

freedoms away because of the crime of having another person see the fact their body is uncovered, because the law says it should always be covered outdoors.

Many of the police in some jurisdictions have just come out of the military (or, were in the military prior). A police professional could get fired if they don't give tickets, and/or without sufficient tickets their profession won't have sufficient funding. The market-State system requires involuntary monetary income from the public, and the police are one profession therein. Even more, if someone does not pay the police what they expect, they are likely to come to the persons house with guns and put them in a cage, or go directly to their bank and withdraw the funds.

**NOTE:** *In Swedish there is a saying, "You don't need a policeman, you have one in your head." This is sometimes known as horizontal policing. In an unhealthy context it can sometimes include individual shame and/or social shame. The shame, if not released, can lead to the negative decay of the personality resulting in harm to self and or other.*

The frequent question from those who recognize the value of police in the market-State will often ask, "How do you maintain dynamic equilibrium in society without police?" Community maintains "dynamic equilibrium" by transparently computing the accessibility of objects and services and making things (habitat services) accessible. The only real way to ensure that harmful technologies are not used to the detriment of humankind, is to ensure that everyone has what they need, and therefore, has the very least number of reason to misuse the technology in the first place. (Schauer, 2015)

**NOTE:** *The police are not a system to handle structural violence. And the role of the police in the market-State, to investigate and arrest criminals, can easily obfuscate a societal structure that is itself, violent.*

### 3.6.1.1 Security

Security (a.k.a., protection, defense) may exist to protect against threat of:

1. Violence (physical harm).
2. Theft of property.

Security can act in the following ways:

1. Force de-escalation procedures.
2. Less than lethal (LTL) procedures.
3. Incapacitation (force escalation) procedures.

The injustices of the world are violent, and sometimes (though rarely), forceful intervention is required to restore a state of fulfillment. Rarely, forceful intervention is required to serve justice and defense. Herein, it is extremely important to remember that it is a cycle

of violence (physical and structural) that perpetrates the continuation of societal violence. Many people in early 21st century society support and are a product of structural violence. When there are people who do physical violence based upon beliefs or sociopathic thinking, then others need to be physically defended from them. In any given society, there is the potential for structural violence and for direct physical violence, and they need to be dealt with differently. In both cases, the structure of society requires changing, but in only one of those cases is physical defense required.

In the early 21st century, a large percentage of the global workforce (larger in richer countries) is dedicated to surveilling and protecting (acting as a defending State for) the assets of the "rich" (that the "rich" have accumulated over time through trade).

**QUESTION:** *What percentage of the workforce are involved in surveillance and guarding the assets against others in society?*

### 3.6.2 Prosecution

*A.k.a., Prosecutor, attorney general, State prosecution attorney.*

The role of the prosecution is to investigate and attempts to convince either someone assuming the role of judge of the court, and/or a "jury" of peers, that the crime had been committed by the suspect, and that the crime is indeed a crime that should have punishment and/or restoration procedures as a consequence. In the judicial process, when the facts of a case are not clear-cut and there is a suspect for a crime, the "adversarial" system comes into play this is where the prosecution represents the State and presents evidence and arguments to prove the suspect's guilt, while the defense represents the accused and presents counterarguments and evidence to cast doubt on the prosecution's case. It's in this adversarial contest that the jury's role becomes pivotal. The purpose of a prosecutor is to collect evidence to persuade the judge and jury of the accuracy of his/her case against someone or some group. Evidence is used to persuade and convince, then people vote, either the judge is the only person with the vote, or the jury votes. In the market-State, the prosecution exists to investigate the crime after charges and to present evidence (or dismiss) to the court of a criminal case against some entity.

Judges and juries are tasked with evaluating the credibility of the evidence and testimony presented by both sides. When "we" (the social population) don't know exactly what happened, and there is a suspect for the crime, then cases are formed -the prosecutor's case versus defenses' case, therein, and a jury relies on belief (supported by evidence, or not) to convict. While it is true that belief plays a role in their decision-making, it is not belief in isolation. No matter what testimony is presented the jury will rely on belief, "Do I believe this person or do I believe that one" (i.e., do I believe the prosecutor or

the defense). Jurors always rely on belief. However, jury decisions are ideally based on the standard of “beyond a reasonable doubt,” which goes beyond personal belief to require a high level of certainty based on the evidence presented. Jurors are instructed to carefully scrutinize the evidence and are guided by the judge on the legal standards they must apply when deciding whether to convict or acquit.

A jury’s deliberation is a collective process where “peer citizens” discuss and analyze the evidence, witness credibility, and the arguments made by both the prosecution and defense. The goal is for the jury to reach a verdict that is not solely based on belief, but is underpinned by a reasoned interpretation of the evidence in light of the “law”.

### 3.6.3 Criminal record

*A.k.a., State violation record, access violation record, law violation record.*

In a restorative justice-based environment, individuals are held accountable for their actions without the idea of a State-based criminal record. The suspect, victim, supporters, InterSystem safety, and a facilitator are present during restorative justice sessions. Or, at least this is the optimal arrangement of persons to construct a restorative justice section when forgiveness and healing are most likely. It is possible that not all restorative justice sessions can include the suspect and victim together. There are many tools and methods for facilitating healing separately so that healing in person may also be possible. This is a way to hold someone accountable without the necessity to separate them from community (historically, put them in a cage and give them a criminal record). In community, when individuals are separated because of issues of violence, then they are done so in a way that their well-being is raised [and trauma overcome] so that they may once again be able to experience the whole population of community. A rehabilitation process, which would enable the person to enrich society rather than be a drain on resources.

A criminal record is an information record based on the violation of State law. States use criminal records for State security purposes. Markets use criminal records to decide labor-power performance criteria and likely competency. In the market-State, criminal records can make it difficult to get a good paying job. A criminal record is sometimes associated with a financial debt that must be paid to the State for some duration of time (starting with the instantiation of the criminal record). Criminal records can significantly impede travel and general socio-economic access.

Violations of decision system protocols in community are also recorded. The resolution process and results are also recorded. These recordings are not generally damaging to the continued life fulfillment of the individuals involved. Because, the result is healing. This is in contrast to a criminal record, which damages individuals’ access to jobs and movement in the market-

State. In community, individuals may have on their profile a record of their [decision] access violations; or if not, there is still the ability for someone to run a search on the individual because all information is transparent. Herein, each violation of a protocol becomes a precise restorative case.

The treatment of those who have harmed others and are separated (e.g., “prisoners”); their treatment is a reflection of societal values and individuals therein. There is a dangerous narrative in some cultures that says, once someone has been convicted of a crime, whatever happens to then afterward is warranted. A criminal record is chain on individual healing and fulfillment in the market-State.

For feedback in community (and authority in the market-State), if there is evidence of a crime, it has to be investigated. Some countries have even codified this principle into this law. Decisioning around crimes ought to involve intelligent tolerance, versus ignorant denial. Societal tolerance of mistakes and challenges and learning and choices.

**INSIGHT:** *Identifying conflict is identifying problems with boundaries. Identifying crime is identifying problems with fulfillment. To identify conflict-based crime is to identify problems with the boundaries to global human fulfillment.*

### 3.6.4 Criminal punishment

*A.k.a., Incarceration, imprisonment, incapacitation, jail, imprisoning, arresting, jailing.*

In many societies in the 21st century, traditional slavery is abolished, except for the punishment of crime. Many early 21st century prisons are in fact modern day slave plantations. There are no prisons in community, there are only facilities for self-development and therapy. These locations may have similarities to prisons in that the attending population are not permitted to leave, but the population are not locked in cages or corridors. Criminal justice is based in punishment, which refers to subjecting another to violence due to a past event. Imprisonment has a variety of negative effects on offenders, their families, and society. It often leads to a breakup of family or other social relationships and lessens parental involvement with children. Problems related to finances and single-parenting can arise for family members who remain in the community. Prisons may adversely affect individual offenders by increasing their ties to criminal compatriots or creating stress, thereby overwhelming an inmate’s ability to cope. Inmates may learn antisocial and criminal attitudes from other inmates, which could lead to increased criminal activity upon release.

There are three types of imprisonment conditions (jail, closed prison, and open prison):

#### 1. Jail (in the market-State) temporary imprisonment

in a police holding cage, while a tactical short-term investigation is conducted and tempers are allowed to cool off.

2. **Jail (in community)** re-location to a short-term medical team facility space/room designed with stringent security measures and complete restriction of common habitat services.
3. **Closed prison (in the market-State; a.k.a., security prisons)** a policed facility designed with stringent security measures, to hold people in cages, and completely restrict them from common habitat/city access and services. There are high-security (maximum-security) prisons and also low-security (minimum-security) prisons. Prisoners in high-security prisons are said to pose a greater risk to society than people in low-security prisons. Individuals in maximum-security closed prisons often have limited access to activities outside their cells and restricted interaction with other inmates. Individuals in minimum-security closed prisons have fewer physical barriers, education services, and work release programs.
4. **Closed prison (in community; a.k.a., longer-term arrested medical facility)** a medical team facility designed with stringent security measures and complete restriction of common habitat services.
5. **Open prison (in community and the market-State)** a restorative justice facility where the prisoner reside longer-term and return to sleep at the facility each night, but can spend the day attending education, contribution, and family activities.

States imprison people for various crime-related reasons, including but possibly not limited to:

1. To keep them from committing additional crimes.
2. To make sure they don't hurt anyone else.
3. As a punishment to deny them their freedom for short or long periods of time.
4. To profit from their incarceration.

After someone is arrested by police (internal State military), they are put in a jail (of some form). A jail is a place where those people who have been "arrested" are mostly held in cages, either alone or with others, for a temporary period of time. A jail is essentially a temporary human [encaged] holding area. When someone is convicted of a crime, they are then put in prison (a larger jail). A prison is essentially a long-term human [encaged] holding area. Which is the same thing as a jail, but a human cage holding structure that can hold a larger population density of people (Read: prisoners). Under early 21st century market-State conditions there are prisons where humans are held in actual cages as punishment for a crime. The transformation of a prison system into a re-orientation and contribution

service system are to be major achievements in the transformation of governmental force procedures into those aligned with the value orientation of restorative justice.

**INSIGHT:** *If there were such a thing as "prison" in community, then they would be an uplifting and transitional experience for everyone inside, and that would be better for everyone. Putting people in cages to solve socio-economic problems does not work well for anyone's fulfillment.*

In the market-State, when returning home from incarcerations, people convicted of crimes face many obstacles that prevent them from securing housing and accessing employment and educational opportunities. The obstacles are also often compounded by additional barriers by including limited access to pro-social activities and restrictions on re-uniting with family, among others. The circle of support and accountability model focuses on the safe re-integration of people returning home with well-being from safety isolation (e.g., incarceration) and a environments of violence.

In the market-State, another common term for prison is incapacitation. The concept of incapacitation means that as long as offenders are incarcerated, they cannot commit crimes outside of prison.

*"You can judge a society by how well it treats its prisoners".  
Fyodor Dostoevsky (A society should be judged not by how it treats its outstanding citizens, but by how it treats its criminals.)*

### 3.6.4.1 Punishment oriented [criminal] consequences

It is necessary to clarify here the typical market-State set of consequences that may be applied as punishment for a guilty verdict in court:

1. **Financial and/or asset penalties** (e.g., fines, appropriation of property, etc.). These are supposed to represent punishment through the introduction socio-economic hardship and/or equalization of socio-economic hardship by seizure of assets to balance justice.
  - A. Civil default judgement means loser must give over their private assets (physical, financial, etc.).
  - B. Civil asset forfeiture judgement means if asset was involved in a crime it becomes the appropriate property of the State.
2. **De-platforming and banning** (and, removal of content uploaded content). For example cannot rebroadcast emergency alert broadcasts. Which means you can't report live from a place where an emergency alert is going on.
3. **Jail** mandatory coerced temporary-stay isolation.
4. **Prison** long-term violent punishment-stay isolation.

## 4 [Transition analysis] The law and the political State

In general, the law is a political mechanism that allows, enables, and decides the use of violence by a monopolizing authority. In the early 21st century, apparently “neutral” language and established institutions, operated through law, can easily obscure relationships of power (Read: power-over-others) and violence. The emphasis on individualism in the law similarly hides patterns of harm, power relationships and violence, while making it more difficult to adopt community values and experience human interconnection.

Note here that in concern to the term, ‘politics’, there is no social consensus over its definition; many authors that use the term never actually define it. However, it could be said that the term ‘politics’ has the following generalized definition due to the root of the word -the root of the word politics is from “polis”, the Greek word for city-state.

Hence, in the context of a city, politics can refer to decisions about cities (always in the contexts of States, because that is the root of the word “polis”, city-State). In this sense, politics refers to a structure where there is decisioning (in groups) about the urban (city) environment (in the context of a State). Politics is decision-making in groups about how to use real-world relationships based upon having power-over others and using it to reform the city environment. Herein, “political economy” refers to decisions about the economy within a capitalist society taken by political positions based on [self-]interest. A political-class economy (political economy) infers different socio-economic classes. And, if there are different classes, then there are likely to be politics (“exercise of power” and “class struggle”) between classes. Politics is a societal organization where social classes mix in a set of contractual-trade relationships, with each party typically seeking advantage over others, and one group of people rise to a ‘current’ leadership position of the State and/or market societal mix. Of note, politics in the market occur to produce sales; and, politics in the State occur to gain power and have influence. Where present, politics likely involves all aspects of society, notably, the economic and social.

In the context of the State, politics is the complex and dynamic process through which power is exercised (in a market-State). Politics is the acquisition and maintenance of power over others. At its core, politics involves the struggle for power and influence [in the market-State]. Because politics involves the exercise of power-over-others, in a market, it is competitive. Politics includes both formal political systems, such as governments and political parties (law deciders and administrators), as well as market enterprises (businesses) and informal networks of individuals within social movements. Where there is a political system, all aspects of society become political, because all individuals live entirely within the city-State.

Market economists typically believe that upon completion of a market exchange, both trading parties gain from the trade[market]. Market economists typically claim exchange (consensual only) to be the “empirical science” of maximizing human benefit and benefiting human behavior. Therein, behavior is believed to be governed by a set of market-economic “laws” that are impersonal and politically neutral; therefore, as the more market-over-State based economists believe, politics and economics should and can be separated into distinct spheres (i.e., the State does macro-economics, and the market does micro-economics). The idea of a political-economy (or, political economy) seeks to return those two apparently distinct categories (the economy as separate from politics), to one integrated societal category, “political-economy”, upon which a sane production system for human fulfillment may be built.

Criminal justice, as a form of human management, relies on politics instead of values and science. If it relied on science, it would not be punitive, and hence, not be “criminal”. In the early 21st century, law is inherently political, because:

1. It is part of the State, and the State is a location where politicians and citizens take [political] decisions about their material environment.
2. Judges are selected by the citizens through a competitive vote.
3. Judges are selected by government officials, generally through a competitive vote.

In community, law is inherently scientific, because:

- Laws come from voluntary association, from a place not of force, from scientific evidence based in human fulfillment and ecological regeneration.

The experience of politics is the experience of ideological participation in a system of [factioned] authority for influence over decisions about society, which involves various activities, including but not limited to (i.e., the potential political processes are):

1. **Voting** (*democratic type of society*).
2. **Debating** (*democratic type of society*).
  - A. If “you” are only going to allow one side of the conversation to speak, it’s not a debate anymore; it becomes a monologue (*democratic type of society*) or a platform for propaganda (*authoritarian type of society by undermining the essence of a socially constructive dialogue*).
3. **Documenting decisions** as “public policy” creation (Read: law establishment) to structure decisioning, take decisions, and resolve conflicts, which can be done in two ways, through:
  - A. Transparent documentation (*democratic type of society*).
  - B. Secret documentation (*authoritarian type of*

society).

4. **Influencing** (and lobbying) by means of:
  - A. Family and friends (nepotism as favoritism or privilege to family and friends over other people).
  - B. Property (get given)
  - C. Power (get given)
5. **Coercing**, blackmail and compromising (*authoritarian type of society*).
6. **Protesting** (*democratic type of society*).

Political processes can be used to facilitate transition to community, by facilitating the identification of social problems and promoting holistically integrated solutions to individual fulfillment and social flourishing. In the early 21st century, the outcomes of political processes can have profound impacts on individuals and society at large, determining the distribution of resources, opportunities, State granted rights, and ultimately, individual human need fulfillment.

The [competitive] game of politics often involves the continuous engagement in sophisticated rhetorical persuasion, often by emotional appeal and selective obfuscation, in order to take decisions about the allocation of resources in society. Politics encompasses the various activities, institutions, and relationships that shape the form of the authority-based governmentally structured State. Some States have more control over the social and market-economic aspects of society, and other States have less control over the social and market-economic aspects of society. Over time, politics has created (become) bureaucracies and organizational power hierarchies that layer a city and its governmental-State. Political ideologies are sets of beliefs, values, and principles that shape and guide political actions and policies.

In the market-State, law is the political rule-set that maintains peace and established order through the methods of reward and punishment (extrinsic motivation). Conversely, in community, law is scientifically informed decision resolutions about human fulfillment and ecological stability.

The law has two functions in a market-State society:

1. To resolve disputes (by judging punishments and rewards; or identifying problems and following through with restoration measures).
2. To prevent disputes (by exposing the process of law (decisioning) to the public to determine how to resolve disputes).

The process of resolving disputes under the law in the market-State involves:

1. The judge “finds” facts (by listening to the assertions of the disputing parties (e.g., plaintiff and defendant) without “prejudice”.

2. The judge discovers the most appropriate law and applies it, using argumentation (against/for), to the facts.
3. The judge holds the judgement (an argued conclusion) according to the law and it will be enforced by authority.

Different societies have different structures by which behavior control (documentation) is constructed:

1. In the market-State, that which is legal/lawful is that which follows protocols (rules) associated with the decisions of authority.
  - A. In the market-State, laws and their individual interpretations (by judges/justices “of the law”) vary according to who is interpreting them. Once a legal precedent has been set, it is difficult to receive a different ruling (Read: judgement in a legal case) unless (1) the law that “judges” is changed (i.e., a change of the law by those who create laws), or (2) the justice(s) that are interpreting the law is changed (i.e., a change of the specific individual with the role/ task of interpreting the law). The judgement [decision] of a judge is often called, “the court’s opinion” (a.k.a., court ruling). Ideally, laws are designed to be specific and are written to address the full spectrum of circumstances that may blatantly violate or circumvent the authority and/or law. However, in market-State practice, laws often contradict one another or do not address the fully the intricacies certain circumstances.
  - B. In the market, what does it mean to make something “illegal”? For the concept of illegality to be meaningful as a law [to be enforced by enforcers], the State has to use lethality/ violence to enforce it.
2. In community, that which is “permissible” [by standards] is that which follows protocols (rules) associated with the a community-based decision system, informed by working groups and habitat teams.
  - A. In community, laws do not have interpretations; they are specific an objective. And, laws are scientifically informed to sustain optimized human fulfillment and healthy societal operations.
  - B. In the market, what does it mean to make something “illegal”? For the concept of illegality to be meaningful as a law, the restorative justice and medical team use science to inform harm reduction and facilitate human restoration.

In reality, there is no authority that is not reduced to

the mind of an individual (i.e., authority is a belief held by individuals). In a society where authority is ubiquitous, individuals' choices become artificially narrowed, and their language is likely to become that of the language of an authority.

Herein, the term "authority" means power over others (producing an subtractive relationship and not driven by the intrinsic motivation of individual). Under State legal conditions, authority is the legal (a.k.a., legitimate) power that one person or group possesses and practices over another.

As John Taylor Gatto (2012) observed,

*Authority is the author who is writing "your" script in life, until "you" learn how to think for "yourself". If you're not authority over your own script in life, if you don't seek out knowledge and inquire for yourself, then who is writing your script, by default. "You either learn your way towards writing your own script in life, or you unwittingly become an actor in someone else's script."*

Where there is jurisdiction there is authority (i.e., jurisdiction is authority). Where there is authority there is permission (i.e., authority is permission). Where there is no jurisdiction there is no requirement for permission to be anything other than the natural self. Where there is no authority, there is no such concept as "law", and therein, freedom of fulfillment has the possibility of becoming a realized part of society's integral nature. When someone is subject to a jurisdiction, then they are subject (i.e., servant and servile) to its protection. And, its protection of "you" might include "your" death, or caging "you" if you seek to effectively fulfill your needs or nature without permission. Under the state of authority, guns back up permission. In a community-type society, nature is the only permission.

When humans live without enough [fulfillment] there will always be people who have to "steal" to fulfill their needs, or de-stabilize others to feel stable, and there will always be people who punish, because failure to gain permission results in punishment. And, punishment encourages bad behavior because it a form of violence and revenge. At the end of every government law is a gun or other weapon. Government is control and regulation of behavior [through monopolization of violence]. To say government is necessary is to say violence is necessary, for every action taken by government is backed up by violence or the threat of violence. Human relationship not based on violence are always better than those based on violence. Violence is necessary if you want to control people. Government is a territorial monopoly based on violence.

In nature, legal[ized] relationships do not exist. Legal relationships are abstractions based upon [at least] the ideas of ownership and authority. In nature, individuals cannot even be said to "own" the bodies in which their consciousness is embodied. Instead, the population

of a community-type society is accessing [vs. owning] the material and conceptual structure that composes all of society, which is constantly turning over material resources and processing information accessed from outside and inside of oneself (i.e., from the environment. To have a "legal relationship" there must first exist the concept of "ownership", and the idea of ownership must be accepted by the individuals in a collective such that it becomes normative. Therein, it becomes a life dis-orienting risk by dis-aligning decisioning from the 'nature of access' for everyone to mutual fulfillment. If "ownership" [to the self] does not exist the self is just itself, an individual consciousness temporarily accessing common material resources (without the requirement of an authority), then legal relationships do not exist. Hence, in a community-type society, "crime" is understood more in terms of a violation of objectively understood 'decisioning principles', and not subjectively judged 'legal relationships'. Subjectively judged legal relationships are usually structured to end in punishment, whereas objectively understood decision principles are usually structured to end in the fulfilled restoration of whole and healthy relationships. Under a legal system, what considered normal (about our life and culture) is a situational opinion, and not a fact.

Normative relationships can and do change [with changes to a decision space]. These relationships tend to change based upon the evolution of a social group's value set, understandings, and approach, which exist in a state of emergence, but may be perceived as static, and become essentially [artificially] fixated when codified by authority. Therein, the codifying (or "legalizing") of a normative relationship and the laying of interpretation and judgment based on the codification (Read: a mandatory and punishable obligation) is a mechanism against individual and social adaptation. And, when society can no longer correct for actual injustices and social corrosion, then it enters a disengaging entropic spiral. Legal definitions are an appeal to authority. Legal authority is how The Law is codified. Legal authority means that if the law is broken by "you" it ends in either "you comply" or "you die". That is a fundamental layer (or characteristic) of what criminal justice.

**INSIGHT:** *Law is moral information.*

Many modern justice systems are at best a parody of what a justice system should be. Justice cannot be based on the arbitrary "law" of a ruling class, or even on hierarchical social class (i.e., politics, political justice), if it is going to lead to the stable orientation of a community. Ultimately, the only way to make any headway towards eradicating the social corrosion of "crime" is to cooperatively redesign society so that its institutions and organizations stop attacking people's self-determinism and stop hurting them at a sexual, physical, and mental level. Humanity should structure society for fulfillment, from an moral standpoint, regardless of whether it has any effect on crime or not. But, if it is posited that

one of society's fundamental and most ancient roles is to prevent "crime" when people associate, then the necessity to do so becomes even more pressing, reinforcing and accentuating its encoding.

Early 21st century society, because it is a legally structure society based on competition for monopolization of access to judgement is in many ways divided into:

1. Law makers (those who decide when to use force).
2. Law enforcers (those who use force).
3. Public and spectators (everyone else to whom force may be applied to control behavior).

In games of competition, whether they exist at the societal level, or the level of a small group, a metaphorical "stick" is often needed to beat those who break the rules. Alternatively, in more cooperative structures methods are used to restore harmony and fulfillment, and to address the cause of that which did objective harm. It may be of interest to note here that the etymology of the English language term "sticker" [for the rules] comes from the historical role of a referee in competitive sports games. This referee (umpire) held a stick, which he used to beat rule breakers. Other terms for this type of role include, but are not limited to: judge, enforcer, and punisher. The civilian side of the punisher is the denouncer who denounces people to the punisher. In the early 21st century, the term "stickler" has also become associated with denouncers, as they are the ones who are the ones who insist on exactness or completeness in the observance of rules set by authority figures. A "sticker for the rules" may punish the rule breaker themselves, or turn the rule breaker in to the punisher.

It is a sad fact that the design of the current global justice system of early 21st century society equally dehumanizes and humiliates all the victims of an alleged crime. Not only are they trotted out over and over again (often for profit and agenda), and forced to relive their trauma on command, but they (and the population as a whole) are made to pay for prison stay through taxation, and the further decay of society.

The early 21st century "rule of law" is treated as a cover of hypocrisy used by those expressing normatively accepted bad behavior to shield themselves from punishment. It is not justice. Morality that is authoritarian by nature is not morality, it is doubletalk (or doublespeak). In early 21st century society, individuals learn to deal with the concept of authority at a very young age. Not only do they, generally, learn that their parents can order them around, but also that those orders don't apply to the parents themselves, and authority figures. The idea that the punishment of others by authority figures for violations of authority becomes normalized. Accusing authority of hypocrisy is pointless, since authority knows/has the ability to engage the power to monopolize punishment.

Fundamentally, any ethical principle or ethical system is invalid if it is asymmetrical in application (to locations,

times, or persons). One of the prime characteristics of a false morality is that it makes it impossible to differentiate right from wrong, which, is precisely what morality is supposed to do. So as moral systems, things like laws and doctrines are complete failures. In their actual purpose, which is to secure control over populations, they are on the whole imperfect, but generally successful (keep in mind that many revolts are hierarchy over another competing for such power).

Laws are, in part, how competitors work together peacefully. Laws are a product of a scarcity of cooperative solutions and mutual empathy. Eventually, laws [that encroach on liberties] become a dictators toolkit for the next leader or "nodded" person who gets into office. Alternatively, values are shared among cooperators.

The truth, the early 21st century "rule of law" has regularized and maximized the injustice that existed before the rule of law; that is what the rule of law has done. When in all the nations of the world the rule of law is the darling tool of the leaders and the plague of the people, then humanity ought to recognize this. Humanity, as composed of self-integrating individuals, must transcend these superficial boundaries in its thinking and behaving - it is the inter-national dedication to "law and order" that binds the leaders in a comradely bond, while binding the development of a global human community. The Law is governmental permission to act (i.e., law is permission and/or provision by authority). Therein, the law is an excellent scapegoat by the dominant and in-power culture to vilify groups that it doesn't care for or like.

Powerful people are often excepted in a power-oriented society through the application of their social power. Through the acquisition of social power there exists less liability. Those in power will often appeal to its centralization - to the preservation and expansion of their power-base. Therein, all power structures tend toward aristocratic and self-serving laws. Therein, a "citizen" is someone who is "running" a simulated encoding of the State [of self-limitation].

Law is delusion and fakery, everywhere. While authorities and other leaders in early 21st century society point to the law, society as a whole ignores the way law injures individuals. Law is not an unwavering source of justice; it is the unwavering sword of authority, and by consequence, fear. This is what happens in early 21st century society: when something goes wrong "you" create new law, "you" never think to remove or disarm the law; "you" make more law. "You" create more legal professionals. An evolved society seeks to reduce the number of laws. It anticipates the multitude of ways law might damage society. Do "you" anticipate the way that laws damage "your" society?

Structuring an ideology about crime which defines crime as an action that exists in a vacuum, divorced from all context, which is the natural consequence of the "personal responsibility + owned liability" doctrine, ensures that crime will not ever be solved as a social problem, and that everyone will always remain at risk.

And, in a market-based socio-economic environment there will always exist a class of people who seek to profit from this risk.

The idea of combining 'personal responsibility' with liability leads directly to the idea of 'blame' (as judgment) placed upon people and institutions. Blame is an isolated measure; it is a wayward measure of self-protection. If someone doesn't like the behaviors of a government, then they have the "right" to blame the president, blame the government, or blame political lobbyists. If someone doesn't like ecological disregard, they have the "right" to blame this or that corrupt business or some regulatory body for poor performance. If someone doesn't like being poor and socially immobile, they can blame government coercion and interference in a the "free market". Having a "right" to blame is not an orientationally useful idea. The very idea of "blame" is antagonistic to a systematic solution-orientation due to its high likelihood of narrowing an awareness of the causative factors to a subset of those factors, and may even open a society to the diversion of "liability" through force-based interrelationships [and ultimately, property].

The words "fault", "blame", and even "judgement" are social constructs that have no scientific justification. These are words that humans use to describe other people's behavior they don't like. Authority uses judgement to proclaim "guilt", "innocence", and to make examples out of people. When an authority can make an example out of anyone, then something is wrong in that society. And therein, when the claim to authority is by way of a hand on a book, a scribble on paper, and an "office" or "chair", then something is similarly wrong with that society.

No one wants to be held liable (i.e., blamed) in a liability-based society, and hence, people will seek, via every means possible, to out-game each other in being held liable (as in, blamed responsibility vs. accountable responsibility). Therein, power given will not be easily given up because it provides a security net to those who might be held liable. A blaming social structure generates a liability-based economic structure in which people game each other to be held less liable, and the game involves everyone's lives.

If society wants to solve a systemic problem (i.e., crime in context), then the system that generated the conditions and conditioning that [in part] allowed for the manifestation of the crime must be analyzed as a whole. And, new understandings generated from that inquiry must be designed (or encoded, "codified") into the next iteration of the system so that the systemic problem inherent to the prior system does not exist inherently in the next system.

What was called "admiral behavior" and "evil behavior" in the past may not make sense in a different paradigm. For example, someone who is called a traitor in police state (e.g., a "whistle-blower") might be called a hero in another paradigm. What is a "criminal"? It is a term relative to a particular context, a particular [normative] system.

In specific, what "you" call a criminal depends upon the culture "you" live in. When the Romans fed people to lions, that was not considered criminal behavior. Today, such behavior would be considered criminal. If someone were to say, "there is too much crime in the world," then an intelligent response by an inquiring mind would be to ask what the interlocutor meant by the word "crime". Does it mean there is too much false advertising? Does it mean what the drug companies claim about their pills? Does it mean the withholding of efficiency in socio-economic goods and services? Does it mean the punishing of people for growing certain types of plants? Does mean parents who put their children in day-care and go off to work for over 20 hours a week? Does it mean the facilitation of structural violence? Does it mean hitting children? Maybe it describes a doctor when s/he says, "You" need an operation, but in truth, s/he is influenced in the decision because of a financial-type societal need to pay off a new house, or feed his/her children. In other words, it is very hard to tell "criminal behavior" unless the term is clearly defined in a comprehensive socio-economic context without defining fulfillment. Fundamentally, laws create criminals, and cultures of limitation create victims. Convictions cause [the social construction of] "convicts".

In many unjust societies purport that every story has to have two polarized sides (e.g., "guilty" or "not guilty" [by the "right" of authority]), unless the narrative involves a criminal, and then it only has one. An unjust society is structured upon social polarization, and hence, social manipulation. In these societies, all opinions (as well as beliefs, likes & dislikes) may be considered equally valid. Therein, the presentation of two equal and opposing perspectives as valid, morally, is a form of social manipulation (as "oppositional social engineering") that generates a false and polarizing dichotomy in the psyche of a population it prevents observation of the whole system it becomes a debate (in the pejorative). When the only side is a losing side, then individuals must look at the underlying societal structure that generates said options. And, in order to recognize that both sides are sides of loss, then there must exist an inquiry into the polarizations initial[ized] authorization into the societal structure; possibly, as inquiry into the encoding of the idea of "law" itself.

If "you" want to solve a problem, then everything is open for discussion and "you" can't have any fear of offending anyone or any particular [presumptively] established group. If "political correctness" is advocated for, then there is not fulfillment among society, and the encoding of fear is certainly present. Out of the fear, ultimately, people can be led to externalize power (i.e., give their power away to others). And yet, fear compromises an individual's power. To regain one's own sense of power one must begin internalizing the source of power (as opposed to externalizing it onto authority). When individuals see themselves as victim, they are externalizing power.

Herein, the job and behavior of judges in the modern



legal systems could be considered erroneous and unreal, and may be viewed by future societies as itself, 'criminal behavior'. Judges make decision and they reach real world conclusion concerning what is to be done by "their authority" to other human individuals in stark isolation from that which is the real world, while at the same time claiming the mantle of authority, of superiority, and often of omniscience in their examination of what they call "the factual evidence of the case". Their "factual evidence" includes little about the values, backgrounds, and history that makeup the individuals involved; it includes nearly naught about the conditions and conditioning, or about the larger socio-economic environment that interfaces with and throughout the lives of those who are by force to be judged by them. For, judges and lawyers are neither scientists nor systems thinkers, they are not philosophers or open inquirers, but they are authoritarian costumed, sophisticated professioned [legal] actors playing a role in the further obfuscation and hindrance of human fulfillment. Judges and legalized authority figures collaborate in ways that cause unnecessary suffering in other people's lives without a mechanism by which they might otherwise even notice the repercussions of their behavior.

In the market, enforcement and prohibition are life employment acts. And therein, governments everywhere, by design, represent the wealthiest property owners.

Show "me" a judge or a prosecuting attorney that doesn't believe that what they are doing is righteous and proper and moral in society to keep those "bad guys" who don't obey the rules under control. Don't the rules just beg to be questioned: what are they based on, who made them up, can they be changed, how are they influencing behavior? Is there empathy for those who don't follow the rules, either wittingly or unwittingly? Is there a "victim", is there a "criminal", or is there one of us, someone whose life experiences have led them behave in the manner in which they have behaved. Therein, society may learn to adapt, iteratively, so that more fulfillment is more likely. Where is the empathy and mutual fulfillment in extortion, in coercion, in punishment, and in the perception that humans cannot integrate, systematize, and self-organize for everyone's benefit. Some societies, need to recheck their premises. If there is a pre-disposition of some people to not understand what emotions are (i.e., psychopaths / sociopaths) and to lack empathy, compassion, or appreciation for the needs of other [human] life, then how could a society tolerate a hierarchical governance system and any system of judgmental interpretation, for it is bound to have negative consequences due to a lack of empathy on the part of judges (Read: jurisdictional and political). Those who seek power, or the benefits of power, and lack empathy, are highly likely to take decisions without a holistic accounting for the needs of everyone. To lack empathy is to be ignorant to the consequences of one's actions on others, and also, on one's total self. A lack of empathy involves the failure to identify real needs among conscious entities, which

are common, and possibly, to cling to counterfeits and pseudo-satisfiers. One might ask, "What do others feel when judgements and actions are systematically thoughtless of human fulfillment (i.e., when they lack the context of mutual human fulfillment and the potential to restore relationships to that dynamic)?"

The conventional "legal trinity" is:

1. Force.
2. Law.
3. Power-based negotiation/contracts.

This legal trinity is ubiquitously adhered to across all governments. And yet, do not governments always put forward judiciously inept efforts when they investigate themselves, which generally turns into a search for a pre-determined outcome. How can a coercive force investigate itself; it can't. In community there is facilitation of individual self-development and restoration of socio-technical fulfillment, which are not equivalent to [law] enforcement. Notice how the word "force" is present in the term "law enforcement", clearly showing how law is based upon force (i.e., the monopolization of violence).

There are two forms of real authority (authority that promotes self-integration) and two forms of beliefs in authority (authority that limits self-integration):

1. **Evidence is the only authority** (Read: sensation by consciousness). The first real form of authority (internal response to stimuli).
2. **Understanding is the only authority** (Read: modeling by consciousness; visualization). The second real form of authority (coherent internal integration in response to stimuli).
3. **Power over others is the only authority** (Read: coercion). The first false form of authority (externalization of response to stimuli).
4. **Social conception is the only authority** (Read: solipsism and false reification). The second false form of authority (externalization of response to stimuli).

It is important to remember that at the end of every individual's opinion, there is a big question mark; and, at the end of every judicial opinion, there is weapon. In most democracies, court opinions are the "law of the land".

Stefan Kühl (2016:146) in *Ordinary Organisations: Why Normal Men Carried Out the Holocaust* observed, details how State extermination policies in the 20th century were implemented in the form of programs that are typical of every law administration and every police force. There is a common saying within law enforcement, and even among many citizens, "Whatever the law, it has to be enforced." Whereupon, people who have given their power and thinking over to the State of authority, may then say, "And, if we want to change the law, then

we must change our leaders” (i.e., to change when the application of force is valid/invalid, those who decided when the application of force is valid/invalid ought to be changed). This viewpoint fails to question the premise that the validity or invalidity of the application of force by a group of selected deciders is the appropriate way to organize human behavior. It fails to question whether organizing society around the subjective use of force is optimal.

Note here that the neither the term “peaceable” nor “peace officer” is used or applicable in a community-type society, for it denotes the idea that authority “pieces together” freedom, which is an inaccurate representation of real world experience. If “you” aren’t finding the peace within yourself what peace are “you” finding? Peace is not the absence of conflict; it is the ability to handle conflict through peaceful (and non-aggressive) means.

In general, judicial professionals have engaged their ability to inquiry, and often inquiry logically, but they are limited in their inquiry and their logic by the structural paradigm (or “stricture”) in which their profession exists. Instead of exploring a system-wide solution-orientation involving root causes in an accurately informed context [useful to humankind], they have the authority (as a right to force-based power) to act based upon interpretation, which opens the possibility for the injection of selfish beliefs, “I know plenty about that individual, he has been in jail before, he is a criminal”, or “that individual comes from a high class family. A family I respect or may do a favor for me in the future. They deserve a little more class in how I treat them person”. That is sometimes the proverbial “yard stick” to a judge, associative memory and ego projection.

At its essence, all judgemental actions are based on selfish and perfectly self-reflective conditioning experience, not the truth. Willpower may be engaged and cognition applied logically, but fulfillment is not the end result for there exists a disconnection a belief, in authority and in one’s own righteousness. The modern judgemental-legal system is a paradigm of make believe theatrics that violently forces regular people to participate, with real life-threatening consequences and system-wide [behavioral] repercussions, and it is without a mechanism for effective recognition of fulfillment and fed back re-orientation.

It is unwise for a society to superimpose an ethical principle over a structure that reinforces values and behaviors that run in opposition to the ethical principle. Fundamentally, laws do not prevent aberrant behavior from manifesting when (or, as) it is socio-economically, structurally induced. It isn’t the Law that prevents crime; a society must fulfill the conditions (or needs) of individuals. Through law, rules of cause and effect are subject to authority rather than an objective and systematic approach involving critical thought and scientific evidence. Effectively, laws give people a false sense of security (preservation and protection) that ~~may~~ does cause them to make bad decisions.

Locking people up in a cage does little to address a

socio-economic system that breeds corruption through its structural components of debt, commodification, the need to cut costs, the need to maximize profit, to exercise differential advantage through competition-based mindsets, and the structure of enforcing restricted access to life needs through private ownership.

Under market-State law, those with power of influence and money (which generally go together) are likely to have access to both reputation (so they are going to be regarded better, generally, by the justice system, jury, etc.), and better and more influential lawyers (and possibly, politicians). In bribe taking and lobbying countries those with money and power will have the ability to pay legal decision makers to decide in their favor. In the early 21st century, the law is the opinion of the powerful, and inevitably subject to interpretation, whereupon it is the job of lawyers (as a class) to take what is written (possibly, or possibly not, in plain language), and twist it so it forces the result that their client(s), who are paying them, regard as desirable. Such linguistic and relationship problems that are extremely expensive and time consuming.

In early 21st century society, “judges” are the official interpreters of the authority’s message. These individuals gain and maintain their power through the [structured] invocation of fear. And, whomever these people are, they are part (or will eventually become part) of an administrative structure primarily concerned with controlling large numbers of people through fear (e.g., governments and corporations). Yet, they are not to be feared; they are to be recognized. Behavior conformed out of fear is contrived and not empowered toward a higher potential. Fear-based control structures divide and subdivide like a one-celled structure, constantly spawning new versions of itself (e.g., capitalism 1.0, 2.0, 3.0 ... n.0), which live alongside the old. The rites of celebration might change with each version, but the corrupted structure developed in order to control the masses through fear remains. When fear and force are introduced humanity is held back from its potential. Of the many effects that fear has, it stifles human intellect, reducing the ability think critically, and limiting the potential for globally workable solutions.

The “factual evidence” presented to and by the man/woman in a costumed suit, a legal professional, is almost never the truth, and in the rare cases that it is, the organizational structure in which the role of the judgment exists does not allow judges the ability to usefully act upon the information; they too are in a professional box with belief structured boundaries.

In large part, the purpose of a judge is to lay judgement. Judges, with degrees of leeway, determine how the “convicted” are to be treated and their potential future worth in society. If “you” can be judged, then “your” potential is necessarily limited. Such a social organization where selected individuals are given the power to determine the future course of someone else’s life [after the “factual” recounting of a decontextualized and monopolized conflict] will not ever amount to a

society worth looking up to or remaining a part of.

Without a common objective reference and general direction for social organization, then political factions are apt to form, each faction maintaining their own subjective [or ill-defined] definition of the terms they use to describe their direction. In this context, that of ambiguity and a lack of a physical reference, the idea of resolving conflicts on the basis of mutual understanding is a myth. Political factions will eventually enter into conflict and competition over the orientation of society, each side vying for their interpretation [of the “correct” organization of a single life-sustaining ecological system]. Under such conditions power structures and power acquisition strategies are likely to form, eventually leading to the degradation of freedom and efficiency, and ultimate the very survival of the society will likely be drawn into question. Hence, a stable society must find coherence among the entire population as to what, in the real world, the term ‘justice’ is actually referencing.

New laws become part of the “logical argument” that future judges employ in how they redefine perception (or the euphemism, “interpret the law”). And, once someone’s perception is redefined, then so too are their responses [programmatically] restructured. Or, to say this in another way, once someone’s perception is influenced, then their behavior is likely to be influenced, including their emotional and mental reactions (or responses). Hence, judgment creates an additively chaotic system for their is never an integration of structures (there is not a logical integration and effective dissonance-cleansing process running in the brain mind-consciousness) of someone with judgment. Laws on-top of more laws to patch problems that previous laws have created confused perception on-top of confused perception generating isolationary irrationality. This leads to chaos (as randomness) ad-infinitum; and, in an information system it eventually leads to a sequence [of process events] that generate either exponentially lower or higher entropy, as adaptive transformation or destructive termination of the system itself.

When the concept of authority-based interpretation is introduced into the social structure of a society, then a whole system of interpretation is likely to be established leading to competing opinions, interests, hierarchies of interpretation, and jurisdictional judgment, as well as punishment for “wrong” interpretations. This is a terrible organization for a society. Within such a society there will undoubtedly exists an ongoing struggle between the forces that would congregate, direct, delegate, concentrate, and aggregate [market and socio-political] power, and the forces that would keep it distributed and available to all.

And, in that back and forth struggle it is very rational for the agents in control to do things that are blatantly against the morality and ethics of the society, sometimes just to observe which of them go unchallenged. As morality is increasingly chipped away, further precedent is set for future interpretations of that which is supposed to be moral in the society culture normalizes behaviors

that cause even greater suffering and lead further away from human fulfillment.

If laws were to exist in a society, then should they not be based on consensual human interaction, only a violation of which would be brought to social (or “systems-oriented”) attention? Any system that is funded and based (or structured) upon violating consensual human interaction, such as modern societies “legal system”, will never provide a safeguard against said violation of consensual human interaction, for it is based upon doing so itself. When what someone says, or a judge says, determines anything in a social system, then it is out of touch with the real world where humans have common needs that might be knowledgeably discovered and synergistically fulfilled “judicial opinion” is still opinion it is useless to a useful[ly fulfilling] orientation. Arguing about opinion in court [a larger and more forceful context of opinion] is actual insanity, and it will be seen that way by future generations. Jurisprudence, as the philosophy, study, and science of law is, as it globally stands, a codified system of doublethink. In the real world there is no power in rulership, in contracts, or in force, beyond the power of the belief in authority. Fundamentally, law is just an opinion with a weapon [formerly at the edge of a sword, now at the barrel of a gun, and in the dystopic future, potentially at the quantum bit of a transhuman circuit].

A “license” is permission from the State, or more recently, from corporations, to do something that is otherwise illegal. It is a “permission slip” do to something that is illegal without the slip. Like in prison or school when someone might need a permission slip to go out in the hallway or to use the bathroom. Therein, a “contract” is a licensing agreement between two parties with property. Whenever there is law, there is the potential for legal illegality the construction of a legal framework to protect what should be fundamentally illegal in any fulfillment (or, democratically) oriented society.

In truth, ancestors always volunteer their descendants for better or for worse. “Informed consent” is a legal illusion, which builds the façade of sentient “rights”. Early 21st century society has been so busy building law upon law, generation after generation, creating its great illusion of “rights” that it has lost sight of any orientation or principle toward developing human capability for fulfillment without coercion. A legal/litigious society strangles itself. Look at all the insane decisions people make in early 21st century society because they are afraid of being sued (i.e., litigated against). And yet, it is natural, even when someone makes a mistake to “cover your ass” when your life, your future, your career, or your family are at stake (in a competition). Some societal structures incentivize deceptive and maladaptive behaviors. Yet, many of the lessons in life that are the most useful are the result of a mistake [that was restored from and advanced beyond].

When trust is absent, suspicion feeds on suspicion. The court is an arena of suspicion with competition among

performers. In the court, the trust is with “authority”, not between common and consensual human beings, who are being both willingly and unwillingly being violently monopolized by a normalized structure. The court is a legal ritual, a competitive arena. In competition people always devise their own justifications. In a monopolized competition all opinions become either equal or irrelevant, except for the opinion, the likes and dislikes, of the governing authority. And therein, fixed and immovable law merely provides a convenient structure within which to hang justifications and the prejudice behind them.

The court is an arena for political and sophistical debate. The idea of a “debate” has a very specific historical context. People debate in order to win [in public perception]. A debate is not a high-integrity form of communication; instead, a debate is a formal contest of argumentation in which two [or more] opposing teams defend and attack a defensible proposition it is a protectionist form of socio-economic encoding. Debates do not facilitate comprehension for a prior understanding of the subject matter is necessary to perceive the use of fallacious, specious rhetorical argumentation (i.e., sophistry), which is not always recognized by even the purveyor of the argument. A debate is a strategic and sophisticated competition of persuasion. Debates are won and lost by contestants. Debates divide and subdivide, they alienate. A debate is not a philosophical argument an inquiry toward more comprehensive truth and understanding a form of truth seeking and dissonance reducing communication. And yet, a debate can be fun, challenging, and help with confidence when applied in the correct context (i.e., not a socio-economic context where people’s lives are at stake) it is important to realize what it is and the bounds of its usefulness. Fundamentally, debate is not a useful social communications medium or a useful means of acquiring a greater understanding [of a situation]. And yet, a “friendly debate” can help an individual to test their ideas observe how they withstand attack, either intellectual or fallacious -a debate may be an opportunity to learn and see how ideas stand up to scrutiny (maxim: steel sharpens steel).

The term “healthy debate” is an oxymoron. Morality is not up for debate. Human fulfillment is not up for debate. Human health and well-being are not up for debate. Falsifiable science is not up for debate. Human and ecological restoration/stability are not up for debate. A community does not debate. Debate negates understanding and undermines a real [world] solution. In truth, there is no use fighting over opinions; only factual understandings, and behaviors therefrom, can move humanity forward. One might question when one is having an important conversation whether the conversation is a disputation or a philosophical argumentation between two or more parties for increased understanding and overall improved integration. A debate (dispute in the pejorative) may be used to generate dissonance in order to produce

a greater integration -challenge to which inquiry is a conscious response, builds strength [in understanding].

A philosophical argument does not involve people screaming at each other or dis-engaged from each other; it is the following of a train-of-thought and the removal of contradiction therein between people by visualizing and integrating new understandings. Philosophy is applied to remove clutter from one’s mind, to trace the origin of ideas. The rational scientific method is applied to understand existence and non-existence. The experimental scientific method is applied to verify observations.

When people deliberately undermine philosophical arguments and inquiries in a sophisticated and trickery-based manner (i.e., acting as a “sophist”) it is a clear sign that gaming-strategies have been engaged and philosophical inquiry is dis-engaged. Debates do not involve a critical approach to lower entropic integration of information about a common ecologically referential system, a lifeground.

When in a conversation, and an interlocutor becomes either confused or is recognizably trying to debate, it is best to:

1. Look at the communication from the perspective of data, and not the other’s whims or opinions.
2. Apply critical thought and identify fallacies.
3. Find common ground.
4. Reassess the continuation of communication with the interlocutor if no common ground or evolution of thought is possible.

In early 21st century society political and judicial debates largely decide the lives of individuals as well as the socio-economic orientation of society.

Natural law is the universal, non-man-made, binding and immutable conditions that govern the consequences of behavior. Natural law is a body of universal laws which act as the governing dynamics of consciousness. In general, jurisdictional law is opinion, because in the legal process, the defense attorney and the prosecutor are trying to convince (persuade) the jury or judge to win their opinion.

Case law and statutory law are man-made laws. They are laws without reference to the natural world made up by “lawmakers” (legislators and judges) the studying of these laws is the studying of fiction. Man-made laws are just opinions backed up by force and violence. They are fictional, sophisticated, and arbitrary constructs with real consequences. Therein, superior enforcers of such laws state, “We think this is what should be done and if you don’t go along with it we have people who will cage you and possibly shoot you based upon that belief.” Both case law and statutory law are people’s opinions backed by a gun or threat, and ultimately, by the belief in authority.

In a society structured around legislation, changes in legislation lead to real, and sometimes dramatic, changes

in society. Thus, the question must be asked, Is it wise to have a political process, a bureaucratic power hierarchy, a complex and obfuscated interpretation structure, secrecy, profit, lobbyists, leaders and marketable professionals, among others, who by their influence and power determine the orientation and direction of a claimed society?

The idea that there are these people who are going to make all of these great and wise decisions with guns (i.e., government) is nonsense. Because of course all of the people who can make the best decisions in the world always want to be armed. Because they are really wise, really smart, and know the best decisions for everyone. Because they get “democratically” elected power for their politically persuasive ownership status. Because they have the very best ideas, so naturally, they want lots of weapons. ‘Statism’ is [in part] the belief that a small number of people should be given all the guns in the world to inflict their will on everyone else. It is mad and delusional. Often, the people with the most effective and useful ideas are the most cooperative and voluntary they see the benefits of harmonization, which is opposed by hierarchies of power.

In modern parlance there are two general forms of “authority”. The first form is that of “authority by means of status or social position, and it entails a whole host of related [descriptive] characteristics. The second form is something of a misnomer (i.e., it is misnamed), it is a “knowledge authority”, and it is the idea that someone who has a well-informed understanding and factual knowledge set [often derived from lengthy re-verified experience] is some kind of “authority”. A “knowledge authority” is someone who is knowledgeable on a particular subject matter or skillful at a particular aspect of life ... is just someone who has spent time learning a particular topic or refining a particular skill. Knowledgeable and skillful people have expressions of their love [and devotion to their self-development] to share. But, is it right to call them an authority? Probably not. It is more accurate to call them knowledgeable and skillful.

When an individual begins to seek greater self-direction and social intelligence, then the question of whom s/he should listen to arises. Who has factual knowledge and verifiable skill? Who has actual knowledge and a refinement of their coordination, maybe gained through first hand direct experience of a thing?

The first form of authority, a power authority, is not necessarily knowledgeable about any subject matter in particular; knowledge is not a characteristic component of its complete definition. Instead, the claim given by those in authority is that they ought to be listened to, and their commands followed and obeyed, because they have the ability to apply force [in the social power hierarchy]. Conversely, a “knowledge authority” doesn’t give commands, and hence, is not an “authority” as such. The first form of authority is really referring to the idea that there is a person or a class of individual human beings living on the Earth that somehow have a moral

right to issue commands that may not be disobeyed regardless of the commands sensibility. It is the idea that certain people have the moral right to issue orders; and that another class of people have a moral obligation to obey these commands. And, the authority’s “subjects” have no equivalent “right” to refuse the commands or orders -it is the belief in “rulers” and “subjects”, which has become obfuscated under its most modern version, that of “political democracy”.

Essentially, when power authority exists, then there exists the belief that some people are the masters over others with the right to issues commands, and other people are their subjects (or “slaves”), who have a moral obligation to obey those commands regardless of how truthfully informed they are or their sensibility. Authority is fundamentally based on this notion: that some people belong to (Read: are owned by) other people who they may not disobey nor go against their word [otherwise punishment is right and valid].

The concept of “jurisdiction” underlies the socio-economic encoding of the belief in authority. Jurisdiction means that “you” are under the moral obligation to obey the commands of the local “authority” (first form) while spatially present within the ascribed geographic setting (or region) on Earth known [written] as that jurisdiction (or territory). A “territory” is where jurisdiction is exercised; and, violence is the means for controlling territory. The idea of a “county”, a “country”, a “nation”, and a “State” are examples of jurisdictions (or “jurisdictional territories”).

The belief in authority is [in part] based upon the concept of a [defensible] “jurisdiction”. Jurisdiction claims that the geographic location of someone’s birth and place of any action subsequent is subject to the man-made written laws of the entity that has a monopoly over the use of force, violence, and coercion in that area. Etymologically speaking, the term ‘jurisdiction’ comes from the Latin: ius (genitive iuris; there is no “j” in Latin) meaning “right, law” + dictio “a saying”. In English, “diction” means “speech”. Hence, jurisdiction literally means, “to speak the law,” or “the law is what we say it is, we speak the law, and it is right because we have written that it is right”. Notice how this logic is based entirely in moral relativism and circular reasoning.

In a given geographic “legalized” area (or “jurisdiction”) an authority characteristically exists to author and enforce law, which is to be obeyed at the cost of a monopoly on violence directed at disobedience regardless of reason, of commonality, of lifeground, and of human fulfillment in general. That is what “jurisdiction” is based upon, people who believe that they are the authors of law and that they get to speak subjective commands into existence, and somehow that makes ethics and morality, as though it were to create some sort of a moral obligation on the part of their “subjects” to obey those commands. Hence, synonymous with the idea of authority (i.e., one of its principal characteristics) is a decision space that orients toward a monopoly on force, fraud, coercion, violence, and other forms intentional aggression, which eventually becomes structurally violent through deeper

socio-economic [pattern] encoding.

Aggression is a highly context sensitive behavior; context insensitive aggression is pathological. Aggression appears in three contexts:

1. Desperation for food.
2. Desperation for sex and reproduction.
3. Desperation for safety.
4. Desperation for retribution.
5. Competition for scarcity (e.g., individuals weigh themselves against opponents in competition; where, if the perception is that of being weaker, you aggression is avoided).

Authority is an illusion, it is not based in fact or truth or knowledge or wisdom; it is a belief system (i.e., authoritarianism). And, it is a belief system that is based in mental imbalance. It might be true to state that when “communing” with others someone is likely to pick up their dis-eases. The people who believe in and condone or practice authority (observed in part through command-oriented communication) are those who have adopted some level of the belief in authority into themselves.

Authority is ultimately based in violence. If the commands are refused on the part of the subjects or the “slaves”, then the authorities always respond with:

*“If you don’t do this, if you don’t obey these commands, then I/we also possess the right and power to do violence onto you physically or psychologically or even to grab that which society commonly agrees is “yours” as punitive measures, or hinder your continued fulfillment of needs. In other words, “my” authority has the right to intentionally and artificially limit the fulfillment of “your” needs.”*

Common dictionary definitions associated with the concept of authority include:

1. **Authority:** Power or right to enforce obedience; moral, ethical, or legal supremacy; the right to command, or give ultimate decision. *Source: Oxford English Dictionary (2013).*
2. **Obey:** To comply with, or perform, the bidding of; to do what one is commanded by (a person); to submit to the rule or authority of, to be obedient to. *Source: Oxford English Dictionary (2013).*
3. **Jurisdiction:** Administration of justice; exercise of judicial authority, or of the functions of a judge or legal tribunal; power of declaring and administering law or justice; legal authority or power. *Source: Oxford English Dictionary (2013).*

Laws, ordinances, statutes and rights are relative to a jurisdictional-authority. They are not a common, or even objective, standard relative to reality as it actually exists. Legal positions are always vague and lack moral

clarification, and they exist in some degree of mis-alignment with human fulfillment, which is essentially why they are called “legal positions” or “legal opinions”.

Patchworked systems (e.g., legal systems) are an admission that the underlying social structure is inappropriate for the nature of the organism. Structures that patch instead of feed-back are maladaptive and ineffective for organizing human fulfillment and flourishing. Prolonging a failed model of fulfillment, justice, and resource use/distribution leaves a population vulnerable to the predations of those who would take control.

There are perfectly natural impulses that are useful under certain situations and not under others. Resisting arrest by State police is one example of a natural impulse that is not useful when the police have a monopoly on the use and escalation of force (and violence). In fact, they exist to monopolize the escalation of force; it is part of their role as legal enforcers. Of note, the statement, “s/he resisted arrest”, is actually a retributive phrase for blaming the victim, which is tragically common. When the government or police give an order, then “you” must surrender everything about “your” humanity on the spot or they will escalate violence, and even then, they might escalate. These conditions are globally pervasive. They, enforcers, are 100% in control of “your” physically manifested embodied consciousness when they say they are, or else the results will be psycho-physical pain through to death for “you”, and possibly “your” family.

Metaphorically, if all someone has is a hammer, as a tool to solve problems, then everything starts to look like a nail. And if police and prosecutors are your only tool, sooner or later everything and everyone will be treated as “criminal”. People in a violence-reinforced system will make use of a violent tool just because it exists.

If society maintains a clear and lifegrounded-referential language, then it is likely to maintain a moral orientational clarity and an ability to improve society, but as long as individuals are lost in the language of belief, the State, violence, and of the market, then individuals will never be free of their own chains for that is all that they identify with.

Herein, it is of the utmost importance to recognize that violence can be enabled by working for the institutions and establishment that conduct the violence. The term ‘enabling’ is used herein in its negative sense to describe dysfunctional behavior approaches that are intended to help resolve a specific problem but in fact may perpetuate or exacerbate the problem. Employment in a system of violence and tasks that maintain that system of violence are enabling of an environment of violence.

It is reasonable to ask oneself why there is little to no provision in the modern socio-economic system to ask the question “why” of the design of the system itself. Early 21st century society is not indiscriminate; there is actually organization to it, as difficult and discomfiting as it may be to see. When the operation of early 21st century society is explored in its totality it is possible to see that it is not a systematically fulfilling organization,

but a ideological organization designed to perpetuate itself by means of violence, scarcity, and the inhibition of sufficient need fulfillment. And herein arises the issue patchwork: if the system isn't examined in its entirety, if the *how* of its operation isn't explored [as a result of asking *why*], then patchwork is liable to create bursting issues elsewhere in the system as effects ripple around already unconscious and dissonant interrelationships. Patchwork just "keeps the system going" as it is moving down the same trajectory. Unfortunately, patchwork isn't a systematic exploration of the system and an inquiry into the root of the problem.

In reality, patchwork is not a solution; and because patchwork in a political system is always applied in an incomplete information context there is a great likelihood of making things worse. Early 21st century society has become quite literally a "push button society", whether it be diets or voting, where people find a new diet or "leader" periodically and lack any actual realization of the violent nature of the structure that is being rebuilt around them. Citizens push a button on a board and then stare at their bodies and their governments for 3-5 weeks, months, years during which time they may be extendedly unhappy, and then, they push the next button. No one does anyone else any benefit or justice by selling them inaccurate relationships and pushing figureheads in front of them. Patches may have momentary usefulness (e.g., when someone is haemorrhaging), but they are not sufficient to determine and resolve the actual issue that caused their need in the first place.

Early 21st century society is disconnected from human need and the generative lifeground common to everyone. Hence, it is not capable of effectively reproducing life functions it has no life coordinates to it instead, it exists for the appropriation of resources from the life host to multiply itself ... for what? For more multiplication, for [economic] "growth" and power consolidation. A society without a sustainable relationship to its lifeground is unlikely to facilitate the development of fulfilled individuals and maintain a state of healthy and stable resilience. It is, in fact, a problem that the average individual in society couldn't go into nature and build a shelter or start a fire or make a pair of pants to save his/her life. It is a problem when someone becomes diminished in his/her capabilities of providing for oneself and others, and has instead become reliant on the dominance of others to provide for most, if not all, of one's needs.

Laws and interpretation have the unintended consequence (and sometimes intended) of extending the reach of political authority further and further into personal liberty and social freedoms [to the unfortunate point that it is just expected that everyone will be monitored by the authorities each time they communicate over a telecommunications network].

There is a mistaken belief that justice is overwhelmingly important by arguing that it derives from two natural human tendencies: a desire to retaliate against those

who hurt oneself or others, and the ability to put oneself, vicariously, in another's place. So, when one sees another is harmed, one can project oneself into their situation and feel a desire to retaliate on their behalf. If this process is the source of human feelings about "justice", that ought to undermine human confidence in them. Does the struggle for retaliation really lead to fulfillment at the individual and the social level, or does it perpetuate a dynamic of reactively and chaotic destabilization? The desire to retaliate is an organismal reflex programmed centrally for protection and survival in the wild. And, it can be structurally and social re-activated in society, through particular types of conceptual and spatial structures, where it is counterproductive to common fulfillment.

The correct use of language is important, for language influences perception. For example, "criminalized" implies that an act was done to an individual, that he or she is the receiver of a label. "Criminal", however, implies something inherent within the individual. "You" ARE a criminal. "You" HAVE BEEN criminalized. The difference is subtle, yet significant.

As Lao Tzu well observed,

*"The more laws and order are made prominent,  
the more thieves and robbers there will be."*

Some societies do the following: if a crime occurs, lay blame and liability on a few people. Then, call them criminals and send some of them to jail for penance. While this is occurring, they distribute massive amounts of opiates to the public in a variety of forms, including thousands of television cop and murder dramas (part of the propaganda machine) to further reinforce the belief that this "perfected system" is making them more secure and safe and free from the criminals. So, those who watch television are likely to go to bed with fear in their heads and with the contradiction that all is right with the world through government. Societies that behave in this manner are deeply unwell. Such behavior is not a strategy toward adaptation, it is a pattern of behavior that perpetuates stagnation, corruption, and dramatic forms of corrosion.

Punishment is a form of deprivation, it is the process of further depriving a human being of their needs, while preventing access to that which the socio-economic system has to offer: money; objects; services; information; and participation, etc. When punishment renders as justice, then it is a very unfortunate form of justice. For in fact, it is not a form of justice at all. In a punishment-ownership system, conflict is not something to be [re-]solved, but something to be [re-] owned. Some go so far as to say that the criminal justice system represents a theft by the State of the "victim's" and "offender's" conflict; and, that the State or gang maintains this capability through a monopoly over the use of force and coercion. They state that the system is designed to keep power in the hands of the people

who hold the power, and do so [in part] by way of having a monopoly on arbitration, negotiation, or dispute resolution. The State [of authority] is an impediment to fulfillment in society at every turn.

Whole functional families don't impose. Imposition works for those who don't care. Here are some examples of coercion: Don't feel like paying taxes . . . Sorry, its that or jail. Don't feel like paying for government schools . . . Sorry, its that or jail. Don't feel like following orders because of a victimless crime . . . Sorry, its that or possible death. Don't feel like supporting a war . . . Sorry, its that or jail. Institutional systems in the world impose like crazy. Oh, didn't listen to mother in her disagreement with father . . . Spanking and time out, go to bed, confiscation of cell phone.

In the social and political work known as the *Leviathan*, Hobbes puts forward the idea that a sustainable and just State could be achieved through fear, through the conjuring of a demon to rule over everyone, and that "Leviathan" still remains strong in early 21st century society through [the] codification and ritual [of the State]. The State is early 21st century society's Leviathan.

The two most common Statist primaries are (note that Statists are those who believe in authority, specifically, the authority of a State):

1. "A law for everything and everything managed by law."
2. "Law is the ultimate science."

There are a large number of relevant maxims surrounding the topic of law, some of significant ones are noted below (note the definition of "justice" carried by these maxims is often set as a pejorative):

1. **MAXIM:** In Law two wrongs may cancel each other; therefore, may those who do wrong, do it together. That is the purpose of Law.
2. **MAXIM:** The business of law is to make business for itself, to ever escalate complexity.
3. **MAXIM:** The more corrupt the society, the more numerous the laws. Legislation injures community, law injures conscience. Morality cannot be legislated.
4. **MAXIM:** Governance systems govern the potential of individuals.
5. **MAXIM:** It takes servants to make a government.
6. **MAXIM:** Fear facilitates the installation of authority [in the minds of those susceptible]. The term "court of justice" through which justice is administered by means of authority, is an oxymoron past down from contradictions in the understanding of fulfillment long past.
7. **MAXIM:** Law is infinitely expansive [in abstraction] and adaptively manipulative in practice. One might ask, Do we want more "criminals" (i.e., criminally

liable) or do we want more fulfillment?

8. **MAXIM:** A socio-economic system must be flexible and change to fit new demands; otherwise, it becomes 'law', merely the justification of the powerful.
9. **MAXIM:** It is the height of irony to look for justice in a center of profit (i.e., in a court).
10. **MAXIM:** Fair trade is fair competition; fair law is fair authority.

When looked at through a retributive lens, crime is seen as a violation of authority [over property], defined by law-breaking and guilt. Once a violation occurs, justice requires the determination of blame and administration of pain in legal contest between the offender and the State. Therein, crime is seen as creating a "moral debt against society" (Read: a violation of the will of those in power), to which offenders must repay the debt through a process of righting some odd metaphysical balance via punishment of the offender. Within a retributive moral framework, the "offence" and "guilt" are defined in purely legal terms, without physical referent, and justice becomes determined by following correct rules and procedures. In the criminal process, the offender is pitted against the State, which in practice means that one proxy professional representing the offender (e.g., a defense lawyer) is pitted against another legal professional representing the State (i.e., "prosecution"), with another legal professional (i.e., judge) acting as defining arbiter. This ethical orientation to crime and justice is contrasted with the orientation that understands crime and socially corrosive behavior as an opportunity to orient toward an even higher potential of human fulfillment. If crime is essentially an injury, then should justice not become a process of healing and caring?

It is wise to distrust any group of market "professionals", especially legal professionals. Early 21st century society holds "professionals" in high esteem ignoring the nature of intense competition for new achievements and recognitions that foundation their professions, and which invariably overcome such groups (or "professional communities"). Market professions have an incentive structure that promotes unfulfilling and uncooperative behaviors. Professions are groups where a peer review system is conveniently balanced with peer pressure for [at least] ego-rewards. Therein, "professional" always means market power, or the opportunity for hierarchical power. Power (in a market or hierarchy) is to be distrusted in all its forms. Those with such power have the opportunity and incentive to give with one hand and take with the other; and, they often do, or they would not hold power. Hierarchical power in all its forms is a façade and ought not be trusted. Fundamentally, there is a potential for those in power to abuse their [acquired] power, and when competition is present, not only is it likely, there is incentive.

Always remember that professionals seek their own self-preservation. They are in danger of destroying



their careers and livelihoods if they act or openly think outside of the established professional (competitive) boundaries. It may be said that professionals “profess” their worth [to the paying authority]; though, what they profess is often reduced in meaning in the context of mutual human fulfillment.

Each and every individual bears a collective responsibility for the violence and aggression caused by the failure of the institutions that they support and participate in, and which chronically dis-cord, humankind's most fulfilling nature. For example, here is an extreme analogy to illustrate this responsibility. Suppose that person 'A' brainwashes person 'B', his child, from birth and for 20 years, to consider certain people as having to be killed; how murdering them is good, and so on. Then 'B', after his 20 years of brainwashing, goes out and kills one of the members of that targeted group. The attitude in some “justice systems” is that 'B' is the sole guilty party in this murder. This is of course pure logical insanity for it does not account for the conditions and conditioning that led 'B' to initiate aggression against another it is a lack of recognition that there exist social institutions of violence that can actually be participated in and regeneratively structured through volition. When the conditions and conditioning are more greatly understood, then society can re-calibrate and re-orient in such a manner that the factors that are known to lead to the expression of an undesirable behavior are reduced, if not eliminated this is social coherency with a movement toward a higher potential. Someone who is brainwashed is someone who doesn't recognize they have a decision space (i.e., a choice).

This is not to say that the individual who commits an act of aggression should be “pitied” and that society is really at fault. Instead it is to say that there are a variety of factors that lead individuals to commit acts of violence against another, and every factor must be recognized and studied if society is to reduce the expression of those behaviours in the future. If responsibility is to be placed, then it must be placed on both the individual and on society for making the behavior possible.

Insufficient fulfillment continues to exist [in part] due to an inability to think systematically and holistically, which [has led to and] maintains the two-party justice model that imagines that all disputes involve two parties: the plaintiff, the alleged victim of the crime or tort, and the defendant, the alleged violator. It is clear that this model recognizes no third-party, that which might be called the social or environmental element, and which can become sub-consciously influenced into generating a persistent orientational state of insufficient fulfillment, of “instability”.

The consequences of a two-party model are considerable. A bi-lateral approach is not a systems approach and will never lead to systemic solutions. It is a false dialectic a limited set of choices that aren't the only choices available (e.g., the Hegelian dialectic); it is an information set continuously divided up into two, which has the potential of generating a state of confused

polarization more appropriate for conditioning than the self-directed expression of conscious inquiry toward a higher potential of experience and of truth. Without tools for accurately orienting, consciousness can all too often become “caught up” in waves of instability.

Governments and monetary economic systems are similar in that they define the choices and perceptions of their subjective entities. For example, the market always gives those who use it the choice of product produced into a competition-oriented environment for the acquisition of an abstraction of your effort (i.e., money) devoid of social context and human need. A false dialectic is the state of an illusion of choice, of polarization. Polarization dialectics entrap an individual's mind, pitting one individual (or party) against another (e.g., the two party political system). It is a form of structural violence. A society oriented toward fulfillment will maintain an awareness of it as such, while seeking to reduce or eliminate its presence [because of its inherent orientation toward polarization and conflict, away from wholeness] without causing the next state of the system to have similar or worse disturbances.

What is unrealistic is that turning to a system based upon violence is somehow going to make the world a better place, whether that be explicit violence (as in, the State / government) or structural violence (as in, the market). Remember, “bullies” use violence in three ways: they use political violence to intimidate; physical violence to terrorize; and mental/emotional violence to undermine.

The solution to violence is [in part] to stop asking others, primarily governmental officials, to initiate force on one's behalf. Suffering also arises around “good” people who request or tolerate the initiation of force as a means to their own ends. In this manner “good” people empower those who do and direct violence throughout history. Using governmental force to impose a vision on others is intellectual sloth and typically results in unintended and perverse consequences. Therein, law is just a version of some influential person/group preference(s) for harming or disarming another.

Here, it is essential to recognize that processes are not government. It is not correct to equate the two. Just because the government (or other hierarchical structure) currently provides a service does not mean that there aren't other organizational structures that could provide a better service, one that more sufficiently fulfills a known and requested (or “demanded”) need. It is possible for all of humanity to full lives abundant in fulfillment, that are not enmeshed inside of market and State infrastructural systems.

Instead of asking how big (as in, scale) the government should be, it would be more useful to first ask, “What does government mean, and whatever it means do we want to integrate it into the deepest recess of our lives?” Similarly, it must be asked, “What does a market-State society mean, and whatever it means do we want to integrate it into the deepest recess of our society?”

If society calls one group of individuals in a given

geographical territory of the word “government”, then how does that define society, and what understandable consequences result from the integration of that structure? Society are left with the concept that a special group of peoples have a “right” (jurisdictional, legal) monopoly on the use of force and coercion within a spatial (geographic area). And, with the encoding of this understanding comes the belief that this “right to monopolize force” is going to protect everyone and safeguard everyone’s “rights”, which are given by that authority. This view, of course, does not take into context that ‘coercion’ and ‘force’ are themselves a violation of the foundation of “rights”. “You” have the right to be protected from something, or some event, by means of a monopoly on violence. Such a belief system carries with it the idea that if a decision or act is not illegal, then it is somehow right and ethical, regardless of its consequences and socio-ecological ramifications. Rights are given by an authority with a monopolization on violence, because rights are to be defended completely (i.e., monopolistically) when violated.

To perpetuate a monopoly [of force] in any society, regardless of the services provided, is an imposition on morality in the context of fulfillment. If services are imposed on people [against their will] and either cooperation or competition, or both, are denied, then that is a contradiction that will disrupt the health[y resonance] of the community. Notice how government establishes a “jurisdiction”, and typically, there can be no other competing jurisdictions in that jurisdiction [at scale].

Examine the nature of the concepts that are being forwarded and trace them down to the nature of reality. It may be found that there is no limit to how wrong off of alignment with fulfillment someone, or some society, can go because of a following of the path of authority. In a democratic market-State society, everyone seems to somehow acquire authority [to rule] over one another through the concept of “rights” and “democracy”. This is the belief that some group of people should rule over others and be the final authority; or, that everyone should rule over everyone else and everyone’s rights are the final authority democracy. Through the belief in authority individuals’ abandon their own critical thinking and cooperative faculties, their own independence, which they surrender to someone else who purports to know what is best for them (may “representatives” or “all other voters”), and acts in their best interests, or “the public’s” interest”.

Often, those who believe in “democracy” generally also believe that government exists to fulfill human needs. They have been told this by their government. However, herein, that type of “government” would exist in contrast to the participative and self-directed fulfillment of one’s own needs in cooperative relation with the needs of other individuals in a psycho-socio-ecological community. The very structure of government is that of a protectionist, power hierarchy (a form of structural violence). The same structure is also present

and true of all trade, business, and financial markets. Trade represents the competitization (marketization) of human socio-technical relationships. Money represents the commercialization of human social relationships. Governments and market entities maintain a similar hierarchy and consolidated control structure. In a socially powered and incentivized hierarchical system, violence always flows downward, down all the way to the children. Even the basic nuclear family-market-State structure is a somewhat seemingly benevolent hierarchical police state for most children. The market and the State may at first appear unrelated in their regenerative orientation, but a closer examination might reveal a similar protection[-ism], exclusion[-ism], and competitive[-ism] value orientation.

If violence is seen as expressing a rent in the texture of a community, it would be wise to avoid making neat and self-satisfying dichotomies of criminals and non-criminals, guilty and innocent, law-abiding and law-violating, aggressive and non-aggressive. A sane society would not be content with a justice system of “Who did it? or “Who done it?” Certainly, such a society would not suppose that “the one who did it” has lost all claims of respect and is fair game for private vengeance, by one’s own hand, the authority’s hand, or by the hand of a hired assassin. It would surely not do what some societies do and scapegoat so-called aggressors to reassure the public of their own (or the systems) utter blamelessness.

When one learns that someone in their community who has committed a long series of major and minor acts of violence against persons was himself the victim, throughout childhood and adolescence, of abuse and contempt and denial of love, of drugging and deceit and manipulation, of one’s developmental needs not being met, of the chronic triggering of primal instincts, of deeply aberrant conditioning, and of a failure to provide tools and structural opportunities for self-development, then one cannot but feel that a responsibility exists toward that person. The difficulty of meeting a responsibility does not relieve one of its existence; while awareness exists it will be tidally washed ashore with each mental [“housecleaning”] sweep. What is wrong is to abstract, from the fact, that the person who committed violence is a human being and to regard that person only as “the killer,” “the rapist,” “the aggressor,” “the bad guy,” “the perp,” “the terrorist”, the “criminal”, which are abstractions that run systematically through some forms of so-called “justice”.

When demonizing others, one has a tendency not to see others as human beings with their own history and traumas. Demonization creates a divide and conquer complex. And, dehumanization is key in preparing people to attack, kill, and profit off of other human beings.

Humans have an automated protection system from their genetic heritage, from their protective mammalian hard-wiring. If someone can accept that this automated defense system as part of themselves, but not allow it to control them, then it is possible to rise to the level of a socially intelligent human being. For the survival of

the organism, the mammalian brain has the potential to repress or override the higher cognitive brain, which desires thoughtful choice; such as the choice to have a child in a moment of passion with another human being. However, when sufficiently nurtured and exercised the “higher brain” can expand its choice space to consciously allow or deny requests by the mammalian brain, which would otherwise be systems-level commands, by the reflexive mammalian brains for control of the nervous system. A community-type society does not take norms or rituals or traditions as a given, and without further thought. Community is not the prioritization of culture over human need and the present situation. Of course, the optimal situation is to design an environment where this automated protection system (the desire for authority to ensure preservation) is not unnecessarily triggered.

**INSIGHT:** *It is unwise to forbid children from doing things they might be wise enough to do.*

## Scholarly references (cited in document)

- Cashmore, A.R. (2010). *The Lucretian swerve: The biological basis of human behavior and the criminal justice system*. PNAS. 107(10). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0915161107>
- Imiera, Prince Pius. (2018). *Therapeutic jurisprudence and restorative justice: healing crime victims, restoring the offenders*. De Jure Law Journal, 51(1), 82-101. <https://dx.doi.org/10.17159/2225-7160/2018/v51n1a6>
- Larson, B., Jensen, R., & Lehman, N. (2012). The Chemical Origin of Behavior is Rooted in Abiogenesis. *Life*, 2(4), 313–322. MDPI AG. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/life2040313>
- Moore, R.H., (2005). *Psychological foundations of TIR*, in V.R. Volkman (ed.), *Beyond trauma: Conversations on traumatic incident reduction*, 2nd edn., AMI Press, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Ward, T., Steward, C. (2003). *Criminogenic needs and human needs: A theoretical model*. *Psychology Crime and Law*, 9(2):125-143. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316031000116247>
- Williams, H.M., Erlank, E.C. (2019). *Traumatic incident reduction: A suitable technique for South African social work practice settings*. *Health SA Gesondheid* (Online), vol.24, Cape Town. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hsag.v24i0.1106>
- Volkman V.R., & Roman, M.W. (2005). *Beyond trauma: conversations on traumatic incident reduction*. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 26:3, 353-355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01612840590915720>

## Book references (cited in document)

- Kühl, S. (2016). *Ordinary Organisations: Why Normal Men Carried Out the Holocaust*. Polity.

- Schauer, F. (2015). *The Force of Law*. Harvard University Press.

## Book references (non-cited)

- Dorling, D. (2015). *Injustice: Why Social Inequality Persists*. Policy Press.
- Herbert, F. (1977). *The Dosadi Experiment*. Tor Books.
- Rose, L. (2011). *Most Dangerous Superstition*. Larkin Rose.
- van der Kolk, Bessel. (2015). *The Body Keeps the Score: Brain, Mind, and Body in the Healing of Trauma*. Penguin Publishing Group.

## Online references (cited in document)

- Pranis, Kay. (2014). *Circle Keeper's Handbook*. Glenview Elementary School. <https://www.edutopia.org/sites/default/files/resources/stw-glenview-circles-keeper-handbook.pdf>
- Ulex version 1.2*. Github.com/proftomwbell Accessed: 16 February 2024. <https://github.com/proftomwbell/Ulex/tree/master/versions/1.2>

## Online references (non-cited)

- Afzaal, A. (2012). *The violence triangle*. Ahmed Afzaal Blog. <https://ahmedafzaal.com/2012/02/20/the-violence-triangle>
- Allen, S., Lotterby, S. et al. (1980). *Yes Minister*. TV Series (1980–1984), London, UK: BBC. <https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0080306/>
- Criminal justice system flowchart*. Accessed: 28 Mary 2021. Bureau of Justice Statistics, USA. <https://bjs.ojp.gov/media/image/45506>

# Geopolitical Transition Analyses

Travis A. Grant, Elizabeth Grant

Affiliation contacts: *trvsgrant@gmail.com, elizabethreizinger@gmail.com*

Version Accepted: 10 February 2023

Acceptance Event: *Project coordinator acceptance*

Last Working Integration Point: *Project coordinator integration*

**Keywords:** geopolitical transition, national community transition

## Abstract

Given the knowledge available within the whole [Auravana] community standard, it is now possible to begin taking political and industrial action to initiate transition to community. It is understood that transition will take significant time, but it is important to begin considering and working on transition now, if it is actually a strategic goal. The transition to a community-type configuration of society will take many years and a lot of effort, and it will be well worth it.

A community-type configuration of society can occur in a limited manner at the scale of a single habitat, or regional habitat network. Although a community-type society is generally spoken of as a global system, it is possible to create a working, albeit scaled down version of the system at the local municipal scale, at the regional municipal scale, at the State/national scale, and at the scale of a union/federation of States.

In order to initiate transition of a territory, a geopolitical analysis of the region must first be conducted to determine the present condition of society. Once present conditions are understood, a transitional plan must be created to link the two states/versions of society (i.e., linking the current one and the one being transitioned to).

## Graphical Abstract

Image Not Yet  
Associated

# 1 Guiding transition to community

The [Auravana] community standards may be used as a visionary and strategic guidance tool for policy and administration of the transfer of resources and people into a community configuration of society. The community standard can orient decisioning by the current government most greatly toward community, and the transition thereto, because it presents a workable vision of national reunification around our common human and planetary heritage.

## 1.1 Primary working assumption

We understand that socio-technical standards are the foundation of our society, and we can create a set of standards that can guide our nation into a future where we live in optimal fulfillment together given intelligent planning and the availability of resources over time.

## 1.2 Primary proposal

Our proposal is to budget for, create, and sustain a working group whose primary purpose is to develop the standard for community [operation and transition] at the national level. The policy decision would be to promote “national community”. This working group will produce a set of “living” documentation representative of community, given what is known and available. The deliverable documentation deliverable is a set of societal specification standards that can be used to inform government, industry, and the public about what is possible and preferential in concern to the optimization of national human need fulfillment and regional ecological restoration.

The initial proposal is an ecologically restorative community-university habitat network:

1. Establish the community habitat network:
  - A. Establish an indigenous community-university habitat network to develop and spread community standards.
  - B. Establish a non-indigenous community-university habitat network to develop and spread community standards.

## 1.3 Material result

The material result of this work is a network of community configured habitats across the nation with two primary options, mineral-based and bio-construction based. The rural version of these habitats is a low-density dwelling option for the population. City-type habitats are for a larger population density. Both types of habitats involve production, unified planning, and integrated infrastructural operations.

We propose that through these habitats it is possible

to optimize the use of resources, optimally meet human needs, and sustain a flourishing life-radius for all individuals. This network of habitats acts as a human habitat service fulfillment platform that supports the fulfillment of our common needs and preferences. All humans have a set of common needs for architecture, food, education, medical (health), leisure, protection, etc. Within the open source community standard, habitat service systems are designed and engineered, materialized and operated, and retired. In part, this standard is a civil societal proposal to transfer resources and people from the market-State into a network of urban planned and infrastructurally integrated habitats that are materialized within a community-type configuration of society.

The simplified phases of policy request are:

1. Initialize a working group via a proposed working group charter to develop standards for community as a configuration of the society.
2. Plan a habitat service network.
  - A. Develop and construct a master-planned habitat.
3. Plan a community education system.
  - A. Develop and adopt a education curriculum based on community standards.
4. Plan a community on-boarding program.
  - A. Develop and adopt a community residency program.
    1. Personal profile.
    2. Habitat [agreements] profile.
    3. Production [access] profile.
    4. Contribution profile.
5. Build a rural community habitat network.
  - A. Construct a rural restorative habitat network:
    1. For indigenous.
    2. For non-indigenous.
6. Move people and resources into the network.
7. Duplicate the network over a variety of urban environments to gradually replace market-State society and its resulting conditions with a community configuration of society and the resulting conditions of human fulfillment and ecological regenerations.

We want the space to present a three-day course to the ministries. A three day course from Auravana of national community. Let the nation be known for the efficiency with which community can be created at the national level.

National community involves at least all of the following:

1. Community standards development.
2. Community education.

3. Civic environmental caretaking.
4. Community values integration (into the State and into industrial production).
5. Community objectives integration (into the State and into industrial production).
6. Sharing a perception of national labor as a duty to the national community population.
7. Sharing a perception of transparency as sustaining accountability and trust when individuals are reliant on the services of others.
8. A contribution coordination service.
9. A statistical economic calculation service.
10. Habitat construction.
11. The gradual transfer of people of resources into an operational community habitat network.

### 1.4 Geopolitical factors simplified

There are a host of simplistic geopolitical factors that need analysis:

1. **Stringent traditional and highly-integrated regulations (against community transition):** Strict rules and/or bureaucracies, in developed (typically) nations, can slow down community integration. This is a point of potential conflict that can be avoided entirely by waiting until regulations are most appropriate.
2. **Compliance costs (for community operation):** Meeting regulatory standards can be expensive and time-consuming.
3. **Sector sensitivity (affecting professionals still living in local market conditions):** High professional job losses face intense scrutiny. This is a point of potential conflict under market conditions, and must be strategically considered.
4. **Technological adoption and process re-alignment flexibility:**
  - A. Smaller and developing countries often have fewer barriers to the adoption of newer technologies, and also more need (i.e., the newer technologies will be more transformative for them). In the developing world there are more urgent and unmet needs. Developed countries are more likely to put up regulatory barriers and install legal protections for pre-existing technologies and professions. There is a different incentive structure between developed nations and developing nations. Developed nations have an economic, social, and inertia to their pre-existing methods and technologies. The same is often true for smaller and more agile businesses versus larger ones. The first mover advantage can lead to later paralysis and ossification if the system wasn't designed

to be updated and adapted later on. Then after industries have become entrenched and technologies have become taught, technicians want to keep making their bigger than others salaries, granting them prestige and access over others.

### 1.5 Geopolitical transition factors

There are a set of geopolitical transition factors that must be accounted for in any analysis:

1. **Historical context.**
  - A. Pre-transition (to now) geopolitical characteristics.
  - B. Catalysts for transition (motivations to transition).
2. **Analysis of the transition.**
  - A. **Political transformations and dynamics:** Analysis of changes in governance structures and policy orientations.
    1. **Governance challenges:** Analysis of the difficulties in adapting existing governance structures to support community-oriented objectives. This includes issues related to policy-making, regulatory frameworks, and institutional inertia.
    2. **Stringent Traditional and Highly-Integrated Regulations:** Analysis of how strict rules and bureaucratic procedures in developed nations may hinder community integration.
    3. **Community review board organizational and outcomes analysis:** Examination of the structure, function, and effectiveness of community review boards in facilitating the transition. This involves assessing their role in governance, oversight, decisioning processes, and the tangible outcomes they achieve in terms of community engagement and policy impacts.
  - B. **Economic transformations and dynamics:** Examination of shifts in economic policies, market regulations, and their impact on the national and local economies.
    1. **Economic sustainability:** Evaluation of the transition's long-term economic viability. This includes analyzing the resilience of economic models that prioritize community well-being over traditional market-driven growth metrics.
      - i. **Object-technical reproducibility analysis:** Investigation into the reproducibility of technical objects or systems within the new community framework. This pertains to the ability to maintain or enhance technical and technological standards and

innovations in the context of community-oriented values.

- ii. **Financial-economic analysis:** A comprehensive assessment of the financial implications of the transition, including impacts on investment, public spending, and overall economic health. This analysis aims to identify financial risks and opportunities presented by the shift towards a community-focused model.

- 1. **Compliance costs:** Examination of the financial and operational burdens of meeting standards for community operations.
- iii. **Token sector sensitivity:** Discussion on the impact of transition on professional job markets, highlighting areas of potential conflict within local market conditions.

C. **Social and cultural transformations and dynamics:** Assessment of changes in social norms, cultural values, and community life.

- 1. **Social inclusion and equity:** Exploration of how the transition addresses or fails to address issues of social inequality and inclusion. This includes assessing policies and practices aimed at ensuring equitable access to resources, opportunities, and participation in community life.

D. **Environmental transformation**

**considerations:** Evaluation of the transition's impact on environmental policies and practices.

- 1. **Environmental sustainability:** Assessment of the environmental policies and practices that emerge from the transition. This involves evaluating how community-oriented approaches contribute to sustainable environmental stewardship and the mitigation of climate change impacts.

E. **Flexibility in technological adoption and process re-alignment:**

Comparison of barriers and incentives for adopting new technologies and transitioning information into the common heritage. Technology is based on information, and community information is based on a common heritage pool of information.

- 1. **Technological and regulatory adaptability:** Strategies to overcome inertia and ossification in established systems, ensuring flexibility for future updates and adaptations.

3. **Impact assessment.**

A. **In community (impact assessment for community, primary measurements):**

- 1. Decisioning impacts.
  - i. On service fulfillment.

- 1. On human need fulfillment and well-being.

- a. Flourishing community access cohesion.

2. Residency impacts.

- i. On life-phased habitat access.

- 1. On contribution-phase habitat access.

- a. Optimized and free community access cohesion.

3. Transition outcomes.

- i. Object transfers into common heritage.

- ii. Information "property" as common heritage (i.e., information transfer into intellectual common heritage).

- iii. People transfer their life-radi into habitats composed of land, resources, and assemblies recognized and coordinated as a common [human-ecological] heritage.

B. **In the market-State (impact assessment for market-State, primary measurements):**

1. Domestic impacts.

- i. On governance.
- ii. Economic outcomes.
- iii. Social market-State cohesion.

2. International implications.

- i. Foreign relations.
- ii. Economic interdependencies.
- iii. War or peace treaties and signals measurements.

4. **Strategic recommendations.**

A. **Policy recommendations:** Detailed suggestions for policy actions that can facilitate the successful transition to a community-oriented society. This includes recommendations for governance reforms, economic policies, social programs, and environmental protections.

B. **Future research directions:** Identification of areas where additional research is needed to better understand the transition's impacts and to refine strategies for community development. This might include empirical studies, theoretical explorations, and comparative analyses with other states or communities.

## 1.6 Organizational transition factors

There are a set of organizational transition factors that must be accounted for in any analysis of a real-world organization that expresses behavior:

- 1. Show the deliverables of each organization.
- 2. Show the project plans of each organization.
- 3. Show the productions of each organization.
- 4. Show the funding source of each organization:

- A. Show (all) trades.
5. Show the relationship with the State:
  - A. Show (all) commands as behavior conforming, linguistically understandable laws.
6. Show the NDAs of each organization (economic production transparency).
7. Show the relationship of the organization to the Standard for a Community-Type Society.
8. Show intelligence in using the standards to coordinate, collection, analyse, and apply information over three domains of possible action:
  - A. Organizational deliverable domains (what has and/or is being produced).
    1. Show how the deliverable(s) of the organization integrate into the Standard for a Community-Type Society.
  - B. Organizational licensing domains.
    1. Show how the organization licenses its deliverables.
    2. Show how the licensing relates to the licensing of content that enters into a cycling commons where alternative configurations are shared back into the commons with care (as in, care for others). This type of licensing is typically known as left licensing and open-left patenting. The information is licensed into the commons (could either be viewed continuing to have or not have rights, the license says that to use, the derivations ought, must, shall be returned to the commons to evolve together.
  - C. Organizational personal relationship domain.
    1. Personal relations between contribution service organizations that encode behaviors and produce deliverables that promote, educate, coordinate, and facilitate the operation of community at the societal scale.
    2. Personal relations between organizations with a common narrative.
      - i. Analysis of mission, vision, purpose, goal statements in relation to the standard for a community-type society.
  - D. Fulfillment statement actualizations domain.
    1. Fulfillment survey of users by intersystem team.
  - E. Residatation relationship domain.
    1. Habitat and societal service operations between contributors to a societal-level contribution service system that operates habitats at the community-based local-/regional-network/global-network scales.
      - i. Physical habitat services within a local habitat that provides residatation for a user, thus granting continuous access to

full local and regional services.

1. Personal access.
2. Common access.
- ii. Supra-decision system information working-group services.
  1. Information-intelligence access.
  2. Database-knowledge access.
  3. Interface-intuitive access.

Now, with all the above, data, produce an calculated rank for the next intelligent step for action for a conscious human being who wishes to create community at the societal scale for the whole of humanity.

1. **Create a user identity in the knowledge base.**
2. **Join the contribution service system** (a service to our nation as one species living in common here on Earth together and loving living among each other every moment of our lives. "I love you and have compassion for all of our us together". I will contribute, and together we will raise the world's standards.
  - A. **Join a standards development team.**
    1. I will do the work of developing a unified and integrated intelligent standard for the sustained and optimized operation of a societal system that meets the fulfillment-needs of all.
  - B. **Join an education service team.**
    1. Day-counted workshop.
    2. Semester-base course.
    3. Multi-year course.
3. **Join the habitat service team.**
  - A. I will do the work of operating a previously agreed to master plan of the habitat (local, in specific), as appropriate; I operate and respond to incidents:
    1. InterSystem life habitat operating activities.
    2. InterSystem technology habitat operating activities.
    3. InterSystem exploration habitat operating activities.
4. **Join a residatation access service.**
  - A. **Join in living within life-phase access system.**
    1. I agree to live in a local physical habitat positioned on the planet in a regional production arrangement with a global production system informed by a global societal-decision system.
    2. Agree to a local set of by-laws, habitat agreements.
  - B. **Join the residential master design planning team .**
    1. I agree that I have a preference for the objects that I need, that are produced in the



environment, and will be produced in the future.

2. Participate in the aesthetic and functional-sector master-planning of production of the local habitat the participant (user) inhabits over some cyclical a duration of time, typically 3-5 years for the average habitat. In other words, participate in aesthetic and functional surveys to determine the next configuration of the local habitat the user is resident within.

The Auravana Project exists to co-create the emergence of a community-type society through the openly shared development and operation of a information standard, from which is expressed a network of integrated city systems, within which purposefully driven individuals are fulfilled in their development toward a higher potential life experience for themselves and all others. Significant project deliverables include: a societal specification standard and a highly automated, tradeless habitat service operation, which together orient humanity toward fulfillment, wellbeing, and sustainability. The Auravana Project societal standard provides the full specification and explanation for a community-type of society.

This publication is the Project Execution for a community-type society. Project Execution is a sub-set of the Project Plan to construct and operate community at the societal scale. This document separates out project execution lists and significant plans from the core Project Plan publication. A societal-level project plan describes the organized thinking and execution of a socio-technical environment. This Project Execution publication identifies the executable projects lists and significant plans to create a community-type society for global human fulfillment and ecological restoration. The project execution has three core sections: (1) the project lists, (2) the contribution service plan, and (3) a transition proposal plan. In part, this document proposes a transition to a community service operation at the societal scale.

Fundamentally, this standard facilitates individual humans in becoming more aware of who they really are.

All volumes in the societal standard:



[auravana.org](http://auravana.org)

\$7.00  
ISBN 979-8-9861436-2-0  
5 0700 >  
9 798986 143620