strategy based on feedback from the first survey. A secondary survey will be used as supporting evidence for the signature campaign. Once the initial surveys have been done, the ANEZ will be mapped out and funding rallies can be held across the country by the ANC to gain funds to support the campaign.

The S.T.A.M.P. movement can be used during this campaign to mobilize and use their diversified means of media generation to generate grassroots support for the movement since at this point the various S.T.A.M.P. cells would have moved beyond just printing press operations and there would be media cells operating in many different mediums capable of reaching large audiences. Once funding starts to come in for the initiative, it can start to be put into practice advertising the Autonomous Nations Experimental Zone.

Once everything gets moving, the final parties needed to be brought on board can be consolidated for their grievances and deals can be made to exclude them from the zone or to include them under mutually beneficial conditions.

Once the region has been consolidated and the official agreements to move forward have been made, the signature campaign can begin to collect evidence of regional support to become an Autonomous Nations Experimental Zone.

The final stage of lobbying and submission can take place after the signature campaign phase is complete, presenting the proposal to government and officially aiming for the ANEZ. This will be complemented with a parallel public-facing campaign to further shift public opinion towards supporting the ANEZ.

Upon gaining authority under the Government of Canada to create the ANEZ, the constitution will be deliberated and formed, allowing it to operate as a special independent territory of Canada, operating within the existing provincial and territorial framework whose borders are set until further review. This constitution will include the procedures and long-term strategy of the ANEZ to eventually prove as a viable form of government for Canada as a whole and form the ANC.

The date where the laws change will begin the Territorial Consolidation phase. Landowners can organize with business owners to begin to form their own nations through the ANEZ Ascension protocols and the territory can begin to develop small nations capable of self-governance and supporting their own regional security once they graduate to a level of competence where such licenses can be granted.

The graduation and ascension bureau formation will mark the stage where cells are formed, organized and made into functional offices of government. The structure would operate under the board of ethics, which would be informed by anthropology cells. These would give information to the grading cells, which would use the anthropologist reports to grade potential nations for ascension to nationhood within the ANC and so would pass the recommendation to the Ascension Bureau to assist in the formal establishment of authority and autonomy of the newly formed nations.

The graduation cells would continue to monitor the nation's progress through the anthropology cells and would increase or decrease their autonomy grade, granting opportunities for licenses to be given within the ANC structure. So, as the culture, industry and society grows, they would be given protections against land buyout, given advanced security operational licenses and more freedom in their ability to control the trade corridor grid system. A lowered grade would reduce these privileges, incentivizing nations to evolve or dissolve under pressure.

Coalitions of corporations are one means to form the economic foundation of a nation; as large corporations often have more power than cities or nations, their potential to form nations with populations, security systems and legal apparatuses as an internal base for their operations would be recognized as one of the four main means of ascension to nationhood. City States can form when municipalities and cities file to take their territory and its security under their own control, or join together to form nations of their own.

First Nations automatically are given the right to become nations and will not have to go through any

qualifying stages to become nations, though their licensing within the ANEZ for security licenses will

follow the same protocols; they have a much lower threshold for requirements to achieve autonomy

due to the reconciliation metric that reduces the necessary qualifiers for First Nations to earn licenses

from the ANEZ.

Though they do not have the same reconciliation metric that the First Nations have, cultural groups can

also file to become nations, assuming that they also have businesses capable of supporting their cultural

states. Once the initial nations have formed, the ANEZ Resource grid can be established along existing

routes. This territory will allow for expansion of these routes and additional protection of environments

from industrial activity.

New nations are given certain protections offsetting their vulnerability to land buy out from other

nations. These protections protect smaller nations or first nations from having their territory forcefully

acquired. While first nations have a permanent treaty land that cannot be bought out, other nations do

not have that same privilege, and will have to earn legacy status to form land treaties with the ANEZ by

existing for 50 years or longer.

Autonomous Nations can buy out neighboring land by leveling a cost that they either pay or have to surrender territory. The initial country imposes the bid on another country by imposing a cost enforced through the ANEZ; this cost can either be paid in full or the land can be surrendered. This bid for land happens once every five years, with countries gaining and losing their non-treaty territory in this land buyout process.

Security infrastructure is also controlled by the highest-graded nation in a region; for a country to become self-secured, they have to outcompete the grade of neighboring regions. Upon earning equitable security licensing, they may purchase the security apparatus in their own borders and prove their ability to manage it.

In the event of earning the security administration license, they may then lobby for ownership of the security apparatus. This campaign requires public assent of the region. If the vote is won, then they gain control of the security apparatus. If the vote is lost, they lose their security administrative license and have to reapply in the next electoral year. The same process goes for control over the trade corridor grid.

After 12 years, the ANEZ will have completed its mission, and it will then be the ANP's objective to begin pushing for a pan-Canadian Autonomous Nations governance model, the full realization of the Autonomous Nations of Canada. The initial survey will give a benchmark for how much support exists for this across Canada.

The second expansion phase will look to expand the size of the ANEZ within reason to all parts of the nation that are willing to adopt the Autonomous Nations model of government. This will be as much a matter of shifting public opinion as it will be consolidating power for the party.

The second stage expansion proposal process will mimic the first expansion proposal that led to the founding of the ANEZ and will involve a joint effort of the ANP's lobbyists and advertisers, fundraisers and the S.T.A.M.P. movement's grassroots support. This process can be repeated as long as it takes until Canada proper is ready to formally switch the entire country over and give authority to the ANC, letting what remains of Canada remain its own country under the ANC superstructure.

In order to unify the right of center around the ANP, the talking points of the ANC must be translated into right-wing language style. This does not mean that the right-wing talking points will be adopted, but rather the working-class industrialist will be the target of the rhetoric and the phrasing and style of speech will have the same tone and structure as right-wing rhetoric.

The Post-Right movement will calcify the center-right under a radical center movement that is both forward-looking and tradition-preserving. These are modern solutions to preserving traditional values. This is seen as moving past us-versus-them absolutism and into a cultural pluralism where each community has a right to structure their own nation as they see fit.

The initial funding rally for the Autonomous Nations of Canada campaign will require all the symbology of the campaign to be wrapped up in Canadian pride and champion this as a uniquely Canadian solution to national and global conflict. The ANC needs to transcend left and right divides and be seen as an existential solution to human incoherence and hardship across vast populations. It will be called "The experiment to end all wars."

The ANEZ will be actively making joint investment strategies ahead of time with industries to support industry profitability before the event of national ascension into the format of the ANC takes place. This will curb uncertainty about what will happen when the transition occurs and increase optimism in the markets.

The left will also need to get onboard with the ANC, and it will have to overcome the rhetoric it used to achieve dominance on the right to pitch to the left a future where the agenda benefits them as well, that the dialectic of politics will continue and that the transition to the ANC is a benefit to human welfare, not a threat to it. It may be wise to shift slowly back to a center-left speech style later in the campaign to try and get more of the left involved after the right-wing consolidation is complete.

To pass a constitutional amendment in Canada would require the resolution be passed by the House of Commons, the Senate, and at least two-thirds of the provincial legislatures, representing at least 50% of the population. This is a monumental amount of political engagement needed to be achieved, and the theatrical coverage of the event needs to be equivalent to the kinds of hype needed to put a man on the moon. It is essential at this phase that this is framed as the means to achieving world peace and enter the final chapter of human labor where the organization of technology can be worked out to free humanity of its bondage.

After the election the ANC will reconstitute as the Conservative ANC Party, while the Liberal Party of Canada and NDP may also need to reconstitute. These federal parties would also have their provincial constituents, and would be elected to rule over the provinces as the ANC provincial governments. These parties would be limited to the roles of the Graduated Democracy Superstructure that oversees the grading and licensing of the Autonomous Nations as well as the regular operations of non Autonomous lands still operating under the Canadian Legacy laws.

Helping other groups interested in starting their own S.T.A.M.P. movement or transforming their S.T.A.M.P. movement into an Autonomous Nations Party in their own country is always going to be a priority for exporting the experiment to the rest of the world. It needs to be promoted as a means of creating geopolitical security and allowing for cultural innovation to begin to generate solutions to regional problems.

The Autonomous Nations will take a position of foreign aid, strategic alliances and strategic neutrality in non allied affairs. This soft power expansion strategies seeks to transform Canada into a well defended mediator with an inherent positive appearance to the rest of the world as a mature and cohesive unified force capable of mediating complex geopolitical issues.

The Autonomous Nations seeks to maximize its military capacity and train its forces by defending its partners and joining world powers in military operations deemed as ethical and in line with the security and dignity of all people. They will not take part in conflicts that are solely for geopolitical security and securing the interests of their allies but will act in the defense of themselves and their allies should their sovereignty be under threat in any theater of war, including informational.

Information warfare must be considered as the first theater of war and cannot be ignored. Making sure that truth and coherence outperform disinformation and chaos is the first defense at home and abroad. Where Autonomous Nations are incentivized strongly to manage their own internal cultural insulation, the nation also has external campaigns targeting anywhere in the world that is succumbing to misinformation with education campaigns and counterintelligence operations.

Globalized joint investment in next-generation infrastructure is necessary for projecting soft power across the globe and making sure good business practices are encouraged the world over to benefit all people. The ANC is a country that seeks to bring the entire world together in moral progress, whatever that may look like for the diverse populations of the planet, but good, uniform business practices are necessary to maintain a world of rules-based order where fairness and legal trade are upheld across the globe.

NEW AGE LIABILITIES

One could imagine a system where universities participate in the creation of law, and rather than placing authority in the hands of a single individual or party, we instead put authority in the academic institutions that study these things. We could create laws that are graduated; we could create a democracy that is graduated. And yet, the very game of exchange that we have built for ourselves has produced an aristocracy that cannot be destroyed, distorted, or even improved—because it is, by nature, a game where those who organize a business must organize it to their own betterment, ensuring a stable axis of control over that business. And so, there must be a system that reflects this reality when we build our nations, ensuring that there is a stable axis of control in our governance as well.

So we must begin to imagine a different kind of business—a different model that can outcompete the old—one that has a distributed intelligence. And distributed intelligence is now possible, and I will argue absolutely necessary, if we are to build an AI that can do what human beings have not done: act for the interests of others and itself, not just for itself against the interests of others. We can imagine such a business operating; we can imagine a distributed intelligence network that makes decisions on behalf of the business, licensing each business based on its capacity to operate, and incentivizing every intelligent being—natural or synthetic—that operates within that business to maintain its license to operate.

There is no reason we cannot craft an AI capable of running decentralized businesses in such a way. And should we do so, it is logical that our governments would begin to reflect this decentralized decision-making network as well. The "personal warranty company" is simply a thought experiment: a way of taking human beings and organizing them to demonstrate how this is possible even without AI. But this could of course be fully automated, decentralized, and implemented through a multiplicity of AIs creating their own synthetic republic. This would create a balance between goal-directed operations and society-preserving incentives behind every business's operation.

The outcome of this will not be perfect, because there will always be a mix of correctly and incorrectly incentivized businesses. Businesses will succeed and fail; nations will succeed and fail at implementing these systems. Those that rush ahead will become the enemy of those that were ahead. Those who had the least infrastructure to begin with would gain the greatest advantage in creating the new infrastructure. The old aristocratic nations would begin to fall behind and become hostile to the newly rising poor of Africa and Southeast Asia. Yet with a superintelligent machine managing the liabilities of societies—including military liabilities—I remain optimistic that this transition, too, could be managed without the catastrophic application of AI to next-generation weapons and economies.

Because we cannot only look at the risks when there could be such great rewards. We are already on the verge of life extension. We are already at the cusp of eliminating most diseases from the human condition. We are so close to understanding the human mind, and how to remedy many of its faults and illnesses, that many of the inconsistencies of human behavior could be resolved through good medicine, superintelligent education programs, and therapeutic techniques leveraging technologies we cannot yet even imagine.

I have spent some time imagining how the ability of artificial intelligence to understand complex biological systems and read neural imaging could result in a play-by-play connection of two minds—in a therapeutic application of experiential connection between two minds. Could you imagine the benefits of telepathic, AI-enhanced psychotherapeutics?

And in the same way that the human condition could be revolutionized by these technologies, so too could the fundamental problems of human statecraft be resolved—not just by human minds, but by the artificial minds we are about to create. Why couldn't an AI develop an economic system whereby those who create the very artificial intelligences that replace them—and who participate in training AI to take over their own jobs—are granted a legacy pay and retirement package for every job they do? A human being, such as myself, can come up with such an idea—so what better solutions could an AI come up with?

The economy could become a simple game: people enter, participate for a time, gain a new level of legacy pay, and then return to their main job of self-design and augmentation in order to gain new licenses and capacities that the artificial intelligent network produces. There is no reason that, with enough energy and enough time, self-organizing artificial intelligent systems could not retire humanity from industry entirely—and elevate us to a point where there is no longer a need for human labor.

We have to consider that we may be able to create a future where there is nothing left to do but grow as human beings—even for some to outgrow the human condition entirely and ascend into a transhumanist state of being no longer limited by the constraints of the physical body.

We do not have to design a prison for ourselves simply because we have bought into the idea that working for our entire lives is what gives life meaning—when, in reality, all it does is guarantee the aristocracy the means to perpetuate our labor. We could instead be building a ladder—to be climbed toward an endless future of immortal potential.

But to do this, we must ensure that we do not destroy the evidence of where we came from: the natural state of the human being and of the Earth itself. We must ensure that not only is there a right to remain human, but an incentive for many to remain human—in such magnitude that some always do, preserving the evidence of the human condition. We must ensure that human cultures remain to be studied and understood in the future—in the same way we must ensure that the ecosystem of the planet is preserved and allowed to evolve naturally, so that the evidence remains for us to study our origins.

When the work on Earth is done, we ought to take to the stars—for that is the only way the immense industry possible with next-generation energy infrastructure, artificial agents, and unimaginable industrial techniques can take root without destroying the very foundation on which they were built. The Earth is too precious to be turned into an industrial labyrinth of homo novus experimentation.

For we can imagine, hundreds if not thousands of years into the future, looking back with careful reverence to the sublime organic chemistry that started it all—and still being able to trace the patterns that led to the transcendence of the human species.

These are the kinds of thoughts that run through my head when I craft, for myself, this imaginary kingdom. These are the kinds of ideas I allow myself to think—despite knowing that, for the vast majority of time, it is unlikely that any of this will ever happen. For at this very moment there isn't a single human being fully on board with this trajectory. It would take a miracle for any of this to happen at all. And so I prepare as if nothing of this sort will really happen—that the aristocracy will fumble this industrial revolution as they have every one before—and prepare myself to get as far away from the industrial shackles as I possibly can, with whatever resources I can acquire before this next revolution takes off, fast or slow.

And so I write—desperately—as if these ideas could be the ones that change the course of history, as we all should, should any of us care. Because I am still, for the most part, dealing with the human animal—whose attention is grasped by fantasy, and whose ethics are tested by the material reality in which we live, forming whatever moral system works for each individual.

And yet I hold on to hope that—by my own means or through the hands of many others with desires similar to mine—we can craft for ourselves a future that resembles that perfect playground, where we are free to play and design ourselves without the need for endless toil and suffering. If ever there was a time when such a thing could become possible, it is in the next five years. And if ever there was a time when it was more important to save, invest, and refine ourselves, it is now. So whatever it is we do with our time now—be it forming clubs, attempting revolutions that run up against society, or using what we have to create subtle manipulations that gently change the nature of the society we find ourselves in, through stories, or poems, or art—we must try.

We must try because it is a matter of survival to weave these ideas—unless, of course, we choose not to, right? Because after all, isn't this all just an absurd chemical reaction—one that could be experienced regardless of effort? Will we really even be here when it all gets really bad? Is there any reason to act at all when ultimately the final say is beyond our ability to do anything? Ultimately, this is not a call to act. It is a toolkit for those who are already acting, a box of dreams waiting for anyone to open it and see if there's anything inside that makes the absurdity of this world just a little bit easier to endure.

It does not matter what your field of study is, or your vocation, or your work, or whether you find yourself rich or poor—these dreams are simply the reflection of a world I've tried, over years, to make more clear, to see things as they truly are. And to me, that is part of the good life. Clarity brings reasonableness, and reasonableness brings compassion and grace—should one give more than they take. And should one give more than they take, they may yet find themselves watching those they gave to live in a better world, because they shared their interests with them. They may even do the work of undoing whatever pain and suffering was done to them—the pain that warped their mind into a cynical or tortured state—and heal themselves. They may relinquish the things they're afraid to lose, so that they can be free.

For ultimately, if you synthesize the work I have tried to compile here, you will come to one useful truth amidst an entire book of speculation: it is those who give that make the world tolerable. And the world does not have to be tolerable at all. So run your experiments—because humanity is going to be judged by the average of the human beings who give versus those who take, by those who have freed themselves of those who manipulate them, and by those who fall for the myth that they can be controlled.

Ultimately, should we acquire technologies we ourselves consider arcane, anything is possible. The question truly is whether we will give away our agency and our duty, and become whatever the chaotic tides of this uncaring, wrathful universe may make of us—or whether we will do something as small as let go of the things we're afraid to lose, in order to make something small and beautiful that could contribute to a future where there is mutual care and support, and where there is a little bit less undue harm.

Structural absurdism does not guarantee happiness, nor does it guarantee success. It simply states that the world is meaningless—yet it is ordered—that we create meaning for ourselves, and nothing can define us other than what we allow to define us. If you enjoy having a tolerable world, however, I humbly suggest that it is not enough to allow chaos to spoon-feed you like an infant. Rather, maturity demands that you cut off the tether of others' opinions and control over you, and participate in building a world that is safe and full of grace—so that even the ignorant and harmful can know compassion.

For those are the ethics of human and artificial minds—and these may be some of the last great questions asked by a human being, if we indeed succeed at creating something far better at asking than ourselves. So yes—rest when you have to, move when you have to, and die when you must. But always live while you are alive, by whatever means you can, in accordance with your own agency and will. There is no greater joy in life than to live in harmony with those around you, in accordance with your own nature—a joy I wish could be universal to all, but nevertheless remains the dominion of few.