

The Null Hypothesis of Politics: A Direct Republic

By Donnie Gebert

Edited by Dave Narby

For the latest version, check www.thenullhypothesisofpolitics.com

Contents

- 1. Forward: Where to Begin?**
- 2. Heresy**
- 3. Democracy**
- 4. Republic**
- 5. A Constitutional Convention**
- 6. A Direct Republic**
- 7. Rights**
- 8. The Law**
- 9. Surely, you can't be serious...**
- 10. The Legislature**
- 11. Intellectual Property**
- 12. IP in Government**
- 13. Enforcement of Contract (law enforcement)**
- 14. Diplomacy**
- 15. Intelligence Agencies**
- 16. Defense**
- 17. The Art of Secession**
- 18. Basic how-to-decentralize-your-jurisdiction(s)**
- 19. About the Author**
- 20. Afterword by the Editor**
- 21. Footnotes**

1. Forward: Where to Begin?

This is intended to be a coffee table/toilet book (The Iliad it ain't). I believe it's a conversation that needs to be had and what I hope is one of many possible solutions to a shared problem. This isn't an easy topic, it requires an open mind: one that accepts the laws of physics and the weather before forming an opinion about any of it.

What passes for 'academic standards of quality' or 'common sense legislation' these days clearly will not suffice, so this has intentionally been written more conversationally. Head's up: If you believe in social or cultural heresy, this is the only warning in the book. **Run.**

How I've decided to secure my intellectual property is to leave cryptocurrency addresses throughout the book and publish open source. This is for three reasons. It's a lot easier not including fifty middlemen in its distribution; It's a good example of how to assess a statutory mechanic like IP (intellectual property) and perform it without systemic legal aid. The second is to avoid blatant hypocrisy (that will be clearer later). The third, real reason, is that all of you paid for my education whether you wanted to or not.

My "Interdisciplinary Doctorate from the DoD" was practically given to me, all I did was show up. Charging anyone for my understanding of the political battlespace seems fraudulent and creates a barrier to entry. I prefer to be paid for working, not for sharing information that I gathered on your dime. There's "tip jar" cryptocurrency addresses throughout the publication if your so inclined.

That said, I need to start this properly:

This book is dedicated to my family, both blood and extended, who have educated and assisted me during my life and this course of study. I really do only get out of bed because of all of you.

And to my Family, Lacey, Gabriella, Anthony, and Victor: Thank you for helping this maniac every day.

I love you more than everything.

2. Heresy

Questioning the narrative in America (and everywhere else humans dwell for that matter) has always been unpopular with the powers that be. The status quo slowly changes over time, but that anything outside the narrative of "conventional wisdom" always seems to be ridiculed - regardless of the period in history. Given this, how does even one begin to examine The US Constitution?

If we examine various models of history, we can come up with some macro themes:

The ideology of a system is just its functioning philosophy; it's the stated intent of the system.

The mechanical segment is the testable outcome: the actual results that have nothing to do with ideas or beliefs. The mechanics are actually what counts.

The ideology is where the failures, excuses, misrepresentations, and lies are hidden, as they are not visual or testable in any objective way.

The relatively short human life span can be measured against the volume of history. We have available to us (at the click of a mouse) approximately 6000 years of historical data. While I only have approximately forty years of personal experience I have access to a tremendous amount of data to put to task. Let's get away from absolutes and recognize The US Constitution as positive progress, not the end-all/be-all in human organization models.

In the birth-crawl-walk-run cycle of human progress, I submit we are about half-way through crowning. The macro-societal organization systems are just starting to be understood, let alone refined. How laws come into being (and respect for those laws) has changed (and rightly so). As our system has degraded and laws were more and more easily available for purchase, laws were naturally purchased. This has led to petty, self-serving, and overbearing laws.

The overwhelming majority of these laws cannot be enforced, even if they were a good idea to begin with. When the law is debated for the gains of a few, the law isn't (and shouldn't) be respected. Unfortunately, this deserved lack of respect also erodes how average people interact with each other. Law isn't supposed to be petty or micro-managerial. If it is, it only encourages less and less civil behavior, always setting a new, even more debauched level for that which is acceptable in 'public'.

I'm personally very pro-freedom, you should be able to go home and do as you please. However, public interactions need to have a shirt-and-pants-on standard. This is where the rub begins. Because there must be some standard expectation of interaction between people, what will that standard be? The law should be the bare minimum expectation of other people's behavior - but it isn't. It's now the plaything of rich and powerful people: Because that's how the system works.

Let me be clear: You cannot vote this problem away. If you could, voting would be illegal. *The system must mechanically change to cause a different output.*

By definition change is not the "same old thing". That means you must be willing to shitcan your eighth-grade civics class. You need to be able to understand the workings of how society organizes in the 21st century. You need to look at all the pieces of those systems as if they were Legos and assemble particular systems to fix the current system where it fails, without creating new faults.

The system that was assembled in 1791 cannot function in an age where information moves at the speed of light, period. Any civil planning you think that you can get done in the current system I can thwart, obstruct, or erect toll in your world, legally, since the invention of the telegraph. Why? *Never mind why folks.* How? You don't know me. Why should I have this ability granted to me by the system?

How is it a total stranger with connections can manipulate the system for 300 million people? The answer is that the system allows for it by making some people superior to others. Everything past that is competency and funding. No one is entitled to a system. The concept that we're all working together is false. Accurately stated, we're all in the same system and that system has control levers that, without question, enable a few at the expense of the many. If you expect that opportunity to not be exploited, you're naive at best.

The system needs mechanical stops that will not allow strangers to inject themselves into your sphere of existence. *This means that all processes are performed in an on-chain transaction on a decentralized and publicly viewable blockchain OR a known human (with a name and an address, if not a verified insurance policy or personal financial stake locked in a smart contract) performs that act. It also means that the legal system has zero offensive capability. This means that no one can file suit unless they can demonstrate damages.*

The idea that someone else doesn't like your actions and can ask and/or bribe the violence monopoly for an injunction is asinine. If your actions harm others and/or destroy property, they now have everything they need to file suit. No need for opinions to have a legal purchase, just evidence.

I'm not saying competition won't push back against whatever I'm trying to do. I am saying the system shouldn't be designed to allow offensive administrative tactics against others. Defense? Sure! But I should have to show damages to file suit or have laws passed to protect me, and without that, I should not have the option to pass laws against you.

This sounds odd only due to the fanciful world of eighth-grade civics. We were taught an explicit thing and an implicit thing when we learned about the creation of legislation. Explicitly, you were told that you can't make laws by yourself and that there's a group process for doing that. Implicitly, you were then shown a process that would most likely exclude you from being able to do so. You get one vote. The end. It's presented as the only thing available to us, and if the system in place wasn't so corrupt, we might just keep it as is and never be the wiser. We are even trained to revere those that created said system despite its obvious problems.

Friends... Change comes from within. I submit that accepting this is the key to fixing our

political problems. A mirror and some tough love, that's all. If you expect another human to write laws for you, then you should expect to work for them. Does that sound unreasonable? ...Because it shouldn't.

Civilization is something you actively participate in, not inherit. Civilization won't be here unless you own your end. We must have the freedom to live the life we want without the 'gift' of citizenship cast upon us at birth. More accurately, the assumed duties that come with the said gift are the problem. This book is to show you how to work through some hard problems by asking hard questions and assembling ourselves in an intelligent, efficient, and peaceful manner.

Here are four critical questions:

- 1. What allowed the US Constitution to break down?**
- 2. What are the effects of the broken mechanics in #1?**
- 3. What happens when we remove the pieces evaluated in #2?**
- 4. By what method do we proceed once #3 has been sorted out?**

Those four questions, when answered, should produce an output of a constitutional convention (or something to that effect). Number four should produce an artifact document that you and I would most likely refer to as a constitution. So while I do not see most people objecting to engaging in this process, "How do we do that in the 21st Century?" seems to be the 64,000-dollar question. This book proposes at least one way to have a constitutional convention for an unlimited number of people, over as long a time frame as needed.

The change that I think is needed is to assemble America's legislature v2.0 in a decentralized manner. We're aiming for organization without coercive civil governance, and high economic safeguards against the use of coercion and violence, while also dealing with criminal activity or governance models. This functionally changes how elections work, how funding works, how laws are made, and how we interact with each other in the legal sense. There is more hands-on for the individual but fewer ways for your funds to be misused, stolen, or simply squandered. You deserve better, and this is one way to get it.

We need a constitutional convention. The problem is that the last time our nation did this was 1791. So much has changed that the output of that convention (the US Constitution) is no longer functioning, and the evidence is mounting that it hasn't for most or all of our lives.

Living in a post Constitutional period is more confusing than dangerous because the Constitution did its job. Post-Constitutional America is overwhelmingly peaceful, despite the few lunatics paraded on the news. This isn't about destroying the Constitution; it's about accepting that those of us living in the 21st century have a wonderful gift of hindsight granted by the Constitution. It's

about having a hard look in the mirror and realizing that we do have the ability to improve the way we do things and there is a need to do so.

The way humans behaved 200 years ago is fundamentally different, economically and socially. The systems will not change until they are properly understood and repaired in an economically sustainable way. That's all. Alter or abolish was always part of the document; individual sovereignty should have been a given but let's assume it wasn't possible with the technology that existed in the 1700s. Individual sovereignty is now technologically possible. So why not?

3. Democracy

I remember reading the definitions of direct democracy and constitutional republic 27 years ago in my eighth-grade textbook. Even then, I realized two definitions were missing from our lessons about how governments function, namely: *The text didn't contain definitions for a constitutional democracy or a Direct Republic*. I recognize now that only teaching two systems creates a false dichotomy based on our societal biases. But, I knew nothing of the topic at the time.

Back then it just seemed an incomplete comparison and my focus was broad-context (after all, I was interested in passing tests). I wasn't yet concerned with deep learning so I moved on. Two and a half decades later, I can look at this false dichotomy with a better context. I finished a career in the military. I've traveled, studied history, economics, and other cultures. After plodding through every asinine political topic under the sun, from national defense, to SJW's, to "climate change".

I found a root cause of all the emergent issues surrounding these topics. It's the methods by which they are adjudicated: the law. Specifically, the issues are explicitly not measured and tested for the validity of those ideas. They are subjected to a winner-take-all process, a plea to authority/antiquity/popularity or other appropriately fallacious lines of reasoning and processing.

The laws were pitched based on biases and rhetoric designed to keep the electorate in the dark and at odds with each other. Then, the unsound methods got piled on top. Those who understand the system happily feed off of it to wealth and privilege, sometimes to the point of terrible depravity, and for many years. See Harvey Weinstein, Kevin Spacey, Jeffery Epstein, et al.

Direct democracy is self-explanatory: you vote, and the winner takes all. This is historically known to produce the "tyranny of the majority" (per Socrates). He was murdered by popular demand for being a verbally offensive, social heretic. Sound a little too familiar?

SJW's are all about hemlock and hysteria these days. This method, voting, has a popular ideology but an unpopular reality, and both are simultaneously true. The ideology states all are equally represented if they have a vote. But the reality is that this method is how you harness the aggregated ignorance of the masses and turn it on any opponent by making them a minority, unequal by definition. One may argue that the majority may not necessarily be ignorant, but no one may argue that democracy does not create minorities. It's the nature of the methodology, not the public relations campaign of the philosophy.

The word democracy is also used in two other key instances that are seemingly designed to confuse and deflect from its nature as a backward methodology. Democracy is commonly used to describe the concepts of 'a republic' and 'the social agency of an individual'. It's not much a wonder why there is so much confusion in the political arena when the key terms and concepts in the discussion are routinely interchanged. While I understand that there are no objective definitions, there are consistent and inconsistent uses of a word concerning a definition or different definitions. This can be due to confusion. Of course, this is also called lying.

I don't find it odd that this fact pattern falls into the political arena, one that is eyeball deep in attorneys. Without a consistent understanding of how the system works, someone can be easily misled with some simple changes in language. Each one of these aspects needs to be addressed, understood and accounted for, and then systematically planned for if the problems are to be holistically solved.

To nail down a few terms and keep the discussion clear, **democracy** will only be referred to as a method of conflict resolution and interchangeable with the word voting. Democracy will not be used to reference one's social agency, nor a republic-type system. **Direct** will be just that, self-expression of a mechanic or 'self without representation'.

A constitutional republic is a far more complex idea than a direct democracy. While defining 'direct' and 'democracy' ensure high fidelity communications, they are, for the most part, self-explanatory. To understand a constitutional republic, we must first define terms.

4. Republic

The word constitutional just means "that which is contained in a constitution". It has no inherent content associated with it. One must read a specific constitution to have any real reference. New Zealand, Canada, China, N. Korea, and many others have a constitution or founding document(s). While this book revolves around the US Constitution, this argument[1] template may be overlaid on any constitutional document or artifact.

The question that arises from this is "What makes a republic a republic?" Specifically, what functions of a republic are different from a democracy? If all these countries have a constitution, are there any constitutional democracies or are all republics? What's the difference? If all republics require voting to function, doesn't that make all republics just a form of democracy?

Google[2] defines a republic as:

Republic- rə'pəblik - noun 1. A state in which supreme power is held by the people and their elected representatives, and which has an elected or nominated president rather than a monarch. 2. archaic - a group with a certain equality between its members.

These definitions are not simple and they lack precision; they require other words to be explicitly defined before one would understand what's being said in this one term. That said, the archaic is far simpler and much closer to our shared understanding of a republic.

The first definition has large "mechanical" holes in it. The terms "state" and "supreme power" can have several meanings. An explanation of how the people and the representative both hold "supreme power" would be needed. The mandate of an election/nomination process is nonexistent and unknown. There isn't an explicit and intelligent distinction between a president and a monarch.

We can get several hundred models from this lack of precision. When dealing with terms, it's not that a term must remain simple; it is that when one complex word is added, a definition can change drastically and possibly lead to several meanings. This confusion may be a coincidence but it also may be a huge and intentional fraud surface for an attorney, politician, used car salesman, etc. to use against someone.

To use the complex definition and expect specificity is a fool's errand. Too many variables are spawned by the use of so complex a definition. For clarity and specificity, we'll focus on the second definition, "a group with a certain equality between its members."

This is only vague in that it doesn't specify what the "certain equality" entails. OK, so let's make that legal equality. Can anyone argue against that? If so, then that argument is supporting the case for legal inequality. Best of luck with that! So a republic is a group with legal equality between

its members. Moving on...

With this definition, we may now compare a constitutional republic versus a constitutional democracy. The fundamentals that break down from here should make sense. A constitution that defines "a group with legal equality between its members" is a constitutional republic. A constitution that defines "voting" or "a voting process" is a constitutional democracy.

The purpose of learning this is to break down each mechanic in a political/legal system into individual items with a distinct function and remove the items that cause legal inequality. Even with these definitions, we can argue that the US is both a republic and a democracy because both pertain to what goes on in the US circa 2020.

However, if voting creates a minority, then a constitutional democracy cannot keep the legal equality of a republic intact. Someone must lose the vote. We vote for laws, directly or via representation. The more thought experiments you run along this line of reasoning, the more it becomes apparent that we live in a constitutional democracy, no matter how one makes the germane distinctions to that enterprise.

The use of a democratic mechanic, voting, is a violation of the ideas of a republic, in spirit, in definition, and fact. I'd like to be very clear: sentiments, notions, tirades, and emotional prattle do not make reality. Defining characteristics are the changes, subtle and otherwise, that allow us to communicate accurately and effectively about the attributes that make things different from one another.

Our words must be specific. We must have facts, and they must be able to be dissected to a germane level of detail. Good decision making comes from good information about what is happening. If one is to look at these issues, they are all rooted in that which is and is not legal.

You may bet your ass that the lawyers have done their due diligence in every single term to construct the half a million pages of law and regulation each of us is now supposedly stuck with. Those people did so with their own best interests in mind, not ours.

Are we just suffering from the known negative effects of democracy but changing the words around to obfuscate where the problems arise? Does the constitution declare equality for all...? But then enact mechanics to ensure that outcome unlikely or impossible? We can be certain of that last part: women and slaves were not Constitutionally equal.

OK, then how do we turn the tide back into the favor of every person's self-interest, instead of the self-interest of a small group of people who happen to have proximity to law and, therefore, power?

5. A Constitutional Convention

But whether the Constitution be one thing or another, this much is certain - that it has either authorized such a government as we have had or has been powerless to prevent it. In either case, it is unfit to exist. -Lysander Spooner

What would a modern constitutional convention look like? Better yet: What would a modern constitution look like?

The Constitution provided a legal framework for economic prosperity. As most people would measure their existence, economic prosperity is the vast majority of that rubric. There aren't too many people living in the 3rd world griping about lack of Wi-Fi, air conditioning, and trash pickup. Their existence is on a far lower standard. Those folks worry about water, shade, and illness.

To understand what's right with the Constitution, we have to give credit for what it does. It does provide us a common frame of reference. Flawed or not, we can start from this common ground. It outlines several principles by which civil society is assembled. While the verbiage has been ripped apart over the years by the lawyers, the core tenants are still there, outlining that which the government may not do.

There's a common misconception about the rights of free people; humans don't have constitutional restrictions on their behavior: the government does.

Technology has changed two relevant aspects of the government enterprise objectively: There are other organizational models available that were not available in 1791, and there are paradigms that damage the protections to the mechanics of the document, namely the speed of information. If we are looking at it from this perspective, this is a clear case that the Republic of America, v2.0, should be discussed.

To keep the synergy of human flourishing unhindered, we need to completely accept the philosophy of human rights without exceptions, including those put forth in the Constitution. The document declares freedom for all, with exceptions. We keep the freedom for all part and prune exceptions, keeping with the republic definition established earlier.

This is one of the reasons everyone needs to create their own personal constitutional convention. They must understand the processes that make civil society an end-user agreement with the rest of humanity, not a set of rules to be blindly obeyed or argued over. More accurately, the government is supposed to have restraints, but the philosophy of governmental restraint is not in effect by the mechanics put in place.

When a system designed to restrain the legal actions of a legal fiction fails to do so, it's not functioning and needs to be changed or replaced. It is these mechanics, not the philosophy of human/individual rights, that need to be replaced.

I think the Constitution is the best jump-off point for a palate of human rights in human history.

Admitting the Constitution isn't perfect isn't just honest, it's self-evident. The framers put mechanisms in place to alter or abolish it; if they thought it was perfect, there'd be no reason for that mechanic otherwise.

The founding fathers did not have the gift of our modern hindsight. We do. The hardest part of learning a new system is unlearning what you have learned. That is as difficult for every crop of humans, since forever, as is for us. It's so difficult in fact, that it's worth asking: How much of our current system is broken?

Changing the whole thing is indeed drastic and unnecessary. Surely not all of the systems are broken, are they? No. We live in a 90% solution and walking down the street I think most people see that.

However, that last 10% is beginning to destabilize the other 90%. To that end, this book is about laying out the 'how' and the 'why' one can fix a failing government before it fails for you. This book is about how to perform a damage assessment of any particular structure, city, county, state, or nation, and repair what needs fixing, like a Jetson instead of a Flintstone.

It's not just about removing the bad parts of a system. This is about sustainable solutions that adapt through time for our children, as was intended by the Constitution. We'll go through the enterprise environmental factors and demonstrate that coerced, centralized resources always create minorities and victims, and that decentralized methods of governance are not only more efficient but more humane as well.

Many folks are trying to have a Constitutional Convention. Mark Levin has touted a convention originating in the state legislatures for years. Does anyone think everyone will get invited to the Constitutional Convention? It's not logistically possible.

I do not argue that systemic changes should be avoided... But how? The "how" needs to incorporate all of the people this time, excluding no one, and making no exceptions or immunities for anyone. These immunities have allowed those closest to the law access to levels of abuse that look like the Inquisition. The hardest part of changing the system is unlearning the dogma we've been saddled with.

Every one of us has the right to participate in a constitutional convention and ensure the laws we are agreeing to are agreed upon. We also have the right to abstain from the garbage other humans want to live with and think you should be mandated to obey. Regardless of your preferences of legal structure, the cost of enforcement cannot be mandated on anyone but yourself. If you can make someone pay for law enforcement, and not include them in the formation of the payment and legal structure, all you have assembled is a complex tyranny or a derivative of slavery.

This is slavery by percentage-of-work-generated instead of slavery by ownership-of-the-person performing the work. The current US system is a milder form of socialism, seizing productivity in the form of taxes rather than the means of production. Should we have a convention?

Absolutely.

Should this be done in a manner where anyone is excluded or there are any closed doors? No. The processes discussed here are to facilitate how one may redo a legal structure without anyone moving.

Think of it as a legal Berlin wall coming down. In 1776, the representative from Georgia took a month to get to Philadelphia and a month to get back, while spending approximately two months there. This is a severe economic hardship for most people in any era. This meant that only the most affluent could afford to attend the drafting of the Constitution, the senate in Rome, or any other representative system since the beginning of history.

The systems of representation one observes throughout history were pragmatic needs of people without means. It's better to be involved in an organization that works to better everyone's prosperity even if everyone can attend in person because it's too costly. This makes the need for representatives a pragmatic one.

This is no longer needed in the 21st century. We are all one click away from Washington DC, and every other country is also one click from their government capitol. Direct participation is preferred to representation, if for no other reason than to prevent fraud.

The greatest fraud surface is the *representation*, and I submit *this is by design*. This furthers the argument that the US is a constitutional democracy; should the representatives be removed and we all voted in the House and Senate, we'd have a direct democracy. Is representation the only mechanic that makes a republic a republic? What about the Constitution? What role is it playing? If we only change one mechanic and a direct democracy emerges, is this a republic at all? How is it possible that the greatest fraud surface of all is the only thing that keeps the system from being a direct democracy?

There is a common myth that there is a separation between church and state. This is ideologically correct and methodologically false. It's true to the extent that there's no official religion in the US; it's false if you simply replace "the state" or "the government" in place of God.

Fact of the matter is, *there are no states or governments*. They are legal fictions; they do not exist. They may not be confronted, restrained, or killed because *they are not real*. They are however, represented by "officials" - and these are simply people *who have a higher legal status than you*. So much for legal equality... Those humans have legal immunities that *you do not*. "Ordained" is a more accurate description.

All the verbiage in the Constitution is designed to *produce* inequality; all the laws are very specifically tailored to articulate *who does and doesn't get immunities and for what*. The theory is that those immunities granted by law will not be abused (this turned out to be a piss-poor theory). This "hope it doesn't get abused" should be contrasted with "cannot be abused *by design*", a specific measure to ensure that something doesn't happen, or is very unlikely to happen by way of tailoring the process correctly.

I see the acceptance of a strategy as a voluntary act, not a mandatory truth. You may do it one way; I may do it another. The problems arise when one of us is forbidden to try our own method, for good or ill.

Like many, I've learned more through failure than success. To deprive people of that type of learning is not only inhumane, but it's also the patriarchal shenanigans the Left gripes about (and they are right to gripe). As Yoda said, "Pass on what you have learned; strength, mastery but weakness, folly, failure also. Yes, failure most of all. The greatest teacher, failure is."

The goal is to provide a strategy for the individual to have a seat, attend a constitutional convention, and sign all the necessary documents themselves. That is the description of a "contract law society"; in other words, everyone signs the new constitution. The goal is achieved when the reader understands it is now possible to act as their own representative and make the changes the political system has failed to provide, for themselves. Changing the political system through educated attrition and individual responsibility is the preferred outcome and goal.

How to do this? First, using a decentralized method to assemble the convention leads to questions like "What rules must everyone adopt to even have a relevant convention?" Similar to the assembly of a decentralized legislature, centralization only occurs around the relevant issues to maintain peace and defend rights and property. We only need to remain civil and productive in a convention.

We need not be in agreement, upfront or at all, about anything else. Because these functions are so similar, sequential, and the organizational process flows better, admission to the convention and the republic are bundled. You can't murder or rape as a member of the republic or the convention. No point in not signing up for both up front.

At this stage, you are done. Easy, right? An a la carte constitutional convention boils down to joining a contract law society by agreeing to not murder, rape, steal, and/or commit to do no harm. We all sign our own John Hancock at the bottom. This is the only portion that everyone does.

The rest falls into your legal structure, which you'll assemble when you need to. The constitutional convention was just a meeting of the minds on foundational issues. Once individual rights are covered, there are personal and logical delineations that cannot be templated. Should those decisions be made for you, the 'legal equality' of a republic would be askew. Exact solutions are tailored by and for the individual. I'll provide examples in later chapters.

6. A Direct Republic

There isn't much talk in *The Art of War* about *why* one goes to war, just the principles revolving around *how*. This is very telling about the enterprise; it's not about why. It's about how. The fundamentals of how one solves a problem revolve around the enterprise environment factors of success and the strategy and competency of execution; there is no right or wrong way to perform X. The goal is X and it's complete, the end. A phrase I picked up in the military sums it up nicely "If it's stupid and it works, it's not stupid."

This is not an ends-justifies-the-means argument (although it can be read that way). This is just a statement of fact: If you Rube Goldberg a solution into play, as long as the machine was assembled correctly, your end state will be met. You cannot blame a farm combine for taking off your arm, only your ignorance about what would happen when placing your arm in the combine. *How* things work versus *how and why* you want the machine to work have no inherent connection.

This book is not meant to throw shade on anyone else with an idea on how to reorganize things and/or "fix the system". It is designed to argue with those systems, which are typically coercively centralized models, and lay out an organizational method called a "Direct Republic". This argument is not meant to be ideological, but rather mechanical and functional, like a fire escape plan on the wall. This book isn't really about why (though there's a lot of that thrown in), it's about how.

The real issue revolving around politics is that at this point, there is a single, *mandatory* "choice" made. A false dilemma, Republican or Democrat social decision, and then *legal immunity* for the actors. We have one bucket of funds, taxes, and now we fight over whose way should be spent, and who should be immune from legal recourse.

There is no good reason for this. Maybe a historical argument can be made that there weren't enough resources in yester-year, and something that sort-of works, is better than two or three or five failed works. Fine, but that argument is no longer valid, because we live in a time of vast resources and productivity. We no longer need to have a single focus in our mutual efforts; there's no need to share (and fight over) a single resource pool to accomplish societal functions.

Compromise is not the best method of conflict resolution if all do not agree to said compromise; this is how you damage a functional model with methods that you and I would avoid in person. Congress is my running example for this.

All processes have facets or "surfaces", by their nature. This describes a structural member of a process or an organization to which I can attach something, like flesh on a skeleton. By looking at the system structure, you will start seeing how processes can go afoul, intentionally or through honest error. Also, someone is looking at every panel in the Ikea diagram of those process, looking for ways to exploit it. That's just life.

For example, if a mayor has the privilege of doing city business behind a closed door, you'd best hope he's honest *because that closed door is a huge fraud surface*. Should the mayor need a safe space to conduct public business? Nope. Public business and bids should be just that: public.

Everyone knows you have no expectation of privacy in public, yet public positions routinely come with immunities for behavior and process that provide the ability to commit fraud. If these positions were that of a private enterprise, *the other members of that enterprise would never allow that position to exist without a higher order of transparency*. It's bad business practice and a fraud opportunity that coworkers wouldn't bet their paychecks on.

With government, it's the *design of the system*, and *no one is incentivized to stop the nonsense*; they're given pensions to *not* know and *not* find out and *not* fix the problems. A project can have several successful methods to fulfill the goal. Why not have separate mechanisms, to each their own? Let the Democrats participate in one method, and Republicans participate in another.

While this may sound a lot like overly-passive conflict resolution, it isn't. This method is allowing cold, hard reality to be the opponent, not another group of people. Pick a topic, any topic, and you get differences about how to solve a problem. Republican solutions, Democratic solutions, Green Party solutions... Everyone has an idea. Why do these ideas have to share resources?

Why isn't each solution specific to their own party? Why is the law used as the battleground for a single, universal solution? It's not necessary. The law can define how two systems can coexist.

I cannot tell you how every group will solve every particular issue. Different solution sets present themselves to different people. Democrats, in different geographies, e.g. California vs Massachusetts, will use their own environments and resource pools as they see fit, and there is no inherent need to standardize. No one can guess what local solutions will look like, because no one knows better how to solve local problems than the locals do.

I can say that when all parties fund their own solutions, and agree to let the others to their own solutions, *competition* will determine the outcome, not the law. The law needs to prevent all the conflicts it can and structure the more difficult issues on a case-by-case basis. It cannot and should not structure all conflict, as if by holy writ.

For example: Democrats typically fund education and Republicans fund national defense. As a rule, each party has their own stance on the issues. Why not get out of each other's way? Why not have separate DoEds and DoDs for Rs and Ds?

There's a fiscal hostage situation, used as political leverage. "I paid in so I get a say." is a legitimate complaint, more so when forced to pay. While I cannot comment on all the potential outcomes of this method, I can say that when you are only paying for the social programs you use and/or desire that your contribution was yours and the outcome was yours.

If it was too expensive, that is the feedback you need. If there was damage caused, you may be held as an accomplice held responsible for cleanup. Involvement isn't always positive but that was your choice, and you can leave that organization after that situation has a resolution.

However, the real effect of a Direct Republic has implications on multiple facets. It's not just a less-conflict prone method. It removes middlemen, which are the greatest fraud surface, *and the immunities they give to themselves*. It is also, de facto, the process of decentralization.

The most important feature is the removal of the go-betweens and the immunities the legal system(s) give them. You want your power back, without a political vacuum? Fill in your part with your part... No vacuum!

So a more complete definition of a Direct Republic, as assembled here is: A forum of debate and presentation with legal equality between its members that resolves conflict through explicit voluntary contract.

The current model of the Constitution has two parts to be understood in their own spheres of influence, ideology, and mechanics. There aren't too many people left arguing with the ideology: Human rights are here to stay, and the constitutional rights palette is based on human rights. The problem is that the Constitution's mechanics are flawed. A Direct Republic is one method to fix that.

7. Rights

First, let's tackle Rights Philosophy to understand what human rights are, in the context of constitutional rights. Why wouldn't constitutional rights mirror human rights? This was odd to me. The Bill of Rights has been paraded around as if those are a list of our rights. They're not.

Those are supposed to be government restrictions. Turns out, rights just describe human liberty. It looks like the Hobbesian "state of nature", a naked human in the wild, alone and hungry. ...*Freedom!*

To list everything a human can do, objectively, involves every action you can do alone and every voluntary action you can do with another human. That's a huge list. So large, in fact, that it's easier to invert the idea and list it as a single right: the right to abstain.

--The right to abstain: the basic human right to not participate in an act to which one is not directly involved, a voluntary participant, or a catalyst.

All rights fit into this singular maxim. Let's look at "the right of free speech". This right has no physical restrictions; one may talk to themselves all day. This is commonly meant as shared speech, not just the act of speech.

OK, so the qualifier is that other people are involved. What does speaking do to another person? Nothing, save communication. Every argument against free speech or limited speech revolves' around the claim that the reaction to that speech is harmful, in some way. This breaks down further to two basic examples, "hate speech" and "yelling fire in a movie theater".

When it comes to "yelling fire in the crowded theater", I'm going to shamelessly steal an excerpt from Murray Rothbard's *For a New Liberty*:

"Consider, for example, the classic example where liberals generally concede that a person's "right of freedom of speech" must be curbed in the name of the "public interest": Justice Holmes' famous dictum that no one has the right to cry "fire" falsely in a crowded theater. Holmes and his followers have used this illustration again and again to prove the supposed necessity for all rights to be relative and tentative rather than precise and absolute.

But the problem here is not that rights cannot be pushed too far but that the whole case is discussed in terms of a vague and wooly "freedom of speech" rather than in terms of the rights of private property.

Suppose we analyze the problem under the aspect of property rights. The fellow who brings on a riot by falsely shouting "fire" in a crowded theater is, necessarily, either the owner of the theater (or the owner's agent) or a paying patron. If he is the owner, then he has committed fraud on his customers. He has taken their money in exchange for a promise to put on a movie or play, and now, instead, he disrupts the show by falsely shouting "fire" and breaking up the performance. He has thus welshed on his contractual obligation, and has thereby stolen the property — the money — of his patrons and has violated their property rights.

Suppose, on the other hand, that the shouter is a patron and not the owner. In that case, he is violating the property right of the owner — as well as of the other guests to their paid for performance. As a guest, he has gained access to the property on certain terms, including an obligation not to violate the owner's property or to disrupt the performance the owner is putting on. His malicious act, therefore, violates the property rights of the theater owner and of all the other patrons.

There is no need, therefore, for individual rights to be restricted in the case of the false shouter of "fire." The rights of the individual are still absolute, but they are property rights. The fellow who maliciously cried "fire" in a crowded theater is indeed a criminal, but not because his so-called "right of free speech" must be pragmatically restricted on behalf of the "public good"; he is a criminal because he has violated the property rights of another person."

I will add to Rothbard's argument by adding a related aspect, methodology. Socialism is an ideology that is antithetical to property rights; its central tenant is to "seize the means of production". By making the concept of speech a "public commons", two things happen. The first is that someone else may determine which speech you produce by law; they may not have total control over the production but they can direct it in a safe direction away from their interests, with cops if needed. E.g., this document could have gotten me imprisoned or killed in other places and/or periods of history.

(To prevent this material being shelved by intellectual property law and for my own safety, I released this book open source and passed it around as fast as possible. Should someone shoot me now, more people find out about the free material. *Safety first campers.*)

The second is that the speech then suffers from the tragedy of the commons; no one is accountable for that which they produce because the law made them immune, so the standard of what's acceptable becomes arbitrary and selectively enforced while the quality becomes real shit. I think the socialization of human rights yields this in all instances. It's just more obvious when it does so with an economy and destroys prosperity.

Hate speech is the easiest to deal with; it's discourteous or rude. While this changes from place to place and culture to culture, there is no way to prevent this. There isn't any intelligent reason to try. It's logistically impossible even if you want to. There are not enough enforcers to police these acts and any attempt to fund a force that size will go broke. Never mind the "who will watch the watchers?" discussion. It's math.

I am not dismissing the ethics of all the people who think "hate speech" is a thing. I am stating that there is no way to stop this in reality and anyone promising to do so will be logistically incapable of performing anything except selective enforcement. That selective enforcement will be aimed as they please, not as you think it should be - The end.

My two cents: Get over it. People say stuff. Regardless of your stance on hate speech, it's impossible to stop it and any attempt to enact a form of prohibition will only be used against some people, minority populations. Hate speech is a trap. The effect of this method is to prevent

a decent discussion/argument from spreading, and chilling people from sharing certain ideas by emotionally or legally manipulating and/or discouraging the proponents of "hate speech" without consequence, and instilling the fear of retribution in those who speak.

When applied to hate speech you get certain ideas not to be spoken, let alone discussed and evaluated for nonsense and chicanery. If one gives a brief look at any topic that one can describe as hate speech, you'll find a robust reason your politicians do not want that thing spoken about, or only spoken of in a narrative they desire. It really is that easy to confuse people once they are emotionally involved.

JP Morgan said: "There are two reasons someone does something, the good reason and the real reason." The reason "hate speech" gets attention is because it makes the politics inflammatory, hard to manage, and easy to dominate the conversation with emotional manipulation. As long as those topics only have one acceptable dialogue, the conversation is safely contained.

When examined, the arguments fall apart and the topic shifts back to the inability to legislate said topic. When does a politician want to tell you reality doesn't allow legislation on such a thing due to logistical impossibility? *Never*. They will instead lie to you and have some proposed legislation hot-off-the-press to ensure their role, and pension, in a solution.

The more one approaches the study of rights, the more the topic comes back to the right to say "no" for yourself, and with no law empowered to change that. To ensure this feature was preserved, it came to me that law needs to be modular and personal and that each feature needs to be mechanically inseparable from the system. By doing this, the Constitutional/human rights would be absolute.

I do not see the current system capable or even interested in change. I see a population ready for change, without a plan. That plan has to work for everyone, from all points, simultaneously.

This is where I throw the gauntlet to those who complain and to those seeking change; this is how it must be done. Otherwise, a minority will be created, harmed and/or exploited, and the cycle of failed models will begin again with a new group of human victims that will fight back, not comply, and feel entitled to use violence and/or seize some means. When failure is in your house and your lap, scapegoating gets very hard.

Who's the best person to protect my rights? *Me*. Who's the best person to protect your rights? *Me*, again (nothing personal, I'm better at this stuff than most). But that poses a problem for *you*.

I'm busy. I cannot be there for you but even if I could, I can't be there for everyone who reads this book. It's logistically not possible to do all that and admitting that the government is in the same position is a big help in getting to real solutions.

The simplest analogy I have for this is to think of a game like World of Warcraft. I'm experienced at the game, I have the tools and level to prove it. If I could change the game to help a Level One player spend the maximum amount of time progressing and learning in the most efficient manner possible, I would give them my high-level armor, and no weapons. The armor will allow them to

rarely die but they cannot progress faster than their skill level allows.

To translate this into a legal structure, I'd need to design the rules to outfit everyone the same, maximum armor, and no weapons. The legal system isn't supposed to crush or grief you for being inexperienced.

To an extent, we can make some parts of the law so difficult to get involved with that novices cannot apply and ensure that the less-experienced are safe from themselves until they demonstrate competency. The rest is a learning and participatory structure that you cannot get dragged into and forced to subsidize.

That's the functional understanding of a Direct Republic that I work with. I can't solve your problems for you but I can get everyone out of each other's way so each can understand their own bailiwick. How you clean up your intellectual knowledge gaps and fiscal societal slippage is your choosing.

8. The Law

A Direct Republic produces a vehicle by which The Machinery of Freedom may function. In his book, Dr. David Friedman, son of Dr. Milton Friedman, makes the case for market-based systems of law[3]. The technology to deliver this methodology is in production or use as this book is written.

These new blockchain, peer-to-peer systems are a vehicle which can produce quality decentralized law and legislatures, tailored to the individuals' need. A modular system allows for different people to engage in different degrees of law without further social involvement and/or subsidy. Everyone must agree to the constitution/basic contract. While this sounds forced, it isn't.

Anyone unwilling to agree to and/or allow human rights is, by any intelligent definition, not civil. That's why it's imperative to leave the basic contract as small, yet specific, as possible and add no duties upon anyone; Conservatives call the maxim "do no harm". Liberals call this maxim "live and let live" or "give peace a chance". Libertarians call it "the nonaggression principle". Socialists call it "punching a Nazi".

High time to be a lil' anti-social, methinks. It's not about placing ideological or nationalistic duties upon anyone. Treason is a nationalistic notion better described as a breach of contract, except treason requires no contract. It assumes you had a duty to think/ behave in a certain way by birthright.

Military members sign a contract; they are liable for something like treason. The average human on the street cannot be assumed to be "loyal" to anything. Remember, the mechanics of treason looks like changing your mind. Unless you agreed to something beforehand, it's imperative everyone has the freedom to change how they think and why.

We can address the "might makes right" elephant in the room right here. In The Machinery of Freedom, David Friedman demonstrated how the interactions of property rights, including physical harm as your body, is a type of nontransferable property, that human (and even non-human) species recognize as territorial boundaries and defend them, with violence if necessary.

Each participant in the altercation understands that they may be wounded or die if the escalation in a conflict arises to violence. In theory, a cost ROI is done where the defender will need to put it all on the line because they cannot lose all they have to an aggressor, which is subjectively true; some folks will die if an aggressor takes the last of their food, money, shelter, etc. They must defend with their lives, if necessary.

The ability to take is not how our species adjudicates. Unlike the animal kingdom, we have a unique ability to reason through the conflict and the option to not physically adjudicate everything. This doesn't work with those who "cannot be reasoned with", aka not civil humans.

I think we can make it explicit here, to Hell with those who cannot manage to keep their hands to

themselves, be they tyrants, shoplifters, or socialists. Individual productivity and innovation are how humans progress to greater levels of prosperity. Anyone who cannot agree to "do no harm" can't live here. They cannot be trusted to be civil.

However, there aren't that many real socialists, and the violent group is so small that I'll assume that agreement to the basic constitution/contract is all but a forgone conclusion. Also, this system doesn't prevent socialism, as defined by a Socialist. They may practice economic socialism w/o borders, simply by knowing the in-network socialist venues. They may not "seize" any "means".

This system weighs all the incentives of civilization for the cost of a signature. My friends, *the most dangerous group are the dishonest*. They will lie and sign the contract... And be dealt with later, as is the nature of criminals.

With the violence issue addressed, we can agree that all violence should now look like the defense of one's self and property (self-enforced and/or by contract), or crime. Again, it's not that all the systems in use today are trash. It is to say that these systems are a source of corruption and fraud in all of our lives when the enforcers experience immunity, especially for violence.

The remedy is to make those structures voluntary, a la carte, and accountable. Some cities have fired their police. Did real crime disappear? No. The statutory nonsense went away and "crime" dropped. Statutes don't help keep the peace, and your local cops are only willing to have peaceful interactions unless they need activity points. They are incentivized to harm, so they do.

You didn't think "speeding" and "tail light out" were actual crimes, did you? These are excuses for legalized theft, nothing more. They serve no social purpose and are the cottage industry of a nanny/tyrant state. However, they are executed by "just doing muh job" types and that is not the guy you need on the watch (e.g. see Broward County Sheriffs, not even trying to stop a school shooting).

Police services are also "bundled". Bundling is the process of taking something positive and something negative and offering them as one inseparable product. 9-1-1 service sends a cop to every scene, regardless of the need. "Safety first" isn't *efficiency* first and there's no reason fire and EMS cannot do their own security; they certainly have the right to defend themselves.

Fire is more a function of your homeowners' insurance than the state anyway; funding EMS can also be done under homeowners, medical insurance, a la carte payment, subscription, or any combination thereof. The sky's the limit when you and a vendor agree to a service that is delivered to you. The cost, service, and methods delivered are not up to you when some politician figures in his pay and pension in before any problems are addressed with a finite budget.

Addressing law with modular, unbundled solutions also ensures that NAFTA and TPP type laws only pertain to the players, not an entire population. The upsides and downsides are experienced by the players only. This is how successful ideas are allowed to flourish and garbage ideas are allowed to fail.

Also, the twisted logic used to place blame becomes very difficult to transfer to the "opposition". Your structures will succeed or fail based on the contributions and actions of the in-group. There's no legal standing for out-of-group actors to take land and resources, interfere with the administration, or interject subversive methods into the in-group organization. At worst, a Direct Republic is "calamity isolation" via "compartmentalizing disaster". Again, the feedback gained through the isolation of an idea allows the actors a greater mastery of the enterprise environmental factors.

Maybe your city cannot afford a fully-functional fire department. How does that failing system get remedied? Do people pay more, or do they choose to live without? Will they be able to get fire insurance? Will the insurance company(s) subsidize the fire company to lower that risk pool? The methods used by the state to answer these questions don't, nor do they provide sustainable solutions. Borrow, inflate, and refinance is what they do.

The dollar unpegged from gold before my birth and is just starting to see the end of its life cycle. The inflation hiding tactics (like hiding the inflation in the stock and housing market), have given the dollar life far past what it should have, and the rising housing prices allowed the state to collect more taxes. They hit up over a quarter of a billion people by stealth taxation, coming and going. How convenient.

A system life cycle (such as a fiat currency system) that lasts as long as a human life is not only difficult to understand, but hard to argue with when it appears to work for so long by one person's reckoning, even when it's leaking fraud the whole time. This is done carte blanche by the politicians to silently rob people through systemic weakness.

Un-bundling law and government services allows people who lead simple, unsophisticated lives to only deal with the amount of law they need, when they need it, as is their human right. International trade may be the realm of lawyers because the settlement and adjudication agreements are bound to be complex, if not multilingual. The methods of risk and trust one may want to engage in are not objective and shouldn't be standardized by strangers, let alone weaponized as the law has become.

The next several chapters will address the decentralization of other monopolized government services into unbundled, modular issues. The Constitution has provided a runway for human prosperity for the last 200 years. The dogma surrounding the document is simultaneously richly earned and oversold. It has set in motion a paradigm where human rights have flourished to a greater extent than anywhere else. Yet, at the same time, it's left some people behind.

It's important to remember during this process that this book is, at no point, saying "The Constitution is trash." It is saying there are broken mechanics that damage the mechanism of its philosophy, and those can be addressed without losing the gains to human rights, prosperity, and general human flourishing.

Can you write law? Nope. The law forbids it. How convenient. How's that work? An involuntary

contract, the Constitution, signed hundreds of years ago by strangers, whom we've been taught to love, is binding upon everyone for good or ill until forever? Again, this is not about ideology or throwing shade. This is the current mechanical foundation of the system.

When you get past the sales pitch, you can see how this process is mechanically flawed, even before you read it. This is both economic and intellectual socialism, in one document. It's the cracked foundation that authoritarianism brings to any process. I know a lot of constitutionalists that don't like realizing their document has been tainted with socialism. This is Marxism, 30 years before Marx was born.

I'd like to be definitive with this: *This is by design and meant to exclude the masses to be abused by a few.* Please do not be so naive as to think the public servants are unaware of all this. The current system is someone else's solution for us, all of us. There are far too many coincidences and similarities, at this point, to conclude the incidental channeling of power and immunity.

The clergy of the Catholic church has used its position to shuffle sex criminals to new locations for centuries; the government has begun doing the same thing with its chosen players such as Dennis Hastert, the former Speaker of the House, and the (recently, conveniently & unbelievably dead by suicide) Jeffrey Epstein, Bill Clinton's sex-trafficking concierge, to name a two recent ones.

The foundational concept of current law is intellectual property. Intellectual property is the concept that an idea belongs to someone, exclusively or exclusive in some aspect. A common example of this is copyright law. An original author is granted, by law, exclusive use of his work for varying durations depending on circumstances, defined in law. (Logistical feasibility is not a required characteristic of legislation, lol).

Another example of this is you may not engage in a certain topic/process, making law, because there's a law that says you may not, making you a less-than-equal party in humanity. There are two issues with the IP nature of law. The first relevant IP concept is that US law assumes you may not write law. The IP is reserved for the legislature outlined in the Constitution. The law should not assume this inequality in the formation of law; it's a logistical concern. The second assumes IP law is a valid construct that can be applied and enforced equally for-all, regardless if that is possible or not. Logistically, the law cannot violate the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics even if the process of making it is properly followed.

The interesting delusions come from legislation that cannot function/be afforded, yet got past an entire legislature. I find no harm in assuming that we'd all like to see everyone everywhere flourish, just not at our own expense. I don't spend volumes of my time and labor improving my life and that of my family so that it can be taken and given to someone else.

When I have excess, I give what I can, to those I can. I also fully understand that no one group of people has the perspective to have a successful "War on Poverty". The idea is fundamentally flawed, on its face.

Poverty cannot be killed; it's caused by the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics and will always exist until overcome by work. "Work on Poverty" doesn't quite focus group the same. I know, saying that wars should end is heresy in 21st century America, especially coming from an old warhorse like me.

While I do understand there's a time and a place for war, how modern Americans accept and declare said event is not done in a manner in which Sun Tzu would approve. It's also why all of America's wars in the 20th and 21st centuries have been abject failures for the little guy that those wars were supposed to protect. The American taxpayer lost all the wars, even the ones that were "won".

Those granted immunity by law can be inhumane, inefficient, and extremely dangerous, sometimes by design. The people placed in these positions believe they can commit acts in the name of "the greater good" or "the law" (see "Madeline Albright's reaction to the notion that 500,000 Iraqi children dying to sanctions and saying "We felt it was worth it."").

The cell phone camera revolution has shown the methods employed by law enforcement and government actors in general. These methods operate in a legally and financially immune paradigm. The department is insured for X amount, then the city, the taxpayer, picks up the rest of the tab. It is almost unheard of to make the individual government employees pay for their own mistakes.

When a cop knows that his own house or pension is at stake, maybe their behavior and demeanor will change. Or, maybe their occupation will change, or perhaps some of both. Either way, the individual accountability for one's actions needs to be the standard for any claiming to be a protector and certainly does not include legal and financial immunity. *The law having exceptions of such a nature creates the problem.*

We bicker over the symptomatology of how or why someone should do something about X, regardless if anyone knows anything about X. This is an inefficient decision-making model, at best, and the common excuse is "Well, that's the system". Despite political candidates running on platforms of change, that's not what the system is geared for. Therefore, that is exactly what has changed. Nothing.

This is what we are seeing in the unraveling of law; immunity for actions, despite those actions being otherwise forbidden. It's obvious when a police department investigates itself and declares "no wrongdoing". Never mind the obvious conflict of interest; they change the words around, as another layer of chicanery. They do not say "The officers did not violate any statute or commit any crime." And the legally nonsensical term "wrongdoing" is used. This means they are not lying when they say the cops did commit a crime/statutory violation. They are not lying because they didn't say it, they said wrong doing. That's what makes it ok and best of luck doing your own investigation.

Criminals are not referred to as "wrongdoers" when there has been a violation of statute; they are

called "suspects", "detainees", "violators", or "criminals". Why isn't this language used about state/government actors? Unless they are being thrown into the system, they are spoken of in generous and non-suspicious terms. This is the first layer of covering for themselves without recourse to the customer/taxpayer, save an armed revolt. Does anyone wonder why public officials are allowed to hide their addresses?[4] I don't.

They stick the bill for their livelihoods, pensions, and security to you, and the law says you will pay it or feel its wrath. This is the mechanical immunity that needs to go away, forever. That's more than just a legal change: it's a cultural one, but it's one that is well underway. The #walkaway and #unrig movements exemplify this.

The result of the current system is a process of representation + democracy = centralized power. The same power that we overwhelmingly agree is best not in the hands of an angry mob, is now in the hands of an unaccountable few. The nature of humanity will make those few imperfect.

The machine breaks. The portion of what you and I see in any system is its actual function, not the beliefs or convictions of those involved. There is no real argument past this; if a Kookoo clock is designed to release a bird on the hour and it doesn't do that, it's not a matter of likes, prayers, hopes, or shares. The clock is broken.

No need to commiserate a broken clock, it's fixable. It's not fixable when you refuse to open the clock, look at the inside, determine the root cause, and take the actions that will remedy the why-doesn't-the-bird-pop-out-of-the-clock issue. It's also not fixable when broken items are illegal to replace. Again, how convenient... There are humans you cannot harm but, by law, they may harm you.

As long as this is what we accept as equality, the systemic shenanigans will persist. This is where I will suggest everyone read *The Art of War* by Sun Tzu. I recommend this for everyone because the book is not just about what warfare looked like thousands of years ago. It's a guide to holistic problem solving without ideology. It's not about *why*, it's about *how*.

But what about the rule of law, you ask? The law is made by a few. It's more accurately stated "the rule by those who make the laws". That's not you or I. At some point, the goal is simply to exhaust you into accepting the system as it is.

Remember, as long as the Rube Goldberg machine is put together properly, it will succeed. If any point one of the vital pieces in the machine is removed, it fails. This is the difference between winning and losing. In this case, we've all lost our human freedom and have been told it's "for the greater good". In reality, it's to turn each one of us into a fractional-reserve slave in a legal system that feeds a small group. As Carlin said, "It's a big club and you ain't in it".

It's not about genders, races, or religions. It's about state actors and your perceptive biases. The organizational structure is designed to turn the entire landmass into fifty-one tax farms, with some smaller subdivided tax farms under the federal and/or state bailiwicks. This mechanic, the tax system, is the vehicle of state success. You must pay for your demise and their pensions are

just sugar on top.

Because you have to pay for these job positions, there is a synergy against you that is hard to beat. To fight against the tax system is a great economic loss to you. You are paying your opponent to fight you while you fight for your side. You have to financially fight for both sides at the same time.

If your opponent had to fund their operations, they'd never get out the gate because you aren't their funding source anymore. This logistical capability is superior to your logistical position. That's math. It's also philosophically obtuse; why can't you make someone else fund your operations and lifestyle? The statutes say so. How convenient.

The state claims you owe money for being alive here. If you hold the title to real estate, you own property tax, regardless of the use of services. This is the fraud surface the state actors require to exist. They sell this as "community". Organization doesn't require the state but it does require resources and coordination. Businesses cannot put you through their doors at gunpoint and demand you buy something. This mechanic makes the legislature a bank for public money and favors.

This is the reason it pays so well to be a lobbyist. While it may take two years to get a ten million-dollar grant, three million of which you will have to kick back in some manner, you will net three and a half million a year at the end of those two years.

This is the advantage of economic centralization; as a representative, there's a honey pot to attract the people you want to chat with to you. Politicians sell economic and legal privileges. This is the cycle that must be broken.

There is no intelligent argument against absolute economic freedom. One may confiscate the property of anyone arguing against economic sovereignty because the person arguing for it thinks it's OK, right? What right do they have to complain? It's their idea and method, after all.

The immunity from one's own ideas is the only thing that keeps the charlatans and their brain-dead followers in business. Declaring "I'd happily pay taxes" blows up in your face when you are the only one paying. What they mean is "I'm happy to see you taxed and this program funded. Sure, I kick in too but I require someone to be forced to kick in more, because the program won't get off the ground with just the in group to pay for it."

This is the nature and vehicle of socialism. In this case, it's publicly subsidized ignorance and/or preference that simultaneously declares property rights for oneself but not for others. This shared-misery ethic is politically rampant.

Legal reform is political reform. This is the needed understanding for you to address your issues with "the system". While you may not like the legal system, expecting others to fix it is exactly what is done now and why it's garbage. This is why a DIY legislature is the only sound way. It's to ensure you don't end up with *my* bullshit at *your* house.

9. Surely, you can't be serious...

This is not a slight against religions. Religions are voluntary and one may change religions without moving your house, job, and life[5]. States and governments are involuntary and you may not change without running away. Religions are not inherently violent; states/governments are.

This has nothing to do with the ideas behind the religions or the states/governments. It is 100% linked to the methodologies they employ. It is widely accepted that religious ideology is not a legitimate reason to murder and pilfer. It's mostly the opposite of state/government ideologies.

All of the mechanics that a theology uses in a system of belief are present in the US legal/political system. The state functions as a placeholder for a deity. Crimes are heresy. The law is holy writ, criminals and sinners are axiomatically wrong by their nature.

Lawmakers are the high priesthood, only they can concoct the law and grant absolution/pardon. Lawyers are the priests, only the anointed may approach on your behalf. Enforcers are the devout, thanked and revered for doing their work, regardless of the outcome. Trials are a type of purification ceremony. They are the only process to cleanse a crime. The mention of "taking the law into your own hands" is unthinkable and openly shunned.

Again, all of it is blindly assumed to be a just process, regardless of the outcome. The processes are transparent when convenient and/or honest and opaque when corrupt. Oaths and pledges are the prostrations and public signs of devotion, to avoid persecution and virtue signal ones' explicit devotion.

The climate of this public groveling has become prolific. This has become so absurd that an interviewer asked comedian Bill Burr if his critique of the Catholic clergy raping children went too far. Bill's reply was "Don't you think the priests went too far?" When pedophilia has defenders from verbal slights, one may assume that the religion of non-confrontationalism and non-judgmental virtue signaling is at Crusade levels.

Governments grant absolution to those who enforce the law; you and I are not allowed to write, enforce, and/or abolish the law. This is the mechanical/legal immunity that makes the ideology of any particular religion/state/government irrelevant. While the common myth is that the separation between church and state is very real, it's not when it comes to the "manner of methods" department, and that's the department that matters more than anything else. It's in the façade of ideology and the continuing narrative that "better" ideas deserve such immunities where we see inequalities appear.

This is for all practical purposes seizing the means of intellectual production, via the law. By using the concept of "the rule of law" to exclude other methods, one may remove the right to not participate. This line is where slavery, the law, and Marxism coexist. The law, not written by you, declares your productivity be commandeered for "the greater good", not benefiting you, and resistance is unlawful. Those coming to steal from you have immunity to do so. It's the same

baseline problem in Venezuela.

The "common good" is too expensive when only a few determine what that good is and that you will be forced to contribute. Milton Friedman described it as A and B deciding how C will help D. You have to believe in and/or be trained in centralized law to be fooled in this way. While the concept of the rule of law is not being contested here, the manner said law comes into being is.

The political/legal landscape is that if one thing is not right, the entire argument fails. If any point a Rube Goldberg machine of success has an interruption in the flow of energy, the motion of the machine will stop. If any point in the legal system you are disenfranchised or boxed out from participation, you've lost your agency over yourself. *This means the system is set up to deny justice or service if a failure is present, by design.*

Yes, these services have systems to provide feedback about what section needs to be worked on. The point is, the system's not assembled to *not* fail. When the system fails and allows your human rights to be violated (or is the catalyst for that violation), you are expected to accept that failure. You are not allowed to fix the broken portion, and it will apply to you again tomorrow. I recognize that the key to undoing this is education, but it's also more than that.

The systems in place have gone out of their way to be as ergonomic as possible. Removing some of these systems contains both educational and pragmatic hurdles. It's not just being angry about the sheer lunacy contained in the system these days.

Removing X, let's call that eminent domain, also affects Y, let's call Y roads. It's not simply removing the eminent domain ability from the state, it's about teaching everyone what an easement is, how to use them, why that happens, and having an ability to enforce the contract without cutting corners and giving the state the legal right to re-deed property without the owner's permission.

That's quite a bit to learn and that's just one state function; nor have we addressed how to do micro-easements across large areas to make something like a road happen. Prof. Walter Block has several books on the topic. No one answer works best. There are options.

The heartwarming part is that's why this system gets difficult to fill in sometimes. Any portion that requires your input is not for me to choose, just describe. I cannot fill in your options for you and this system, a Direct Republic is intentionally open-ended. Humans have to be told it's OK to kill and steal, as a rule. Very few do this kind of thing spontaneously.

The majority of exceptions you accept are via law, either natural law in the case of self-defense or statutory law when the cops declare "statutory violation". This process looks like deciding to live your life in peace and then have an adjudication system, should you need one. Why have an adjudication system where all things are assumed to be a universal mandate and then, after you've complied, you can live your life in peace?

The abolition of the legal system is not too far-fetched. However, without a plan, I can accept that this wouldn't sound too appealing. A lot of work would need to be done from scratch by millions of people.

This book is the plan to make this process as easily understood as it can be. No, a government failure like the USSR is not a better idea, even though the US is headed in that direction. It is a better idea to have the tools for a transition before that transition. What was on the other side of the Berlin wall when it came down isn't anything anyone wants to go through.

10. The Legislature

I posit that it is the right of every man and woman to form their own civil society and legal systems but they are unable to because there are no societies of one and no one needs to adjudicate with themselves. The concept of society requires others to be involved and not necessarily those you agree with. A homogeneous society seems pretty easy to live in.

This is like Earth circa everything before the 18th century. When 90% of the planet are farmers, agreement isn't difficult to come by because the same perspective, one of agrarian survival, is the norm. That world is gone, I hope forever. While some romanticize the idea, very few will subject themselves to the life span, poverty, and standards of that time. Any first-world ideologue that supports this lifestyle may become Amish or go live in central Africa to satisfy their urges; we needn't join them.

No need to tear down the modern world for the sake of a few coffee-house morons who've never missed a meal, let alone done a month of hard labor. The first world is great and we're keeping it. To this end, the centralization of law is a very real problem.

Some people call it socialism but it's more than that. It's not just how the law affects the economy. It's how it affects the way you think and understand the world. The law limits what is possible, in most cases arbitrarily. This is extremely detrimental to an economy and the intellect of human beings.

I admit shying away from the phrase "awakening" but I've met several people who will use that term openly. I'm warming up to the idea that our species is in the middle of a paradigm shift in our understanding of how things were and where they're going. I'm also forced to admit that much of the schooling I received was organized propaganda, not an education.

The curriculum was designed to get an outcome, not enlighten. All of this was legal, mind you, every mandated day of it. Amazing how it's not ChiCom-style propaganda when *your* government does it.

In an effort to stay away from the word utopia, we have to start where we are at. Twenty-first century America is a centralized and failing system. The federal government cannot pay its bills. It prints and borrows to keep the voters happy and this cycle is spiraling down because too many people, the world over, have gotten wise to the subsidy racket.

Voting, in many cases, is little more than aggregated ignorance and that's assuming that it wasn't pure ballot fraud from the back room of a Broward Advocate for a County Avis. Leaders have falsely told millions of people the world works in a certain way.

As it turns out, political rallies aren't for spreading valuable information. They're for propaganda and emotional abuse of the masses to get them moving in one direction. Be it lemming or sheep, it's not a good look.

The real landscape we all live on, like it or not, is economic. You produce, you trade; if you don't produce, you can't trade. If trade slows, there are fewer goods and services for everyone. Any message spread to the masses that the world works in another way falls between misinformed and bald-faced lie. If someone tells you they create jobs and spend their days making, planning, and delivering speeches, they do not create jobs. They create a narrative.

Successful narratives get you emotionally involved, not intellectually involved. This is the art of politics. Mind you, politics is worthless and not any tangible benefit to you. The organization represented is what you need, just not the middlemen.

If you accept a political system that allows you to be forced by law into things you do not want to fund, then anyone who can purchase or control that system will make you fund their job and/or their pension, public or private. If they make themselves immune from it in the process, it adds insult to injury but the root is the injury, not the insult.

By not addressing the root cause(s), you will achieve nothing but symptom management, not a cure. Of all the things this book is to convey, it is the understanding that the root cause must be addressed first, lest you chase symptoms at the behest and amusement of your rulers. I am certain that if I can write your laws, that *you* will have superficial choices... *And I will never have to work again.* It's the nature of power, to corrupt your perspective with privilege.

With the reasoning established why these systems need to be decentralized, let's get into the meat of *how*. The concept here is that of the legislature of a Direct Republic. This makes a strategic baby from a constitutional republic and a direct democracy, keeping only the desired parts that do not contain the root causes of legal inequality from either system.

The next step is to take the constitutional republic and remove the constitutional mechanics that make the laws what they are. We keep the rights philosophy and expand those rights to all humans without exceptions. We then keep the concept of a republic, without the 2nd and 3rd order effects the democratic component added to it.

Remember, we're talking about the last 10% of the human organization model. It is a downhill battle, once the battlefield and strategy are properly illuminated. The hard part is dumping the propaganda of our youth to see how this is harming the average person.

The solution to these challenges only sounds odd, but it also coalesces. Everyone writes all of their own laws. In a DIY legislature, you act as your legislator. A legislator that can only make laws for yourself, in your own legal silo, and fund the programs you want without committee approval. Then, legal silos are connected by content, not by geography.

The admission to the legislature is the agreement to a basic contract, a contract outlining human rights. This ensures a constitutional convention is ongoing for each new participant, as those humans come of age and join. A contract law society where the base contract entails just the human rights/right to abstain statement and the list of basic crimes, the crimes humans recognize for thousands of years, you agree to not perform.

All able and willing may enforce violations of human rights and obvious property crime, on the spot. There are no special humans; no one can do acts of offensive violence. Any further security you have would look like the response team of your HOA, security system vendor, or private response teams. See Dale Brown at Detroit Threat Management Center for business models.

These people are empowered to enforce your property rights and "do no harm" but do not come with the state agent claims of immunity, and are fully liable and insured for their actions. The rest assumes no human has the right to make law over you and you won't be involved in the enterprise of law past that unless you have a need. If you do, it's done by voluntary contract and modularly.

My favorite example of this is a scene from the movie Braveheart. The English lord comes to claim the right of prima nocta, first night. This claim is that the lord may have sex with a new bride on her wedding night. If one desires, in a DIY legislature, you may have the right of prima nocta but that law only applies to you, *so you can go fuck yourself*.

Bad ideas will not end up enforced: because of the costs of doing so, economic and social, is self-defeating. By making your laws only apply to you: - You cannot be forced to fund programs/functions you do not approve of. This keeps others out of your pocket and leaves their ideas to their solution.

It also lets people know how difficult (or not) a project is to complete, and what it takes to get it done. You get feedback on your ideas. If no one else shares that interest or legal maxim, enforcement becomes impossible beyond yourself. Bad laws cannot perpetuate due to lack of funding, lack of immunity, lack of insurability, or plain old lack of interest. The costs of your laws/programs are fully on you, not socialized upon others.

This prevents the "tragedy of the commons" and provides feedback on what some enterprises require, such as defense and prisons. The liability for your actions and contributions are fully on you. Immunities do not exist; the financial or contractual risk is 100% yours until someone will contractually insure you.

The harm you and your cohort cause will be compensated to the victims, one way or the other. You get better laws with those you contract with and realize the issues that arise when dealing with out-of-group systems. It's an economic education, in and of itself.

This method is designed to make the directness of a direct democracy an absolute mechanic in the organization of the system but separates it from voting, for logical, pragmatic, and principled reasons. The principle that you decide what programs you fund are the essential reason this happens. Logically, voting creates minorities and removes the decision where your funding goes from you; pragmatically it prevents aggregated ignorance and allows everyone to put their funding where they want to see it.

Everyone needs a real understanding of who wants to fund what. The removal of voting

eliminates the two worst fatal funnels of the process, representatives and the centralization of vast sums of resources to argue over. It's also no accident that these choke points represent the largest fraud surfaces in the process.

Politics is war by other means, and the ballot is the hill the voter dies on. It only took 300 Spartans at the Hot Gates to hold it from hundreds of thousands of Persians -- until another method was devised. Today it takes 535 to perform the same act in D.C. against 325 million.

11. Currency

The first tangible change that needs to be understood is decentralized money. This is important to every individual, to be using a medium of exchange that cannot be inflated away from you. That value/purchasing power is yours. Any method to take the prosperity you have produced without your permission and knowledge needs to be avoided, not regulated into a few pockets.

Despite the propagandized notion, centralized regulations will not protect you. The regulators will allow you a "safe space" of ignorance to bask in until the minute you realize you've been robbed by those the system was designed for. That's how that works.

The basic understanding of what money is, how it works, and which monetary systems do or don't expose you to fraud isn't taught in school. The reason should be obvious. The system needs you ignorant of its theft and believing you are not at risk.

Why are these things not discussed in government schools? Is not this information vital to the intellectual growth of an adult? The reasons currency cannot be contained in the constitution/social contract are many. Mandating one kind of currency causes market effects that look like what the dollar does now.

Trial and error allow for a refinement of monetary processes that humanity needs to ensure quality systems. Voluntary trade doesn't need to be channeled into one medium. It's currently channeled into dollars for tax collection and economic manipulation via the SWIFT system, not your financial safety or overall prosperity.

Some religions claim that any paradigm that doesn't allow them to trade freely is a sign of the end times, so there's no need to go there either. The current wave of cryptocurrencies provides all of humanity a way to transact without tax gateways, permissions, or borders. This is inherently destabilizing to government organizations.

Government ideology doesn't keep those organizations alive; their ability to allow actors to take property and manipulate currencies without personal ramifications does. By using funds that move according to the rules of cash, decentralized and untracked, we remove the resources the government uses to fund its operations by making partial enforcement extremely difficult, and holistic enforcement of taxation impossible.

It is the customer's right to choose their own ruleset with what they decide and pay for, not where they were born and by strangers. By using decentralized systems of trade, we lower the exposure to how many people are affected by economic shifts or malicious actors.

An event around the dollar doesn't just affect America, it hits every asset on the planet because it's the reserve currency. Having Bitcoin, Litecoin, Dash, Digibyte, and Decred allows each person to make intelligent decisions about the currency in which they trade, for their own reasons. The near-instantaneous interchangeability of these currencies allows you to protect your assets at the speed of information without political impediments designed to blind-side you.

11. Intellectual Property

Google defines intellectual property as:

"a work or invention that is the result of creativity, such as a manuscript or a design, to which one has rights and for which one may apply for a patent, copyright, trademark, etc."

I will make the case that IP is a 100% nonsensical concept and cannot be enforced, even if one wanted to.

It's attempting to legislate imagination into reality. What does this have to do with law/politics? A lot more than one realizes. Property must have characteristics, a definition, that can be measured, be given dimension, and possessed. Without that, the property is not real. This is the fundamental flaw in IP. If you cannot market that which is in your head, its value is demonstrably zero.

Let's apply this to two examples, one digital and one not. The point is to demonstrate that the method of distribution will not allow for the protection of the content after release. Attempts to protect that IP after its intentional release, in the owner's chosen format, will require massive legal proceedings to be subsidized by the public; subsidies are a telltale sign of a process that cannot be sustained on its own.

IP is in existence for a few to benefit but the aspect of IP that the law intends to guard against is what the benefactor is trying to perform, the dissemination of information. I want to protect my ideas while sharing them. Its method is antithetical to its goal. To accomplish this, these creators expect the IP involved to be managed by law and not by their method of distribution.

Should one write a book or take a photo, the content has an origin. The content creators have performed wildly different amounts of work; both would like IP protection, so that they may get the maximum amount out of that work. Who doesn't want that? Let's assume that one's content is their own until they put it into the public, at which point the work has been exposed to hundreds of thousands of minds. Then, based on the method they released that content, we examine if it is possible to enforce IP without public subsidy.

In the case of the photo, the creator decided to use a digital file to sell the picture. The photo has to be found to be purchased. If two people were to have the same photo, the distribution of that picture will go to the person who markets it best, not necessarily the one who took the picture. This is not to take away the photographers' efforts; it's to understand where the money is versus where the effort is.

If the photographer has the originals stolen from their computer, this is theft of content. Let's not cloud the IP system function with a blatant crime. If they release the picture on a website, where the planet has access, why should we subsidize the legal enforcement of this act? Placing the image on a billboard is a de facto release of that content to a wide, anonymous audience.

Software developers have made their products available by subscription and have used dongles (a hardware USB component) to ensure their software stays scarce. The value is linked to the utility and the scarcity of the item, not the rampant duplicability of software. The photographer chose digital media to release this photo because the cost of distribution is almost zero.

If there is a watermark or software layer to protect the image, fine. Should you and I subsidize the enforcement of the IP of this image, even if the image has the protection removed? No. This is not about content, it's about insecure methods of transfer with known fraud facets.

Enforcement of this nature is of a nature that you and I cannot keep up with. Lawyers love the idea; Some content creators love it. The people paying for the idea really lose out. To fix this, the photographer may print the pictures, guard digital proofs, and market their images. They may have a subscription service for five bucks a month to have access to the gallery. There are ways to secure digital images and software without a legal subsidy for their protection.

Why aren't content creators told to secure their work by methodology? We lose because these types of laws WILL be selectively enforced, by necessity. They cannot be holistically enforced, as you aren't going to get ahead of the issue. People in India and China will copy that stuff because it's easy to do and they don't have the money to pay for it.

The idea that "we need systems in place" to prevent this is asinine. The content isn't really scarce and the platform allows for it. Better find another way to make your product secure. The law isn't a wise or cost-effective method and the real effort is in the marketing, not the content anyway.

For a book, the majority of the work goes into getting those items into the public view for purchase; the editing and printing of a book is a risk taken on by a publisher, plus marketing costs. This is not to downplay the writers' effort. This is to look at the work it takes to get a book to hundreds or thousands of stores versus writing a book.

The logistical undertaking of distributing books is massive and has ongoing production and advertising costs; the writer needs to write and sustain only themselves. Let's assume there's a market for the book and the first print goes to market. One cannot beat the first run of books to market, axiomatically. It's cheaper to buy than steal.

Is there a market for a second run? Third? Let's assume there is enough for a second run. Should you and I subsidize the enforcement of material that has already been released to the public in a run of books? No. A publisher that poaches content runs the risk of making a bunch of books that no one wants. However, the content of the book has already been released to the public. The poaching publisher had to do a lot of work to justify the risk of books being published with no buyers.

While the content of the book is the value, the book is the vehicle protecting it. The security is that it's scarce and not easily copied, from print, or produced. An author may reword and re-release content. Should you and I subsidize this act? No. Let the publishers make their decisions on how to release content intelligently instead of making unsustainable and selective laws.

Should photographers and writers find a system to deal with this? Absolutely. Again, I wish them nothing but prosperity in their efforts but they cannot stick the public with the bill of enforcement. They need to have protections in their contracts that allow them to sell their work, upfront or in another way they approve of and deal with the consequences of their actions. While I do not look at IP as a huge legal conundrum, I find it odd how it applies to the very concept of law.

12. IP in Government

The Constitution is a form of IP, on the law. It claims only Senators and House representatives may write law; no other law may be considered legitimate. What human(s) determined this for all of us?

We cannot be bound to systems that do not function in modern society and we cannot legislate reality away even with the best of intentions circa 1791. Why do these systems allow for only themselves and no competition? The attempt to sell law as a Band-Aid for all social conversation is impossible and ridiculous. Why even have the ability to make legislation beyond the second law of thermodynamics?

Reality is a constraint on every project. One of those realities is the budget. We can argue around and around about what laws should or shouldn't matter. We can argue around and around about what parliamentary procedures should or shouldn't look like. My question is this: Why should we?

The best manner I know of to define law and interconnect civil society is to allow for self-construction of individual legal spheres of influence and individually interconnect, as many soap bubbles merge to make a single, large bubble.

It may sound counter-intuitive, due to the current way laws are made and how we were trained as children of that process. I submit that 300 million people will write better laws than 535 people and the result will be of a higher quality and yield greater satisfaction than a centralized system.

DIY legislatures do not make positive claims that someone else's land should be under X jurisdiction with X set of rules. It's a system that says my land is under X set of rules. Americans are not warring over the political conversation, just refusing to have one final say on several things, due to the gravity and deeply complex nature of those particular issues. Fine.

There's no point in having a system clogged up with the kind of sick and childish games the political class plays. The forum that they've abused should be denied to avoid being abused further. You need the protection of a system that doesn't make complex international agreements apply to you when you don't have or want to have anything to do with it. It allows the law to be modular, similar to insurance, rather than a several thousand-page mandate from politicians and the moneyed interests that dominate the law.

Politics can cease to be a front in a war because of a lack of participants. The system conscripts us all into a fight we neither need or want. DIY allows those who want to make complex business deals to do so, at their own risk and solve IP and laws dealing with international interests without being subsidized by the rest of us.

13. Enforcement of Contract (Law Enforcement)

I've referenced several instances of law/contract enforcement already and the marginal/terrible service that is inflicted on the populous. Investigations and enforcement have no inherent reason to exist in the same organization; moreover, there are conflicts of interest that arise when enforcement parties are the ones being investigated.

It is in your best interest that these conflicts of interest are best separated into two groups of fully accountable actors. Neither have the need for any uninsurable immunities and both acting within the contract guidelines you and/or your legal agency have established prior to the incident. This should also make sure that you only pay for those who are qualified and insured for their actions. Both should have enough skin in the game.

Enforcers and their financiers, to make violence an undesirable option in as many situations as possible. Enforcement of personal security/law is expensive and best handled by self and/or as a personal expense. VIP security shouldn't be funded by the public purse.

9-1-1 reactionary security teams can be done by home security companies with far fewer casualties, incident, and expense; this comes from "keeping the peace" and not "law enforcement". Insuring fully-trained professionals enforce contracts without immunity creates the proper skill-set and liability balance that enforcement currently lacks, and is a primary source of the lunacy seen in both law and law enforcement.

Corrections can be done in several sustainable and voluntary models for violations of human rights and contracts. Anyone committing human rights crimes or who is unwilling to make restitution for other contractual violations can be placed on an island to live in nature. Again, civil society is not a human right, nature is. This eliminates the need for those with a legal right to murder and precludes the need to live with the effects on the executioners while ensuring no further contact or maintenance of the offenders.

If you think that's too harsh, you may look into other solutions, like prisons or the death penalty. Both have enterprise factors to be assessed, agreed to, paid for, and someone must be responsible for. There are many prison models and death penalty methods, none of which will I go into. I like the island; you may explore your options, understand your involvement, and assess costs on your own.

I found understanding law and prison economies very educational about how those realities work or, better stated, do not work. If you think you will not have a corrupt system when a group of humans is permitted to commit murder by law, by all means, place yourself inside that matrix. Just leave me out of it. That method cannot be objective and may express the worst values of a culture. I say this as a 19-year veteran and former death penalty guy, use the island. There are fewer arguments and inconsistencies, with a long-term clemency option.

14. Diplomacy

"When goods don't cross borders, soldiers will." - Frederic Bastiat[6]

Diplomacy is more a function dictated by nations or interests of specific parties, rather than individuals. This is an administrative function that interconnects with defense, intelligence, and law. In the instances where a liaison is required, this should be secured and funded by those organizations that already exist and do so in an open-source manner; otherwise, this type of business is private and left that way.

The check on this is the funding of those agencies to behave in a transparent manner. Having this open-source check on transparency and the ability to deal with external states and organizations is a relevant function that most shareholders of a major company will demand, and can be viable in a decentralized model.

The issue is that the diplomatic process is organized around the desires of those controlling the US government administration, not the average human living in America. Politicians declare "foreign policy" vital to the state. I agree; so let's remove the state from the equation. There is no US and Russia. The concept that a population of 325 million can only have dealings with another population of 170 million when approved by this small group of politicians is not only stupid but is the recipe for war.

The real barrier to dealing with a Russian is the language barrier, the payment complications that come with distance, and contract resolution and enforcement. To assume these formidable challenges with a legal albatross around your neck is beyond problematic. It's how to control a lot of people by their economic roots. I think the best assessment is that some companies work with people overseas.

This is risky and difficult. The level of involvement you and I should have in adjudicating should be 100% up to us; zero non-involved people in the way and zero onus to participate. The government actors dragging you and I into a NAFTA-type situation is counterproductive and easily avoided. I think we should just do that and avoid foreign entanglements, leaving the risk and rewards to those who do.

15. Intelligence Agencies

Jumping off from what may seem to be a fragile diplomatic solution, we can discuss how open-source intelligence can fill in information many of the gaps that one would fill now with news, diplomacy, and education. In the modern world, I think one should have access to intelligence services, but not in their current form. No one should be forced to pay for these systems, should they not want them.

To separate this activity from diplomacy, this is information that can be found by you if you were involved with that activity. The saying is "Never send a spy where a schoolboy can go." This describes all the events you might want to know about that you don't have time to look into.

Everything you don't know is a secret; this organization should be putting relevant strategic information out to everyone, openly. The idea that secrecy is how you get protected is beyond ridiculous. The people with the information have turned that privilege into a pension machine and legal choke point.

Ed Snowden has demonstrated what an unleashed NSA does. He also demonstrated how ineffective blanket surveillance is and the nonsense legal modifications required to sustain the idea of mass surveillance.

Targeted information operations against known bad actors is a vital function in the modern world. Openly broadcasting video and picture evidence of bad actors to the entire population ruins these opportunities for them and is as much of a deterrent as one can get. Contractually allowing benign information to flow through these channels, information state actors would claim statutory control over, is a huge information pool.

You and I benefit from having these issues in the open, not classified and not for only the eyes of a few. The NSA should be providing open-source virus software, known cyber threat IP addresses, and a host of support to everyone that can be referenced for self-help. They also can support those with valid contract enforcement issues and military mission support by bringing the relevant information to bring known human rights violators and bad actors to heel.

There's a lot of information that should neither be prosecutable, nor of interest to any investigative body, and that's not the job of real intelligence operations (like blanket surveillance). Individually delineating between privacy and secrecy makes the search for bad actors and protecting the information you feel the need to guard simpler, for both parties. It also frustrates the efforts of criminals by making the things we are guarding very difficult to access by placing the information in the open. One has no need to guard the information everyone has.

Security has greater returns when resources are focused into a narrow scope. Robert David Steele has done a lot of work on open-source intelligence that is free to the public. I would add that a passive HUMINT network that provides a safe, publicly available intelligence source of crimes and deception is needed for accurate diplomacy and defense of the population.

The closed-door nature of these agencies is allowed by their ability to fund their operations with

your money and claim legal immunity. They can have money or immunity -- but not both. The funding is the actual check on this organizational model, not the vote and clearly not the law.

Blockchain drop boxes, with finite release timers, can be one tool in this effort. Anyone may anonymously drop information onto a blockchain information box. That box has a private and public key; the private key is the only way to access that box for X number days.

A journalist or intelligence analyst may receive the key and have X days to investigate. After those days expire, that information is open to the public. Electronic, anonymous dead drops will not be the entire scope of intelligence but it will make that information unclassifiable and a great way to blow the whistle, in public or private operations, both domestically and internationally.

16. Defense

Defense is the most difficult topic to address because it is somewhat geographically based, costly, and inherently violent. These are constraints on the enterprise that cannot be eliminated, only mitigated. I would recommend the book "Chaos Theory" by Dr. Robert Murphy to begin the understanding of the economic case.

The costs can be mitigated through competitive market solutions. Many of the items produced by the defense industry have civilian uses but are banned from public distribution. This keeps the "Military Industrial Complex" on the government dole to survive.

By not having a clear understanding of which actors have a business model of creating war *products* versus which actors are creating *war*, we have an initial problem. It's hard to tell which one is which when everyone's getting paid. The government solution is (naturally) to use the government as a solution; but this isn't a real solution for you and I (or anyone outside D.C.).

Many of these companies have wartime and peacetime applications, some only have a wartime role. Having business models that require subsidies is a gross inefficiency (if not fraud), and these businesses should be released from the legalities sheltering them from the market. Frankly, they keep filling the flying cars up with TNT and running them into buildings, because that's all a cruise missile is, while people try to figure out how to automate cars, that travel only on the X and Y-axis. Why not have automated cars that fly and fewer weapons?

Having a funding mechanism for the small group of strictly wartime functions that require peacetime upkeep, such as a Navy with multi-year production cycles, is required to have those superior tools in the event of a violent adjudication process (a war). There are plenty of people willing to undertake this endeavor openly and honestly, but the funding requires a longer financial dedication and higher costs. It may be time to trim back the military. Maybe not. I yield to Milton Friedman on this and say the market will determine the scope of the enterprise.

The only reason Americans agree to current defense spending is that they have no idea of the true cost to them. If the percentage of the national debt, inflation, and taxes accrued were openly known, the average human may want to cut back. Printing money has shown to produce political organizations that will turn the war machine on until the currency collapses, in many cases. Therefore, sustainable solutions are required; there's no avoiding it.

By having to make the business case to the customer for defense, the transparency model is the only method to secure funds, by subscription, crowdfunding, and/or other voluntary methods of fundraising. Without a legitimate threat model, some of these processes should be allowed to sunset. Use of a war-proof currency, a currency that cannot be controlled by a state, is a great way to ensure you don't end up paying for a war.

Another method to lower military costs is to place politicians back on the battlefield. There isn't a reason to send thousands to fight against a regime controlled by a few. The assassination model of warfare works very well in a decentralized society. Your politicians are incentivized to not

exist and other nation-states have no head to strike at, should they choose to start something.

This method adopts a SOCOM model of warfare. Participants collect evidence of crimes of a regime prior to any mission. Once those participants have done the due diligence of gathering the crimes against humanity, a mission of the smallest necessary size is used to openly capture or murder that individual or group.

Upon return, those participants then stand trial for their actions. It is assumed that no mission will take place without the evidence/due diligence upfront. It is also assumed that in a sound legal system, there would be no conviction based on that evidence.

Funding for said operation/equipment would involve several hundred or thousands of individuals, none of whom would have immunity for their actions and contributions to the level to which they participated. Warriors are risking criminal penalties and funders are risking civil/financial liabilities.

Placing the skin of individuals into the mix should breed a wiser restraint/reward than the current situation. The completion of a mission is not then left in a top-secret vault. The end of the mission is the trial and production of exculpatory evidence for the warriors involved.

It's their ass; they know it. It'll be done right if it had to be done at all. As an Army and Navy veteran, my money is that this will go over with those who do this kind of work, even if it is impenetrable to most civilians. Removing political issues, understanding the job, and calling it what it is should help remove the random and inappropriate uses of the military.

We are discussing organized murder in the form of war. If it is to be practiced, it should have intelligent constraints. Can we all admit that legal is not a rational standard anymore? Let's avoid whole theaters of carnage and trillions of dollars expended, shall we?

This method also avoids some of the pitfalls of the problem known as "fighting the last generals' war". The WWII, two-separate land-theater model is outdated and no longer a germane threat to Americans. This is still the US battle plan, despite there not being a single credible threat against which to apply that model.

One may make the argument that Russia and China have the forces to try, with about ten countries vying for third place. China and Russia don't have the movement assets to fight anywhere but Asia. The model seems to be a rationale for spending, not a rationale of defending against credible conventional threats.

My assessment is that the money is pumping to the Military-Industrial Complex, so bogeymen must be proffered up in order to justify spending the money. Then some government mouthpiece is rolled out with reasons to have a military that's an order of magnitude greater than the next military on Earth.

North Korea was a favorite until recent events. Russia is a timeless choice but has been played out ad nauseam, especially for a country with 1/7 the GDP; they cannot hang with us. China is a very underplayed card; it appears they have a lot of influence, if not actual intelligence operations running inside the US government.

China's scenarios look more economic and look like what's happening now (trade war). There may be a bunch of space equipment behind the curtain. The problem with secret spending is that trust is the part that is first abused. We don't know anything other than WTF amounts of money are gone.[7]

Rather than funnel resources into the government, we'd be directly funding defense contractors or working through a DoD that doesn't answer to any political body. While we've all been trained to think this is the worst-case scenario, I submit this is just force-of-habit. The realities are much different than the propaganda that requires politicians in the middle.

This is just another application of the thesis of the book: If you do not hold financial reins to your social spending, you are being deprived of your agency. All war is based on deception, and politics is just a lie to defraud you.

17. The Art of Secession

I went through the Art of War and married axioms that can be used to fix the broken system with the principles of the Direct Republic method. Again, the point of this is recognizing how other people can deceive you in the functioning of a system and save your rights and resources by method, not by trust or vote. Here are some ways The Art of War applies to this situation.

"Hence to fight and conquer in all your battles is not supreme excellence; supreme excellence consists in breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting." - Sun Tzu

The highest form of war is to not fight at all. Planning is the process of understanding your objective, understanding all of the relevant enterprise environmental factors, and getting ahead of them to provide non-coercive and non-violent solutions. For those who think this is not the objective case, ALL coercion and violence require not just conflict but financial support. Paying more for a solution is, by demonstrated preference, not what people do intentionally.

Place two identical items beside each other for different prices, the cheaper one is purchased first. It's a no-brainer. The ultimate goal is to have almost no violent interactions. Those that do happen are swift and contained. All other adjudication is handled civilly by mutually-defined processes. This is not only a recipe for success, but it's also sound in both method and cost ROI.

"The art of war is of vital importance to the State." - Sun Tzu

"War is the health of the State." - Murray Rothbard

This shows the state to be a problem, not a solution. Read: The inverse of this process is being so far ahead of a problem that the solution doesn't require coercion. When 90% of humans were farmers, long term planning based on self-denial was the measure of an adult and the norm. Today, the idea of self-denial is considered prudish, at best, and "long-term" is gauged between weekends, not seasons.

Long term planning was a vital life skill to farmers for all of human history. 200 years ago, 90% of all humanity were farmers. These people had to understand several valuable, immovable, and unarguable aspects of their own existence that are lost by most people today. They lived in a world where nine-out-of-ten people had a broad, shared, disciplined, and simple perspective.

Farming wasn't an occupation, as most people know it. It's a normal life for the whole of human history. People needed to survive. They plan and plant food; they preserve food. A savings account looked like a full pantry, not a bank. While I'm not in any way advocating moving back towards that life, the lives we know are mechanically detached from our own survival, in almost all cases.

The focus of schools is to get someone a job and social utility, with the promises of prosperity for those who obey and follow the plan. They lived in a time where survival and flourishing superseded equality, and I don't mean by a little. The treatment of women, other races, and children, rated from poor to inhumane. The environment was much more difficult to cope with.

Those people had harder lives and I'd not expect those people to care much for modern concerns to the level of delicacy humans do now. We don't understand pain and/or discomfort as a lifestyle on that scale just as they'd not understand many modern comforts or advances and how it affects their lives.

"According as circumstances are favorable, one should modify one's plans." - Sun Tzu

This cannot and should not be done for you by someone else. This is why the law has been centralized, to box you out of every facet of the legal/regulatory state. If not, it's hard to implement someone else's solution for you. That solution, the vote, was issued to you and you need to return it... And all the baggage that goes with it. You need to be able to change your laws, modularly and as needed by your own needs. It really doesn't work when you have to submit and get approval from your community, especially about individual decisions.

"All warfare is based on deception." - Sun Tzu

If the highest form of warfare is to not fight at all, then the front line of humanity is truth. Who mandates that? Hopefully, no one but this is not true with the law.

The law has been wrangled to encompass methods that you and I cannot exhibit without penalty. Savagery, by law. This immunity currently covers all of the unacceptable human behaviors, from murder to lying.

If the system is not transparent, no one can "watch the watchers" and they become worse than the problem they were assembled to overcome. (Ex: cops legally seize more than thieves steal; now add taxes on top that). If politics is war by other means and all warfare is based on deception, then politics is a lie that is necessarily separate from societal organization.

"If he is secure at all points, be prepared for him. If he is in superior strength, evade him." - Sun Tzu

Can we admit one assembles a security structure with the intent to make evasion very hard or impossible? That's the point. Why that is done is the relevant discussion.

The law has the security apparatus on an impossible goose chase in the name of ideology without intelligent, known costs to the customers, aka the public. As we have assembled this structure to be evasion resistant, participation is key to the two primary goals: ensuring human liberty (the reason we have this system in the first place), and ensuring the costs are transparent, known, not being used to restrict the liberty that it's designed to protect, and to ensure the system remains solvent and functioning.

The ability to withdraw support for the security apparatus is vital to human rights and intelligent functioning. It's also why *you're* not allowed. This whole system is *someone else's* solution for you and I. It needs to be disassembled, and wisely. Installing ways to leave, by design, is not the freedom to harm others. It is a safe way out of a policing racket that has no power in law to follow you.

"In the practical art of war, the best thing of all is to take the enemy's country whole and intact; to shatter and destroy it is not so good." - Sun Tzu

As the country in question is our own, this is a given. Civil wars are anything but civil and represent absolute failure. A civil war may also be termed a domestic insurgency when the government is the opposition.

This is an example of the type of issue that future governments need to face and are structurally very vulnerable to. This idea is the most disruptive concept to centralized governance I know of, and may represent an offensive and defensive method of influencing political change in a population without intelligence or military operations.

The Direct Republic concept is a philosophical WMD aimed at committing an occupational genocide, in the same way Henry Ford killed all the wainwrights. To that end, we're doing as Shakespeare suggested, kill all the lawyers[8]. This is accomplished by removing the need for their occupational function in a legal structure. A simpler legal structure shouldn't require representation, more so when you wrote the laws yourself and, necessarily, had to learn about those laws to be subject to them.

"Hence to fight and conquer in all your battles is not supreme excellence; supreme excellence consists in breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting." - Sun Tzu

This is what the current system has done to the public. It can only work so long before a revolt. Better a peaceful revolt, aye?

"Therefore, the skillful leader subdues the enemy's troops without any fighting; he captures their cities without laying siege to them; he overthrows their kingdom without lengthy operations in the field. With his forces intact he will dispute the mastery of the Empire, and thus, without losing a man, his triumph will be complete. This is the method of attacking by stratagem." - Sun Tzu

This book is sharing a stratagem, a Direct Republic. A successful plan should be as close to the antithesis of the problem as possible. The step that ensures success to your plan should be the "on" button. Everything else should be risk mitigation and efficiency planning.

"Security against defeat implies defensive tactics; ability to defeat the enemy means taking the offensive." - Sun Tzu

Changing legal structures is a defensive maneuver. This doesn't require harming members or enforcers of the old system unless those people feel like "seizing your means" and making you pay for their system and force your participation. The Direct Republic method should prevent violence between parties in most cases.

If you have a government that cannot be abandoned/fired through non-participation, you have a worse problem than a faulty legal structure. Any group of government employees that refuses to be fired may be fired upon. This is America after all.

"Energy may be likened to the bending of a crossbow; decision, to the releasing of a trigger." - Sun Tzu

In a legal system, your energy is not supposed to be released except where you want it released. Seizing the means of your energy/money/efforts is exactly how socialism functions. This is how one can make the case that taxation is the vehicle of socialism. This is also why one may safely say that the US Constitution contains socialism, in Art. 1, Sec. 8.[9]

"Hiding order beneath the cloak of disorder is simply a question of subdivision;" - Sun Tzu

Again, this is what the legal system is doing to you. Racial, ethnic, financial, political, theological, ideological, and methodological spheres will be mixed and matched to keep confusion amid the electorate. Until the public demands a system that makes propaganda a useless tactic to try, expect more nonsense in the public discourse.

To be clear, honest people don't use this tactic. It's antithetical to honesty. Using a system that makes it very difficult for propaganda to be used is in every honest persons' best interest.

It's clear at this point that the federal system is used against Americans and is working at the behest of a select few, not those paying for it. You are a serf. Should you refuse to pay for your vote, which is essentially the tax model, your agency, person, and property will be attacked as if a heretic, not a mere dissenter.

"Hence that general is skillful in attack whose opponent does not know what to defend; and he is skillful in defense whose opponent does not know what to attack." - Sun Tzu

Your safety is paramount. This method is designed to make progress despite opposition and rhetoric from politicians and government employees. Again, you have a right to fire them. They do not have a right to make you pay for any of this.

Alter or abolish until these organizational models are done right. This method functions by thousands of people solving their own problems without government permissions and overwhelming the enforcement matrix. The Cloward-Piven strategy of destroying a welfare system is similar.

"If we wish to fight, the enemy can be forced to an engagement even though he be sheltered behind a high rampart and a deep ditch. All we need do is attack some other place that he will be obliged to relieve." - Sun Tzu

This is what the denial of your money does. You have the right to alter or abolish. If not, you have the right to fight. We're avoiding fighting unless absolutely required to. The system has to guard its financial lifeblood and enforce the law.

When the law that legalizes taxes is impossible to enforce, taxes won't be collected because the second law of thermodynamics doesn't care about politics. Only that which can be supported will

even be attempted.

"Carefully compare the opposing army with your own, so that you may know where strength is superabundant and where it is deficient." - Sun Tzu

This was easy. I will stick with the faceless masses relying on their own self-interest over the publicized few, every time. The weaknesses and strengths of the system are not the individuals involved. The human element reports to the systemic structure, not the other way around.

Statements like "People are the reason the system works." are emotional prattle and practical nonsense. When the rules are set so that someone can come in and be counterproductive to those paying for a service, the rules or the budget cannot be sheltered from change. Not both. Feedback is needed to tune the system.

"In making tactical dispositions, the highest pitch you can attain is to conceal them; conceal your dispositions, and you will be safe from the prying of the subtlest spies, from the machinations of the wisest brains." - Sun Tzu

If we were waging war on each other, this would be valid. WE'RE NOT. Therefore, the transparency is to ensure the opposite of that, open organization by agreement. The current system uses this principle against those who pay for it, the public, and this is where all the chicanery comes from.

The time for political promises is over. These systems will be changes that reflect our values, and those pretending they can hold back the tide of human progress any attempt to do so, to their own futility and peril.

"How victory may be produced for them out of the enemy's own tactics — that is what the multitude cannot comprehend; All men can see the tactics whereby I conquer, but what none can see is the strategy out of which victory is evolved." - Sun Tzu

Opacity prohibits the sharing of the method. This is not about war; there need not be secrets in this strategy. We're all coming to the table from the same perspective, peaceful prosperity.

To that end, we should have full strategic and tactical continuity. Everyone gets a copy of the plan. Everyone plans their own campaign. Everyone teams up with those of similar plans and deals with those rules in house. No voting, no speeches. I fuck off over here, you fuck off where you are. Fin.

"Military tactics are like unto water; for water in its natural course runs away from high places and hastens downwards; So in war, the way is to avoid what is strong and to strike at what is weak. Water shapes its course according to the nature of the ground over which it flows; the soldier works out his victory in relation to the foe whom he is facing. Therefore, just as water retains no constant shape, so in warfare there are no constant conditions." - Sun Tzu

"Be like water making its way through cracks. Do not be assertive, but adjust to the object, and you shall find a way around or through it. If nothing within you stays rigid, outward things will

disclose themselves. Empty your mind, be formless. Shapeless, like water. If you put water into a cup, it becomes the cup. You put water into a bottle and it becomes the bottle. You put it in a teapot, it becomes the teapot. Now, water can flow or it can crash. Be water, my friend." - Bruce Lee

It makes no sense to offer a system that would need to be up kept in a similar way as the Constitution requires. Our children will not do things as we do. Saddling them a system that requires the individual to overcome ingrained cultural biases and a popular-yet-fallacious political education is asking that society be organized only by the brave and the psychotic. Why?

Why is all the effort you muster required to change the mind of others instead of changing the manner in which you do it? Because you are not allowed to demonstrate any other way, let alone a better one, that's why.

A system that allows you to perform a better set of values and lead by example does more to recruit people to your position than any politician ever can. The freedom to choose our own social experiments will not only allow us to express our own values without constraints but will keep parasitical ideologies like socialism out of your world. I felt a great disturbance typing that last sentence, as it was also an open invitation to debate any socialist who thinks they have the chops for it.

"In war, the general receives his commands from the sovereign." - Sun Tzu

Sovereignty has been removed from you. To that extent having defense that you can fund (or not fund) as a control mechanism makes you the sovereign. It may mean you withdraw your military funding and that military action takes place anyway.

This system is not capable or intended to stop all future harms. It's to allow you to participate (or not) in any given societal action, and be included in the benefits or consequences of those acts. As far as "the sovereign" controlling the military, this is flat out stupid.

The skill set of a general is not up for a vote. You cannot get sound solutions via a politician, group of politicians, or by the aggregated ignorance (a vote) of any given electorate. Leave missions up to the participants; they choose the commander for the mission, by ability and task at hand.

The idea that the general public has the skills, relevant information, and fortitude for these matters is not only laughably incorrect but totally unnecessary. That said, this system also allows for all funders and participants to be held liable. Immunities and their side effects are the problems being solved by the sovereign, you.

"We may take it then that an army without its baggage-train is lost; without provisions it is lost; without bases of supply it is lost. We cannot enter into alliances until we are acquainted with the designs of our neighbors." - Sun Tzu

This is the principle a Direct Republic employs to avoid wars; Deny your resources from those

you don't support and make the collection of resources for said enterprise harder than the war itself. Any group that cannot gain voluntary material support should be allowed to fail. Subsidies are the bane of human progress by funding activities that are by definition, infeasible.

"Gongs and drums, banners and flags, are means whereby the ears and eyes of the host may be focused on one particular point." - Sun Tzu

These are battlefield tools for communication. If you are not on a battlefield, these are used as a distraction or to lure you into a battlefield. The goal is to focus you into a propaganda hole, not just away from what is actually going on.

A tactic may be inverted to be used against you; that which is designed to draw focus and organize amid chaos is used to obscure focus and organization during peace. For example: Arguing about flags, US or confederate, keeps people fighting for those who use background noise to commit crimes. See: "The CIA and FBI making false accusations a legal issue for a sitting president".

Be wary of people trying to dis-intermediate natural allies and sound communications with such tactics. The use of this tactic is rampant in corporate-sponsored media. If you don't know your subject matter and logical fallacies, you will be grieved by the ignorantly passionate and intentionally deceptive.

"Disciplined and calm, to await the appearance of disorder and hubbub amongst the enemy: — this is the art of retaining self - possession." - Sun Tzu

"Never let a good crisis go to waste." – Winston Churchill

This is common in politics and only reinforces that those people are waging war on you. Allowing others to use a crisis against you is a personal vulnerability I would warn against but I do understand why it works.

"Do not swallow bait offered by the enemy. Do not interfere with an army that is returning home." - Sun Tzu

Vote, go home, repeat. You lose, every time. Avoid the bait. Do the work yourself and *make the decisions on your own.*

"When you surround an army, leave an outlet free. Do not press a desperate foe too hard. Such is the art of warfare." - Sun Tzu

This is how they failed. We're fed up. We're looking for other solutions that won't or can't be controlled or monopolized. It's as if this is an instinctive intellectual reflex of our species.

"Peace proposals unaccompanied by a sworn covenant indicate a plot." - Sun Tzu

Transparency or nothing. Sunlight is the best disinfectant.

18. Basic how-to-decentralize-your-jurisdiction(s)

The removal of your governance structure should be performed like a controlled demolition. Every point of the operation needs to be understood up front. Each piece should get its own care. Then, patience is key.

This transition may take your area two years or fifty. If people around you are happy with their systems, you may be on your own a while. Pioneering ain't easy.

Your city/county/state has a current state of health or disrepair. The most important part of reorganizing is not changing what isn't broke. Each level has unique and difficult issues.

Using the federal level as a template should cover most problems down to the county/large city level. Individual and small town land issues are more challenging in other aspects. Dr. Walter Block at Loyola University is a human dictionary of methods to solve these issues.

The first step is targeting and releasing any federal agency established by executive order. There is no requirement to involve Congress at all. Intelligent timelines are formed for either the total cessation of operations or the sale, whole or piece-meal, of a said agency to a private bidder.

This allows services that the government organization is not statutorily mandated to maintain to be allowed to sunset or be maintained by people who can make the agency solvent. Starting with federal land holdings without buildings will be a great way to start the process of blockchain land deed transfers without the complexity of large buildings with multiple tenants/owners.

The personnel working there can be disseminated in many productive ways. I would think anyone under 5-year government service should be released to the civilian world, and anyone eligible for retirement is retired. Five to ten years of service may be retasked but this entire operation is a downsizing.

This group may follow the first, maybe not. This is speculation for me and choices to be made by those people, on both sides of the decision. This can happen. It's just very unpopular with the people expected to execute the task.

When someone is willing to work themselves out of a job, they are unquestionably about service. It's possible that mass quitting may delay certain portions. I think it's important to make the processes of drawdown positive for those who participate, giving them a longer retraining and transition runway.

I also think it's important that the process becomes worse on those who make the process difficult. What Project Veritas has uncovered in October and November of 2018 demonstrates the virulent and parasitic members of the Democratic Socialists of America that can inhabit a social structure to control it and create internal obstructions. Maybe they shouldn't get a nice transition.

After the EO (executive order) agencies are privatized or retired, we slice the statutory agencies into two groups, functions one may consider vital and everything else.

Group One

- Defense (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, Coast Guard, Space Force?)
- Intelligence (NSA, CIA, DIA, et al)
- Diplomacy (State and germane support agencies)
- Justice (FBI, DEA, BATF, USSS, US Marshalls, ICE, et al)
- Energy (DoE (for dealing with nuclear weapons)
- Agencies involved in domestic subsidies
- Agencies needed to logistically provide for above

Group Two

- Everyone else (Post Office, DoAg, DoEd, etc.)

Group two has a longer runway for transition because it's after the EO agencies. This means two to five years of preparation before these are dispatched in a similar fashion to the EO agencies. These are bureaucratically required to go through Congress, as both a transparency check and a safety mechanism to avoid rapid disassembly at an unfortunate pace. These would have gone in the EO round if they could. Group 1, however, is the heavy lifting.

Military Nuclear weapons/tools need to be dealt with and a reality that cannot be avoided. We should destroy one every Thanksgiving, along with other serious world leaders, instead of pardoning turkeys.

The US government should do this even if we're the only ones doing it. We should also work out nuclear terrestrial and extraterrestrial tool usage scenarios. It's a topic that needs to be addressed in an era of destabilizing nation-states, here and abroad.

The scope of defense needs to be reevaluated. The dual land theater scenario has been the "last generals war" since 1946. The factories that make weapons can be retooled and gainfully occupied with a flying vehicle/space industry focus. They could even make rubber dog shit for all I care. The offensive military mission of "maintain empire" needs to go and a cheaper, leaner, and almost wholly defensive model needs to be adopted. This leaves room for the assassination model of foreign policy, if needed. Even then, if we are killing anyone overseas and the reaction of those people is not "Hey, thanks", then we're most likely doing it wrong. Even then, individuals will be held accountable. Better have their exculpatory evidence before leaving the house, aye?

As a matter of self-interest, I would suggest adopting the stance that industrial weapons manufacturers are a grim fact of reality. Russians will make weapons if Lockheed doesn't. China if not them. It's math.

Our dual goal should be to keep these industries and professionals living here and support them in doing something besides government work. It seems to always be war.

Self-flying cars seem smarter than self-driving cars and self-flying bombs. There are options but the conversations aren't happening. What's not being disclosed that costs so much? The dog ate my budget story isn't working anymore.

Real, transparent defense contracting for equipment and manpower is needed or this will mess will never stop. Every. single. penny. This black project nonsense has turned into a real shit show.

While the idea of a black market is a bit silly to me, it makes perfect sense when applied to selling human beings. That is something one must hide because civilized humans won't tolerate it. Where best to hide it than behind a classified wall? Or the walls of the Vatican? We cannot afford closed-door solutions anymore.

Intelligence open-source-everything is the bailiwick of Robert David Steele and William Binney. I would eliminate the classification system and perform information security by open-source dissemination. All secrets would be open to all, and therefore inert.

This is not to be confused with a private R&D budget in the private defense business. This is ensuring that humans who are problems are not classified with a dossier, they are shown on the Internet with a bounty for mostly-safe return. Cleaning up human problems need not be a government-monopolized operation.

Let's face it: We need watchers for our watchers. Let's put the pros in charge and quit pretending cops are those. Old Navy SEALs do less damage and use fewer resources when violence is needed. They also almost always display better judgment.

Security changes touch the information sphere. Information *is* the security sphere if you are hooked into it. Why not? You pay for those services and, therefore, have the right to that information.

If you weren't forced to pay for it, it's just someone else's research. That said, I think a public agency that broadcasts the dirty secrets of every government and other fraud out to everyone in real-time is a very real social good. It also makes diplomacy a lot easier, as there's just your business with others, not "official channels" outside of your organization.

Domestic subsidies: This is just looking before the leaping when destroying a program. There are

industries that really need a heads up that the gravy train is out of track. These issues have several years to work out solution sets, plan, and execute in their turn. The idea that this should go on in perpetuity because something else sounds too hard seem like an excuse for lackluster work. Yes, the issues would be difficult to deal with. However, not dealing with them is becoming an obviously worse option.

That's it: I hope you now have a functional idea of what a Direct Republic is, how it might work, and the problems it solves. This work isn't meant to be a definitive be-all-end-all, but a jumping-off point. I hope (with all of your help) to write a sequel, perhaps: Implementing a Direct Republic: Death to Political Business as Usual (or some other appropriate title). Thanks so much for being here.

And finally: To who challenged me in life, positively or negatively, Thank you. Both were equally wise but I would have missed half of it if y'all let me be comfortable and entitled to my stupid.

#razethebar #killallthelawyers

Full stop, but not "The End".

-=-

The editor recommends you go to Donnie's website www.thenullhypothesisofpolitics.com. There you will find media appearances and further resources. Please sign up for email updates and contribute if you are able.

19. About the Author

Donnie Gebert is a former US Army intelligence sergeant, ammunition supply specialist, infantryman, and US Navy electronics technician. He was medically discharged after seventeen years of active service and lives with his three children in Texas.

20. Afterword by the Editor

I distinctly remember the first time I heard Donnie Gebert, it was on Robert Murphy's excellent podcast. <https://www.bobmurphyshow.com/episodes/ep-42-former-military-intelligence-officer-donnie-gebert/> It stood out because he was passionate, articulate, and spoke at a rapid pace (all indicators to me that someone has seized on a new, radical idea that might just be important). I found myself re-listening to the show three times in order to make sure I understood what he was communicating.

I went to his page and began to listen to every media appearance he made, as I realized he had discovered something that more scarce than silver: An original idea for political organization. This wasn't just the "same old, same old" third-position Libertarian arguments against the administrative-surveillance-financial-military-complex state. This was something entirely new. I decided to help in any way I could, and so I am.

Now I disagree with Donnie (and perhaps your average libertarian/anarcho-capitalist) on several points, specifically:

- Intellectual property - See the arguments being studiously ignored by most libertarians here: <https://strangerousthoughts.wordpress.com/2010/11/14/the-economic-principles-of-intellectual-property-and-the-fallacies-of-intellectual-communism/>
- Bastiat's quote (attributed, although doubtful) on armies and borders: *This is because it does not follow logically that an internally self-sufficient country would engage in military adventurism.* If a historical example of this exists, I welcome anyone bringing it to my attention.
- Nuclear disarmament - I personally believe every country ought to have nukes. Note the fates of Iraq, Libya, and now possibly Iran (which don't have nukes) vs. North Korea (has nukes). There's also no practical way to police nuclear weapons, so any attempt at it is effectively gun control writ large. ...Very large.

I also think Donnie puts too much focus on the fraud in DoD vs. the fraud that exists in the general federal (and state, county, city, borough, town, village, hamlet, etc.) bureaucracies, as those dwarf that of the DoD in terms of spending (but I'm perfectly happy to start with the DoD, and there may be practical reasons for proceeding this way).

However: **All of these disagreements are moot**, because they wouldn't interfere in the slightest with implementing a Direct Republic at a town or county level first as proof of concept. ...Which is where you would need to start in implementing it, if it is to be given a chance to work.

There are many questions to be asked and answered before we can attempt this. I'm sure that you have come up with many during your reading (or listening) to this book. We hope that you will share those with us so that together, we might hammer out a more perfect version of the founder's vision for America in the forge of liberty, using the tools the 21st century has available to us.

-Dave Narby, ed.

You can complain to him about typos (and hire him for writing, editing, voice work, and any other project) at: www.davenarby.com

21. Footnotes

[1] See *The Lost Tools of Learning* by Gale Sayers to understand the grammar, dialectic, and rhetorical phases of an argument. <http://www.gbt.org/text/sayers.html>

[2] ED: I thought it important to also note Webster's Dictionary (1828) definition of a republic <http://webstersdictionary1828.com/Dictionary/republic>

(used because its definitions are closest to those used during the writing of the Constitution):

REPUB'LIC, noun [Latin respublica; res and publica; public affairs.]

1. *A commonwealth; a state in which the exercise of the sovereign power is lodged in representatives elected by the people. In modern usage, it differs from a democracy or democratic state, in which the people exercise the powers of sovereignty in person. Yet the democracies of Greece are often called republics.*

2. *Common interest; the public. [Not in use.]*

Republic of letters, the collective body of learned men.

Careful readers will note significant differences.

The reason the editor felt the need to bring special attention to this is because those who oppose Liberty (indeed, self-determination of any sort) will opt to change the language if they cannot change the laws. Note the difference between the modern first definition of "regulate" <https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/regulate> and the first definition of Webster's 1828 version. <http://webstersdictionary1828.com/Dictionary/regulate> Now consider that change in understanding that follows from that definition in the context of the 10th Amendment https://infogalactic.com/info/Tenth_Amendment_to_the_United_States_Constitution to the US Constitution (specifically the abuse of the "Commerce Clause" <https://mises.org/library/2-constitution-four-disputed-clauses>).

[3] *The Machinery of Freedom* by Dr. David Friedman
https://www.daviddfriedman.com/The_Machinery_of_Freedom_.pdf

[4] ED: This is not the case in every state, e.g. New Hampshire. Which in the editor's opinion is one of the reasons it ranks #1 on the State Freedom Index.

[5] ED: Some religions with a penalty for apostasy (e.g. Islam) are notable exceptions. https://infogalactic.com/info/Apostasy_in_Islam

[6] ED: Although the provenance of this exact quote is in question, it's arguable Bastiat would have agreed with it. However, the Editor takes issue with this axiom as noted in his afterword.

[7] Investment advisor and former Assistant Secretary of Housing Catherine Austin-Fitts puts this figure north of 21 Trillion (with a "T") dollars. <https://usawatchdog.com/21-trillion-missing-u-s-government-a-criminal-enterprise-catherine-austin-fitts/>

[8] ED: I thought it important to note that in the context of this quote from Shakespeare's Henry VI, the character "Dick" was referring to the king's (AKA government) prosecution lawyers, specifically. <https://www.armstrongeconomics.com/armstrong-in-the-media/armstrong-trial/legal-reform-learning-from-the-mistakes-of-the-past/>

[9] AKA the "general welfare" clause. https://www.usconstitution.net/xconst_A1Sec8.html