

10 Billion States

Part I Why this is the only solution

Political Classes

Nation States

Economics

Work, education & tech – but mostly work!

Monopolies

Part II The proposed Solution

Immediate dangers of the basic solution

Why societies go wrong

Contract based law

What's the point?

Contract templates, contract writers and the contract market

Alternatives to the 10 Billion States solution

Common Law

Conclusion

Part III How it will be achieved

Bidding high and low

Resolution is the goal

Smash around a little Mazlov

The significance of 'Who monetizes?'

What you look like gamified

**There is nothing much to de-capitalizing
negativity or fear**

Conceptualizing the state of play

So what happens next?

Paying taxes

Declaring war on competitors

Part IV Where we will be when it is achieved

Your money / energy goes where you say

All participants have best in class political services

The left / right divide vanishes

Communalism gets murdered on it's ass

Everywhere you are is Youland

Wealth will become valueless

There will only be one crime

The timeline

The history

10 Billion States

This is 10 Billion States, but you can call your state what you like. You can live there on your own and build it yourself, or you can never visit it at all, just treaty up with a superstate of your choosing and lodge it safely on the server as a back up if the shit ever hits the fan again.

Statecraft ain't hard!

I have to laugh because I haven't got the first clue about the validity of that statement. Look, there are some clever people on the planet and there definitely are some cynical ones. There are cowards who will never have faith in their fellow man or any affinity for him. It is my belief that they are a minority and that that minority becomes smaller as faith in life grows. Here we are facing an epoch defining change in global political organization – like it or not – I want to take that step in faith. I figure if I can't have faith in you, what the hell is there to gain anyway?

I want the crazy by choice to have that choice and be crazy. I want the cowardly to have a place to hide but the rest of us to know if they ever step out they will be welcomed back like it's nothing at all. I want the greedy to be greedy and I wish them the thrill of their successes and victories but I need the security that if they ever again choose to take from me and mine, an alarm will go off and me and mine will be ready to go to war.

I'm not on the left or the right, I recognized long ago that these were false concepts, a fun little training ground for Political Science undergrads to play around in, that somehow got out and started messing with the minds of the reading public who trusted us philosophers to keep that garbage in check – sorry! So 10bs isn't a political agenda, it doesn't have a political agenda unless it is this:

You have the right to choose the rules by which you will live and not have to deal with people who want things different. If your way of life cannot survive without feeding on another group of people living differently than you can't have it unless you are willing to wither and die or go to war. People want a world with no war or they don't. If they do, then they will treaty for no war and can't be any. If they don't there can be. My politics has nothing to do with it. I live in Fagistan - a feudalistic versatile gay state with military service and suicide troops. We are nominally expansive, but fight to strict hip-hop crumping rules. We always embarrass ourselves at the Olympics, which is the only place some of your kids will ever see us!

Why this is the only solution

Hold up! Solution to what? There I go dropping a solution before I've mentioned a problem, that isn't good form at all! If you reckon you know the problem then read the subheadings ahead until I get to a conclusion. The rest of you. Here we go...

Political Classes

Straight away I'm throwing in an ambiguous term. I mean to. I'll tell you why. Because I'm talking about labels and I'm talking about groups of people. You hear terms like Conservative, Socialist, Libertarian, Liberal, etc. How well are they defined and how much do they help? What is the purpose of classifying our political stances? Is it to group ourselves under a flag and say 'we're this'? Does it work? Don't we argue with those in our group all the time? Is it always true that we align with them ahead of the other political positions? Are we not, as individuals somewhere unique in our political beliefs and able to agree with almost everybody to some extent but almost nobody on every question?

If it's the case that we are all capable of forming and most likely have formed our own unique and personal position, then are these labels not a hindrance to resolution over political disputes rather than a help? Perhaps, these labels serve an explanatory purpose after the fact, but this would make their function really about journalism and history, not about doing politics. In this book, I'm talking about doing politics. I therefore will be talking about Political Positions, and by this term I will mean, yours. What you as an independent individual sovereign of your own state believe to be right, expedient, just, legal, and appropriate to do, in any given situation. I will treat the political spectrum as a granular poly-dimensional array of possibility across unbounded dimensions.

The other meaning of the title of this section is classes of people. Most pointedly a class of people who have begun to believe that it is their destiny and not all of ours to set the rules. I find this idea offensive. Let me be clear. There could be a contention that not everyone is naturally inclined to think about politics. I regard that as nonsense. Irrespective of register (the language chosen to discuss a matter), everybody talks about politics! If you don't believe me – put the book down. We are going to get nowhere!

One of the problems in the political world today is that people have been programmed to believe that politics is a sport for specialists. If it is not a universal activity it is meaningless, baseless and fraudulent. If you claim instead that not everybody wants to be actively involved in political effort, that they prefer to have others do the job, and look in from time to time so they know what's going on, then I completely agree. This implies that we need some representative system, but it does not justify the breakaway of a Political Class, nor the assumption of special privileges or power by representatives. It does not, as you will see, justify the creation of representatives at all. To be clear – if you want to not bother sorting out your own political work, tools can be provided so you don't have to. In a modern country thousands of political decisions which result in regulation take place every year. Arguably this is well in excess of what is needed, but in any case, few of us want to have to rule or vote on every one of them.

So already I'm seeing two problems: We have an inadequate and misleading classification of our own political views, and a primitive idea of political management, which is centred on the idea of public servants, who long since stopped considering service to the public to any part of their business.

Nation States

Have you ever taken a holiday? Ever been to a beach, taken most of your clothes off, and lain on your back covered in oil, facing the sun so that everything in your vision turned white, and relaxed to the point where when you stood up to go for a dip you needed a second to get your balance? Well, suppose the people to your left or right of you were from a different country. This is pretty likely. Anyway, having exposed yourself in this way, can you credit the explanations given for the wars that have been fought between nations – at all?

Face to face people tend to identify their commonalities, to get along and enjoy each other's company. Most of us, I expect, have experience enough that we know this to be the case. What can you conclude if we hear stories about a culture, race or nationality which just don't tally with our experience? Were we just lucky with the people we happened to talk to?

Let's get back to the last section and talk about political positions. Imagine your opinion stood in it's own space within the full array of possible opinion, do you imagine the grouping of those positions would in any way equate to the boundary lines drawn around the bodies of members of Nation States? Or would you find that your position on welfare, on military spending, on the driving speed limit, on the legal age to smoke, on the how close people ought to live to airports, etc. would vary as much – no more or less – with foreigners as it would with your neighbours? So why have a boundary in the first place? I agree that there are extreme views out there, and I have some myself. We cannot easily live together and perhaps we should not try. But the divisions are matters of opinion, not of race, or national identity. Nations are nonsense.

I won't claim that they always were nonsense. There may have been a time in a lesser populated world where tribes or nations met as strangers and legitimately preferred their own kind, but to claim that all these groupings remain natural today seems a gross exaggeration. Also, to claim that borders have been maintained or are being maintained because it suits the purposes of powerful people who operate a wider sphere of influence and benefit from a population who resolutely identify with a country, does not seem an outrageous idea. I feel that I need to back this idea up, yet it's staring me in the face. Royal lines cross these borders and always have, multinational companies have been accumulating power over the past two centuries and now make a mockery of our national identities, and all through this, war looms as a real threat to ordinary people who seldom ever play the global or international game.

Having the whole world fall for the notion that we should identify as national citizens in a world where the powers which determine our fate do anything but, is extraordinary, and it's hard to believe that the whole construct has lasted this long. Nations as far as I can see provide one benefit to mankind today – sports teams.

It's about how you ask the question:

Do you love your family, friends and neighbours? Yes, of course!

Do you want to be part of an organization which will lie to you and get you killed when there is a winning move possible in a game you aren't allowed to play? Fuck off!

Economics

There's a nice little fairy tale about the beginnings of money. Once upon a time people bartered for goods, but this was difficult because it's rare that what we have to trade has an equal value to what our neighbour has to trade, so some bright spark came up with a token of value which could be exchanged for goods – presto – money was born! You heard this as a kid, do you remember? But did it actually answer your question: Why is there money? No? Well, I'll answer it now. Money is hate.

We have wolf pelts, you have beer. We'll supply the wolf pelts you supply the beer! Your beer is shit this year. Maybe we're not happy about it, but you have to drink it too. It's still a pelt a barrel, and we're still bringing it. Why? Because we're friends. So what happens when we fall out and we still want the beer? Well we still do the trade, don't we, only now, when you have a crappy crop, we want to give you less for it. That's the moment when we invent the money, not before. Money allows people who don't like each other to secure the means of mutual existence together. No hate – no cash!

Do we deal with the money first or the hate? Let's deal with the money because I haven't finished! When in the fairy tale or history did anybody make the statement: 'Money is to make rich and poor people.'? Suppose we make the statement now, does it make any sense as a proposition? Why be rich? To be happy. Why are rich people happy? Because poor people are miserable! So why make something to create a group of happy people who are smaller than the group of the miserable and are only happy because they are not in the other group?

The beneficiaries of the money system, any money system are the minority of people who have more of the stuff and the system serves these only. How in any free democratically run body of people can money hold enough attraction to be approved? It cannot ever. This must suggest that manufactured crisis is an older thing than most people realise and it throws the whole fairy tale in a certain amount of doubt.

Societies will adopt money, willingly and with understanding only when they fully intend to gamble against another society who they do not like, and in no other circumstances. Let's examine whereof any contrary belief arises. A society debates the question of whether to abolish money. It's argued by somebody that without money, they would all have less. Why? Because money makes the lazy work harder, and without the feeling of need, nothing will get produced.

Who fears the lazy? The exhausted. Who fears a fall in production? People who don't have enough. Who benefits from our obsession with money? The rich. They know how to keep us hungry and they know how to keep what they have. Throughout human history a bunch of people have lived in our mist with none of our concerns, difficulties or obligations. They don't respect us because they don't identify with us. They share no common beliefs with us, because they manufactured all of our beliefs. They believe in simply living their lives as they wish and having us live ours as they tell us.

The complication with economics is that it seems complicated. It really isn't. It is simply an illusion which opens us all up to any form of abuse ever dreamt up. It is unadulterated hatred with a little bit of ridicule to spice it up.

Okay, now the hate. Go out tonight and fuck somebody you don't find in the least attractive. Are you back? What have you learned? Any questions?

Work, education & tech – but mostly work!

I used to play a game at school called Bulldog. It's pretty simple. All the players but 1 (usually) start at one end of the playground and one starts in the middle. The one in the middle is the catcher and has to catch all of the rest, by picking them up, throwing them down or touching them a given number of times depending on the rules. The catcher first calls out the name of 1 runner. They have to run first. The difference between bulldog and 'it' or 'tag' is that the runner can get help. Once out of a designated area 'homey', they can shout 'Bulldog!' and then the rest of the runners can run. Otherwise he/she can choose to take on the catcher by themselves and run all the way to the other homey, whereupon the rest of the runners run.

Now there's a simple way of being successful at this game. You employ the tactic of safety in numbers. You hide! You run behind the other runners like American football receivers use blockers. That way, unless you get targetted, you have a good chance of surviving until late in the game. Now why would I bring Bulldog up in a section on work? Well because in a lot of jobs I've done I've seen a similar tactic employed, and in school as well. Keeping your head down and never standing out is a very good tactic in keeping your job and keeping it bearable.

But it isn't a challenge, is it? Is your life a giant adventure or is it a balancing act between securing your needs and staying out of trouble? Maybe you love your job – cool, I've been there too. You realise however that your situation is not universal, nor, I would estimate, is it typical. Recent polls suggest most of us don't see the point of doing the jobs we do. It's felt by an increasing number that the work we are in provides no or little benefit to society, and the recent lockdown would seem to demonstrate that if when we stop showing up, it doesn't make very much difference.

Again there is a widening gap between the myth of work and the actuality of it. What do we suppose that the myth even is any more? Why, when we hear that our jobs may be under threat from automation do we fear redundancy. Why can't we celebrate the fact? It seems to me that reduced need for working people should be acknowledged as one of humanity's greatest achievements to date. Where is the celebration. Where are all the new sports, games and pastimes? When do we plan to end all the economic nonsense once and for all and live as free people, finally? We've earned it.

Yet people seem to believe that they need to work. Why? Would it break your alarm clock's heart if it didn't get to ruin your sleep 5 mornings a week? Would your marriage fall apart if you were home? Can you not face early retirement? The funny thing is, this has happened before, at least it was about to happen once. Back in the 20s, technology took a great leap forward with onset of innumerable labour saving devices. The mod cons were expected to change life/work balance for good but this change never came about. The Wall Street crash happened instead and after the long recovery from that event, it seems the hope had been mostly forgotten. Why was this?

Well Fascism was a big distraction. The massive stress of the second world war may have put the idea out of people's minds for a while. The post war recovery took quite a long time also, and the international situation between the West and Communism along with the threat of nuclear war kind of killed the utopian dream. I imagine that being on the threshold of a leisure age and then plunging into 2 decades of crisis might have bugged up a lot of people's optimism. But not everyone's, there were still (I believe) comic books and science fiction. I seem to remember when I came on the scene these were smaller cliques than they became later, but had their roots way back in the time before this optimism a century ago. They have

enjoyed a resurgence because escapism has become the best way of staying sane. The music of the 60s, the drugs of the 70s, the cinema of the 80s, and the return of the tech explosion in the 90s were the generational distractions we were fed. If you still believe that these occur all on their own or that we collectively create our own culture, I suppose I have to contest this point. I'll get to that. Bear with me though. I want to explain why, in spite of there having been a possibility of revolutionary change in the work we do a century ago, nothing significant changed.

About now I have to gamble. I have to tell you something many of you will refuse to believe. It's all orchestrated. All of it. I don't know when politics became a sham and culture became a science. I can only say that when The Matrix told us we had our timeline off by about a century, they were about right. For the past hundred years, nothing real happened. Well, that isn't quite true, you see, for one class of people, the work/life balance did permanently change and life became a game. A game which they could never lose, but for the rest of the world, life became nothing more than a fiction. A fiction which we live, and which an increasing number of us can no longer tolerate.

Now let's examine our school days. Not the bit on the playground this time, but the rest. What were we educated for? I was staring out of the window most years until about May when I'd start 'revising' for exams. I liked exams, nobody expected me to listen – there's no talking!

There seemed to be a lot of walking in single file – practice for queueing. A lot of shutting up and listening. Training in shutting up and listening! Quite a bit of endless repetitive doing things in a book. Boredom endurance conditioning. Some reading as a group. Waiting for our turn drills. Then a whole load of listening to the teacher and making notes to be tested later. Subordination prep. The rest, school trips, practical stuff like cooking, lunch and open day, were probably about hassling our parents to remind them graduation doesn't necessarily remove them from the school's reach! I learned two things which helped me throughout school and university. Decimals in year 3, and the 'Big O' notation at college. That is to say, I already knew them, but I found out that other people knew them too and there were words for them, this was quite a relief! Decimals empowered me to be specific about things I didn't know, and the Big O allowed me to stop doing maths altogether!

How much of your life have you spent stuck in a job or home you didn't like? How many times have you tried to change your circumstances and failed? How many different ways have you tried to become whatever it is you think of as successful? Has work led you to wealth? Did education lead you to opportunity? Have efforts paid off or have they all been wasted? How old will you have to be before you realise that it isn't you that's failing. It isn't luck, and it's not bad choices, or lacking effort, or bad timing or a particular isolated act of malice which cost you the success you calculated you'd reach?

Eliminating these explanations, it becomes clear that the malice is systemic, the glass ceiling is real, you get as far as you are allowed (and if you are honest – that will not be very far!), and you are who you are wanted to be – a built to order cog in a machine built to keep the status quo.

Monopolies

It's generally understood that monopolies have been allowed to emerge in every market, and that they have now gained the level of power where they can do whatever they want. The history is interesting and the problem is manifold.

This book is not the place for the histories of the companies who now own the world. The lesson from those histories is vital to my argument and will be mentioned later. I want to observe, here that the problem with this state of play is not simply that monopolies are anti-democratic or that they are counter to the principles of the free market and that they destroy consumer power. No monopolies present a greater problem, formed as they were through a competitive, profit driven system. You see the profits can't stop. There is no end game... 'Oh we won now, let's kick back and chill.' No. The profits have to continue. New markets must be created, new frontiers have to be breached. So what has happened? They have started a land race on our bodies and our minds. We are their next frontier and we are being conquered through medical intervention, psychological programming, and cybernetic enhancements which are just around the corner. All because of the underlying economic model – capitalism, which already lost it's credentials.

People want it back. This is an issue because so many other people want it stopped. Later I'll break that problem down and show how, cast in different terms, the left and the right have no dispute.

The proposed solution

It's all got to go!

All of it, from cradle to grave. The education, health, financial, work and political system. The lot. We have to stop and begin again. We need to furthermore, ensure that lies and fear can't be allowed to creep back in and start dividing us. Nation states can't be allowed to emerge and redefine our relationships with one another as universally connected and cooperative. The social contract needs to be decided upon and ratified by all of us on a voluntary basis and without coercion of any kind. These agreements, once made need to be placed beyond the possibility of their ever being doctored or concealed from anybody wherever we go in the universe.

Actually, achieving an endless concord will not be possible. Space travel will eventually break the social contract because it will lead to speciation and thereby remove allegiances. But this won't happen for many thousands of years. Our job right now is to fix our situation and sort out things for the next few hundred generations. There are a few warnings we can leave, of course and we'll make every effort to do this, but please try and remember the boredom you experienced when you heard war stories from world war one! All very real for the people alive back then who lived through that nightmare but morose and trivial to kids of the 80s. There's really only so much we can do to protect unborn generations, but what we can do, we may as well do as well as we possibly can.

What happens when we stop the liars? Firstly we all have to talk and determine the truth. Actually, the liars, once exposed will help out in that respect, because once we start to see the actual situation we are in regarding the way we've been lied to and conditioned, truths will be

revealed. Fundamentally, I believe it to be obvious at this point that ordinary people, by which I mean those not directly involved in a conspiracy of lies against the rest of us, are well disposed to look out for the well being of every one of us. This helps! We are learning more and more as month follows month, post covid, about the extent of the lies we have been told! Should we pull this coup off, we may find that there isn't all that much to do to fix things. Don't misunderstand. I mean not much besides what we've all been trying to do all this time, things will just start to work as expected when we remove the element which wants everything to fail. Obviously rebuilding the world will be an effort. It just might not be as difficult a task with the predators and parasites removed.

Where we will have a problem is with bad habits, caution based on misinformation, prejudices of every kind which have been hammered into us, a lack of faith in progress based on old information, and mistrust, again, based on old information. Also there will be the question of where we draw the line? Are all our enemies trillion or billionaires or do bullies who wear uniforms or punch the clock at civil service jobs also need to climb the fuck down before they're thrown?

Immediate dangers of the basic solution

Here's the problem with a power vacuum – it gets filled. Who does it get filled by? People who were already trying to get into power! Why do they want power? For the same reason the people just ousted wanted power – because of the fear that if they do not achieve power, someone else will take it.

Now, we know that there is a freedom movement, but look at the thing! We're nearly 3 years into the global coup (the obvious part, I mean, the bit with the panic and lockdowns!), I only just met some real resistance leaders (if they are real!), last weekend! What kind of organization are we when we've laid nothing down on paper in terms of policy, standards of conduct, philosophy, doctrine, law, pledges, or procedures. When we don't even know each other have never held a proper assembly and have collectively decided upon nothing? Are we claiming to be ready to take over the world? Not in the slightest. We barely trust each other and we can't agree on which leg to march off!

Worse, we're all so used to being told how we are, that we actually need to hear somebody tell us if we're doing well or badly! It is as stupid as it sounds. There is this idea that people (and they are almost invariably an abstract someone else) need to have things play out at them like a theatre performance. We always think of this in the third person, but it is ourselves too. It's been so long since we saw any reality, when it happens in front of our eyes, we don't know what to make of it. If a bomb went off and blew our legs off, we'd crawl home and turn on the TV to see if it happened!

How should it go? 2 years ago it was crystal clear. We barge into parliament and we drag everyone out, then a few weeks later we watch them all crying in court confessing to everything, then we hang them and spend a few months correcting each other's pre-liberation style slip ups, like when we accidentally defer responsibility or look around for an authority figure, or test an idea to see if it's economically viable, or some such totalitarian hangover dumb shit. Then eventually we all figure out that we've been deceived by government for the longest time and we'll never do it again, and we each find something wonderful we can do to establish a bit of the new world chaos, and finally get on with having a good time all the time.

Now it isn't so clear. The crime culprit model has been superseded. You see it's not just the players who are corrupt, but all the instruments, institutions and the whole concept of politics itself that are all fucked up. It's apparent that ousting the scum who run everything will not be nearly enough. We're going to have to strip ourselves and everything in the world down to the bare bones and think everything through again.

Now at the beginning of this I stated I was going to tell you why 10 Billion States is the only workable solution to these problems. I've briefly outlined the problems. So here goes.

Why societies go wrong

Has this ever happened to you? You ran out of money. You had exhausted all of your favours. You couldn't get a loan. You needed food, drugs, drinking water, power, whatever, and you finally thought – This is it! Now I have to resort to crime – and you realised you hadn't a clue how to go about stealing! It happened to me, and I began to theorise that maybe a lot of the great crimes may have been discovered, at first, by accident.

Examples: You're an employer. You miscalculate your budget and you decide to tell your staff that there is no money and you will have to pay them at the end of the week instead of at the end of the day. Maybe they accept this, and then on Thursday a new employee shows up and is told that payday is Friday. He shrugs and says okay. Suddenly you realise that you can pay your staff in arrears for the work they do for you!

You fit a camera in your shop but when you look at the tape you realise you completely messed it up and you have the staff in shot instead of the customers, but then you notice Mandy spends all her time talking to her friends and never does any of the restock, so you fire her and keep the camera where it is.

You bugger up a treaty negotiation with the chief next door so you tell your people he's an absolute ruthless tyrant who cannot be reasoned with, next thing they are all arming up and offering to kill the dude, so you tell them to be real careful and not to give away the source of the attack, especially if it fails, endure a few days of pure terror before they come back bloody and victorious, wink at you and go home, and you gleefully arrange a diplomatic visit to your other neighbours from which you'll return with all sorts of stories!

A city state in a nearby realm writes and asks you to write them a constitution, so you book a voyage and you check the place out. Within a few months you've done what you consider a reasonable job. You present it to the people, whereupon, they cheer with delight and present you with double the agreed fee. You question the figure and they pull you quietly aside. 'The additional money is a bribe, they tell you, we ask that you don't do any constitutional work for the following lands' and they list all their enemies. Sure enough a few months afterwards a delegation from one of those lands comes knocking and so you recommend the worst philosopher you can think of!

Of course none of these things ever happened to me. I'm just suggesting that crime can be discovered quite by accident, and I suppose further that there are cases, where they don't feel like crimes, rather they feel like some well deserved luck. Here is a further danger of new societies like the one (or the ones) many are hoping to establish very soon. They can quickly become corrupt even without people looking to corrupt them.

If we accidentally create an imbalance between the power of employee and employer or we accidentally spy on our own people, or we accidentally create an assassins' guild, or we accidentally scupper the foundation of an entire state, that's a pretty awful thing to do. But let's not ignore the fact that these are easy things to do, particularly by accident!

So how do you stop these accidents from happening? You can't. They always will. The real question is how do you ensure, that in each and every case, when things fuck up there is a way out? It's real easy and it is called contract based law.

Contract based law

In a contract based law state system you and I cooperate by agreement. We are not joined permanently in a way we lose control of. We have made a decision to work together on issues a, b, and c, and only on a, b, and c. If issue d comes up which we might like to work on together then we do so under a new contract! If a, b, and c get resolved, the contract is over, and if one of us changes his or her mind on a, b, or c, we end the contract. No harm, no foul.

Now these issues can be anything at all. It might be, up-keeping a local park, hunting a killer, not playing music loud after 9pm, giving 20% of our money to the unemployed, allowing employment or money to happen in the first place. The point is, when either of us realise that it's not working for us, we leave the agreement. Under such an arrangement crime becomes almost impossible. If you ask that I agree not to smoke, I'll simply refuse. You won't have the contract, so there won't be a law. The only crime under these conditions would be breaking our word, reneging on the contract, and this would – I expect – have to be an issue of common concern, after all, if we don't honour our contracts, none of our agreements have any meaning.

Therefore, there would – I assume – be a common contract to withhold our diplomacy from those who contract in bad faith. We could determine our own policy on this and relate contractually with one another on the basis of these policies. It sounds complex and it is. It's wonderfully complex, but we have the use of compression algorithms which will serve to map our collective AND individual space. What a compression algorithm does, is takes a large amount of data, and orders it in such a way that it takes the minimum of space. In practical terms, it can take the whole soup of our political opinions and structure it for us so that our individual and collective will becomes immediately obvious and transparent. We are able to not only see what our own best strategy for forming contracts will be, but what the effect of making those contracts will be as well.

For example. I believe that planned obsolescence is wrong. I don't want to use companies who make machines to break, but I live in a neighbourhood where many people work in factories where crappy goods are made. The algorithm tells me that if I contract to never trade with these people, I'll pay 30% more for goods in general, but it then tells me that if I buy shares in a local shipping firm, I can mitigate this by 22% over a few quarters. Hence my decision can be weighed up according to the likely outcomes.

The algorithm then reminds me that I've just made a decision based on an ability to invest, and tells me that 83% of people in my sphere (?) don't have this luxury, and tells me a list of groups addressing this shortcoming, who I can go and make further contracts with. So now, I pool my resources with these, flip the market and the factory stops it's build to break policy.

Now, I agree that this is complicated almost beyond our ability to process, but that isn't necessarily critical because there are different levels at play here. Going back to another

question: smoking. There's no way I quit, and there's no way you'll allow me to smoke around you, but we both agree that you and I should have private space where I can smoke and you can have no smoke, all that's left is a discussion of shared spaces. We just set times and a clean up standard and we're done. There are many issues which can be simply agreed and need rarely or never be addressed again, for example: The right to sleep, the right not to be punched or shot, a duty not to pollute the water supply. There are other areas where agreement will be so common that the majority will sign up: Freedoms of information, bodily autonomy, the right to education, rights of family, freedom of belief and worship. Where there is disagreement, there will be outlying groups, but they won't be a concern for most people most of the time because they will occupy a political space where groups either aim for self sufficiency and self determination - easily provisioned, or they seek influence outside - easily curtailed.

What's the point?

If self autonomous contract law is so complicated why have it?

Simply put, in any other form of social contract or system of law, once we sign up, we are investing our rights for benefits. If these benefits are not delivered, we may find we cannot take back what we put in, namely our freedoms. Furthermore, once a representation system is in place, it becomes the vested interest of the representatives to maintain their authority. Excuses may be made for failings, further patience may be demanded. It might be argued that no better result was possible than the one delivered and that our only alternative to their services would be chaos. Suddenly we've gone full circle. Authority is in place, and it now has a growing list of acceptable excuses when it fails us. We are back to where we were, under somebody's rule with no way out.

Under the type of contract law I'm proposing, the exit is always open. A failure to deliver on a contract nullifies it. I'm proposing a political system where we never give up our power, and I believe that the complication of it only reflects the complication we face in living together, however we decide it's to be done. It could be summarized as the right to retreat. It most likely needs to establish a fallback position for this retreat - an original position, void of contract, where any of us should we choose will still have some resource. Perhaps a share of the common goods which we can take as our personal property should we ever need to break all contracts. Would this be popular? I don't know!

Contract templates, contract writers and the contract market

So starting from the fallback position - let's just call this the starting position though it's not likely all of us will go there often if at all - how would we begin this legislative adventure?

Let's suppose that for any opinion o , there is a degree of complexity in how the optimum legislative position for it is discovered and reached. There will, however be common searches for many o s. If you begin with 100 o s and run the search it's likely that the eventual advice you get back will have applied similar operations to a lot of them. It is further, likely that any opinions you have will not be unique and that your search will be duplicated elsewhere. The search time therefore falls by orders of magnitude according to the participants using the system.

It's likely, further, that all of these searches will quickly group themselves into a set of basic templates, whereby we simply need to pick the template for the thing we are trying to do and run it. As better resources are found, these can update and our results can refine.

Could making such political products become a job or a market? Possibly. There are some of us who do regard life as a great adventure. These people don't seek a simple life – anything but! Perhaps, legislation designer could become the new job for the speculator? Here's a potential danger. Will this culture threaten the people who do want a simple life? Not necessarily. Instantiate this question when somebody considers using man-built custom political software. - 'Do you want to lose?'

Take a look at the chess scene. Are humans winning or the AI?

I would like to see a new breed of high achievers get into political software. Life is an adventure, but what proportion of us can play the game at an elite level? A smaller group. Where will the power always be? The bigger group! Go ahead and have fun, but it's kudos you will earn, not human bondage!

Common Law – An Alternative

There exists an ancient law which is simple, appropriate and has stood the test of time. Common Law refers to the set of very basic and intuitive principles that we do not steal or injure one another and goes no further than these obvious and common assumptions of right and wrong. There is nothing wrong with these principles, or the claims made in their name, i.e. that if we were to reduce the state to these as a basis of the social contract, we could stop government abuses and extortions.

There are many reasons to want more than these basic assurances, though. Common Law does not cater for all of our collective needs, nor does it maximise our potential for well being or utilise fully the potential benefits of forming collective agreements – i.e. societies.

I'm not opposed to the Common Law Movement. I support it's work, but it's my aim, not simply to limit current government overreach and abuse. Rather, I seek to create a versatile and comprehensive basis for all form of future social organization and crucially, a fallback position for individuals, recognised by all. To do this, I'm taking a different approach: Instead of establishing the basis for a collective organisation, I'm trying to establish the fundamental right of an individual outside any agreement as a starting and fallback position. There is no practical difference between pure Common Law and Universal Self Autonomy. The difference is formal. Under USA (excuse the infringement!) The basic social contract protects us first from any collective we might form subsequently. It's a slight of hand – no doubt – a paradox. But is it not the crux of the whole debate?

Are not all forms of social agreements trade-offs between securities and responsibilities? Should we, therefore, recognise in the first instance that we desire personal control on whether to make this deal in any form? Should we make the very statement, that this choice is our formal, first choice and agree to collectively protect this individual power?

Conclusion

Either the world has slipped out of public control or public control was an illusion in the first place. In either case, it's now apparent that abuses and lies are escalating, we're approaching an end game and we need to act now and take control.

Once in control, we need to be very careful that we have thoroughly cut out the rot and we need to make an examination of every element of our political and social structure, removing unfounded assumptions, prejudice, institutionalised barbarity, and the legacy programming which lying despots have infected us with for generations.

Before we commence rebuilding anything, we need to health check ourselves to ensure we don't automatically repeat the mistakes of before and we need to examine all of our possibilities to be absolutely certain that we are starting right, heading right and we're not destroying the freedoms which we just took.

Whatever we decide should be our organization should be if any, we need to make room for everybody as they are, without forcing conformity on anybody. We need to ensure that all participants engage voluntarily and have complete self-determination. There is a difference between making a compromise because it's prudent and making a compromise because you are not offered another way to survive.

A human association on a voluntary basis should not become a matter of necessity. Life outside society should not be an impossibility. Essentially we are entitled to our share of the world's natural resources by birth right and these cannot be taken away. Sharing in anything man-made is a right bought by contract and the contract can be anything we choose to make it.

Finally, we should expect success in such a venture. People are wise, loving, industrious and energetic. Want and hardship, by the work of others has already been shown to have been the creations of greedy manipulative criminals.

How it will be achieved

Does anyone need a quick reminder of how data helps us? Why is it called 'data', not 'information', 'facts', 'the picture', 'the truth'? Breaking down facts, theory, formula, etc. into non-specified factors in all the formulation of idea and opinion, lets us miss nothing. In retrospect when we re-assess our failed predictions, new understanding feeds us new definitions, concepts and relationships. By watching these events; the cause and consequences – the co-occurers, from our observations, we can build a picture of what happened, simultaneously, with what we think is happening, and of what we expect will happen next.

I expressed earlier that I don't labour too much in defining the terms of what we call our political groupings. I see facts about our identity to be better represented in charts and lists and maps. All language is approximate. The conversation between language and reality is one of our best songs. It's a love rhapsody. It's cock-rock. Data will always be much much bigger than truth, wisdom or destiny. If any of those are your bag, take it home and feed it!

Most of the truth is you're fucked! If you're believing something else you better be paying for it and it better be getting wasted! You're fucked if there is any reason at all you're telling yourself you're okay, because fuck knows you're lying and sooner or later you'll regret the time you spent denying it all. The fact you do what you do for fuck only knows what reason, is the only reason the world hasn't healed and self righted. You know this, but because you're fucked, you thought you'd take the lesser rap and not be the stupid fucks who sat there and admitted it. We fully acknowledge the smooth play and so we're all all fucked, but you most of all because with nothing else on the table, well, you deserve it!

Let's call this our little risk mantra.

Politically, we need to ensure we are back in control and it can never be taken away from us. Let's break down the us! That's you and me agreeing on this. We haven't decided on anything else so far, so don't push it. Our deal is a fail-safe. When we lose power, all deals are off. That's the backbone of the deal. I'm not waiting until I can't, before I hit out. I like to think that if I've got the bomb, I've got the bomb. There's no we have the bomb. Who would I be with in such a deal. No! If there's a we that has the bomb, then I have the bomb! If there's a more complicated way that we can have a deal, go away and think it up. I have a fist. What's your 'our bomb'?

Really of course, thinking like this is as near universal as it gets, and so it's got that well connected nodule of 'yeah?' magnitude. Such common spaces, as I explained, (in life as in algorithmics) occupy their space cheaply.

In politics there are undeniable facts: We can't agree on everything. The things I can do are the things I can do.

Anarchist syndicalism is another term for what I refer to as Contractarian Self Autocracy, or Unbounded Plutocracy. It's simply a convention that we all understand that every one of us has the right to author their law and to live with any who endorse it. Underlying this convention is a question over space and resources. Foreseeably, such a practice immediately raises the question of topography. If I'm only entitled to contact with those who endorse my laws, isn't the world a checker-board where I may or may not be able to physically visit my

neighbours? Surely many of our states are going to be born non-viable? What cost is required from the market of states to accommodate geographically and logistically for the outliers needs (and through these, their means), to afford our common statehood.

The answer is there is or there isn't the will. Provision will or will not be given.

This is a point normally called Tribalism. But the 10BS version is backed up by something we still universally control through individualism. Moreover it is created from blocks of statements made of nothing but our rulings, there is nothing in there which is not important to somebody. These kinds of tribes, moreover are not formed through commitment, or bound by treaty of allegiance. The treaty is a transitory creation of the allegiance. Everybody is in it to a unique measure of their own enumerated total will. So there isn't a critical point of make or break. The individual is not obliged to defend the tribal integrity at the expense of a compromise to their intentions. Our allies are just whoever they are this week and our population is bigger or smaller than that of any adversary-in-part.

The need rate of the super-tribe is fluid on two axis: Stress and stress distribution. Both can be regulated continuously by any of us, any time.

We all know we are living through a revolution. Never mind the part we may be playing through it. Let's look ahead to where we will be on day one of the post revolution world. Are we the people who did what it took to get there? Then our war is over. Is it over for everyone? If not – it hasn't happened. Think dis-temporally about who we are. Our will will always be exercised, with or without our willing it! I'm talking about dissatisfaction, disbelief, disassociation. A solution is as good as the unification of approval and the power generally given to it.

Any failing legislation will deny any claim to be a success. I don't say must. I say should.

Bidding high and low

Frivolity and frugality met on a train station platform at open day at your college, They fell in love, bunked off together, and you never met them! This was two tragedies with no possibility of a third, because frugality when mastered is the most stubborn measure there is, and frivolity the most irresistible. Neither craft remains for you. You're the loneliest guy in the universe. And the only two people who are not, are lost forever to the all the rest of us. But I'm a little Bot-alumnus in love with some reality for all of us, and one of us bitches is going to drag my ass to the reunion those wankers show up at soon!

Stretch yourselves two ways at every possible opportunity: Know when you face problems on a global basis, you are generalizing complexity and haemorrhaging self-purpose, when you are personally concerned, you are exaggerating your position and wasting everybody's time. Problems are what the universe gives you for being a bad boy. Perspective is what we do when our numbers are tight and we see through it. There can be a you. I've already agreed there must be. But the you alive after any agreement which you make, made it happen and knows how to do it again.

Rationalize your betting and ignore your circumstances. Play for the house and if nobody is with you at the end, open a window and order everybody back to work!

Play the ends and work the middle. If there is stress around you there are profound errors, but you can't really use them except en-masse, so stack your counters on the mass and know you are loaded if anybody walks away.

If your mindset is linked to the attack on absurdity, then you become rational invulnerable. As well as dumb-proof!

Bidding high and low is a political strategy where we treat our selves as a position which tolerates no change in attention. Neither distraction to or away, and where we float on the 'market' of intention, betting on our best guesses. What does it cost us if we gamble on a seeming certainty and find ourselves alone? We stood to gain nothing, and we need to ditch the 'partnership'. Or if we 'win' we prove we were right all along and something just wasted our attention.

We will develop a living strategy where we are not betting on what a market should do, but arguing about where the market should be.

Resolution is the goal

We reach accurate and efficient bidding by recognising the supremacy of the individual will over any other factor, because we understand the requirement of total participation on a 'closed book' our established, ratified 'right things' stack!

Work out your own commitments, granularly, no matter how stupid they sound. That's you and that's what we need to know you are going to do! If you want any meaningful response, be that! Remember there is the fight, and the stake in the fight. Measure and interpretations are the enemy of your accurate estimations of that fight and that stake. You are on your own and, most massively unimportant in your fight, are the swing voters watching you fight!

The point is, the effective will in a successful bid pays off in the attention you have for the next bid. Not only yours, but all of your co-bidders, and so bigger gambles pay off in proportion to popularity. How far down the shopping list do we want to go? All the way, naturally.

Smash around a little Mazlov

There are high bid bets you have no doubt about. For one: There is no doubt at all that the better the case for everybody, the less you need to calculate and the less chance you have of failure. A bet against Max Maz is a stupidity and obviously a joke.

The significance of 'Who monetizes?'

There is an irresolvable difference between doing a thing because you want to and doing a thing because you have to.

The very act of succeeding in settling with your peers, casts you in a role of the weighted traders. But the act of establishing your own democratic continuity changes you from an interested player, to a platform, and the 'not-a-platform' must then trample you into the earth!

We can talk about market health all day, but let's face it, the market is unhealthy directly as a consequence of us making it a market!

If the cause is to find a level, why blow it out of proportion? Well because it is.

Therefore, having a common angle on when we make a 'call', (i.e. when we tell everybody to take a run and jump), is going to balance this proportional disjunction between the grains and the mountain, and we get to learn the perils of local optima in a very public and hilarious way..

If it's not hilarious, then it's not a true approximation of our reality.

We are currently dis-ingratiated by vast ignorance of ourselves as happy

..and that's not funny at all!

This is a rising tide. If you are swimming, swim up, if you are walking walk forward.

The problem with the world is not a lack of understanding it's solutions. It's the opaque and distorted view of our own effect on the world. We don't receive the result because we don't know we've made a bid, or whether it succeeded. As 10 Billion States, however, we will make assumptions of what constitutes an end game and we will logically play all our bid!

Doing your unique, crazy, total market plunge is the exact cost and payment of civic duty and it buys what it pays. Additionally, all you have is then yours, and you are free. If you are still not happy, be someone else: uniquer.. crazier.. totaller..? Happier! Have as many goes as you want.

Have a logical love of the primary goal of the discussion – that it's solvable. You earned it!

You are not playing yourself, you are gamifying your consequences. BECAUSE they're in everybody's way.

What you look like gamified

Overwork will happen in any inexact resolution. Be the one doing it because you build on broad success, down to minutia. Be a counter-intuitive result junkie, but absolutely dis-amorous of repeat success. These result from a non-bid. A piece of a common assumption – the local optima. You are not fine tuning a perfect calculator, you are fighting through polythene, to get out of the box which identifies you with your factory settings, to get out of your political identity as part of the old supply chain, to find your place in the world, to get out of needing to calculate anything at all.

Ask always – 'Why can't I?' Or you will end up asking yourselves 'Why didn't I?'

Look, there are a lot of ways to be wrong, but it's not the case that being it means anything common to us all!

We're also not trying to build a singularity here, but the full and finite dimensions of our common space. How dumb do you want to look to us, once you realise we are clearly equally dumb when we're looking only for your ridiculousness?

Frivolity and frugality left the party before we got our beer in and work is completely stupid. Nearly everything which we find worth doing, is worth it because it's not worth the effort of

not having it done already. The greater your contribution to our new glorious future, the stupider you will have looked doing it. But this – I think – is more commonly understood than the particulars of our own delusion to the contrary.

You are as cheap as you're great and not the other way around.

There is nothing much to de-capitalizing negativity or fear

In the first case, negative or cynical people need only the demonstration of a better option, a small requirement. And fear sells on Halloween because it can't get a full-time gig.

Fear buyers are zombies. Zombies don't have an inexhaustible appetite – they have no appetite at all. Feed them and nothing happens. The trick is to stop fear sellers from having any of the kill. After all, the fear is not delivering on its bid to the zombie. Zombies failed by fear producers ought to revert to their former happier selves, and the fear profiteer should have a fortune of 'didn't-make-any-difference'. See you on the 31st/10th.

Is the world a Demonarchy? That's the suspicion. Am I the test killer, just here to produce the greatest of all dangers to them and then be destroyed by a test champion or saviour? We'll see. Maybe not, though? Fear is bad for the face though, so I'm not worrying. I barely get away with my smiley one!

Conceptualizing the state of play

We were all born within these highly sophisticated societies called nations. We had to learn what they were called and what these words meant. And, situated within them, we had to play our respective positions according to the rules and the mechanisms inherent in them.

Realize that we are all out of touch with the conceptual framework which we will use to construct the circus of total existence we aim to recreate by our politicised trading. These concepts are a catalogue of our attitudes: Preference, sense of justice, satisfaction, and comfort. Settle upon meanings of these things, and specify where and how these definitions are to be applied.

You were ahead or behind in a game which was built flawed or which became corrupted in the course of play. For centuries, severe injustices and miseries have resulted from the malpractice which our systems have allowed, or introduced. Do you yourself recognise that the current system is unjust? If you do, do you believe that those injustices should go? Does it therefore matter if you have been successful or 'failfull' in your quest to exist in such a system?

In the end, we will have agreed on what everything meant, and there won't be any dis-commonality in this! Whether you got to the conclusion by shifting little pieces of paper around or by picking them up between two sticks, that idiocy will be finished.

So what happens next?

We all agree in principle to give 10 Billion States a try. We download the app. We agree on going live – say when there are a million of us? Then we contact our governments announcing our cessation from their country., and we try and have a better time than everyone else!

The idea of a million people for the minimum attempt is that we might receive hostility from government. I assume that with 1 million people will be able to afford a navy. The Vietnamese Boat People lasted a good few years when nobody liked them. Boats really help! In probability we'll be allowed to land somewhere. If it turns out we have to move most of us, then, again, the idea is not yet workable. But, A million people as a trading block is still a large number. Wherever there is a concentration of us, our effect will be felt. After all, 10 Billion States orders our concerns according to our priorities and if we are being oppressed, then collective action against such oppression is advisable.

Paying taxes

We pay only for what we use. As foreigners, we do not pay the government for administration. That is done for their citizens. We do our own. We don't pay all of what would normally be our tax bill because we don't use all of the services offered. For example, we will not pay for military, judicial or policing, because we will have our own. The same will be true for medical tax if your country has it. This leaves, public infrastructure, community taxes and tax on property where applicable to non-nationals.

Our tax rate will of course be as advised by the app, i.e. the best rate for us to pay, automatically.

If, this is a better way of affiliating than nation states, then our numbers will increase towards an eventual tipping point when nation states become a minority choice worldwide.

Declaring economic war on our competitors

Quit your job. That is your number one priority. The trend towards a global monopoly has wrought an economic landscape within which your money escapes you and then imprisons you. Don't feed it. Stop now!

When you trade, trade to your maximum self-interest, trust others to do likewise and the truth to be the only consequent. This includes trading your time. Once all of your money funds your interests, you become a power. For every trade which benefits your competitor, they become more powerful. Government can have no rival. That's what governing means. You are self governed and to protect that power, you decide to collectively protect self autonomists to the maximum. Any other form of government is a fraud.

Our aim is to steal the only property of any value which a government can have – it's population. What is it without them?

Where we will be when it is achieved.

Your money / energy goes where you say

I scan a barcode in a supermarket and it tells me if I want the item. If the store is a participant this will happen because the rest of the stock exists in an ordered list of my partners and these are qualified in terms of our existing contract potential. Otherwise, the item I scan is simply rated by my contact potential with that brand and product.

I apply for a job, the employer's contractability is run against the offer terms and if there is a workable scenario, I'm told what it is and I make that offer.

I want or need anything, I can see the list of suppliers and the implications of doing the deal, and do it or not accordingly. All of my accessible data is harvested and all of my opinion is derived either from transactions I make or from my attitude to them. Opinion data can be inquired of me directly, tested organically against my person-o-type, or directly entered into my constitution. It's easy to categorize these opinions legally, because they fall into either, non-negotiable rules or lexically ordered conditional rules. Their type can be deduced from our statements, decisions, and from direct questioning.

Gradually, my constitution is generated, and as this is going on, I'm beginning to redirect my association according to my politics, or whatever I believe with.

All participants have best in class political services

The only deal between all 10BS participants is that we commonly protect common access to 10BS. This will give us all confidence that every participant is getting a fair deal. The consequences for this are as follows:

The left / right divide vanishes

The left and right do not wish to deal with each other and will not be prompted to. That's not to say that there won't be contracts between left people and right people, they just won't be political contracts. Both right people and left people will decide for themselves (implicitly or explicitly) if a deal is political and this is included in the calculation. So, The left can't complain what the right does with its labour and the right can't complain what the left does with its money!

Communalism gets murdered on its ass

Where people live is not part of who they are any more, unless it sucks and then it is! And then it won't! So who cares?

All the bullshit associated with our inherited cultural identity will vanish in a puff of its own whiff. You can still support your football team, but the idea that you and your neighbourhood are superior beings destined for mastery of the universe will be a little hard put to compete against a global compact to give everybody what they need to personally be the greatest in the universe on their own.

Everywhere you are is Youland

As you are a country and your territory is under your feet, and as your contracted associates live everywhere, there are no countries, as such between ourselves. If there remain non-participants contracted with nation state countries, they are either countries which don't contract with us, and we don't deal with them, or countries which allow us to move within them or stay there as foreigners, and live by their laws if we accept the deal. Otherwise we leave, or exist in them as criminals.

We move people if we need to, but if we need to, there's no point. There's nowhere to go, because there is no world. Basically we are unpopular, and we'd be advised to pool the rest of our resources and buy a territory. But, we'd be better off giving up politics and flying under the radar. Life is rubbish!

But if we're popular, we will be in a situation where the greater part of the world is foreign populated. Then, nation states will become the purchasers of territory from us.

Wealth will become valueless

While there's no limit to what anyone can accumulate, whatever accumulators have will only be tradable with people willing to trade with accumulators. So, should they ever become abusive, they will be trading only with other accumulators – i.e. breaking even. So accumulation will follow the law of diminished returns. Thereby, accumulators will not be able to maintain the value of what they have because they are definitively a minority and do not set the value of their property.

There will only be one crime

Crime will be impossible because we make our own law. The only crime is breaking a contract, and this will always be fraud – never forgetfulness because we all have the best in class political software. The only way we'd be forced into fraud is if we fail to find a trade group with a density to cover haulage costs, in which case the world hates us and we're better off, jacking in being ourselves!

Conveniently, 10 Billion States has the break-safe feature that a state of there being no agreement voids all the contracts, so a state of anarchy will occur at such a juncture. This can happen to us individually, factionally or collectively. But all it will really mean is that we have to change some of our choices. Maybe we would need to stop eating newborn babies. Maybe we have to go as far as not running over cats! There is no real difference between that consideration and the situation we exist in as law abiding members of nation states, except that 10 Billion States contracts will more likely break if somebody makes war, than nation states will break. (These break at the end of wars!) And, if we find ourselves in a state of disaster personally or factionally, we can void the contract ourselves without facing immediate

deportation from our country of residence. Because nobody would take a deal like that unless they were working a hustle of their own.

The timeline

The 10 Billion States App is being built. It should be complete this year (2023), so in time for the first million pledges. You can go to the website and express interest now. The site will have a forum and a pledge counter. If you bought this book early in 2023, there will not be many pledges yet! The design of the code will be updated during the build, and as the team and the movement grow I expect many more contributions than only my own.

The history

10 Billion States was begun in November 2019 and started as an afterthought. My plan had been to write a social network for unpublished fictional characters, but I noticed the bots on the site would be ideal for democracy software which I first wrote about in a science fiction novel of 2001. I'm a bit of a one trick pony.

Now I'm rewriting the modular design to work without the training data from the social network, however, data is super abundant, and currently not yet monopolized or illegal. As I have said – it's all ours, we just need to stop giving it away for nothing to people who have no intention of using it for our benefit.

For the past 3 or so years I have been trying to fund and publicise the project. The breakthrough came in December 2022 when I found a programming partner. By that time I had already launched 'The Contact Catalogue', a directory for the freedom movement. 'Concat' organizations will be contacted about the time of the launch of this book to gauge their interest in affiliating with me. Long before 10 Billion States goes live, I will publish its fore-runner, 'Concat Village', an online environment for freedom movement organizations and businesses. This will be by nature, a virtual political social network. If you are part of a freedom movement organization or have a company and want to trade with the movement, you are invited to join Concat village.

All that remains for me to say is, Thanks for reading. I hope you will choose self autonomy as your political future, and I look forward to joining with you to create a world immune from exploitations and abuses.

Fare well.

All these resources can be found (at the time of publishing) at:

www.jjvosper.wixsite.com/10bs