

# KINSHIP

## *A proposal for a different way of living*

### Introduction: The Great Unravelling & The Seed of Hope

We're living in a time of great transformations. The systems supporting the web of life are fraying under pressure from a civilization inconsistent with the environment that nourishes it. We're polluting sea, sky, and land; species disappear at alarming rates; the climate shifts into states that may or may not support many life forms, including ours.

The hopefulness that characterized previous generations has given way to alienation and lack of confidence in the direction of our lives. Many of us find ourselves in purposeless work that does little more than ensure enough money to buy the consumer goods that don't satisfy us and the simulation of food in supermarkets that we make do with. Technologies that were supposed to enhance human experience increasingly turn us into their tools. While productivity might increase, meaningful connection to one another and the world becomes more difficult without machine mediation.

These characteristics of modern life are symptoms of an ever-increasing divergence between the culture we live in and the way the world functions. There are specific laws (we'll outline seven) that define how life works. Cultures that ignore or actively work against these laws ultimately fail, going up against an adversary they cannot defeat: nature. Cultures that respect and align with these laws thrive.

Most accept the current state of the world as the inevitable outcome of 'progress'—an ineluctable historical process that's been the same everywhere. Some are confident we'll increase Earth's carrying capacity through sheer ingenuity. Others see this as nothing more than hubris.<sup>1</sup>

A minority, however, is questioning the basic premises upon which this culture is based, increasingly expressing a desire to move to its edges to experiment with different forms of living. People worldwide are rediscovering three freedoms fundamental throughout the human story: the freedoms to move, to disobey, and to create new social worlds.<sup>2</sup> In this document, you'll find an invitation to exercise these three freedoms to sow seeds of a different culture—one consistent with the laws governing life, with potential to fulfil us, make us and the web of life more resilient, and reimagine what it might mean to be human in today's world.

For the moment, I've chosen the English word *Kinship* (**kin** = family, relatives, from Old English *cynn*, Proto-Germanic *kunjam*, PIE *ǵénh₂os* "birth, race, kind"; **-ship** = state, condition, quality, from Old English *-scipe*, from *scieppan* "to shape, create") to name this idea, this project. In part, this is because kinship is a quality, an attitude of relating, rather than the name of a place. As such, it is the name of a characteristic to aspire to, rather than merely a place to build.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Ophuls, *Immoderate Greatness*

<sup>2</sup> See Graeber & Wengrow, *The Dawn of Everything: A New History of Humanity*

This is not a political project. Politics at this stage of civilizational unravelling is not the domain where meaningful change happens. *Kinship* is grounded in ecological realism—observing and living within the laws of nature, letting natural processes rather than human ideological frameworks be the final arbiter of what works. This is not about ideological alignment but about people willing to test all assumptions through direct ecological engagement, maintaining an experimental attitude that takes natural processes as the final judge of ideas.

## Threads: The Seven Laws

One premise of *Kinship* is that our culture is, in many ways, inconsistent with the laws governing life. Here we're not referring to physics, but laws that most directly influence the types of social realities and relationships with the non-human world we can create. John Michael Greer outlines seven such laws.<sup>3</sup>

### 1. The Law of Wholes

"Everything that exists is part of a whole system and depends on the health of the whole system for its own existence. It thrives only if the whole system thrives, and it cannot harm the whole system without harming itself."<sup>4</sup>

While our culture reduces all things to their parts, the universe functions in wholes. This is the basic difference between being *reductionist* and being *holistic*. The fundamental implication: it's not possible to truly know something without considering how it fits into its broader context. Consequently, we—alongside everything else—cannot truly thrive unless the whole context in which we live thrives. If we pollute the air to industrially produce consumer goods, or use technology reliant on polluting energy, we're ultimately shooting ourselves in the foot.

### 2. The Law of Flow

"Everything that exists is created and sustained by flows of matter, energy, and information that come from the whole system to which it belongs and that return to that whole system. Participating in these flows, without interfering with them, brings health and wholeness; blocking them, in an attempt to turn flows into accumulations, causes suffering and disruption to the whole system and all its parts."<sup>5</sup>

The dominant culture may deny this law more than any of the others. It's been built on an endless quest for accumulation, seeing it as a good above almost any other. We're taught to accumulate money, homes, friends, partners, experiences, qualifications—for no reason beyond that doing so is

---

<sup>3</sup> Greer, *Mystery Teachings from the Living Earth*

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p.21

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p.29

'good'. We might even be told it makes us happier, but basic observation verifies this isn't true. Comfort and wellbeing are not synonymous.

Accumulation is fundamentally about *having*, while participating in the flows of the living universe is fundamentally about *being*.<sup>6</sup> The problem with emphasizing having over being is that possession is itself a fiction—at the end of our lives, can we take anything we've accumulated with us? We all know we can *be*, and can do so without effort; when we look deeply, though, can we find anything we have ever truly possessed? *Kinship* aims to give us space to be, and for that to work, it needs to take away the space to accumulate.

### 3. The Law of Balance

"Everything that exists can continue to exist only by being in balance with itself, with other things, and with the whole system of which it is part. That balance is not found by going to one extreme or the other or by remaining fixed at a static point; it is created by self-correcting movements to either side of a midpoint."<sup>7</sup>

In nature, if something accumulates, a correction takes place to restore flow. Such corrections are not moral (right/wrong), but *natural and neutral*. The unprecedented accumulation of matter, energy, and information in our culture over the last several thousand years will lead to re-balancing. This is because our culture and economies are themselves parts of wholes, not self-contained systems (cf. The Law of Wholes). We might pretend the human world is somehow set apart from the rest of the world, but that's self-delusion.

This law isn't about going to extremes or remaining fixed at a static point. Neither is the objective to reach a point of balance, but *to practice the art of balancing*. The former is an end-state, the latter is an action, a way of moving in the world. What does this art look like in practice?

Notice you're in an extreme; apply a corrective action (instead of simply swinging to the other extreme); pass through the midpoint, recognizing you'll inevitably swing a little toward the other extreme, and; repeat—forever: *balance* is only useful if we use it as a verb, not a noun.

### 4. The Law of Limits

"Everything that exists is subject to limits arising from its own nature, the nature of the whole system of which it is a part, and the nature of existence itself. Those limits are as necessary as they are inescapable, and they provide the foundation for all the beauty and power each existing thing is capable of manifesting."<sup>8</sup>

While it may seem self-evident that life is characterized by limits, our culture is predicated on the notion that human ingenuity can overcome most limits, given the right resources and knowledge.

---

<sup>6</sup> See Fromm, *Being or Having?*

<sup>7</sup> Greer, *Mystery Teachings from the Living Earth*, p.29

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p.47

Tech oligarchs spend billions researching how to overcome mortality by uploading consciousness to the cloud, or surmounting genetic programming that makes ageing inevitable. There's confidence that nuclear fusion will result in limitless, clean energy. Human beings, it seems, are made to break limits, not to recognize, respect, and appreciate them.

We often fail to recognize that things thrive *because of*, not *in spite of*, their limits. Wholes are defined by their limits, as are flows. The thresholds at which re-balancing occurs are also limits. Basic examples: only so much sunlight falls on Earth each day, and only a small fraction can be used for photosynthesis; only so much water falls as rain or snow. These limits in turn define how much vegetation can grow in a set place, and that defines how much animal life that vegetation can support. This list could go on endlessly, since there is no single thing in existence that does not have its limits.

John Michael Greer points out that this might be the law that most "*offends the ingrained prejudices and unquestioned assumptions of our age,*"<sup>9</sup> even though limits lend things both their power and their beauty. A bird cannot fly unless it accepts limits on its structure (no teeth, hollow bones); it is because of its limitations that flight is possible, and because of them that we can appreciate the beauty of a bird riding the current.

Ultimately, this law invites us to turn the prejudices of our age on their head: limits are not to be broken, but embraced as sources of beauty and power.

## 5. The Law of Cause & Effects

"Everything that exists is the effect of causes at work in the whole system of which each thing is a part, and everything becomes, in turn, the cause of effects elsewhere in the whole system. In these workings of cause and effect, there must always be a similarity of kind between an effect and at least one of its causes, just as there must be a similarity of scale between an effect and the sum total of its causes."<sup>10</sup>

Put simply, this law states that nothing happens by chance or coincidence. Whole systems are governed by complex causal relationships, with causes and effects being similar in *kind* and in *scale*.

The principle of similarity in kind can be restated as "What you sow, you reap". If your goal is a cool drink, putting a flame to it isn't going to get you there. It's important to align methods and goals, and to gain understanding of cause-effect relationships in the systems we inhabit. For example, if we accept that accumulation is not a good to be pursued, can we identify what leads to it in our culture? If we identify those causes, can we find ways to stop them? Or put positively, if we accept that a culture enabling flows of energy, matter, and information is good, can we identify what will enable this? The same logic applies to many points: haste causes shallow understanding; control and hierarchy cause dependency and resentments, etc.

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., p.47

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., p.57

The second principle is similarity in scale, encapsulated by "Great oaks from little acorns grow". Large, complex effects require sufficient accumulation of causes of similar scale; you can't light a bonfire with a single match, but you can with a single lit match applied to sufficient kindling.

## 6. The Law of the Planes

"Everything in existence exists and functions on one of several planes of being or is composed of things from more than one plane acting together as a whole system. These planes are discrete, not continuous, and the passage of influences from one plane to another can take place only under conditions defined by the relationship of the planes involved."<sup>11</sup>

The way history is taught in most of the world gives primacy to the materials peoples used: stone, bronze, iron, steam. This is but one way we can see how the physical is given primacy above all else. The primacy of the material plane can also be seen in proposed solutions to challenges we face. If plastic is everywhere, the solution is developing environmentally friendly plastics or better waste management. If the issue is a brain tumour, the solution is to remove it or act on its material structure through various treatments. In both instances, the assumption is that there's a single plane which matters: the physical.

Giving such primacy to the physical world is a historical anomaly. Since time immemorial, human beings have understood that reality is composed of multiple planes that, while distinct, also operate upon one another. John Michael Greer outlines four such planes. Beyond the physical, there are also:

- ***The Etheric Plane:*** this is the plane of life force or vitality.
- ***The Astral Plane:*** this is the plane of thought, emotion, and culture, where the stories, images, feelings, and values that shape the stories we tell—individually and collectively—exist.
- ***The Mental Plane:*** this is the world of archetypes, where it is not things, but the ideas of things that reign. Here we're not talking about *a home*, but about *the idea of Home*. Other ideas might include Community, Love, Belonging, Wholeness, Humility, Reciprocity. But these are more than just ideas in our heads; they are the potential for all things, existing at the very foundation of life and the universe.

Let's use a tree as an example. On the physical plane, it's made up of wood, cellulose, height; on the etheric, it is composed of living force that gives the tree its automatic intelligence (circulation of sap, photosynthesis, growth patterns); on the astral, the tree simultaneously experiences the world (sunlight, wind, soil chemistry, the presence of other beings), and is experienced by the world (the squirrel nesting in it, the human sitting beneath it, the fungi connected to its roots)—the tree's existence, both from its experience and that of others, is born through its intersubjectivity. Last, on the mental plane, the tree is recognizable because it corresponds to a pattern of Tree-ness; this makes not only a single tree recognizable, but all trees recognizable as trees. The key insight:

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p.66

problems manifesting on one plane cannot always be solved by interventions on another plane alone. The planes are interwoven, but distinct.

## 7. The Law of Evolution

"Everything that exists comes into being by a process of evolution. That process starts with adaptation to changing conditions and ends with the establishment of a steady state of balance with its surroundings, following a threefold rhythm of challenge, response, and reintegration. Evolution is gradual rather than sudden, and it works by increasing diversity and accumulating possibilities, rather than following a predetermined line of development."<sup>12</sup>

At its core, this law means that species and systems adapt to their environment through a constant process of *challenge, response, and reintegration*. The challenge comes from the environment, and the response takes the form of incremental changes in how species and systems function. Importantly, while such changes may be physical, they may also be found across the other planes of existence. Those changes that enable not just survival, but thriving, are reintegrated into the species or system.

While this probably sounds familiar, the Law of Evolution is often mischaracterized. It is not uncommon to hear that some individuals, or human beings generally, are more evolved than other individuals or species; as Greer points out, this notion is "*quite simply nonsense...because every living thing has been shaped by evolution over exactly the same period of time since life first evolved*".<sup>13</sup>

More insidious is the notion that evolution brought about modern human beings and then somehow stopped, with humans representing its apex. This perspective is thoroughly anthropocentric, shaped by religious traditions that consider humanity exalted above other life-forms. Such a teleological view—as a linear process working purposefully toward a specific goal—misses the point that while evolutionary processes eventually lead to relatively stable states, all stable states will sooner or later be challenged and rendered unstable by outside forces.

The key insight: we are not the apex of evolution, nor has evolution stopped for us. This goes for the civilization we've built as much as for us as a species. And yet, this is precisely the story this culture tells itself. It is its founding myth.<sup>14</sup> Maintaining this position means maintaining the hubris bringing us ever closer to the precipice, including the potential for extinction. This is not catastrophism, but simply acknowledging that any species living in a way maladapted to its environment is destined to die out, sooner or later.

Of course, this culture tells us that our technical skills enable us to adapt the environment to us, rather than the opposite. This is wishful thinking. How well is the line of thinking that says 'If the planet gets hotter, we just need more air conditioners' working out for us? If we consider the Law of

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., p.78

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., p.74

<sup>14</sup> See Quinn, *Ishmael*

Evolution seriously, we should apply a critical lens to the culture that's brought us and countless other species to the edge of disaster. We must ask whether it really is adapted to the world we live in. And if it's not, to imagine and bring to life a culture that might be.

This law invites us to actively and willingly participate in the ongoing process of challenge, response, and reintegration. This is the template for embracing change, whether in oneself, in community, or in the broader world. This process takes place whether we like it or not, but if we allow ourselves to flow with it rather than resist it, we—and the culture we give birth to—will naturally adapt to surrounding circumstances, as all existing beings have done. This law also cautions that there is a price to pay for seeking constant comfort; it reminds us how important it is to expose ourselves to the world we live in, rather than to seek shelter from it. Only through direct contact can the dance of evolutionary adaptation be allowed to take place and act upon our being—physical and otherwise.

Last, the Law of Evolution invites us to be patient. It reminds us that change has its own pace, and that no such thing as an 'evolutionary leap' exists. Change is slow, but when the right kind and right scale of causes are in place, it will happen (cf. The Law of Cause & Effects).

### Weaving the Threads Together

These laws are not abstract concepts; they shape how everything functions, including how *Kinship* should function.

The **Law of Wholeness** demands that *Kinship* break the cycle of thinking we and our actions exist in a vacuum. We should be as much, if not more, generalists than specialists.

The **Law of Flow** leads us to cultivate spaces necessary to consciously engage with and facilitate the flows of matter, energy, and information. We become conduits rather than accumulators, sharing freely and not holding onto anything too tightly.

The **Law of Balance** pushes us to foster a culture that can recognize when it is nearing an extreme or point of accumulation, and can apply skilful corrective actions. This law also reminds us to let go of the idea that *Kinship* might reach a final goal or end-point; the process is cyclical, not linear.

The **Law of Limits** asks us to embrace limits as both unavoidable and as the source of power and beauty. Like the bird whose flight is only possible because of its physical limitations, *Kinship* needs to embrace its limits to experience its potential.

The **Laws of Balance and Limits**, combined with insights from Graeber and Wengrow's 'ecology of freedom,'<sup>15</sup> remind us that we do not want to become anything—not farmers, not primitives, not any fixed identity. We want to remain human beings with the freedom to practice agriculture without becoming agriculturalists; to grow food without surrendering excessive portions of our existence to agricultural logistics, to maintain a broad enough resource base so that cultivation never becomes a matter of life or death. When we accept that cultivation can only provide some of what we need—only certain things, only at certain times—we naturally maintain multiple modes. We forage because cultivation has limits. We hunt because the forest garden has limits. We engage in

---

<sup>15</sup> See Graeber & Wengrow, *The Dawn of Everything*

craft work and knowledge exchange because food production has limits. Just as a bird's limits enable flight, the limits of each activity enable our freedom to move between activities. We practice multiple modes simultaneously—some horticulture, some hunting and foraging, some craft work, some knowledge exchange—precisely so no single activity colonizes human existence.

The **Law of Cause and Effect** reminds us that cultural change is a vast undertaking that cannot be achieved with any single grand gesture. A 'pile of kindling' made up of smaller initiatives that are similar in kind will slowly lead us there, perhaps beyond our own lifetime. This law acts as a diagnostic tool; it reminds us to ask whether we applied an action of the wrong kind to an issue (using control to try to create freedom), or if we applied causes of insufficient scale (expecting a single conversation to resolve a deep-seated cultural habit). Ultimately, this law is a mandate for patience: if we consistently apply the right kind and scale of causes, the corresponding effects *will eventually follow*.

The **Law of Planes** reminds us that putting up some yurts and creating a vegetable garden only acts on the physical plane. To forge a culture we must go beyond this. We need to ask on which plane the issues we're tackling—as well as those that might arise through participating—exist. If the community is using too much energy, this isn't merely a technical issue (physical plane), but also one of habits and values (astral plane). You can't fix astral plane problems with purely physical solutions.

One may think of the four planes as manifesting in *Kinship* this way: the Mental Plane is its 'why', the principles or ideas that serve as its core; the Astral Plane is its culture, from storytelling to song, its mode of governance, and its transformative approach to learning skills; the Etheric plane is *Kinship*'s vitality, the health of the land and the people—by working with the landscape rather than against it, we strengthen our shared life-force; the Physical Plane is the material manifestations: habitations, orchards, vegetable gardens, meals. The physical place is the anchor, but the real work—the "seed-bed"—is in the invisible world of ideas, vitality, relationships, and shared purpose.

Last, the **Law of Evolution** reminds us that if we are to thrive in the longer-term, we must expose ourselves to the world we live in; we must not cower in fear. Without difficulties, the ongoing, universal cycle of challenge, response, reintegration cannot take place. If this process doesn't happen, as the world around us changes—as it is indeed doing—we find ourselves increasingly maladapted to it. *Kinship* needs to be a place that allows evolution to take place, while steering clear of any excess.

### The Invitation: Exercising the Three Freedoms

We live in a time of great transformation and, most likely, collapse of the global civilization we find ourselves in. At the same time, the Seven Laws—the foundation of life itself—offer guidance for how we might respond. David Graeber and David Wengrow, in their book *The Dawn of Everything*, argue that peoples across history and the globe, prior to the rise of complex civilizations, availed themselves of three fundamental freedoms to turn away from cultures they no longer identified with, or saw as problematic. These are *the freedom to move, the freedom to disobey, and the freedom to create or transform social worlds*.

The freedom to move refers to the ability to relocate and change one's social environment without constraint. The freedom to disobey refers to the freedom to ignore commands or refuse to follow orders from authorities. And the freedom to create or transform social worlds regards the capacity to reorganize social structures and reimagine how communities relate to one another.

These freedoms were widely present in many early human societies but have been progressively restricted or lost in complex civilizations. Their work challenges the narrative that increasing social complexity necessarily leads to greater freedom, suggesting instead that many simpler societies enjoyed forms of liberty that modern civilization has largely abandoned. *Kinship* wants to reclaim these freedoms.

We move in the opposite direction to the bulk of humanity; while the majority moves toward the centre, we choose to move to the periphery—remote, sparsely populated places. Of course, we cannot move completely outside civilization. Nevertheless, we can move to one of its many edges—those places where the control of the state and its institutions is less insidious and oppressive.

We reclaim the freedom to disobey by saying 'no' to the expectations this culture has placed upon us, and that civilization has codified in its institutions: no to the expectation that we contribute to growing the economy in perpetuity; no to commodification of our needs and desires, our homes, our minds; no to accumulation; no to allowing invisible bureaucracy to decide what's best for us.

The freedoms to move and to disobey are fundamentally *reactive*. The third freedom, that to create or transform social worlds, is *generative*. *Kinship* reclaims this freedom by coming into existence as a living experiment—a process of trial and error, of continuous evolution through challenge, response, and reintegration. We want to experiment with forms of relationship that balance interdependence with autonomy, rejecting both modern atomization and coercive collectivism. We want to move away from specialized hierarchy toward an apprenticeship model where knowledge flows multi-directionally and teaching-learning blur traditional distinctions. We imagine dissensus governance that honours individual sovereignty within shared ecological commitments—where stewardship roles emerge from demonstrated care rather than election, and where the health of the land becomes the final arbiter of decisions. And we want to re-enchant our world through ritual and renewed temporal consciousness: marking solstices and thresholds, honouring cycles rather than clock-time, acknowledging that reality exceeds our explanatory frameworks and that the world is more alive than modernity admits.

This isn't a finished vision but an opening—a clearing in which something can grow that we cannot fully imagine in advance. We know what we're walking away from with greater clarity than what we're walking toward. And perhaps that's appropriate: cultural solutions, as Wendell Berry reminds us, are organisms, not machines.<sup>16</sup> They cannot be invented deliberately or imposed by decree. They must be grown.

## How Might *Kinship* Function?

*Kinship* exists, at this stage, as a proposal and an invitation. I am one person with a vision, seeking companions to explore together what it might mean to live according to the Seven Laws. What

---

<sup>16</sup> See Wendell Berry, *The Unsettling of America*

follows represents some initial thinking—not a blueprint, but conversation starters. All of this is provisional and open to transformation.

A principle shapes this inquiry: What can we *not* do? Rather than asking what more we can build, acquire, or organize, we begin by asking what we can do without. This is a minimalist approach, not a maximalist one—a practice of restraint that serves multiple ecological laws at once.

**The Journey Ahead:** I imagine beginning to journey together from any point now—meeting, traveling, working together, visiting places, learning each other's rhythms. I'm currently considering setting out on a slow trip or trips in late summer 2026 to discover how different people and places are responding to the same challenges and opportunities I discuss here. Perhaps at some point some of these people and I will find ourselves somewhere we want to stay, in whatever arrangement that might be—a temporary base, a longer-term situation, perhaps even land we steward together. Or perhaps we remain more itinerant. The path reveals itself through walking it together.

**Circles of Participation:** However *Kinship* unfolds, I imagine different ways of relating to it:

- **Kindred** are those whose primary commitment is to this exploration—traveling together, living together, building together, whatever form that takes.
- **Supporters** are those who believe in this inquiry and contribute in various ways—financially, through skills, through hospitality, through connection—whether closely involved or from afar. Support can take many forms.
- **Journeyers** might join for periods of learning and exchange, where everyone is simultaneously teacher and student.

But even these distinctions may be unnecessary. We'll discover what makes sense.

**If Land Becomes Part of Our Path:** Should legal ownership become necessary—and we ask first whether it is—we'd approach it as a formality, recognizing that truly owning land is not possible. The land would be our partner, not our possession; it would not belong to *Kinship*, but instead be *kin*. As a partner, it would have as much right as any one of us. Any legal structure would acknowledge this relationship while providing what formality requires, and nothing more.

Kindred would contribute what they can. Some may have more resources, others less. What matters is shared commitment to principles. We'd work out specifics together, guided by non-speculation, transparency, and the understanding that this isn't investment but stewardship.

**If We Settle (In Whatever Form):** We begin with what is necessary and add only as necessary. What shelter do we actually need? What infrastructure? What cultivation? The question is always: what can we do without?

We might start with temporary structures, rented spaces, borrowed land, or something else entirely. We'd develop what we need gradually, always through the lens of subtraction before addition. Not "what else should we build?" but "what have we built that we don't need?"

We'd explore diverse ways of meeting needs—some cultivation, some foraging, some hunting, some craft—without committing to any system as complete. We'd experiment with what works in our specific context, using the Seven Laws as our lens and restraint as our practice. The Law of Limits

teaches that accepting constraints creates freedom; the Law of Balance reminds us that excess in any direction creates imbalance; the Law of Flow shows that accumulation stops circulation.

**Governance:** We'd formalize only what we must. Dissensus principles might guide us: individual sovereignty within shared ecological commitments. Stewardship emerging from demonstrated care rather than imposed hierarchy. But we resist the urge to create elaborate structures in advance. Forms evolve through living them, and the best governance may be the least governance necessary.

**Cultural Propagation:** Knowledge exchanges and gatherings would create connections between people and ways of knowing. Not education provision, not programming, not scheduled workshops—just spaces where people meet and learn from each other. We might document what we learn, but only if doing so serves the work rather than becoming the work.

#### **What Stays Fixed:**

- The Seven Laws of Ecology as foundation
- The three freedoms (to move, disobey, create new social worlds)
- The principle of restraint: What can we *not* do?
- Understanding that we cannot truly own land or anything—we can only partner with it
- Anti-accumulation in all its forms
- Small scale (whatever number emerges naturally)
- Dissensus rather than consensus

Everything else—location, timeline, structures, practices, whether we settle or remain itinerant, what form any settlement takes—remains open.

**Risk and Reality:** This requires accepting genuine uncertainty. Financial contributions might not be recoverable. The experiment might fail. This life might not be for you. We're exploring together, not executing a plan. And we're practicing restraint together, which means often saying no to things others might consider obviously necessary.

#### **Glimpses: What Might Life Look Like?**

We cannot know what *Kinship* will become. These glimpses imagine one possibility: if we find ourselves in sustained relationship with a place. But settlement might take other forms, or we might not settle at all. Consider these not predictions but one way of sensing what this path might offer.

**If we find ourselves in sustained relationship with a place:** We'd likely begin with what we need and nothing more. Shelter that keeps us dry and warm enough. Tools for the work at hand. Methods for meeting immediate needs.

The rhythms would follow seasons and necessity rather than schedules or ambition. Spring: what needs planting? Summer: what needs tending, what's offered freely? Autumn: what needs preserving? Winter: what work makes sense in short days and cold?

Meeting needs through diverse sources, but always asking first: what can we do without? Perhaps some cultivation—but how little? Perhaps some hunting and foraging—but do we need to preserve so much? Perhaps some craft—but what tools are actually necessary?

The practice would be constant questioning: Is this structure necessary or just familiar? Is this cultivation serving us or have we become its servants? Is this tool essential or are we accumulating? The satisfaction wouldn't come from what we build but from what we learn we don't need.

Conflicts would arise not just from too little but from disagreements about necessity itself. One person's essential is another's excess. Working through these disagreements—what the land actually requires, what we actually require, where those meet—would be part of the practice.

Learning to listen to the land as partner means asking what it needs from us, which is often less than we think. Learning to live within ecological laws means accepting that limits create rather than constrain freedom.

But again: this imagines one trajectory. We might not settle, or settlement might look entirely different. We might find that some cultivation matters more than we thought, or that we can meet needs with even less intervention than we imagined. The principle stays constant: what can we *not* do? The answers emerge through practice.

## A Call to Begin

I'm not looking for followers or believers in a fixed vision. I'm looking for companions willing to walk into uncertainty together, guided by the Seven Laws, the three freedoms, and the discipline of restraint—asking always: what can we *not* do?

This is an ecological inquiry, not a lifestyle project. It requires living with less than contemporary culture considers normal, often with less than seems wise, in order to discover what's actually needed. It means questioning every assumption about what's necessary—shelter, food systems, tools, structures, governance, everything.

This is for those who hear 'primitive' as a compliment rather than an insult—who see living close to the land, using simple tools, meeting needs directly, as aspiration rather than deprivation. If being called 'primitive' sounds like criticism rather than praise, this path probably isn't for you. It requires honest self-assessment: Does this genuinely call to you, or does it appeal as an idea that wouldn't survive contact with the reality of restraint, physical work, and genuine interdependence? Are you willing to contribute what you can—presence, skills, patience with uncertainty, commitment to working through difficulty? Can you accept real risk: that contributions might not be recoverable, that the experiment might fail, that this life might not be for you?

If this resonates, reach out. Tell me who you are, what calls you to this, what you might bring, what you're willing to risk.

I'm not promising certainty or comfort. What I offer is honest exploration with others who share the conviction that another way of living is both necessary and possible—one that begins by asking what we can subtract rather than what we can add.

The timeline is flexible: potentially journeying soon, perhaps finding some form of base by autumn 2027, though all remains open. But the real work begins now, in conversation and trust-building, and in learning to walk together.