**What dynamics drive value diversity: Drift or Convergence?**

I’m compelled to agree that drift drives value diversity, though the relationship is not as straightforward as it first appears to be. As people(s) drift away from each other, they logically become more different. But if different, drifted-away groups become too separated from each other, they stagnate (ideologically, philosophically, morally) as they become fully-insulated pods, now distinct and completely convergent within their own walls.

A solution for this is a model of continuous, errant (non-linear) drift. If people can remain in constant moving, there is always a higher chance that people or groups that once diverged will circle back into contact with each other, instead of drifting further away forever. Part of this requires personalities with deeply-ingrained senses of open-mindedness and accountability.

The literature of Arjun Appadurai seems would be an invaluable resource to your team. In piacular, his book *Fear of Small Numbers* comes to mind. He neatly and potently discusses the gap your team brings up, between the fact that increased diversity leads to increasingly inconsolable and irreconcilable differences, and needing to push more and more for “seeing each other as fellow humans” to “reduce the impetus for violence.”

I’d also like to take these bounties as an opportunity to address my overall thoughts on your text, chapter-by-chapter.

I agree that voluntarism, cooperation, and education (the three pillars of intelligent voluntary cooperation) are necessary for an IVC-based paretotopia. But there are gaps in the scope of the analysis that leads to some startling statements that the book is better off (i.e. makes its case effectively) without. These are mostly deterministic statements about the progress of humanity and broad claims made in regards to the prevalence of violence in the world today.

It’s written that “major powers have not fought a physical war in a while, and while there are more civil conflicts, they bring fewer deaths.” The statement implies quite narrow definitions of “major” and “physical”—there are single-digit amounts of drone strikes executed by the US military *daily* that target people (primarily) in Afghanistan, Somalia, Yemen, and Pakistan. There is an abundance of literature on the general theme of the Cold War having never ended, and “major power” conflict being dispersed, disseminated, violence reorganizing and redefining itself.

I think to state that the world is increasingly becoming a safer place contradicts the well-made and point that global war/military machines are bigger and more profitable than ever, the Security State is in full swing in many (major and developed) nations, etc. A more critical perspective on how ‘violence’ itself has morphed, become woven into the fabric of global culture, would help eliminate some of these contradictions between the hope-and-progress mindset and the dystopian material analysis.

I also feel compelled to point out that the statement, “we increasingly have the freedom to say no to interactions without being forced into them” is patently false. Perhaps this is a trend that crypto/blockchain/web 3 is helping reverse, but the 21st century technification of government and policing has surely enmeshed people (particularly in the most developed societies) into this sousveillance that is rife with involuntary, forced action. There are almost too many examples to list and this seems like an area that the authors are knowledgeable on.

The point I liked most from this chapter: how to avoid Hobbesian traps. Making sure all parties remain capable of voluntary decision making is a great way to secure a pareto-preferred future. Crypto and blockchain—I’m thinking about DAOs here—are so great not only because they facilitate supraphysical/transglobal community, but because of their potential strength in structuring hyper-localized groups that are better equipped against the world’s dominant actors.

I also found the analysis of language as a distributed system of decision-making really effective in this chapter. It’s a great example of the peacefulness inherent to multipolarity—when power is distributed as evenly as possible, the process of change is not violent. Language *just happens* because there is no force involved.

Looking forward to addressing the rest of the bounties that I have time for!