

THE PLAN VERSION 0.4: A DESIGN FOR AN ENGINEERED CIVILIZATION

COPYRIGHT © 2014 SCOTT RANEY

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

DO NOT DISCUSS OR DISTRIBUTE WITHOUT PRIOR PERMISSION OF THE AUTHOR (SCOTT@METACARD.COM)

PREFACE

Unlike most books, this section doesn't contain anything about the author or about how this book came to be written. This book is about how going along with the proposals of "authorities" is a bad idea and how our conventions need to change as a result. What better place to start than here in the Preface, so that you can judge the ideas in this book on their own merits, independent of where you think they came from. The information on the author and how the book came to be written will be found in the Epilogue at the end, if you're still interested at that point.

INTRODUCTION

We've had a pretty good run as a species: We overwhelmingly dominate the other species on the planet, and for the most part even the strongest of natural forces. Most of us are now relatively happy, relatively safe, and relatively comfortable, at least by historical standards, or the standards enjoyed by any other species.

Of course there have been failures, including countless millions killed in wars and countless more millions in various acts of genocide. Add in millions more who have died of starvation and disease due to mismanagement of resources, and millions on top of that due to preventable accidents, murders, and suicides. And all of these things continue to occur at rates that should astound, and dismay, any rational and compassionate being.

But all these premature deaths are arguably not even our greatest failure: For every premature death listed above many other individuals have simply failed to live up to their potential, many living longer, but unhappier and less successful lives than we'd all prefer they have.

Why are we so incompetent at managing our affairs? Our species has existed in its current form for tens of thousands of years, and our species itself is something over a million years old. Why even after all this time have we still not developed a system that will prevent these atrocities and enable at least the majority of individuals to achieve their potential?

One possibility is that these types of failures are an inevitable consequence of the leadership we have been living under. There is some evidence to support this. Bob Altemeyer's book "The Authoritarians" (available as <http://www.metacard.com/TheAuthoritarians.pdf>) provides an overview of research on people who have been classified using simple personality tests as Authoritarians or Social Dominators (or both).

For Authoritarians (which in his research he calls Right Wing Authoritarian because they are much more common and the group usually in power vs. Left Wing Authoritarians), his RWA scale measures and individual's tendency to support "traditional" values and leadership (i.e. strongly hierarchical government). For example, high RWA scale individuals tend to agree more with the following types of statements than average (p11):

It is always better to trust the judgment of the proper authorities in government and religion than to listen to the noisy rabble-rousers in our society who are trying to create doubt in people's minds

Our country will be great if we honor the ways of our forefathers, do what the authorities tell us to do, and get rid of the "rotten apples" who are ruining everything.

Women should have to promise to obey their husbands when they get married.

For assessing the frequency and characteristics of Social Dominators, a similar kind of test and scale was used (p160), which had questions like the following on it:

This country would be better off if we cared less about how equal all people are

Some people are just more worthy than others.

According research by Altemeyer and others, a significant percentage of the population scores highly on one or both of these tests, a percentage that is higher among politicians and other leaders (p200) because people with these characteristics are simply more driven to try to achieve leadership roles. This in itself is a serious problem because there are characteristics of both groups that render them *less* competent decisionmakers than average people (p187) including a penchant for hypocrisy and double standards and that they are frequently simply illogical beings (p75-95). They have also been shown to be much more susceptible to corruption and other immoral behavior (p167, p220).

Unfortunately, those are but a small part of the problem: The far larger issue is that both of these groups have characteristics that make them especially dangerous to "outsiders", something both groups tend to be preoccupied with. This inevitably leads them to commit acts of aggression toward people they perceive as being different from themselves (p169). Combined with their inherent tendencies toward immoral and unethical behavior, they are far more successful at achieving their goals of marginalizing other groups than their peers that lack these characteristics are at preventing them from doing so.

It is important to keep in mind during this discussion that these tests result in a continuous and normal (i.e., bell-curved) distribution and that where you draw the line to define "types" is essentially arbitrary. For example, in Altemeyer's experiments he defines the upper 25% of scores as "High RWAs" (and which will be shortened to "Authoritarians" here). It is also important to remember that these are *psychological* definitions which are often more specialized than the usage of those terms in everyday language. For example while "authoritarian" is most commonly used to describe dictators and other

leaders or their governments, in the psychological use of the term it applies to those leaders but more commonly (and more importantly) to the people who have similar personality characteristics and so tend to *support* these leaders (the authoritarian followers). For “social dominators”, which is not a common term in everyday language, you might think “alpha male” or “bully”. although in some cases what you might actually be dealing with are narcissists or sociopaths which display many of the same characteristics (and who generally score very high on Social Dominance Orientation tests).

Although it is a common claim among sociologists and political scientists (e.g. Corning 2005, p411, Kessler & Cohrs 2008) that authoritarian behavior’s evolutionary role has been primarily (or even solely) to promote group harmony and cooperation, these claims fail to address three of Altemeyer’s fundamental findings. The first is merely that for all their tendencies toward harmony and cooperation, groups of authoritarians *fail* (and in many cases fail dismally) to achieve the goals set out for them, as was clearly shown in the Altemeyer’s Global Change Game experiments (p30). In those experiments groups of 50-70 individuals participate in a global political/economic simulation which includes key features of our current civilization, including resource management issues, trading between countries, and militarism and the potential for war. By controlling the percentages of authoritarians in the simulation, Altemeyer was able to project just how fit these types of individuals are to run our governments. The results were striking: While the control group of low-RWA score individuals had a good run where only 400 million people died (a relatively low number in that game), the authoritarian group ended up killing off the entire population of the planet in a nuclear war, and even when the game was reset for them to try again, their death rate was over five times as high as the low RWA group.

The second issue that refutes the claim that authoritarian behavior is merely a sort of “glue” that allows humans to function as a group is that there are three components to Authoritarian personality, and that they are inseparable (even by factor analysis, see Altemeyer 1996 p52): submission to authority, aggression in the name of the authority, and conventionalism. Although the first and third do support the harmony/cooperation hypothesis, the second clearly conflicts with it. There would be no need for authoritarians to be prejudiced and aggressive toward individuals who they perceive to be different from themselves (even they are not even true outsiders, i.e., an “outgroup”) if the evolutionary benefits of authoritarianism are merely to promote cooperation.

The third problem of attributing authoritarianism to the need for group cooperation is merely the uneven distribution of it: If it truly was only needed for general cooperation all humans would be authoritarian. But because only a small percentage of the population ends up being so afflicted, there must be some other purpose for at least the aggression component of the syndrome.

Although Altemeyer's book does delve a little into the causes of authoritarianism, it does not even bring up the issue of why individuals with high levels of these characteristics make up such a significant percentage of the population when it is clear that they often represent a danger to themselves and to others. Unfortunately, as is the case with Altemeyer's theories on the origins of authoritarianism, it is not possible to do controlled experiments that will tell us why it even exists. But a little thought experiment might give us some insight into the issue.

Imagine you're living 100,000 years ago together with a small group of individuals much like yourself (this is the late Pleistocene Epoch, also known as the Era of Evolutionary Adaptation (EEA) that time period and environment in which human genes are being selected for based on their fitness for that time and place). By this point in human evolution you are a member of a fully-evolved human species, but racial differences are just starting to appear, and culture is relatively rudimentary and so cultural differences between neighboring groups are relatively small by today's standards. You live with a group of 30 or so individuals, some of whom are known to be related to you, some not. You participate in common hunting/gathering parties but have meals and sleep in a separate area with your extended family. Your band is essentially egalitarian, with all important decisions being made by the group as a whole and with extensive social controls to encourage sharing, prevent free riding (slacking off to take advantage of the work done by others), and prevent strong leaders from becoming established, particularly if those leader-wannabes start displaying aggression toward other members of the band. Indeed, in most hunter/gatherer societies repeated violations of these policies can result in expulsion or even a death penalty being imposed on the offender (all of the above as described in Boehm 2012).

Life is not easy: Besides constantly having to battle the elements and the local wildlife, including diseases that you have no idea the cause of, there is constant competition from other groups of humans living nearby, humans that are somehow different from you, either in the way they look, the language they speak, or maybe just having different customs. Although both bands have common ancestors and there is some drift of individuals between them, the bands themselves they have been separated for generations, and most or all of the members of those other groups are strangers to you.

Now there are no rules and no referee in when a conflict with this other band develops and so you have only your own moral code to guide you, perhaps in combination with an innate fear that you or one of your band-mates may get seriously injured or killed if the conflict escalates to violence. Which may in fact be the original basis of that moral code: If you didn't have it, you'd be a lot more likely to get yourself killed or otherwise removed from the gene pool, either by other bands or maybe even by members of your own! So, you try to avoid these skirmishes with other bands whenever possible.

In some cases your ancestors may have been made this easier by working out an agreement with this other band establishing a geographic boundary between the two groups which you and they know not to cross. But what happens if it's a new band that has moved in next door, or if your band or the other suffers some calamity like a flood or fire and loses a significant portion of their resources, or maybe merely outgrow the resources available on their side of the boundary? How will your band survive, other than by putting aside your fear of injury and your morals and resorting to violence to address the issue?

If you delay and debate and listen to your conscience your group will likely eventually be attacked and wiped out by the other group. But what if there were individuals within your group who had intense feelings about the conflict and who characterized the other band as being immoral or even evil and so unworthy of your concern? Even better, what if they were willing to fight, risking serious injury or

death to protect you and the other members of your band? Would you be willing to look the other way and let them take action to ensure the survival of your band?

As this scenario plays itself out over thousands of generations, those bands with the right percentage of these "born warriors" would have a clear evolutionary advantage over those with too many (in which case they would become immune to the normal social controls and end up directing their aggression at each other or at harmless members of the band), or too few (in which case they would not have the numbers necessary to goad the band into taking violent action). And individuals who lack these attributes would still eventually be bred to at least defer to these Social Dominators and Authoritarians (SDAs) when they sound the alarm. They'll even defer when they know there's a good chance that things will get out of hand and heinous acts will be committed, acts that they find morally disgusting including the rape and murder of women and children, mutilations, and maybe even human sacrifice (all of which were actually quite common throughout human history, perhaps to the point of being universal).

Unfortunately, in the modern world, this tendency toward aggression and even violence is maladaptive, as is the inclination of "Neurotypical" people to allow these SDAs run the show. The term "Neurotypical", borrowed from the autism community, will be used in this document to refer to people whose personalities are not authoritarians, social dominators, autistic, or any other easily distinguishable class. The term "normal" might otherwise be used except that this would mean these other groups are somehow "abnormal". Which is not really accurate because these individuals should more accurately be described as "specialized", although in the case of Authoritarians unfortunately specialized to perform a role their band (which is now the human race as a whole) no longer requires.

If this analysis is correct, it has major implications for the type of government that will allow our species to reach its goals of putting an end to violence and creating a society with the level of freedom and support required for individuals to fully realize their potential. Certainly it should be clear that, along with dictatorships, even representative government is doomed to failure because many of the people who rise to leadership positions are frequently or even generally unfit to take on these roles: They simply cannot be trusted to do what is in the best interests of The People because they lack a Neurotypical moral compass and capacity for rational thought. Even if they were qualified originally, the Authoritarians in the population would gradually make it impossible for them to govern by corrupting them with money or raising one boogiemaster after another until the leadership bites on one of them and starts an unjust war or begins persecuting some segment of their own population.

And the Neurotypicals, as is their nature, will stand by and watch it happen. Or, if they feel their safety or their resources are being threatened, they may even pitch in to help: Remember, Hitler was confirmed as dictator by an overwhelming majority (88%) of Germans in a national referendum on 19 August 1934. What they got via their democratic popular vote was exactly what they voted for, a textbook example of what Altemeyer (1996) labels as a Double-High, an Authoritarian Social Dominator, someone who has a double-helping of each of the negative qualities of these conditions (prejudice being only the most visible example in his case).

If in fact it is SDAs in government that are the source of the violent behavior, predictions of ever decreasing violence such as are made in Pinker's *Better Angels of Our Nature* (2011) are not only incorrect, but dangerously naïve. Inexplicably Pinker does not even cite Altemeyer, nor even offer any discussion whatsoever of the dynamics of authoritarianism and neglects to even consider the possibility that the decrease in nation-scale violence since WWII may merely be because the rapid advancement of technology has temporarily relieved the human population of their fears of resource scarcity. Unfortunately, when threats of scarcity inevitably return, humans will follow their instincts and call for a return of authoritarian leaders, as they have in Russia, Ukraine, Syria, India, Egypt, and many other at-risk nations in recent years. If these leaders go on to start wars or even begin persecuting a minority in their own population, the Neurotypicals will merely consider this the price they have to pay to protect their security, nevermind that this choice may lead to global conflict or even the end of the human species via nuclear or biological warfare.

But there is another alternative: Rather than continuing to allow SDAs to lead us we must design government systems that will require Neurotypicals, which over the last few thousand years have been gradually but steadily marginalized by the hierarchy-oriented SDAs, to regain their prehistoric role as the decisionmakers for the band (which again is now all of us). They can then ensure with their sheer numbers that all decisions will take into account what's best for the *entire* band, which is something no individual leader or small leadership group can, or is even inclined to, do alone. As history and Altemeyer's Global Change Game experiments show, even though Neurotypicals may be *inclined* to elect SDA leaders and then defer to them in times of scarcity or conflict, if they are somehow forced to retain their decisionmaking power they end up making better decisions for the population as a whole than those SDA leaders, whose main concern is their band/tribe/nation. While implementing a global decisionmaking process like this would have been an unreachable goal even a few decades ago, advancements in the social sciences and in computer and communication technology now finally support the development of such a system.

Although this thought experiment is essentially a digression (it matters not whether the details of it can be proven: a million years of almost constant war by itself provides the answer to the question of whether or not SDAs should be in charge), while we're out here, we should go ahead and explore a couple other avenues.

The first tangent to the digression concerns the role of organized religion in society in general, and politics in particular. Back to the Pleistocene and the conflict with the neighboring band: What tools do the SDAs have to use as leverage to goad the Neurotypicals into action? Would instilling fear and counting on our built-in ability to compartmentalize and thereby override our inherent morality be sufficient, or do they need something else, something that the Neurotypicals can use as a justification for ignoring their moral sensibilities even when their faith in the SDAs is weak? Enter organized religion: Although many mammals have been shown to exhibit superstitious behavior in experimentally controlled environments, humans alone have expanded these tendencies into elaborate rituals and customs and therefore extend the irrational behavior into realms far beyond the reach of ordinary superstition.

What could the evolutionary purpose of that be? Certainly the behavior would appear to be maladaptive: If nothing else via the waste of precious resources on something that has never been scientifically proven as a fruitful endeavor (indeed, even Randi's "One Million Dollar Paranormal Challenge" prize, which has the exceedingly low threshold of requiring proof of *any* supernatural force, remains unclaimed despite thousands of attempts at it). And there are often far greater costs than that, for example the countless incidences of religion-inspired genocide against peoples who are not even in competition for resources.

But what if our instinctive acceptance of organized religion developed merely to provide a tool to ensure that SDAs are able to fulfill their role as protectors and acquirers of resources (albeit via immoral acts in many cases)? Certainly this plays to the Authoritarian's strengths: What better proxy when an appropriate Social Dominator leader can't be identified than the ultimate Social Dominator, God? And when an appropriate local candidate *can* be identified, how useful it must be to be able to multiply his (or her) power by deifying them? Why, the Neurotypicals would *have* to take action if God tells them to, right? It matters not whether that "god" takes the form of a specific individual in the band, all of an individual's ancestors, or some more amorphous supernatural force, so long as belief in this power can be used to goad people into action that would otherwise appear dangerous, irrational, or even immoral, the purpose of our religious tendencies will have been fulfilled. Has the tendency to accept organized religion, with all its irrationality and tendency to *cause* immoral behavior rather than prevent it, been bred into us solely to allow SDAs to take charge when it would provide a competitive advantage to the group to do so?

It is however notable that, like authoritarianism, tendency toward devout religious belief is not uniformly distributed in the population. Perhaps this too confers fitness on the group: By allowing externalizing the moral system for selected individuals in the band, religion allows a finer grained control over them than is possible without it. And by making this externalizing process selective to those individuals who also are most inclined to commit aggression toward others, the general stability provided by the Neurotypicals can be maintained.

That belief in religion can also be useful as a salve to ease the psychological pain of having to tolerate, or even participate in, atrocities. After all, if you (and/or your band) did it to please God, that's got to be OK, right? You might even ritualize it, as in the case of human sacrifice, to emphasize that these are not just base emotional acts, they're an integral part of the process of pleasing God and securing blessings for your band. Seems like the SDAs, which are unusually fond of those types of acts, might get a twofer with organized religion.

This proposed role of religion is compatible with theories based on "costly signaling" such as those proposed by Irons (2001) and Sosis (2003, 2006), which claim that the purpose of religious practices is to promote group cooperation by requiring hard-to-fake demonstrations of commitment. But as is the case with authoritarianism as mechanism for ensuring cooperation, the theory has to explain not only how religion is useful as a method of costly signaling, but also why it is not uniformly distributed among individuals, why it is so unitized with a tendency toward prejudice and aggression, why that *particular* type of costly signaling has evolved over all others.

These theories also do not address the tendency for religions at all levels to fixate on specific locations as belonging to a particular people because it is God's (or more historically, their ancestors') will. This would seem to be unrelated to the issue of costly signaling, but a crucial feature if the evolutionary purpose of religion is resource retention or acquisition: Why else would humans be so inclined to risk death in a war to retain or reclaim some particular piece of ground? By not emphasizing the role of religious belief as a justification for warfare, these theories are at best partial descriptions of the role of religion in human evolution.

The second tangent to the digression is the question of the proportion of SDAs in the population. Because of their tendencies toward aggression, SDAs almost certainly made up a disproportionate percentage of the casualties during intertribal conflicts in our ancestral past. But in modern times, the SDA leadership and population primarily sends in proxy (or even "volunteer") cannon fodder to fight and die in their immoral and pointless wars. Unless it can be shown that this cannon fodder is composed of a significantly higher percentage of SDAs than the general population, we can only conclude that we are now living with a higher percentage of individuals from these groups than at any time in the past. Which means the need to find systematic ways to rein them in has never been greater.

The third (and final) tangent concerns the general applicability of evolution-based arguments to behavioral, social, and political issues (i.e., the realms of Evolutionary Psychology, Evolutionary Sociology, Evolutionary Political Science, etc.), particularly with respect to traits that would at first blush appear to be maladaptive. In addition to SDAs there are a great many classes of individuals that systematically differ from Neurotypicals, differences that would seem to arise more commonly than one would expect if they were simply genetic or developmental "mistakes". But perhaps these differences provide benefits in some circumstances, if not to the individual then perhaps to their kin. Some examples are homosexuality, transgender, addictive personalities, and mental illnesses such as depression, bipolar disorder, and schizophrenia. Indeed, why are some people born liberal and some conservative? Are some of these examples of eusociality, where some individuals are genetically programmed not to strive to reproduce themselves but instead to play a supporting role in ensuring the survival of their kin and by extension their band/tribe? This type of specialization is common in ants, bees, and termites, and has even been shown in mammals such as the mole rat.

Another possibility is that these variations are the result of genetic polymorphism, where a specific gene is selected for because it provides a competitive advantage in some circumstances (most commonly providing greater resistance to disease) even though it can be highly maladaptive in others. While it would be quite unexpected to find that cleft palate or club foot turn out to be related to some adaptive traits, the example of sickle-cell anemia (the gene for which turns out to offer resistance to malaria) and the correlation of IQ with the genes for genetic disorders like Tay-Sachs and Gaucher's disease (Cochran, G. Hardy, J., & Harpending, H. 2006) means that this is not out of the realm of possibility. All of these possibilities should be explored further, if only to understand these conditions but also with the hope that a greater understanding of them and their evolutionary basis can lead to policies that may assist these non-Neurotypical individuals in achieving their full potential.

As part of the design process for a way to do things that does not require turning control over to SDAs we must attempt to rehabilitate the concept of "social engineering", which doesn't mean what most people seem to think it does. The use of laws and policies to coerce individuals into performing (or ceasing) certain actions even when it is not in their own best interest isn't social engineering, it's behavioral engineering. A structural engineer doesn't try to change the "behavior" of steel or concrete, nor does an electronic engineer try to change the behavior of electronic components like capacitors or resistors. Instead, they merely use these components as they exist to engineer systems that achieve the performance goal. So it will be with social engineers, who will design systems that will leverage the strengths of human beings while simultaneously providing support such that their weaknesses don't cause failures.

We've lived without this specialty for far too long. What we are living with now, from our moral codes ("bibles") to our laws to our political systems, from an engineering perspective, are systems composed mostly of "kludges". In the software business, they would be called "hacks", in the marine business "jury rigs", and in roofing business "patches". In home and auto repair, it's the realm of chewing gum and baling wire. They are systems that were never engineered nor even designed to look or work the way they do now, they instead just grew organically, with problems addressed by making small fixes in limited areas with no attempt to look at whether the systems as a whole need to be upgraded. Moral codes, in particular, were devised and refined by leaders who not only lacked the necessary skill and knowledge to be competent social engineers, but also had conflicting motives: Although social harmony was certainly one of their goals, providing methods of controlling their subjects surely had a higher priority, Exhibit A being that the first four of the Ten Commandments are claims to power rather than social codes.

It is as if we all had no choice but to buy new cars with their side mirrors attached with duct tape. But it's worse than that: The people who are selling us these cars are in the duct tape *business* and *want* us to have to buy new tape every time our mirrors fall off. That is, while the primary purpose of our current systems may still be to promote social harmony, the SDAs who developed them have a secondary motivation: To keep themselves in charge and to do things the way *they* want them to be done, not necessarily the most rational or efficient way, let alone the way that is most beneficial to Neurotypicals. Now that we recognize that this is what has happened it would seem that we have the obligation to take another look at the situation, and this time use what we've learned over the past few thousand years to *engineer* our social, political, and economic systems. This time, we must *choose* which aspects of our instinctive natures we are going to harness and encourage, and which aspects we must suppress with individual effort and through the design of these systems.

For example, as it turns out there are good tools that we can use to suppress the most problematic aspects of SDA behavior, many of which Pleistocene Epoch humans had at their disposal but have been lost as populations and government have grown larger and more complex. The first is complete information on what the SDAs are planning to do. Back in the day it was simply not possible for the SDAs to hatch a plot to attack the neighboring band (or even one of their own bandmembers) without everyone else in the band hearing about it. The modern equivalent of that are disclosure laws (e.g., the US Freedom of Information Act) which are unfortunately relatively ineffective tools for ensuring

Neurotypicals have the information they need to monitor and intervene as necessary (e.g., the FOIA only applies to the executive branch of the Federal government, not to the Federal legislative branch let alone states/counties/cities, and the Obama administration denied a record 8,496 FOIA requests in 2013). The second is a structured way for the Neurotypicals to apply social pressure (peer pressure) to the SDAs when a plot like this is uncovered. Sure, nowadays if the plot is particularly egregious there will be protests in the street, and maybe if it doesn't warrant a full-on protest a few Neurotypicals will write a letter to the editor for the local newspaper. But mostly these things just result in a little grousing among friends and family and swearing to work to throw the offending SDAs out of office at the very earliest opportunity, which won't be until the next election which will years later and by that time the promise has been long forgotten. Clearly a more direct system is required.

Unfortunately that more direct route runs square into the issue of "Political Correctness", a social value that began developing around the same time as the research into Authoritarianism by Altemeyer and others finally began to gain some traction. Because analysis of authoritarian behavior as an individual characteristic goes against the egalitarian values embodied in the politically correct zeitgeist, it has become extremely unpopular to propose singling out SDAs for special blame or treatment. For example, Waller (2002), attempts to portray genocides as acts that most or all of a population are involved in committing when even the eyewitness accounts clearly show that there are large differences in the participation rates among individuals, and even in Milgram's experiments (an extensive review of which can be found in Altemeyer, 2006) almost 40% of test subjects refused to administer the highest voltage shocks. Even the most contorted experimental conditions cannot achieve more than a 90% compliance rate. So there are clear and reproducible differences in the willingness of individuals to commit immoral acts against others, political correctness that this is a universal human characteristic notwithstanding.

In addition to adopting a philosophy that social engineering is a legitimate tool for correcting our current civilization's deficiencies, that field will also require the kinds of data collection and analysis that make up the bulk of what engineers in other fields do all day long. For example, if you were tasked with the job of creating a universal health care system for a country, how would you go about it? Would you take a poll of all the citizens to see what they thought they wanted and implement that? Or would do the same except only polling the current elected representatives to see what they would be willing to support? Or would you design several systems, build simulations of them to see how well they work and how much they'd cost and then present the results of this analysis to the public and ask them which they'd prefer? Unfortunately what the Obama administration chose is the second of these, which is clearly the worst of the three options from an engineering perspective. This document is about doing it the third way: Using technology to facilitate collaborative efforts to engineer social and political systems and then allowing The People to directly control whether or not they want to implement them.

Besides addressing the issue of leadership, this document proposes a wide range of other changes to improve the way governmental and economic systems work, both by merely improving their efficiency and by making them more compatible with our instinctive natures. Not all of them must be implemented, and some may turn out to simply be impractical. But there are many interdependencies and so each should be seriously considered and implemented together with The Plan if they are deemed

useful: It's will be a lot easier to implement them all at once in one disruption lasting a few years than dragging The People through a lifetime of more incremental changes. It also gets around the problem that everyone will find something they really dislike about The Plan: Realizing that everyone else is in the same boat will make it possible for individuals to vote to approve it over their own personal misgivings. Having to approve each change separately would make "tyranny of the majority" a core feature of Plan implementation, which is not to anyone's benefit.

Providing a wide range of examples has another benefit: While no claim can be made that this document is an exhaustive list, it should be at least exhausting enough that no one can make the claim that "The Plan is unworkable because it doesn't deal with problem X". Even if "X" is not discussed directly, providing sufficient examples of social engineering principles should remove any reasonable doubt that "X" would become solvable under The Plan through some process that is simply not available in current government or economic systems.

THE PLAN

The Plan as written is imperfect and incomplete. It must therefore be updated and then reapproved by The People on a regular basis as these inadequacies become apparent.

The common theme in these clauses, to the extent that they differ from those in other examples of governing documents, is that the available science on the underlying issues provides direction, and in many cases is settled. Unfortunately most people, including our current crop of politicians, are either ignorant of these facts or deliberately choose to ignore those that do not support their existing world view. For example, countless studies have been done on the question of whether a particular required service can most efficiently be provided by a government agency, private enterprise, a regulated monopoly, or a government contractor. But rather than hearing about these studies when a matter comes up for debate, we get soundbites: "Government Bad, Free Enterprise Good!" or "We must protect ourselves from greedy corporations". The truth, of course, is that "it depends", and what it depends on and therefore which is the best option is what The Plan is all about.

Some of the proposals in this version of The Plan are ahead of the science that is required to support them. Note that this is not the same as claiming that any of these proposals is invalid *because* the science is not settled yet: Only when the research is done and *conflicts* with the proposal does it absolutely need to be modified. This is because it's better to make an educated guess and plan to make adjustments in the future than to simply do nothing. As such The Plan can also serve as a road map to the types of issues that require further research.

THE PLAN: MOTIVATIONS

The human species, which evolved to survive in small groups in an environment of relative scarcity, is poorly adapted to live in a civilization where resources are managed and individual freedom and fulfillment have replaced reproduction as the measure of system success. This mismatch has led to unnecessary suffering and limits our potential, both individually and collectively. The primary cause of

that suffering is a failure to establish Goals and design systems that will help achieve them, systems that work around the human species' manifold maladaptations.

A key question about The Plan (or objection to it) is: How do we decide which human instinctive behaviors should be allowed or even encouraged, and which must be worked around or even suppressed because they are maladaptive? From the first principle of The Plan it should be clear that this is an empirical question, not a philosophical one. Where there is doubt we must do the research and/or experimentation to objectively determine the proper course toward achieving the Goals. To do otherwise is circular reasoning, using a maladaptation to justify acceptance of maladaptive behavior. Examples include relying on gut feelings or the pronouncements of any authority, particularly a religious authority, which has not done the research or experiments to validate their positions.

Allowing these maladaptive instincts to influence our decisionmaking or other behavior is a form of indulgence, a selfish expression of individual instincts to the detriment of the impact on as The People whole. A partial list of the most problematic of our instincts is provided in a later section. Some of the behaviors associated with these instincts must be actively suppressed while for others it may be sufficient to merely identify and therefore remove the instinctive motivation for the behavior, which will naturally allow the baseline rates to decrease. And where behaviors can't be completely eliminated without introducing a new source of suffering, in many cases it is possible to sublimate them, providing a less-harmful substitute form of expression.

These instincts will be classified as "deprecated", borrowing a common term from Computer Science for a feature or interface that is obsolete and should not be relied on because it conflicts with the growth path and so will likely be removed in a future version. While the ability to remove individual instincts from human genetics is beyond our current technology, because humans have a great capacity for learning and are very susceptible to social pressure, merely identifying Deprecated Instincts (DI) will allow achieving most of the Goals without requiring any genetic manipulation.

Philosophically, classifying certain instincts as deprecated is a means of blending Utilitarianism and Intuitionism. There are many examples, both theoretical and real-world, where the prescriptions of utilitarianism conflicts with innate human morality. Laws made to deal with these cases using a purely utilitarian rationality can be difficult or impossible to enforce. In these situations The People will have to develop a compromise that maximizes utility *and* the prescriptions of our Instrumental Instincts. Lists of the Deprecated, Instrumental, and unresolved instincts is provided in a later section.

Noting that these maladaptations are not uniformly distributed among The People and that of particular concern are Social Dominators and Authoritarians (SDAs) who are the most sensitive to fear and therefore have the highest levels of the Deprecated Instincts, the systems must be designed to take this nonuniformity into account.

The design of The Plan is to use human characteristic strengths (Instrumental Instincts) to minimize the negative effects of human maladaptations (Deprecated Instincts).

The primary goal of The Plan is to ensure the success of The Plan and the people who live by it.

THE PLAN: FREEDOM AND CREDENTIALS

The People require complete information in order to make optimal decisions. The freedom of the press shall therefore not be infringed.

Secrecy and deception are primary tools that SDAs use to facilitate their ability to commit immoral acts in the name of protecting their band from dangerous outsiders. In order to prevent them from committing these immoral acts, we must deprive them of these tools. There should be no restrictions on the press, and that includes judicial gag orders and information withheld in the name of national security with the limited exception of coverage of current or planned military missions in a declared war.

The People's rights to complete freedom of belief and action, including the right to free speech and assembly shall not be infringed to the extent that exercising those freedoms does not directly infringe on the freedom or safety of others. To the extent that exercising their freedoms may infringe on the freedom or safety of others, individuals will require Credentials.

Credentials shall be the *only* means of controlling access to resources, and using age or other obsolete or ineffective qualifications shall be discontinued. To ensure the People's freedom and safety, an individual's list of Credentials shall be publicly available.

This is not much different from current practice in most developed countries: One must have Credentials to drive a car or pilot a plane, practice medicine or law, or use certain technology (e.g., explosives and ham radio). This design just expands the range of activities that will require certifications, and simplifies and organizes the practice of granting them. Want to smoke tobacco or drink alcohol or take other drugs? You have to pass a test that shows you have a complete understanding of the substance to be consumed and the risks to the individual and the People associated with it. Abuse that freedom? Get your Credentials suspended or revoked, and therefore your right to purchase or use those substances.

One common, almost universal, abuse of individual freedom is the use of age to restrict it. For example, there are many 14 to 16-year-olds, and a few even younger individuals, who are perfectly capable of participating in the process of government, yet they are prohibited from doing so. On the other hand, there are some 21 year olds who are clearly not ready to be given the responsibility that comes with drug (including alcohol) consumption. It is therefore both an abuse of individual freedom *and* an ineffective means of protecting the rights of others to regulate freedom by age. Instead, the credentialing process should be used to provide freedom based on knowledge, ability, and other characteristics that vary among individuals not as a function of age, but of experience and their internal natures.

As it is the primary tool SDAs use to infringe on the freedoms of others, it shall not be permitted to discriminate between individuals on any basis other than lacking a necessary Credential.

Rather than try to enumerate all the ways an individual may differ from any other, let's instead turn the whole thing around and outlaw *any* discrimination unless there is scientifically valid reason for it.

Conversely, there are a very large number of freedoms people have now that when abused have severe negative consequences to other individuals and/or The People in general. Among the more significant new Credentials will be for parenting, running a business, and voting. All of these things require skills that not everyone has and they shouldn't be doing them until they can show the rest of us that they have acquired the necessary skills.

THE PLAN: GOVERNMENT

As government is a parasitic load on civilization, it is most efficient to have the smallest government possible while still allowing it to perform its required function.

The required function of government being the optimization of cooperative behavior among individuals, something that does not happen voluntarily, falling farther from optimal the larger the number of individuals involved (Mueller 2003).

Because there will always be differences in the needs and priorities of individuals based on their local environment, there must be at least two levels of government, local and global. The head of government operations at each level will be a Manager selected by The People.

The Managers are the executives who direct and supervise government operations. Like mayors/governors/presidents they have complete authority over the execution of laws but do not themselves make the laws. Unlike most current political systems, however, Managers are not politicians but instead are specifically trained and talented in the areas of government operations.

The global government, or Globality, will be responsible for the national defense, implementing laws that must apply to all The People, building and maintaining infrastructure that benefits multiple Localities, and facilitating the interactions between them.

The Globality income will come from sales taxes which will vary based on the product, and from fees collected from users of government services and infrastructure, rates of which are to be reset yearly and approved by The People upon the recommendation of the Global Manager.

There are three essential requirements of a tax system. The first of course is that it must generate the revenue necessary to run the government. The second is that it be efficient, with as little burden on the entities using it and as little enforcement infrastructure and other overhead as possible. The third is that it be fair, with all entities paying into the system in proportion to their benefit from it. As current income-tax systems fail to deliver on all of these requirements, they must be replaced by something better. Anyone who's read a newspaper is well aware of the failure of the first requirement, anyone who's filed a tax return (let alone been audited) knows how the second isn't working, but *everyone* knows that it is the case that there are large numbers of individuals and corporations that are not paying their fair share of taxes via their ability to exploit loopholes in the tax code or simply cheat by not reporting all of their income.

A convincing case has been made to replace income taxes with some sort of national sales tax (e.g., the FairTax), but these systems would need to be customized to account for other features of The Plan.

For example, rather than a flat tax of 30% as has been proposed for the FairTax, which precludes the use of financial, social, and behavioral engineering, the Plan tax rate will vary depending on the Goals of The People and the impacts of each individual product type. Taxes on drugs (including tobacco and alcohol) should be higher than for food, because of the greater costs to regulate them and deal with individuals who end up abusing them (social engineering, i.e., providing information on the actual cost of these products), but also to help limit their use based on moral biases (i.e., behavioral engineering). Taxes on things like appliances and vehicles must take into account their impact on The People and their environment (safety, energy efficiency, embodied energy divided by projected lifespan, etc.)

An example, from the domain of auto sales: What should the tax rates be on a supercars (e.g., Ferrari), luxury cars (Lexus), and entry level models? All the same? This seems poor financial engineering: The Owners of the first two categories are relatively price insensitive (indeed, exploiting this feature is even a primary marketing tool used by Ferrari: By intentionally designing their vehicles to be very expensive they reduce the number of people who can afford them, this exclusivity being one of the main appeals of owning a Ferrari in the first place). So the sales tax rate on them can easily be made higher than for other products without substantially affecting the sales of those types of vehicles. So why not tax supercars at 30% and luxury cars at 20%, to not only increase revenue but also *amplify* one of the key features of owning one of these vehicles, their exclusivity? As for economy cars, they are generally not purchased out of any desire for status, but out of basic need. They could be taxed at a lower rate which would make them more affordable which in turn would raise the standard of living which in turn would ultimately have the effect of decreasing taxes all around by reducing the percentage of taxes paid back out in entitlements. So, for this example, the tax rate could be calculated as $\text{vehicle-cost}^{0.28}$, which would produce a 15% rate for a \$15K USD economy car, a 22% rate for a \$60K luxury car, and a 30% rate for a \$200K supercar.

Now for a social engineering view of the issue: There are several reasons why The People would want to influence the type of car individual would purchase, or indeed the decision whether or not to purchase a car at all. The most important of these is the fact that the full cost of vehicle ownership is not borne by the individual purchasing it (i.e., "the tragedy of the commons"). Environmental impact including embodied energy from the production of the vehicle, its fuel economy, its projected lifespan, and the cost of disposing of it all factor into the full cost to The People associated with a vehicle purchase.

In our car-class scenario above, social engineering based on environmental impact would result in a similar differential tax rate as the financial-engineering example, with the supercar and its high embodied energy and poor fuel economy getting the highest rate and the economy car the lowest. Of course this schedule could be adjusted based on other socially valued features (e.g., an electric luxury car may be taxed at a lower rate than a gas-powered equivalent).

Other factors that might come into play when making a social engineering design for vehicle sales taxes, such as the safety of the vehicle and its occupants, the resources required to maintain it, and the land required to drive and park it. Although some of these may be accounted for in other costs the vehicle owner might be responsible for (insurance, fuel or carbon taxes, land lease rates, etc.), when you're

doing engineering the entire system must be considered to make sure there are no variables that are unaccounted for.

Finally, behavioral engineering: For this we'd need a reason to try to influence an individual's car buying behavior independent of any actual proven benefit to the individual or The People in doing so. Which is why, when you look at it that way, pure behavioral engineering is something that should generally be avoided if at all possible. About the closest handy example of this are protective tariffs imposed on vehicles depending on which country they were produced in. Although this is supposedly done to protect "The People" in a particular country by protecting corporations and employees in certain specified industries, the science shows that it seldom if ever actually works out to "The People's" benefit even in that country, and always has a negative impact on The People as a whole. This is also the case with government funding of "Buy American" campaigns or other propaganda-based behavioral engineering.

Corporations will pay sales tax on the items they use, but not on products and materials they resell. Sales tax rates can be adjusted to encourage investment in particular industries or types of equipment (e.g., to improve energy or water use efficiency). Since there would be no income tax, there would be no need for to keep track of depreciation or file corporate returns, liberating large amounts of capital and labor that could be put to productive use instead.

Localities will be established based on common environment and needs of the people within them. There should be no maximum Locality size, but the minimum size should be 100,000 people, below which there would be insufficient resources to efficiently manage it. Localities need not be based on having a contiguous land mass.

For example, all the developments in an area could make up one Locality, with all the rural land around them making up another. There will have to be some sort of anti-gerrymandering control defined by statute to prevent it from becoming difficult to determine where the boundaries of a Locality are. For example, an entire subdivision will have to fall within one Locality, determined by majority vote of people living within that subdivision.

New Localities may join the Globality by popular vote of the people living in it. Each adopter, including the first adopter, in conjunction with The Plan followers in other existing nations will develop an Implementation Agreement that will define all of the conversions that will be necessary for the new Locality to integrate with the Globality and specify a timetable for their full implementation of The Plan, with a default value of 5 years, a minimum of 1 year and a maximum of 10 years.

For the first few Localities, entire existing nations should be required to convert at once. Whether or not to subsequently allow Localities to be formed from secession of an area of another country depends on the logistics, in particular whether the new Locality shares a common border with an existing Locality and how vigorously the former nation would fight the secession.

The people within Localities shall be free to separate or combine with other Localities as they see fit, provided the minimum threshold is maintained. Should a Locality fail to function to a standard defined

by The People, the Globality may redefine Locality boundaries as needed, or excise that Locality from the Globality.

If a Locality is dropped they'd have to either set up their own national government or restart the joining process, putting them under complete control of The People under a new Implementation Agreement.

This ability to easily refine the borders of a Locality, while an administrative headache, are key to heading off the sort of ethnic tensions that SDAs are designed to capitalize on, and eliminates the possibility of them elevating themselves to positions of power with the promise of leading "their" people into an era of power and prosperity. Why start a war when the people can just take a simple bureaucratic action to achieve the same result?

Localities will be responsible for implementing laws and codes that need only apply to specific areas or people. The Locality will also provide for the education and security of the individuals living within it.

To facilitate the collection of taxes and fees, there shall be a single Global Electronic Money (GEM) system, to be administered by the Globality.

The Globality will contract out development and maintenance of a single global electronic payment system that will replace checks, credit and debit cards, stored-value cards, and electronics-based payment systems. To provide competition, however, individuals will still be able to choose the bank(s) they use as the back-end for these transactions.

Because individual freedom and privacy requires the ability to engage in untraceable transactions, a cash system will also be maintained. To account for the true costs of this system (sales tax revenue loss, production and handling costs, corruption of The People from illegal activities, etc.) a sales tax shall be applied to all cash withdrawals.

There will probably be a run on the banks in the days leading up to this change as people will hoard cash in fear of having to pay a tax on it in the future, so it may be necessary to impose a cap on withdrawals (just as there is now for ATM withdrawals). This behavior will subside in the months afterward and most of this cash will return to the banks, never to be withdrawn again. Note that the GEM system must also enable private-party transactions (e.g., via Craigslist), most likely by running on smart phones or other portable devices. This will not only drastically reduce the need for cash, but also raises the possibility of collecting sales taxes on these transactions, at least at some point in the future.

At both the local and global levels The System shall be used to enable The People to run their government, and so all individuals will be guaranteed access to it as a fundamental human right.

The System will be an Internet-based information management and voting system. As Internet usage has already passed TV and landline phone usage in many developed countries and will soon eclipse their installed base, it is safe to assume that by The Plan is implemented access to the Internet either via computer, cell phone, or public terminals will not be an issue.

Basic components of The System will include forums where topics to be debated are introduced and discussed, with the best ideas determined by popular vote to be formulated into laws and promoted to a voting forum where The People will vote to adopt or reject them (a meritocracy, or more properly mericracy, of ideas).

While it has been true that this type of direct democracy has been a practical impossibility to implement up to this point for a variety of reasons, technological improvements have now finally rendered it an achievable and necessary goal. The issue of the sheer unwieldiness of allowing groups of more than a few dozen people to participate directly in the running of the government can be solved by crowd-sourcing the very winnowing of information that larger groups can generate, and the issues of Social Dominance, Authoritarianism, and resource issues such as of lack of time or skill/education-level of individuals can be dealt with via social engineering.

Although The System will primarily be built using concepts and technologies used in other popular web sites (particularly review sites like Amazon and Yelp, forums like Reddit, Slashdot, and Facebook, crowdsourced content like Wikipedia, and versioning and collaboration from sites like Google Docs and SourceForge), it would need to be far more capable than any of them. Building it will be a large undertaking, but it is certainly within the capabilities of even a relatively small group (dozens) over a relatively short period of time (a year or two). While a full design of The System is beyond the scope of this document, features should include:

- A resilient design, independent of browser or app and distributed across servers.
- Open source, such that anyone can inspect and improve it.
- Security sufficient to protect against or at least detect vote rigging or other tampering.
- A testing system to regulate Credentials.
- Forums divided by topic (e.g., sections of the existing statutes, planning and other land-use needs by neighborhood, etc.)
- The ability for individuals to search topics, including saved searches so that they can be notified when new threads or follow-up posts are created, or when topics cross certain thresholds.
- The ability to rate posts, and add questions and remarks to them.
- The ability to filter and sort posts such that only certain types are shown (highest or lowest rated, posts by Credential level, from certain individuals or groups, etc.). For example, there should be a dedicated button such that all the proposals from the Manager or the Manager's staff will be shown in the main topic overview list, or comments from them shown at the top of the list of any comments for any individual proposal. Since the Managers and their staffs will be the primary proposers and evaluators of proposals, most of the hard work (ensuring the proposals are compliant with existing regulations, absolute cost and cost/benefit analysis, etc.) will have already been done before most people even see a proposal.
- The ability to flag posts as violating one or more rules of The System (spam, threat of violence, etc.) so that they can be reviewed by Moderators and possible action taken.

- The ability to *modify* proposals, which will trigger alerts to anyone who has commented or voted on them, revision history to be searchable and retrievable. This capability is necessary to support gradually shaping a proposal into a form that can be included as law or policy.
- A regularly scheduled vote (weekly?) as the final stage of approving proposal so that all The People will get a crack at them before they are adopted. Note that voting is a required component of The System: Proposals for political systems based on unanimity, consensus, or other policies that do not allow Neurotypicals to override the objections of SDAs simply cannot function because of the differences in the fundamental operating characteristics of the two types of individuals. While majority rule does not preclude attempts at consensus building (and in fact social engineering may be brought to bear to encourage this, perhaps by rewarding participants for each vote above a simple majority), consensus-based decision rules cannot even guarantee that any decision will be made at all.
- A budget approval system that allows the individual to prioritize the items previously approved by popular vote (quarterly?). Some of those may have been flagged as “emergency authorization” in their original vote and will be at the top of the list, unsortable. The rest will be provided as ranked by the Manager but can be moved up or down. There will be a cutoff at the bottom, below which items will not be funded due to budgetary constraints. The People’s combined list will then be used by the Manager for implementation.
- An information system on the users, including their Credentials, posting history (including the success rates of their own proposals and those from others that they have voted for or against), and profile information including a place to record their own suggestions for Global and Local Goals and a way to aggregate this information (i.e., take the pulse of the people). This tool would also be used to establish the credibility of posters and to allow the formation of coalitions of special interests that would work on projects together. All of these things designed to make large communities work more like small communities, which is the environment humans evolved to work in.
- The ability to designate proxies (delegates) should an individual be unable to participate to the level they would prefer, including a way to find suitable proxies that have similar Goal settings and/or similar voting patterns in the past and/or have demonstrated skills in a particular area. The latter being something every individual is instinctively capable of evaluating (e.g., see Keil 2010). Proxies will generally be kept anonymous (neither the voter nor anyone else will know how many are following them) to prevent leaders from arising other than via sheer merit, although of course available after each vote so that they can be verified. Proxies are the only viable way to increase participation rates by including those wide swaths of individuals who have general preferences but have made the perfectly rational decision *not* to invest the time and effort required to ensure they make an informed vote on each issue. Note that this is not a representative government: An individual can change proxies or withdraw all proxies and cast a direct vote at any time. And it is the best alternative to a sampling-based systems where individuals are randomly selected to cast votes and are expected to step up and invest the time to cast an informed vote when selected (a la Slashdot’s moderation system): The latter is not

only very difficult to police but doesn't guaranty an individual the right to cast their vote on an issue that they *do* have an informed opinion on.

- Live vote count updates, and a two-phase commit process, social engineering tools to help Authoritarians follow a lead rather than their internal biases. Note the distinction here between social and merely behavioral engineering: The goal here is not to coerce Authoritarians into voting a particular way, but to provide them with the information they need to conform to societal norms. Although the easiest and best social engineering is just to eliminate the whole possibility of error (e.g., specifying direct democracy instead of a representative-based government), it is sufficient to introduce correcting influences (e.g., feedback) in areas where error is likely. This live voting process also feeds into the proxy system: After the direct vote closes, there would be a 24-hour (or whatever) period where those who had designated a proxy could examine how their proxy voted, and if it was a close decision potentially review the materials and cast a direct vote if they did not agree with their proxy's vote.
- A moderation system and policy, some ideas for which include:
 - 1) The ability to review flagged posts and take appropriate action. The action could be simple deletion of the posts (for spam or other off-topic posts), recommending revision to the poster (for confusing or obviously incomplete posts), or updating the user's flag count. To prevent abuse and the denial of citizen's rights, posts should not be removed or pre-censored no matter how inaccurate or offensive they may be. If posts or PMs are judged to be threats to the degree that action must be taken to ensure public safety, referring them to law enforcement would be the appropriate response.
 - 2) If a user gains a sufficient number of flagged posts, their Credentials may be updated to reflect this. For example, a sufficient number of posts are found to have provable falsehoods, a "liar" Credential may be added. Note that because these Credentials are publicly viewable, The People can use them not only when assessing the utility of an individual's input into the process of running the government, but as a screening tool generally. For example you probably wouldn't want to loan money to or enter into a business relationship with a person who had been flagged as a liar.
 - 3) Users would not be allowed to edit or delete posts, but would be allowed to revise or publicly retract them using the versioning system. Changing a screen name would cause all previous posts to transfer to the new user name. Proper functioning of The System depends on people being required to stand behind their posts. There will be no "right to be forgotten" in The System (and it's a really bad idea in general because it eliminates one of the primary means of social control we still have!).
 - 4) The moderation system must feed directly up into the court system. If an individual believes they can prove bias in moderation, they should be able to escalate the matter to the courts by filing for a review for a nominal fee. If the courts decide in their favor, their fee is refunded and the hammer comes down on the Moderators. If the courts determine the individual is attempting to abuse the system they may be fined additionally for "contempt of court" or "contempt of The System".
 - 5) The moderation group is a government in itself and so should *also* be using The System to establish policies and enforce them. Results of their adjudication should be available via

transcript to allow The People (and the press) to check up on them to ensure fairness and impartiality.

- Multilevel System credentialing: The System level 1 would be part of the Standard Adult credential process and would include basic voting and profile (Goals) updating. Level 2 would include searches, notifications, filtering, and posting and would be for active contributors. Level 3 would include all standard System features and would enable working as a trainer and Moderator on The System doing general housekeeping (and being paid for this work). Level 4 would be for the ultimate authority committee (referring threatening posts or PMs to law enforcement, dealing with hacks, System upgrade design/beta testing/implementation, etc.), should also require a Social Engineering credential. These too would be paid positions.
- To ensure consistency, Credentials will be managed globally, but localities may impose additional requirements to comply with local laws. Some Credentials may need to be periodically renewed in domains where change is rapid.

To limit abuse and constrain the disruptions from SDAs, social engineering techniques would be used. For example, the number of people who had put a poster into their kill file would be available in their Credentials, as would the number of their posts that had been flagged as inappropriate, abusive, or just not useful. To prevent roving bands of SDAs from attacking other posters and/or downvoting their posts in an attempt to silence them, Moderators would have tools to help them detect this and make system advisory posts informing all users of these events (at which point the other users may kill-file the abusers). When a user is put in a kill file, not only would that remove their posts from the feed, it would also remove the effect of all of their ratings (e.g., up/down votes for each comment). A number representing an individual's current credibility in the community should be displayed right at the top of their displays. As SDAs see the results of any antisocial behavior they will tone down their rhetoric (or even cease it altogether), and their desire for social acceptance may even allow them to go along with the Neurotypicals on issues with widespread support. This is a feature sorely lacking in current political practice, where Authoritarians can indulge their penchant to live in a media echo chamber, having their prejudices amplified by repeated playback free from the dampening effect of opposing viewpoints.

Another example: Suppose some individuals show up at a City Council meeting late and wearing bags over their heads. They don't sign up to speak, yet make disparaging comments after every other speaker. When the "citizen participation" part of the meeting comes, they insist that they be allowed to speak, despite their not following the rules or even being willing to remove their bags to reveal their identities. If anyone tries to deny them, they claim censorship and that they are being deprived of their right to free speech. Would you allow this? Of course not. And yet this is exactly how most other public on-line forums work, which is why they frequently deteriorate into ugly and pointless exercises where those who have a contribution to make are drowned out by people who seem to be primarily interested in hearing themselves speak or in driving anyone who has any opinion whatsoever away from what they apparently see as their own turf. Specifying that you want these people removed from your feed is not depriving them of their right to free speech, it is exercising *your* right to go about your business free from the negative effects of disruptive and time-wasting behavior.

The results of all votes would be available at closing so that The People can check that their vote had been recorded and that there was no ballot-box stuffing, just as is the practice for representatives in representative-based government. Although this is not the secret ballot system commonly used for individual voting for the representatives themselves, the choice between making fraud straightforward to detect and the possibility of making vote buying and voter intimidation easier is a clear one. Indeed, by making the latter easier to detect (e.g., via statistical analysis of voting patterns and comparisons with Goal settings) public voting would seem to be the best of both worlds in a technologically advanced civilization.

This type of open voting is not really all that unfamiliar to most people: Caucuses as used in primaries in many states work this way, as do most votes held in meetings in most organizations. Most people do not even have any reluctance to share their voting preferences with others (e.g., Gerber, Huber, Doherty, & Dowling 2012). It has also been shown that the individuals who are most insistent that a secret balloting system be used are the very people who are the least informed on the issues and so would most benefit from having their votes be cast in public, cast through a proxy, or not cast at all (Gerber, Huber, Doherty, Dowling & Hill 2013).

Screen names will be used primarily in The System, but it should be possible for people to match screen names to real-world names with some effort. Not only does this allow independent inspectors to check up on the voting process, but prevents the system from being held hostage by a hacker who manages to break into the main database. Social engineering tools should be sufficient to keep the screen-name/real-name information from being used inappropriately (e.g., one of the flags would be for someone including this information in one of their posts in an attempt to intimidate another user).

It is a common criticism of direct democracy systems that the large number of decisions that (at least supposedly) need to be made by government effectively prohibit individual participation in making them. But if you actually look at the number of substantive decisions made at the local, state, and national levels you'll find the number is already quite manageable: A weekly vote on 2 or 3 proposals would be sufficient. For each proposal an individual would have to read one or two extremely concise and well-written statements in favor of the proposal, and equally concise and well-written statements opposed. Of course, if they needed more information prior to voting they could read the proposal itself along with every comment (in ratings order) about it that anyone else had written (and there will be a **lot** of that information available because instead of whining about the way things are on Facebook or some other forum, people will instead express their opinion in a place where it actually matters!). The whole evaluation and voting process should only take an hour or so a week for most people.

It is also frequently observed (including by the Founding Fathers of the United States) that direct democracy can't work because The People are not up to the job (too stupid, too apathetic, too prone to mob effects, etc.). But these criticisms assume they are unaugmented by technology. The System will be designed and engineered to *improve* human decisionmaking ability by providing them the information they need and in a form most directly usable by them, constrain them into making their decisions rationally using *only* this information instead of relying on lower-level processes or biases,

amplify collective power while minimizing mob effects, provide feedback to encourage participation, and make it easier and more efficient for them to do so. It will simply make us act more capable than we otherwise are.

Only votes from individuals with a Plan Level 1 Credential and with their primary residence in that Locality will be counted for proposals affecting a Locality. Globality elections will count the votes of all individuals with a Plan Level 1 Credential, regardless of their location.

Yes, this means that issues affecting the Globality will at first be decided primarily by people living outside of Localities that have adopted The Plan. There are two reasons why this is not only necessary, but optimal. The first is that The Plan statutes and policies will eventually apply to all human beings and so all human beings should have a say in how they are defined. Allowing the first few Plan adopters define these laws and policies is a recipe for disaster as they may implement culture, language, or location-specific policies that might indirectly (or even directly) harm individuals in pre-Plan-implementation nations. This could in turn cause unacceptable delays in the adoption of The Plan by those nations.

Secondly, the first few adopters will likely lack the financial and organizational resources to implement The Plan on their own. All The People will need to pool their efforts to ensure that these early adopters are successful so that we will all eventually be able to live in Plan Localities.

The decision criterion for elections shall be a simple majority of votes cast. To change the Plan itself, however, the criteria shall be a majority vote in an election where a majority of eligible voters cast a ballot.

Note that there is no provision for Locality-count input, i.e. as is the requirement in the US Senate or for Swiss cantons in national referendums. Allowing this encourage splitting up of Localities into smaller units, reducing their efficiency. Localities should be competing for citizens to *grow* to the largest size possible, not provide individuals with an incentive to do the opposite. Locality-count voting also encourages efficiency-killing hostage-taking behavior (i.e., tribalism, an Authoritarian mindset and tactic). If there is a need to protect Localities from tyranny-of-the-majority issues, it should be sufficient to move responsibility for some decisions (e.g., on resource extraction policies) further into the local domain.

At both the local and global levels, The People will vote to select a Manager from a list of candidates brought to them by an independent committee of individuals with Credentials to participate in the selection process. When The People approve a Manager, that Manager assumes responsibility for operation of the government at that level, and will be placed in charge of all personnel decisions until they either resign or are removed from office by popular vote of The People.

Choosing a Manager will be handled like choosing an employee in a corporation: The committee will advertise the position, collect and review resumes, check references, and then interview candidates (via email, if possible). This information along with the committee's recommendation will then be forwarded on to The People to use in choosing their Manager. There won't be any "campaigning", and

any individual or group that attempts to game the system by advertising should trigger a backlash against their candidate for being corrupt. Again, the free flow of information (full disclosure will be required in all advertising) will greatly reduce the ability of corporations and powerful individuals to game the system.

Manager will be a highly paid and high-status position because The People will be competing with public corporations for people to fill them. It should be expected that the Locality Managers should all have extensive experience in the role, either as CEOs or city/county managers. The Globality Manager will normally be chosen from the ranks of Locality Managers, although this should not be a requirement. Choosing a career politician with little or no management training or experience as a Manager at either level would be a mistake (Obama's mismanagement of health care reform, and the economy in general, being exhibit A).

The People retain the right to remove any government employee, including any Manager, judge, military officer, Moderator, or any other type of employee at any level by popular vote at the relevant level.

This feature is sorely lacking in existing government systems. Even when a non-elected government manager (e.g., cabinet member, Supreme Court judge, etc.) is demonstrably incompetent The People have no effective means of removing that individual from their position. This leads to frequent ineffective or even disastrous results such as what the US has seen in recent years with many regulatory agencies (e.g., the SEC, FEMA, EPA. etc.). No corporation or military force works this way or could. How is it permissible that government managers can hire their relatives or cronies without giving The People any control at all over the situation?

Besides the power of The People, which is unlimited, there are two other sources of political power in the Plan. Both of these have equivalents in today's civilization, but they are far more important components in The Plan government and so the design of the systems around them warrant very close attention. The first is the role of Moderator, which while ostensibly merely that of "traffic cop", could in many cases have major impacts on the freedom of individuals and even public policy in general through the use (or misuse) of flagging and other acts (topic or thread reorganization, etc.). The second is that of Manager, a position that will wield far more power than current executive-branch heads (governors and the president in the US). A system that balances this power with close supervision by The People without allowing them to end up micromanaging their employee is key to The Plan's success.

Business offices and employment of the Globality shall be distributed among all the localities, with these branches containing the necessary level of redundancy to accommodate incapacitation in other Localities due to natural or human-caused disasters.

THE PLAN: LAW

The law code shall be civil law rather than common law and shall be written such that a person of with the basic Plan Credential can understand and use it for their own benefit.

In civil law countries, the law is largely or entirely encoded in the statutes, which were voted on by the citizens of those countries or their representatives. Understanding and using the law is therefore relatively straightforward, and there is relatively little use of appeals courts except in cases where obvious mistakes have been made. Common law, on the other hand, as is used in most English speaking countries, is partly contained in the statutes but large components of which are contained in a long history of court cases where judges attempt to "fix" ambiguities in the law by specifying the reasoning they used in rendering their decisions. This massive hidden trove of information is virtually impenetrable by untrained individuals, and even lawyers' ability to use it is highly dependent on their level of skill and the amount of resources (i.e., billable hours) that they are able to expend. This is a system virtually *designed* to be unfair to all but the wealthiest individuals.

As such, a reasonable summary is that civil law is written by The People for the People, whereas common law is written by lawyers and primarily benefits other lawyers and the rich and powerful. The problems here are even more acute in the US, where the most troublesome ambiguities frequently end up being considered by a Supreme Court that is made up of political appointees, some of whom are authoritarian ideologues who presume to "divine" ridiculous things like the intent of the original authors of the constitution, never mind that those people had no conception of any issue even remotely related to those faced by today's courts and who *repeatedly* admitted in their own supporting documentation (the Federalist Papers) that they were aware that there were serious flaws in their own work that they hoped future generations would fix rather than attempt to enshrine.

There shall be a single global court system with three levels, a local level of judges appointed by the local manager, a global appellate level appointed by the global manager, and a Supreme Court of 5 members appointed by The People using a recommendation/approval system parallel to, but independent from, the one use to appoint managers. The Supreme Court members shall have the highest level Credential in both the Law and Social Engineering, and have the authority to overturn decisions that violate terms of The Plan and the authority to strike down laws that violate the terms of The Plan *or* are judged to be ineffective or unnecessarily inefficient by Social Engineering standards.

Punishment having been shown to be a relatively ineffective form of behavioral engineering, there shall be no punitive damages imposed in lawsuits: If a punitive action is deemed necessary, the relevant Credential(s) of the offender will be suspended or revoked.

The connection between the legal system and current practice of managing "licenses" is weak and inconsistent. For example, there is no guarantee that a doctor found to have committed malpractice will even have their license reviewed, let alone suspended or revoked, because the two systems are independent. Indeed, even *criminal* acts are not directly tied to the licensing system in most cases and the victim usually needs to make a special separate act to cause a review. This makes no sense: Efficient regulation of Credentials *requires* that all three systems be formally interconnected with well specified consequences to Credentials when civil and/or criminal judgments are entered. If a corporation has committed negligent acts that rise to the level of criminality the business credentials of all of the principles should be revoked which will require that the corporation be sold and reorganized with the goal of removing all of the people responsible for those acts of negligence.

THE PLAN: STANDARDS

A common set of standards being a necessary component of global economic efficiency, The People shall establish a System of Standardization by which The People can define them.

This means adoption of the SI (metric) system, for one thing. But it goes far beyond that in the requirement for standardization in product packaging, building codes (and building materials), and a wide variety of other areas which are currently managed by a motley assortment of government agencies, professional organizations, and even private companies. Many of these are run for-profit, which means they are practically *designed* to restrict The People's ability to participate in the standard development process, and because these organizations frequently charge exorbitant prices for written copies of standards themselves, The People are often prevented from even being able to determine if the products they purchase comply with the relevant standards. It will take a *long* time (decades) for this to all get fixed, but if we don't start, we'll never finish.

THE PLAN: LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The land and all natural resources belong to The People. To the extent it benefits individuals and The People, individuals will be granted the use of these resources via permanent leases with rates set according to the value of these resources. Individuals or corporations will own all improvements to the land, and therefore must be appropriately compensated for their value if a lease is terminated. New improvements shall be encouraged provided they are compatible with the needs of The People to preserve or increase the value of the land and ensure its efficient utilization.

Although it may seem radical, as a practical matter there is very little difference between this design and current practice. There are already a great many restrictions on an individual's use of land they supposedly "own", including zoning, covenants, land use and building codes, and environmental regulations. Individuals can be easily deprived of "their" land by seizure due to unpaid taxes or other liens, or even via methods entirely outside their control such as using eminent domain for public works projects or to eliminate blight.

This design is primarily an improvement in the honesty of how the system currently actually works, but does have some additional advantages. Firstly, it emphasizes the obligation of all The People to ensure that these resources are not abused or exploited. Although the immediate effect of this will most likely be higher commodity prices for products that come from public land as The People raise resource extraction rates to reflect their interests, this increase will be offset by a corresponding decrease in the tax rates elsewhere.

Secondly, it moves authority for approving significant changes to The People, who may decide that it is better to leave some resources (e.g., oil and gas) in the ground as an investment in the future rather than having wells drilled in their neighborhoods, even if that means higher short-term prices for those commodities.

Finally, it ensures that The People will regularly review the use of the resources and can more easily change these uses if doing so aids in achieving the Goals: Individuals are far less likely to resist these types of conversions if their conception of their rights to the land only extends to its use and not that they arise out of the mistaken conception that they have some special right to the land because they "bought" it, or are squatting on it, or merely that their ancestors lived on it at one time. This will greatly reduce the emotional content of the process of conversion of the land to eliminate blight, reassignments to more productive use, or remove it from use entirely (e.g., in flood or other hazard zones) and converting it to Parkland. Most property "owners" will be unaffected by this change in characterization: Only those who misuse the land or hold it for speculation or to deprive The People of its productive use will have their plans put at risk.

Locality income will come from land leases, which will be based on the market value of the property, and also from fees collected from users of government services and infrastructure, the amounts of which are to be approved by the individuals in that Locality upon the recommendation of the Locality Manager.

Here there be dragons: Property taxes are a nightmare in the US, with most counties using almost arbitrary systems for setting property values and levy rates. Furthermore even calculating the required income will prove to be extremely difficult because county financing is so dependent on local sales tax rates, state subsidies (particularly for transportation and education), and the exact fees charged for services (which vary wildly between counties). Along with the difficulty in determining the required income, there are also vast areas of inefficiency (if not outright corruption) in the way these funds have been spent because The People have very little awareness of (let alone supervision over) individual budget items at this level.

Secondly, all national public debt and significant amounts of union and corporate pension debt will have to be refinanced as Locality debt as part of the implementation process. This will also tend to increase land lease rates which will in turn increase mortgage PITI (which would actually become "PILI") and rents.

Finally, the issue of land lease rates for non-profits and religious organizations must be addressed as there are very different policies in different areas. Not requiring payment from them at all is obviously unfair and impractical (they use public services, including fire and police protection, and so should pay for them), as is charging them at different rates depending on the type of organization. But because they do provide benefits to the community it would seem reasonable to charge them at a different rate from commercial and residential real estate, just as those two currently differ.

This will all have to be designed, and may result in significantly different rates than property owners are paying now, but once the first few Localities have been established and have a budget track record of a few years it will be straightforward to apply the acquired templates to all future Localities (modulo the large number of lawsuits and criminal prosecutions that will be triggered by having independent auditors go through the previous government's books).

Note that land lease rates do include the value of the improvements to the land, but that there is no provision for taxes on personal or business property. These sorts of taxes are widely abused via loopholes and underreporting and are a nightmare to compute even for those who choose to pay them because they have to factor in things like the current very complicated basis/depreciation calculations. By replacing income tax with a sales tax there is no need for that timeconsuming, inefficient, and dishonest system anymore (e.g., even calling it “depreciation” is frequently a misnomer because for example the structure of a building generally doesn’t actually depreciate which means that it’s value may actually *increase* in the interval between when it is bought and sold, which requires that capital gains (income tax) be paid to recapture this, rendering many what should be routine investment decisions extremely difficult to make).

Since there will be consequences to the global sales tax system from shifting to a wholly land lease local system, the two systems must be designed together (e.g., by not imposing the taxes on mortgage interest and rents (as proposed for the FairTax) to account for land lease rates that will end up being higher than current property taxes in some areas where sales taxes are also used to fund local governments and where public debts are high).

Parkland, and the species that require it to live, have an incalculable intrinsic value to The People. They must therefore establish specific goals as for the acquisition and maintenance of these lands.

The use of the word "incalculable" is not an attempt to use mysticism as a justification; it's merely a statement of fact. For example the proposal that it's important to save the rainforest because there may be undiscovered organisms there that may contain a cure for some human disease is an incredibly superficial analysis. An analogous situation may be chaos theory as it applies to weather, as in the old saw about a butterfly flapping its wings in China causing a hurricane in Florida six months later: The direct effect is not what it's important to consider, it's the ultimate result.

In the case of species extinction, it's not just that a particular species butterfly goes extinct; it's that that species might have been the inspiration for the greatest work of art that human beings will ever create. It's not that some species of tree goes extinct, but what if apple trees had gone extinct and having an apple fall on his head was somehow a crucial component to Newton deriving his theory of gravity? And it's not that only one or two people might be saved by an antibiotic discovered in the rainforest, but what if one of those people was to be the next Mozart and the other the next Einstein? And while each of those examples is highly unlikely individually, they represent only a single additional level of interaction. Multiply the probabilities of all possible interactions throughout millennia of interaction, and we are virtually guaranteed to find enormous costs in that matrix somewhere. And this presupposes that we even have a valid valuation function to use to determine the costs: We have no idea how a future, more culturally advanced, civilization will even value any of these things and therefore how they would value the preservation of species or habitat.

As such, until we know exactly what we're doing allowing even a single species to go extinct is an unforgivable act and must be prevented *regardless* of the cost to the human economy. Certainly we know that at this point there is already far too little Parkland for many species to even continue to

survive, especially in areas that are suitable for agriculture and resource extraction, so the focus now must be acquiring and restoring Parkland, not merely limiting the degradation of existing land. Part of this process will necessarily be the establishment of specific targets for the human population of the earth and then putting social engineering policies in place to ensure that we reach these goals.

To ensure consistent and proper management of Parkland, this shall be the responsibility of the Globality.

Localities have a vested interest in reduction or inconsistent management of Parkland because conversion to Parkland and/or elimination of productive use of the land reduces their income and so increases the taxes that everyone else must pay. The much greater income at the Global level will also make purchases of Parkland much easier to arrange.

THE PLAN: COMPETITION, CORPORATIONS, AND MONOPOLIES

Competition is the key to improvement, and it always has and will always must apply at all levels, from improvement of the individual, to the competition between theories in the scientific method, to the evolution of the species. Therefore, a robust competitive economy must be maintained by ensuring that public corporations make up the vast majority of economic activity.

To maximize competition and efficiency, information technology must be applied in all spheres of human endeavor. For example all corporations should be public, with control and information on revenues and share values available to all The People. This rule will apply to even the smallest businesses, providing them access to capital and experience that they would otherwise lack and yet simultaneously constraining founders from running the business solely for their individual benefit.

Corporations shall be highly regulated by The People to prevent them, or individuals associated with them, from exploiting their shareholders (i.e., via insider-trading laws), their workers (i.e., via worker safety and wage supplements), or The People (i.e., via environmental and land/resource use laws, undisclosed advertising, etc.).

Technology and simplification of the tax and legal system will greatly reduce the burden of forming and running a public corporation, allowing even sole proprietors to avail themselves of this protection and opportunity for growth. It also gets around the "family farm" red herring that authoritarians and other conservatives use as an argument against inheritance taxes: If it's big enough to be worth passing on to your children, it's big enough to be publicly incorporated so that it will survive the founder's death. Being a public corporation also allows for investors in a good business to provide capital to expand it, and for investors in an unprofitable business to merge it with a more successful business to at least improve economies of scale. The exact time and scale of going public will vary depending on the specific business, but it should be expected that business that are more than 5 years old, have annual gross revenue of more than one million USD, or have more than 10 employees (full or part time) should be public corporations.

Corporations will be organized exactly like governments; with individuals (shareholders) using The System to choose the company executives and make other policy decisions. No more supposedly-independent Boards who are overpaid to provide what is generally ineffective and unnecessary "advice" and which have the corrupt bias to overcompensate executives who they share an upbringing with or who may someday be in a position to return the favor.

Corruption from corporate lobbying is an insurmountable flaw in representative democracies, but is still an issue in a direct democracy. The System itself will be relatively resistant to direct influence from it because only individuals will be contributing (Corporations are not people, and so cannot even create accounts). It will also have a robust spam flagging capability to prevent individuals from becoming mere shells for the Corporations. Still, it can be expected that Corporations will still try to hire or otherwise encourage the most erudite individuals to create or endorse proposals that would benefit them. This is not always a bad thing, and individual freedom requires that it be allowed. But The People have a right to any information that they might find useful in deciding whether or not to back any particular proposal. Therefore any compensation to individuals from Corporations must be disclosed in their Credentials.

The best weapon against the corrupting influence of corporate lobbying or vote buying on The People directly is also information: All advertising must include sufficient information in it for The People to determine who paid for it. This brings social engineering into play, so for example individuals then have the capability of rejecting that source of information or even organizing a backlash against the Corporation(s) that are attempting to influence them. Coursework on "Advertising Analysis" must be included as part of the education in psychology every individual receives so that they will be trained to recognize the techniques being used in any particular advertisement or other propaganda and so be less susceptible to those that exploit tribalism, susceptibility to fearmongering, and/or other maladaptive traits in humans. If statements in any particular ad are proven to be false by an independent organization, the penalty could be requiring the offender to pay to run a retraction/correction in the same time/place as the original ad. We may even want to put some of these things into the criminal code: Although we have laws to protect children and the elderly from being exploited by unscrupulous individuals, when a Corporation (or even an SDA candidate for President) launches a campaign with a goal of instilling fear in the population in order to manipulate them into doing things that are against their own best interests, isn't this exactly the same thing, only differing in the nature of the exploit?

Eliminating corporate income taxes will liberate vast resources currently used to merely find and exploit loopholes in the tax code, and simplifying and regularizing contracts will do the same for resources expended on the constant need for lawyers to customize and enforce them. For example, The People will define a Standard Sales Contract that includes terms that all sales contracts should have (e.g., loser pays attorney fees, severability of clauses, etc.) which will be added to all sales contracts by inclusion (e.g., "This contract includes terms of Standard Sales Contract version 1.2"). In most cases, this will mean that the only thing that will differ between contracts will be the price and product description, eliminating the need for an attorney to produce the contract (for one party) or review it for suitability (the other party). It will also better protect both buyer and seller by eliminating "the battle of the forms" (where RFP/invoice/delivery documents have incompatible clauses), the possibility of

accidentally omitting an important clause or making a modification that renders it ineffective, or having the party writing the contract try to slip something non-standard into it in an attempt to give them an unfair advantage over the other party.

All corporations should naturally grow to the largest size possible, economies of scale increasing efficiency. This must be counterbalanced by the need for competition, because an industry with no competition becomes stagnant and prone to corruption and inefficiency. Therefore, no corporation shall grow such that it owns more than 50% market share of a proprietary product line by itself. Once it reaches that threshold, the proprietary nature of the product shall either be released to the market (e.g., open sourced) or the corporation split up into separate, independent, and competitive companies.

"Natural Monopolies", for example roads and other ground-based transportation, basic protective services such as fire and police, and the distribution portion of utilities shall be owned and/or managed by The People. Securing the benefits of competition is still necessary, however, so these services and maintenance of this infrastructure must be contracted out using a public bidding process.

The concept of Natural Monopoly also applies anywhere The People have decided that a product or service is a fundamental human right, such as health care, pensions, and income protection. It cannot be expected that competition from capitalist forces will form naturally in these areas and so it must be specially managed by The People. Competition is nevertheless still necessary, and so current practices of establishing large government bureaucracies to perform the work or merely attempting to calculate and then dictate payment rates (a la the US Medicare reimbursement system) should not be acceptable. Instead, social engineering techniques must be used to design systems that provides the efficiency gained from competition while still guaranteeing a standard level of service. For example, administration of benefits can be sent out for competitive bidding on a Locality level, and contracts for medical services can be bid on in areas where competition can naturally be found, and the resulting reimbursement rates for those services used in areas where competition is not practical to arrange.

Yes, this means that in areas with a sufficient number of doctors that an individual may have to see different doctors for different types of services or pay a differential if they prefer to see some particular doctor. For example, if one network/group of doctors determines that they can do annual physicals more cheaply than the competition, that group will define the reimbursement rate for that service, with the individual given the choice of using a doctor in that network with only the normal (nominal) co-pay or paying the difference between the standard reimbursement rate and the rate being charged by their doctor of choice. This will of course require complete portability of medical records, but that is a necessary feature of *any* advanced health care system and so not an unreasonable requirement. Management and disclosure of services and reimbursement rates must be done publicly to support competition as much as possible. If an individual knows the medical code for a treatment they need, perhaps determined by reviewing their own medical records, they should be able to use The System to find the practitioners near them that offer this service and the cost they'd pay to use each of them. The System will also be used to review the service received to ensure quality and consistency between vendors (including the ability to calculate and publish treatment success rates) and for fraud detection:

The individual must be able to review their medical records and services that have been billed in their name and flag them for outside review if there are discrepancies.

THE PLAN: PATENTS AND COPYRIGHT

To the extent that their protections are in the interests of The People by promoting research and development, patent and copyright protection shall be made available to works available within the Globality.

This pretty much rules out all software and business model patents, and indeed all the obvious, useless, or even completely unworkable ideas that make up the bulk of the things the US PTO has granted patents for. The major purpose of these patents currently is to stifle innovation or as a tool for the legal system to use to impose parasitic loads on the competition (or even potential competition). Although a convincing case can be made to abolish all patent and copyright protection (e.g. see Boldrin & Levine, 2010), doing so could have devastating effects on industries such as drug manufacture and many forms of entertainment. Better to take small steps toward the goal of maximizing innovation, assessing impact as we go.

Acquiring a patent should require a working model or at least an engineering diagram and specification that would allow a craftsman to build a working model without additional support from the inventor. The patent would only be valid for a short period (e.g., 5 years, exclusive of any government-required safety and efficacy testing) unless an actual product using it had become commercially available, after which it could be renewed for an additional period (10 years?). The patent agreement must be specific requirements on license fees and restrictions to prevent monopolistic abuse of the patent. The restrictions on design patents and copyright should be much lower, and in fact in most cases where form follows function will actually provide better protection than a patent on an invention itself. Copyright protection should only last long enough to recoup the cost of developing the original work (10 years?) whereas trademarks could be renewed as long as a corporation continues to use them.

THE PLAN: RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The People shall fund basic research with the goal of improving the quality of their lives and that of future generations. The People will set the budgets, determining how much to invest, and where to invest it.

Rather than being determined by politicians, who not only don't understand the science but also have a vested interest in seeking approval for projects that will benefit the districts they represent rather than The People as a whole, The People will vote on the total budget and the allocation for each research area. Yes, this will probably mean that there will be far less money for expensive supercolliders and manned exploration of space and far more for research on aging and weight control. But if that's what The People want, that's what they should get.

THE PLAN: UNIONS

As an extension of their freedom of speech and assembly, workplace unions shall be permitted, but because unions introduce inefficiencies in competition they shall be discouraged, particularly for employees of the Globality and Localities.

To the extent unions are required to ensure workplace safety and other working conditions, the Globality's workplace safety regulations and enforcement should instead be expanded to ensure this. To the extent unions are used merely to raise wages, they are a corruption of market forces and so are unfair to workers in similar jobs in other companies or industries. For example why should workers who make cars be paid a different rate than workers who make toasters, merely because there are more of them or because they have more Authoritarians or more persuasive Social Dominators in their ranks who are willing to use the threat of violence (economic or otherwise) to achieve an unfair enrichment? If workers in a given job type are chronically underpaid, financial, social, or behavioral engineering tools should be brought to bear to address this issue (e.g., increasing the Standard Income, creating a "Special Standard Income" for that group (more on those concepts below), or establishing tax penalties or incentives to allow corporations to pay them more, etc.)

THE PLAN: RELIGION

As an extension of their freedom of speech and assembly, individuals shall be allowed the freedom of religion and religious expression. As organized religion has been shown to be of little or no benefit to individuals and a dangerous tool in the hands of SDAs, however, it shall be discouraged.

Besides the risks from use as a tool by SDAs, there are many other reasons why it is in the interest of The People to discourage religion. It's a huge waste of resources, for one thing. It also encourages compartmentalization, the tendency for individuals to decide that the rules in one context simply do not apply in others. This leads to all sorts of immoral and irrational behavior (e.g., aggression and violence, discrimination against outsiders, and gambling and other risk taking), to the detriment of both the individual and The People. It also encourages immoral and unethical behavior by providing a means of excusing or justifying it (e.g., "cheap grace" and tithing, which at its core is nothing more than an exchange of money for forgiveness or blessing). The "be fruitful and multiply" edict that Mormons and Catholics use to encourage large families also falls into this category because it places a needs of the religion over the needs of the species (it's also of course an extremely cynical ploy: If you can't convert them, at least try to crowd them out!)

Another great "benefit" claimed by the religious is that by offering the promise of a comfortable afterlife that it makes suffering in this life easier to bear. And by making suffering easier to bear, it increases social stability (i.e., discourages the underclasses from fomenting revolution). While these may indeed be actual benefits, it would seem to be far better to address the core issue, the need to reduce suffering by increasing living standards and the level of individual freedom and independence, rather than merely trying to cover up suffering with a smoke screen of dishonesty.

The primary means of discouraging religious belief will of course be education, since this is already by far the most effective tool at achieving this. Consumer protection laws will also be useful: Want to claim services you provide will ensure good fortune, the protection of God, or a comfortable place in the afterlife? You need to be able to prove it, just like any other business would.

Social cues that it is OK to not be religious will also greatly decreased professed belief, a tendency that will accelerate as it affects the environment that children are raised in: Attendance of services is much higher among adults with children, and that attendance is highly correlated with the religious beliefs of their children. Religious expression dies out rapidly if the parents stop practicing and a child with two non-practicing parents has less than a 5% chance of becoming devoutly religious. The Plan offers social support for this choice, not only because of its identification of organized religion as an authoritarian tool, but also because it contains a scientifically-derived moral code that is a superior replacement for those designed-by-amateurs codes found in religious tracts. The Plan also allows white lies to be told about attendance of services (which fully *half* of those who claim to be religious do, despite the irony of breaking the moral code to make it seem like you are following it): These lies, like gossip, are going to happen regardless, so rather than make hypocrites out of everyone The Plan instead must integrate this behavior into the design of the system.

THE PLAN: GAMBLING

As it is a manifestation of a human maladaptation, their tendency to overestimate the odds of unlikely events, particularly if they would be beneficial, The People shall allow but discourage gambling.

The Credential for gambling should be a relatively difficult one to get, including at least college level statistics and business management (i.e., you have to be able to show that you understand how to set the odds such that the house always wins before you're judged to be competent enough to give your money to them). This of course also means no state-sanctioned lotteries. Although no one wants to see casinos spring up on every street corner, it should be distasteful to anyone who appreciates free enterprise, or freedom in general, to pass mere behavioral engineering laws in an attempt to prevent it. Think of it a check on our educational system: When casinos die out, we'll know that we have an educational system that works.

THE PLAN: CHILDREN, FAMILIES, AND RELATIONSHIPS

Children are free individuals and their care and development is the responsibility of The People. The People will take seriously their obligation to ensure that children have the best chance of achieving their potential. Although the child-parent bond is a crucial component in human development, there is extensive evidence that a biological tie between the two is not necessary, and indeed that proper development is vastly more dependent on parenting skill and availability than on biological relationship. Therefore, there should be no presumption that the biological parents are the most suitable candidates for raising a child and must therefore compete with all other potential parents.

This is not all that different from current practice in developed nations: Abused or neglected children are routinely removed from their homes and placed elsewhere. This is the same thing, we're just

setting the bar a bit higher, and planning to prevent the abuse of children rather than waiting for it to happen and then attempt the sometimes-impossible repair of the damage after it has already been done. After all, a parent only has to live with their mistakes for 18 years, the rest of us have to live with the consequences of them for their (and our) entire lives. Early intervention is key: If at the time of delivery the parent(s) can't show they have the necessary Credentials and income (e.g., they have received welfare or wage support within the previous year), the child doesn't go home with them. Single parent households would warrant particularly close scrutiny. For example Herring (2012) reports on a wide range of studies that shows that children in step-families are at vastly greater risk via the "Cinderella effect" (e.g., the risk of being murdered by a stepfather is over 100 times as high as by a biological father). Requiring (or even allowing) an impoverished individual to raise children is not only an unfair burden on that individual, it promotes the archaic concept of children as property. What matters is what is best for the child, and anyone who claims that a biological relationship is what is most important at the very least doesn't understand the psychology of the matter and worst is a proponent of a kind of prejudice: At its core the concept that biology is what is important is exactly the same primitive and authoritarian thought process on which racism is based, and the "parent as owner" concept is akin to the justification for slavery.

But what about culture? Would raising children born in one culture in another be its own form of racism or anti-culturism? Is doing what is best for the individual worth the resulting cost to some cultures, the resulting reduction in diversity being to the detriment of everyone? Another thought experiment might help us answer that: Suppose *you* are just about to be born. Knowing what you know now, where would you choose to arrive? Would it be OK to assign you to a family and location randomly anywhere in the world? If offered the choice between being raised in single parent household living at the poverty level and living in an affluent two-parent household, which would you choose? Is your culture/religion/socioeconomic class so important to you that you would insist on being randomly assigned a position somewhere similar? Is your resentment of the upper class so entrenched that you would refuse to be assigned to a wealthy family even if that meant foregoing the benefits of being raised in an environment like that (better education, more personal freedom and power, a longer and most likely happier life)? Would you insist that you are so special just the way you are that you would refuse any changes in your upbringing that might result in your beliefs being different from what they are now? Unless you can honestly say that you'd be OK with whatever choice fate makes for you, it is simply immoral to insist that we as a people require every other newborn to face this type of random assignment (credits to Rawls (1971) and the concept of "The veil of ignorance").

This design has the additional benefit of a strong social engineering bias toward preventing "accidental" pregnancies which will help control population at the lowest socioeconomic classes and break the cycle of poverty: People are much less likely to even have children if there is a significant risk of those children being turned over to be raised by more capable parents if it turns out the biological parents are not emotionally or financially up to the task. It should be the highest honor The People can bestow upon an individual to be chosen to raise one of these children, although in some cases they should also be compensated for the time they will invest to do so.

Although various incomplete implementations of this type of policy have been attempted in the past, these primarily have been secretive exercises where little or no attempt was actually made to ensure that the children were placed in households where they'd have the best chance of succeeding. In fact many of these children ended up in institutions or even in a situation more closely resembling slavery than adoption as it is practiced today. One example is the Magdalene Laundries and associated industrial "schools". Another is Australia's Aboriginal Protection Act, a racially-motivated policy that resulted in the systematic removal of mixed-race children from Aboriginal families with the stated goal of protecting them from discrimination, unfortunately transferring many of these children not into stable families but instead into orphanages or internment camps where they fared no better. It is also notable that the popular term for this policy is "Stolen Generations" the very name being an attempt to promote the concept of children as property and to characterize the process of removing them not as an offense against the children but instead against their parents.

This directive also addresses the issue of abortion: Because children are, from conception, the responsibility of The People, The People have the final say on what happens to them. That is, neither individual freedom nor the right to privacy extends to the gestation, delivery, or rearing of a child. Whether to allow or deny the right to an abortion will be decided by statutes designed by The People, rather than individuals or the courts. This also applies to enforcing the obligation to an abortion: For example, the statutes must define what happens if a three month old fetus is determined to have an uncorrectable genetic defect, or is being carried by a woman with a serious drug addiction.

Credentials could be used to ensure another type of safety, a protection from being victimized in relationships by certain types of individuals. In many cases a step toward this type of protection is provided by making sex offender registries publicly available, but that is a very weak protection because it relies on criminal convictions whereas many (probably most) individuals who will commit these crimes have never been convicted (in some cases because they have never committed the crime before, in others simply because they've never been caught). And it does nothing to protect people from a wide variety of other types of abusive relationships, including with people who are prone to domestic violence, or who simply are in relationships with people of the wrong sexual orientation, in most cases in an attempt to appear to be heterosexual when in fact they are not.

To address these issues there should be a "Relationship" Credential which would be acquired with the Standard Adult set. It would include some education (basic relationship psychology), a check to ensure the individual had not been convicted of domestic violence, but would also require a brain scan to distinguish sexual orientation (a procedure no more an invasion of privacy than is a heart scan done as part of a yearly physical). If the scan comes back "heterosexual" or "homosexual", no problem and the individual would get the Credential and their scan results would be given to them and no copy retained by the scanner. If the scan comes back "pedophile", or some other classification that has been shown to be impossible to allow those types of relationships to exist without compromising the security or freedom of any potential partner of that individual, no Credential would be granted. Similarly, a conviction for domestic abuse would also result in that Credential being revoked until remedial work had been done to ensure that individual had learned to control their emotions to eliminate the risk recurrence of this problem.

With this system in place, not only could all individuals protect themselves (and their families) from entering into problematic relationships with non-Credentialed individuals (especially hiring a non-Credentialed individual as a teacher, Little League coach, or clergy-member), but because sharing their scans would become convention as part of premarital counselling a lot of those types of surprises (and disappointments) would also be prevented, all while having negligible impact on the freedoms of unaffected individuals.

THE PLAN: INHERITANCE

The accumulated assets of an individual will revert to The People at the time of their death. Alternative arrangements can be made by will, but the beneficiaries must be public corporations (nonprofit or for profit) that have no direct or indirect financial connection to any relative of the benefactor. Gifts to individuals must be less than \$10K USD per person per year.

Family-based inheritance is the single largest source of inequality in modern civilization. How could it possibly be fair that the children of wealthy families not only receive benefits in education and experience over their entire development that children in poor families lack, but also are simply *given* large sums of money and property as a guaranteed side effect of the randomness of being born? As such, instead of inheritance and inheritance taxes, it must be presumed that an individual's assets will revert to The People, which will auction them off and use the revenue to reduce other taxes on The People. The elimination of inheritance is therefore a key feature that will enable a sales-tax-based system of revenue to work without being regressive. It should also prove to be a major economic stimulus: You can't take it with you and since you can't give it to your relatives either, you might as well spend it and enjoy yourself. The statutes would have to be written to encourage this: While you can't give more than \$10K in cash or property to your daughter as a wedding present, you can blow as much as you want on her wedding (all of that taxable, of course).

Because many (most?) individuals would object to the idea of just transferring their assets into the government's general fund, it should be possible to earmark their assets to go to particular projects and/or Localities, in the Goals section of their System account or in a will if they have one. Even so, non-profit corporations will become much more powerful under The Plan because of this influx of money. As such, it will be necessary to regulate transparency in the financial statements of these organizations to ensure that the money is being spent the way the donors intended. The net result in most cases will still be a reduction in the need for government expenditures in the domains these non-profits serve, which in turn will provide the required reduction in tax rates.

These rules must also be applied to religious organizations because they will continue to receive assets from SDAs and other conservatives for the foreseeable future. In fact, given that the Authoritarian instincts are to support their relatives to the almost total exclusion of any "outsiders" (i.e., you can't get any more ingroup than a nuclear family), the only viable substitute for them will be being able to donate their assets to a religious organization and so will be a requirement of the initial Plan implementation to prevent them revolting. Many of these religious organizations will therefore soon have more money than they know what to do with. No worries: Although some will spend that windfall on lavish

buildings and other frivolity, at least revenue from that construction will flow back to the local economy and increase land values (and the resulting land-lease rates). And what with poverty having been wiped out via other features of The Plan, most of them will not find sufficient charity work to be done locally and will have to expand their focus to improving conditions in the Third World. Which of course also is common-cause with The Plan.

The prohibition on inheritance necessarily rules out using life insurance to skirt these rules. It is necessary, however, that parents have life insurance to ensure that their children and surviving spouse will be cared for until the children are financially self-supporting. As a natural monopoly with no potential for competition to decrease costs, The People should provide this insurance (e.g., a monthly payment of half the Standard Income per child) should no other support be available (e.g., other insurance, wrongful death suit, etc.).

Note that this clause also means that The Plan makes no accommodation for those who believe that they have a right to the land based on their ancestry. Leases for land in "Reservations" or other accommodations for past injustices along with any outstanding funds due will be transferred to individuals or corporations as the affected individuals prefer, the reservation established initially as a separate Locality, then turned over to be run by The People as any other Locality would be.

THE PLAN: HEALTH CARE

Health care is a fundamental human right and the payment for it a Natural Monopoly. Therefore the Globality will manage health care, including dental, hearing, vision, mental health care including addiction treatment, and maternity care including free access to birth control, for all The People.

There is no point in arguing the "fundamental human right" aspect of this as it has already been decided: Show up at any hospital emergency room in any city in the world with a serious injury, and you will be treated regardless of health insurance or even citizenship. The issues with addiction and mental illness even more clear cut: Besides the "humane treatment is a requirement" justification, it simply makes financial sense to treat people before they commit crimes rather than after, at which point we have to pay to house them in prisons in addition to the expense of treating the original condition. This being the case, all that's really left is to figure out the most efficient way to provide these things.

Social engineering will play a large role in designing this system to maximize its quality and efficiency. For example, co-pays must be required for most services, and should be set high enough to discourage waste but not so high as to discourage proper use of the system to address small problems before they become big ones. There must be an emphasis on preventative care, possibly including financial incentives to ensure healthy habits (e.g., possibly tied into the GSF service requirement).

THE PLAN: STANDARD (MINIMUM) WAGE

The Globality will determine the lowest wage such that a standard 40-hour work week will provide sufficient income for a single person to live a secure and dignified life in each Locality. This shall

income level shall be known as the Standard Income, and the hourly rate the Standard Wage for that Locality.

All employees will receive at least the Standard Wage. If market conditions do not result in an employer having to pay the Standard Wage for labor in a particular job classification, the Globality will provide supplement payments to them to make up the difference (the Standard Income Supplement).

Note that the proposals for pensions and welfare depend on this one, and it will also apply to compensation for running The System. Setting the Standard Income will require all the People's input, and they must each keep in mind that they themselves may be living on it at some point. It will definitely need to be higher than current poverty levels, where unexpected home or vehicle repairs can mean giving up all luxuries or even having to cut back on necessities like food. But a certain frugality should be required: Standard Income earners shouldn't be able to afford new luxury cars and 5 star hotels. They should, however be able to afford to drive a safe and reliable vehicle if that is a necessity in their Locality and to travel one or two weeks out of the year or engage in other recreational activities if they prefer.

Instead of imposing a minimum wage, the actual rate an employer will pay per hour for labor will depend on market conditions and the Goal unemployment rate. If the actual unemployment rate is below the Goal, the SIS for those jobs that pay less than the SI will decrease, and vice versa. In areas and industries with a high level of churn the resulting variable subsidy will not require any significant changes to current practice. In other areas, employers will need to learn to pay attention to the unemployment and subsidy rates because periodically (quarterly?) the subsidy, and therefore possibly their overhead, may change. There should also be some social engineering incentives provided to the individual to encourage changing jobs or relocating if the subsidy is lower in some other job they are qualified to do (e.g., by paying them a percentage of the difference as a signing bonus).

The SIS will apply to all jobs, full or part time, and makes no allowance for "tips" or "training wages" or other customs or practices that may affect a worker's take home pay. If an individual believes that the training they are essentially paying for with a reduced income is worth that cost, or that they'll be able to make up the difference in tips, they'll accept a job that pays less what the SIS assumes as a baseline. But because SIS is managed such that it governs the unemployment rate, if they don't believe they are being paid what they are worth, they will simply take advantage of the low unemployment rate and change jobs, leaving the employer with a more expensive position to fill.

To prevent widespread fraud that offering the SIS to the self-employed would cause, the SIS will only be available through public corporations. Smaller and newer companies, sole proprietors, and independent contractors will continue to operate as they do now, with complete flexibility on wage rates, payment arrangements, and working hours. Although they will be freed from burdensome income taxes, withholding from wages, and other reporting, they will have more trouble attracting low-skill full-time employees who will obviously gravitate towards larger companies that can provide them with increased wages via the SIS system. Note that this design also completely eliminates the "independent contractor" and "part time" loopholes that many corporations use to get around

minimum wage and other benefit requirements (and the resulting enforcement bureaucracy attempting to prevent that): By offering a potentially huge *direct* benefit to the wage earners, a benefit that doesn't even actually cost the corporation anything to provide (other than paperwork that is less than what they do now to process income tax withholdings), there will be no need to even worry about the classification issue anymore.

The SI and SIS are in lieu of the FairTax "prebate", Earned Income Tax Credits (EIC), and because it also factors in percentage disability, Supplemental Security Income (SSI). It is a vast simplification over these programs *and* a design that brings market forces (competition) to bear: If an area has a high unemployment rate, SIS will be higher and employers will therefore have an incentive to create work in that area. Conversely, individuals in those areas will have an incentive to relocate to an area with a lower unemployment rate because they would receive signing bonuses and moving assistance from the GRF when doing so. Together these two features will significantly reduce overall unemployment rates and the resulting SIS costs to The People.

The SI will therefore also affect Locality population which introduces an additional corrective influence on it: If the SI is set too low in a given Locality, individuals will find it preferable to live someplace less expensive. Vacancy rates for rentals and properties for sale will therefore increase, which will push down rents and property values, providing a correction to the too-low SI. But it will also cause unemployment to decrease and so employers will start to have to pay more employees at rates above the SI to retain them. So employers and property owners have an incentive to set the SI value higher. But if it is set too high, population in a Locality will increase which will in turn increase unemployment and so the SIS which will lead to higher taxes on everyone. To prevent Localities from gaming the system, the ratio of SIS payments to revenue from sales taxes collected in each Locality should also be factored into the SI calculation. Collecting the cost of living information and setting the SI again will be a key part of living under The Plan, and a process that every individual has a high motivation to attend to in order to ensure that it is done right.

THE PLAN: PENSIONS

The ability to retire from work at a certain age is a fundamental human right, and the funding for that retirement a Natural Monopoly. The People shall manage a pension system to provide for the support of retired persons at the Standard Income level starting at the age where an individual has lived an estimated 80% of their lives.

Economies of scale require that the pension system be administered globally, to be derived from global revenues. Allowing corporations, unions, or other organizations to manage pensions is fundamentally unfair because the amount an individual receives is highly dependent on accidents of circumstance.

The eligibility age for pension will be determined on an individual basis such that the individual will be able to spend 20% of their estimated life span be spent in retirement if they so choose (if you're wondering if this estimate can actually be reliably made, ask an insurance actuary: It's a business and a science). There should be no forced retirement age, however, and the pension must be paid starting at this age regardless of work status.

Pensions will be the same for all individuals, the Standard Income defined for the Locality in which the individual worked (weighted averaged if there are multiple). Individuals should be expected to supplement this amount with individual savings or other assets, or by continuing to work if they prefer a higher standard of living. This design has the benefit that pensioners will be highly motivated to ensure that the Standard Income level is set correctly for each Locality, and will play an active role in both local and global governments where their combined experience will be a great asset to The People.

Note that there may be dragons here too: Many private and union pensions are underfunded and/or have overpromised benefits, some of them criminally so, especially when declining populations (which are inevitable under any scenario) are taken into account. When these assets are folded into the Globality for distribution, land-lease rates for a new Locality will need to be adjusted such that this debt can eventually be repaid.

THE PLAN: WELFARE

In the event insufficient work is available, the Globality will supplement an individual's work to guaranty income at or above the Standard Income. If an individual is partially disabled, the Globality will supplement wages paid by an employer in proportion to the degree of disability. In either of these cases, education and retraining, relocation, and other support will be provided to the individual to ensure they have the necessary Credential in finance and the skills they may require to get work.

The Standard Income Subsidy should eliminate the need for these "Globality Corps" jobs in nearly all cases, but in large-scale disruptive events (natural disasters, plant closings, war, etc.) additional work may need to be identified, and the individual retrained or relocated to do that work (e.g., possibly including additional military training or deployment). This should not just be make-work or busy-work: Even unskilled labor brings great mental-health benefits to those without any work at all, and it furthermore discourages malingering and denies SDAs one of their favorite tools for cutting benefits to those who need them most: Experiments have shown that even animals have a concept of fairness in compensation, and if we do not make welfare recipients work for their income not even the most generous of us will be able to resist the temptation to introduce suffering into their lives by cutting their benefits. A strong desire to punish free-riders is in the nature of even Neurotypicals and so one of those things that we cannot override by just making a rule about it.

Combined with the removal of the financial burden of children from those who can't afford to take care of them, it should be expected that all other forms of welfare, including workers compensation, unemployment insurance, child support, housing assistance, food stamps, etc., and the massive bureaucracies that have grown to support them, will be discontinued. Besides shrinking the size of government and the taxes needed to support it, it will be far easier to prevent fraud and other abuse of the system with this "single payer" design: By requiring that everyone work and that any wage subsidy payments go through public corporations it will be possible for individuals at many levels to detect these abuses. For example, any shareholder would be aware of any discrepancies between sales tax payments, gross revenue, and overhead.

THE PLAN: PLANISH

A common language being a necessary component of global harmony, a new language, Planish, will be developed using the best available information and technology. Planish must be taught from the earliest grades of school in all Localities alongside the existing natural language of that Locality.

All individuals will therefore be educated to be bilingual (at least). Globality and Locality communication with individuals will be primarily in Planish and secondarily in the existing language of the Locality. All communication between Localities with different existing languages will be in Planish.

Learning Planish will be by far the most difficult and time-consuming part of the transition to The Plan for most people, even though it will be designed to be far easier to master than any other language has ever been. The goal should be to have fluent English speakers functional in Planish within a few weeks, and fluent in both spoken and written forms within a year, with a similar timeframe for those with little or no experience with English but a talent for languages and/or a mastery of several others.

In addition to the difficulty issue, there are the issues of cultural pride and aesthetics to address. The former can reasonably be dismissed as being just another manifestation of tribalism, which by the time The Plan has been approved by a Locality must have been generally acknowledged to be a bad thing. The latter is more difficult, since Planish will probably feel like using baby-talk or pidgin/creole/Ebonics at first. This of course is not coincidental since those types of simplifications are exactly what English needs to make it easier to learn and more efficient to use. At first there will also be no quotes from poetry or literature, witticisms, or even clichés for people to use in their everyday speech to dress it up as they do now. But like current languages, Planish will soon acquire these things, and because it is a new language it holds the unique promise that it becomes even better over time.

It will bear constant repeating that language is just a technology, a tool we use to accomplish a particular task. It is not a defining characteristic of who we are any more than trying to continue doing your accounting work on a 16-bit computer running MSDOS would be. Existing natural languages are not only primitive, poorly designed things, but they even lack any upgrade path now that this has become necessary.

Although it will take a lot of work from a lot of people to develop this language, we can reasonably predict that features of the new language will include:

- no verb conjugation
- no verb tenses: Tense will be indicated by modifier words
- regular spelling: if you can say it, you can spell it
- no noun genders
- no tones (as found in Chinese and some other Asian languages)
- maximizing information density by minimizing homonyms and other ambiguities
- provide pronoun gender specificity and independence (e.g., that genderless singular pronoun that's missing from English)
- maximize reliability of machine translation to/from other languages

- minimize vocabulary size through the use of compound and modifier words and by restricting slang and jargon
- recordable with ISO-latin1 character set
- easily generated with a standard US keyboard
- retain as much vocabulary from English (the most widely spoken second language) as possible to make it as easy as possible for those with some English-language experience to learn.

Note that Esperanto, Interlingua, and other previous designed languages are non-starters for the role of Planish: Not only were they designed using inadequate resources and prior to most of these requirements even being determined, but they each also lack some of the required structural features.

The bias toward English in the design of Planish is intentional, and anyone who objects should consider this: If we don't implement Planish now, within a few hundred years everyone will be speaking English. Given that a common language is a requirement for a global civilization, and that English already has a vast head start in most key fields (e.g., business, science, and foreign relations) there is no way to prevent this from eventually coming to pass other than designing something better than English that is still easy for English-speakers to learn. This is one-time opportunity with a relatively small window of viability: Once English becomes the most commonly used language, something that will occur within decades, it will be impossible to ever displace it. Failure to design and implement Planish now means subjecting not only the current population of earth to the hell that is learning English as a second language, but also saddling all future generations with the handicap of its poor design. If nothing else, we must do it for the school kids of the future who will thank us for sparing them uncounted hours in the tedious study of spelling and grammar.

THE PLAN: EDUCATION

A common educational background being a necessary component of global harmony, a common set of educational standards will be defined by the Globality, with education to these standards to be ensured by Localities. Education shall be free to all individuals as long as standard progress is maintained.

Free education shall be provided at all ages and levels, including childcare from infancy. All schools shall be accredited by the Globality based on curriculum and student performance. All schools will receive per-student compensation at a rate fixed by the Locality. Localities may retain public school systems or outsource some or all of this responsibility to private-sector schools, but may not compensate public systems differently than private-sector schools. Competition is the essence of improvement.

The Globality assessment method should assume no fixed grade-level system and students should progress based on their performance. Students must remain in school until certain Credentials are acquired, including those for basic Planish and local language, The Plan (i.e., political science, economics and finance, psychology and social engineering, and the law), and the underlying STEM fields. Psychological instruction should include not only full exploration of the many types of imperfections in human thought and their diagnosis and treatment (including both self-diagnosis and recognition of symptoms in others), but also child development and parenting. Necessarily this means that subjects

that will be de-emphasized include “social studies” (which inappropriately tends to concentrate on non-essential fields including sociology, history, geography, and anthropology), literature, and native language study other than the language of the Locality.

Math and “hard” science curriculums should shift emphasis from highly specialized and theoretical topics that few individuals will make use of in their adult life and toward topics that are more likely to be required for them to make good personal and public policy decisions. For example, rather than teaching physics and calculus, which few scientists and engineers even need to use in their careers, the math curriculum should focus on statistics, which is a set of tools useful in nearly all fields and aspects of personal decisionmaking, and the science curriculum on those areas required to make good decisions in the domains of technology, engineering, public health, and economics.

It would also seem a good opportunity to redesign the way history is taught. Although it's been said that those who do not know history are condemned to repeat it, this is clearly not the case because historians have been writing and teaching history for thousands of years and yet there has been little or no reduction in the incidences of SDAs victimizing their fellow human beings. Nor unfortunately have historians even made any significant contribution to the identification of this fact. So let's stop trying to teach names and dates throughout grade school, very little of which is apparently retained by most students nor has been demonstrated to provide much benefit even for those rare few who do retain some of it (indeed, by heavily emphasizing the history of their own people, teaching history is actually a great way to propagate nationalism, which is exactly the opposite of what an advanced civilization should be doing). Instead history should be taught as part of the psychology curriculum, perhaps in a year-long high-school-level course on "The History of Authoritarianism". In that course, topics such as feudalism, slavery, genocide, imperialism, and pretty much any war you pick would be covered with the goal of identifying which tools SDAs used to get the Neurotypicals to go along with them.

Implementing The Plan now will also save the kids of the future from uncounted additional hours of having to learn the history of what happened between now and then. We can either add additional wars, political intrigues, and economic disasters to their plate, or give them a long blank space filled with nothing but boring, rational, bureaucratic decisions.

THE PLAN: DEFENSE AND DISASTER RELIEF

The greatest deterrent to aggression against Planish Localities is a trained and armed population. Every citizen is expected to receive military training and to serve a fixed term in the service of The People as part of the Global Security Force (GSF), their training to emphasize skills necessary to repel an occupying force (i.e., guerilla warfare). Additional training will consist of skills necessary to stabilize a Locality (or foreign country) that has suffered the effects of a natural disaster or government failure (e.g., first aid, logistics, crowd control, etc.).

There shall be no standing military, but instead a smaller training force that will also serve as GSF commanders and first-responders in times of urgent need.

Citizens will be required to maintain Credentials on current military policies, tactics, and equipment (most efficiently using on-line games and other simulations). Citizens will be compensated for the time spent on maintaining these Credentials, but also must maintain physical conditioning necessary for performance (i.e., failing an annual physical may require unpaid remedial work).

Current military technology relies primarily on offensive weaponry. Which is ironic (or maybe even hypocritical) considering the SDAs have sold it to us as "national defense". Conversion to a true defensive force will not only save The People the vast majority of the expense for this capability, but would eliminate the possibility of wars of adventure and opportunity (which is nearly all of them, when you think about it). The concept of "Fight them over there so we don't have to fight them here" is stereotypical of authoritarian immorality, where any suffering or death in an outgroup is a reasonable tradeoff for protecting the ingroup from deprivation.

Resilient design principles shall be used in any system that must continue to be usable in case of war or natural disaster.

Seems like every time there's a storm anywhere the electricity goes out, putting people's lives at risk. It would likely become completely unavailable for the duration of any war. Our electrical grid reliability must be massively increased by burying power lines, making redundant connections, making it possible to share electrical power generated by PV/wind/cogeneration/hybrid automobile systems in emergency situations, and including resilient principles in the design of residential and commercial buildings (i.e., they don't go pitch black or freeze or otherwise become uninhabitable when the electric or gas supply goes out).

Cell phone reliability in these events could also be vastly improved by including a phone-to-phone store and forward architecture in them such that even when a cell tower goes out email and SMS messages could still be sent and received by phones in the dark area.

The Manager of the Globality shall have the authority to respond to attack or imminent threat by counterattacking military targets only, but must receive authorization from The People within seven days to continue that action or expand it to include the leadership of the enemy.

Far too many people still die in wars, which means social engineering tools must be brought to bear on the problem. As a leaderless society, wars will be fought by the Planish using a complete different goal: Recognizing that no government that follows the direction of the Neurotypicals which make up the majority of the population will declare a war of aggression against another nation, all wars will be determined to be illegitimate acts of the leaders of a nation. As such, the primary target of military action shall be officials and employees of the national government (i.e., every individual who continues to work for that government, from the President down to the local tax collector, will be considered a legitimate target). This should provide a *major* disincentive to choosing a Planish Locality as a target for aggression, and severely impair the functioning of that government should the SDAs in charge fail to appreciate that fact.

As a government of Neurotypicals, the Planish will not declare a war of aggression on another nation. However, if it can be determined beyond a reasonable doubt that a majority of the citizens of another nation wish to implement The Plan, the government of that nation must be declared illegitimate. If after a minimum 4 week negotiation period the leaders of that nation refuse to resign, a war of liberation may be declared against them.

The acceptable ratio of civilian casualties in an attack on a military target shall be 1 to 4. The acceptable ration of civilian casualties in an attack on a leadership target shall be 1 to 1.

Because there is a large overlap in requirements for disaster relief and military operations, including almost complete overlap in logistics, military response capability should be designed to accommodate both needs.

A Global Relocation Force will be set up to manage relocation of individuals as necessary to ensure their security and quality of life, and ensure maximum efficiency of the welfare system.

Sometimes the nature of a disaster requires that individuals be relocated, or that the necessary infrastructure be relocated to them. The GRF will manage both of these alternatives. If the need is definitely temporary, the GRF will arrange to move the infrastructure to The People, whether it be electrical generators, water treatment plants, or temporary housing. If the previous infrastructure cannot be repaired or replaced quickly enough, or that physical security cannot be guaranteed (as in the case of refugees from war), moving them to another location to provide that infrastructure is the preferred option. So, for example in the case of plant shutdowns or other cases of large-scale unemployment (the availability of gainful employment being a necessary part of the infrastructure), the GRF will provide for the relocation of individuals in either small or large groups as necessary and as dictated by the availability of infrastructure support in other areas.

THE PLAN: IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEES

Each Plannish Locality must accept as many immigrants and refugees as possible without significantly impacting the quality of life of the existing residents.

Immigrants shall have the Standard Adult set of Credentials prior to entering the Locality, or be held in secure facilities if it is not possible to train and qualify them in their country of origin. Citizenship shall be granted immediately for accepted Credentialed individuals.

Because The Plan will provide The People with uniquely peaceful and prosperous communities, Plannish Localities will be in high demand as destinations for immigrants and refugees. As has been shown with immigration into most countries, especially the US, those who emigrate to seek a better life are typically the most capable individuals and have the best chance of succeeding under The Plan. Therefore migration into the Globality shall be encouraged to the greatest extent possible without overburdening any Locality. The GRF will facilitate this process, especially in cases where large numbers of individuals arrive as the result of natural or human-caused disasters in their country of origin.

It is important for existing residents of a Locality to keep in mind that in many cases immigration into a Locality will be temporary: As individuals are trained to use the Plan and the System there will naturally be a strong desire to apply it to their country of origin where friends or family members will in most cases continue to reside, and to return once The Plan has been adopted there. Immigration will therefore be a primary marketing tool for The Plan, both because people in other countries who may be considering emigrating will be highly motivated to get their Standard Adult Credentials, and once in a Plannish Locality will be highly motivated to work toward adoption of The Plan in their country of origin.

THE PLAN: CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

The People shall not deprive any individual of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Individuals accused of a crime shall be considered innocent until proven guilty and guaranteed the right to a free, fair, public, and timely trial.

No law or punishment shall be imposed retroactively unless it is to the benefit of the accused.

The People have the right and the obligation to review all criminal trials, and to modify sentencing as needed.

As punishment has been shown to have at best a very limited deterrent effect and long-term incarceration to have a negative effect on the individual and The People, it shall be the stated goal of The People to rehabilitate and release individuals convicted of crimes to the extent that this is compatible with the goal of ensuring the safety and security of the individual and The People.

The criminal and penal codes, as they exist in all countries but especially in the US, are undoubtedly the poorest examples of behavioral engineering ever foisted on The People. The purpose of these codes should be to ensure the safety of the people by ensuring that other individuals don't infringe on their freedoms, and do so as cost effectively as possible. Instead, because they were primarily designed and are managed by SDAs, the system currently functions primarily as a primitive screening tool, simply removing large numbers of individuals from the population and housing them at large expense in facilities that are virtually designed to increase recidivism. And unfortunately this suits SDAs just fine because marginalizing and punishing, aggressively and violently if possible, any individual they can is just their *raison d'etre* (e.g., see Duckitt 2009). Until we can remove SDAs from positions of responsibility in this matter, the system will never work properly.

The first step in redesigning the system is to expunge from the criminal code drug use, sodomy, and any other activity judged to be criminal based on "moral" justifications, particularly if these are derived from religious prohibitions. Only activities that can be shown to pose a direct threat to individual freedom or security can be allowed into the criminal code.

The penal code must be rewritten to ensure that rehabilitation and thereby reducing recidivism rates are the primary goals, with victim restitution being a high second priority. To provide the benefits of competition, rehabilitation facilities shall be run by corporations, with bonuses and penalties specified

contractually and by statute for their effectiveness (e.g., there might be bonuses for turning out an individual with a steady well-paying job (enabling them to pay restitution) 1 year from release, and/or a penalty if an individual reoffends in that period). Removing the offender from the environment that caused them to offend will be a primary tool in the process, so both the rehabilitation facility and any half-way houses involved must be in a different Locality than the one where the crime was committed.

To ensure proper compensation for the Corporation and proper treatment and facilities for the individual undergoing rehabilitation, individual cases should be sent out for bid, with the most difficult cases therefore coming with the highest payment amounts. These corporations will (and indeed should) supply work for their inmates, working and living conditions to be inspected and regulated just as they would be in any other industry. There would be a variety of incentives to ensure proper work ethic, including payment (which could be saved, or prepaid as victim compensation), or perhaps tying release not to calendar time, but to hours worked or credentials acquired.

Any individual convicted of a crime will have all of their Credentials revoked, and must retest to regain at least the Standard Adult Set prior to their release, and their conviction shall be included in their Credentials during their parole.

Although correlation between SDA and organized criminal activity has not been shown yet, there is a high correlation between the behaviors common to both groups. Whether it be a street gang, drug cartel, or the mafia itself, if you were putting an organization like this together, wouldn't you naturally include as many Authoritarians, with their unflinching loyalty, relativistic moral code, and willingness to die for the group, as possible? If this relationship is shown to be causal, The People should make special efforts to identify at-risk individuals and begin treatment for any criminal or anti-social behavior starting from a very young age. As is the case with the general criminal element but which may particularly apply to Authoritarians who are particularly responsive to social cues, removing the individual from the environment where the crime was committed would be an important tool in reducing recidivism.

Note that there are a lot of things that have the force of law in many countries that are not specified in this section (e.g., the US Miranda warning) as these should be more properly specified in the penal code than in The Plan itself.

THE PLAN: ART, MUSIC, HOBBIES, SPORT, AND OTHER DIVERSIONS

An entertained People are a happy People and The People shall see to it that they have their amusements, including investing in resources necessary for these activities to flourish.

One of the major human needs that is satisfied by organized religion is for fellowship. This need can be met instead by encouraging individuals to pursue activities in these other areas. Public investment in the required infrastructure (parks, sports fields, recreation centers, and publicly accessible meeting and hobbyist areas) must be encouraged.

To the extent sports are a sublimation of tribalism, interLocality competition is to be encouraged.

But see Sipes (1973)

THE PLAN: GOALS

If you think about it, it's actually kind of astounding that we don't as a people ever set goals for our government. How do we ever expect to achieve something (even something as basic as "good government") if we don't ever even define what it is we want? While specific Goals are not part of The Plan, the process by which this set of Goals is defined (i.e. as a component of The System) should be. The set shown here is merely a placeholder that shows the format of what the actual Goals of The People should look like.

In many cases, the Goal setting process will be a negotiation with the Managers: The people will propose a goal, the manager will say "To decrease vehicle fatalities by 5%, we'll need to spend \$X on highway improvements and add \$Y to the cost of each car for improved safety equipment" at which point The People may say "OK, do that" or "What about if we just do the road upgrades?". Once a target and cost is agreed upon, it becomes a standard which will be used to assess the performance of the Manager in following years.

The top item in the Goals section will be the current Local and Global budgets that the individual will be encouraged to adjust priorities and the numbers in to reflect their own priorities. The Managers at each level should pull this data from The People each budget interval (quarterly?) when preparing the budget for the next interval to adjust the priorities for recurring items (one-off or new items approved in The System will be included automatically).

Sample Goals:

- The Globality shall distribute 25% of its income back to the Localities for infrastructure projects approved by The People (inter-Locality transportation projects, flood control, Parkland purchases, etc.). Each Locality shall receive at least 15% of the revenue it contributes back in this form unless a lower percentage is approved by that Locality.
- The target yearly inflation rate shall be 2%, base interest rate 3%, and growth in GDP 4%.
- The unemployment rate shall be 5% maximum.
- The Standard Income and median income above that level shall increase by 1% more than the inflation rate.
- The Standard Income in (whatever) Locality should be increased/decreased by X% (i.e., this is an individual's opinion about whether the SI is set too high or too low for their Locality).
- Locality debt should decrease by a rate such that Locality debt averages zero by the year 2050.
- Funding for basic research shall be set at 5% of income (the US currently spends about 3% of GDP, a quarter of that being for military research)
- Military spending shall decrease by 5% per year.
- Corporate subsidies shall decrease by 5% per year or eliminated entirely.
- The Globality Fear Index shall remain below 20% and the Happiness Index above 70%.
- Government consumption as a percentage of GDP shall decrease to 27% (optimal is 17%, the US is currently about twice that, and some European countries are running over 50%).

- Educational targets shall be 95% completing grade 12 by age 20, 30% completing a 4-year college degree by age 25, and 5% completing a master's degree or higher by age 30. To be established by the year 2050.
- The target global population shall be 1 billion by the year 2100, with adjustments to birth rate being the sole mechanism for achieving this (i.e., no fair falling behind and arranging a genocide to catch up!)
- Population density and agricultural production efficiency should be maintained or increased to allow at least 50% of habitable land to be set aside as Parkland by the year 2100.
- The crime rate shall decrease by 5% per year, number of individuals incarcerated by 10% per year.
- Percentage of people who smoke will decrease by 5%.
- Vehicle fatalities will decrease by 5%.
- Overall energy efficiency will increase by 5% per year, and consumption decrease by 5% per year.

THE PLAN: TAX RATES

These rates shall be reviewed and approved by The People on a yearly basis, based on input from their Global Manager. Note that all of the amounts shown here are just examples at this point, with the exact rates to be calculated once an entire budget has been produced and the necessary revenue determined. In any case, the effective rates will be much lower than under any other political/economic system because of massive decreases in military spending, the fraud and overall low efficiency that are characteristic of existing taxation systems, and the benefits of introducing competition into a large number of areas where it currently does not operate effectively.

Also note that the process of setting tax rates is completely open and transparent and approved by The People. There is no risk of special interests (or their lobbyists and resulting corruption of representatives) having any undue influence on the process. Indeed, these groups will probably find that investments even in propaganda will backfire on them as The People will tend to retaliate against any such attempts at manipulation (social engineering). Therefore we are free to implement a system free of the serious flaws in the FairTax proposal (lack of adjustability by product/service type, and having to religiously adhere to the "new = taxed" and "old = untaxed" dogma which would decimate the homebuilding industry, etc.)

Unless otherwise specified, the Global sales tax rate shall be 15%.

Taxes on alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, and other recreational drugs shall be 25%.

Taxes on new vehicles shall be set at (purchase price) [^] 0.28.

Taxes on used vehicles shall be set at 5%.

Taxes on cash withdrawals shall be 5%.

Taxes on gambling bets shall be 2%.

Taxes on stock, bond, and commodity purchases shall be 2%, to be applied when an individual or corporation initially buys into an individual product or product fund.

- This is in lieu of capital gains tax, and because it is a front-end load also accounts to some extent for differences between short and long term gains. Note that transactions mutual fund managers make would not be subject to taxes, but that it will be a big disincentive for individuals to purchase extremely short-term (i.e., day traders).

Taxes on real estate purchases shall be 5%.

- This new (at least for the US) tax is a bit of financial engineering: It would have negligible effect on an individual's purchasing habits, yet would generate tremendous revenue and from the individuals best able to supply it. Unlike FairTax, which applies a full 30% rate to new home purchases and 0% to existing home purchases, the low rate here will encourage building, not decimate it.

Taxes on energy shall be (5 + progressive-carbon)%. The "progressive carbon" component would be something of the form $X * (Y ^ Z)$ where X is dollars per kg of carbon released, Y would be the years the program had been in place, and Z the required rate of increase. The goal would be to have renewables taxed at 5%, low-carbon fuels like natural gas at something like 7%, and high carbon fuels like coal at something like 10% the first year, with the latter *predictably* increasing to something like 30% over 20 years and progressively higher after that.

Taxes on permanent building or energy generation products shall be 5%.

- To encourage investment in improvements to the land, the discount here being recouped over time in higher land lease prices.

Taxes on energy efficiency products shall be 5%.

Taxes on food items shall be 5%.

THE PLAN: LIST OF CREDENTIALS

This is a proposed list of the Credentials for The Plan 1.0. This list will require continuous refinement by The People.

1) Standard Adult Set

This would include credentials required to function as an adult citizen. This includes basic use of The System and education in the fields that it requires (law, economics, etc.), psychology (including mood regulation and diagnosing mental illness), and personal finance.

2) Childrearing

As specified above, The System will require a much more organized and engineered approach to childrearing. Besides these Credentials a fundamental restructuring of child support systems will be required including the elimination of orphanages and most foster home care in favor of permanent

placements/adoption. To encourage the participation of all suitable parents and ensure the best outcomes for the children, The People will provide sliding-scale compensation to the parents for their services. For example a Neurotypical infant adopted by a Level 1 Credentialed parent would come with minimal compensation, a 12 year old with mental or developmental disorders adopted by a Level 3 parent would come with a high rate of compensation.

Level 1: basic parenting skills, child development psychology (for all parents)

Level 2: Older and special-needs children (adoptive parents, child care providers)

Level 3: Child development + clinical psych degrees (trainers/coaches/child services)

3) Firearms

Unfortunately research on this issue has been restricted by SDAs in the US for decades, to the point that it is difficult to know exactly what the appropriate policies will be. Public safety and defense preparedness (GSF) will be the main emphases for Plan Credentials in firearms. Although it may or may not be necessary to register weapons themselves, the Credentialing process itself will support intervention as necessary. For example, if an individual has a Level 2 Credential, and their situation changes (a child or mentally ill person becomes part of the household), the Credential may be reduced to Level 1, requiring that any firearms they own be stored off site (e.g., they'll get an email requiring that they log into The System and confirm that this has been done). This will be in lieu of systems based on restricting access to particular types of weapons. Education and hands-on training are key components of the Credential. For example, to qualify for a Level 2 Credential an individual must have demonstrated that they know that a gun in the home is more likely to be used to injure or kill a guest or occupant of that home than to be successfully used against an intruder.

Level 1: skill and safety on all weapon types (all citizens as part of GSF training)

Level 2: On-site storage of weapons

Level 3: Concealed carry

Level 4: Training, special weapons (GSF officers)

4) Building and engineering

Licensing for building contractors is poorly regulated, varying greatly between jurisdictions and with little enforcement or public input into the process. It is also inconvenient for customers to verify this information and so frequently it just doesn't get done. On the high end, Professional Engineering (PE) time is very expensive and those engineers unnecessarily overqualified for most of the work they do, resulting in a majority of buildings having little or no professional engineering work put into them.

Level 1: Trades (plumbing, electrical, HVAC, etc.)

Level 2: GC (2 trades plus business administration)

Level 3: Designer (like a PE, but specialized in only one trade)

Level 4: PE (overseen by The People and The System rather than professional organizations)

5) Legal, medical, and other professions

Licensing in these fields is currently typically managed by independent Boards made up of other practitioners in those fields. They are not overseen by The People, or in many cases even by any government agency. As such, they have an inherent conflict of interest: They are designed more to ensure the success of the organization and its practitioner members than doing what is best for The

People. These existing systems can be used as a starting point for The Plan implementations, but the actual credentialing process must be managed by The System and overseen by The People.

6) Drugs

It is an innate human characteristic to self-medicate for mood stabilization and to enjoy recreational drugs (including alcohol). Incarcerating individuals who are no danger to themselves or others because they chose not to restrain these instincts is barbaric. Doing so when it causes powerful unregulated criminal organizations to develop to supply these substances and strongly encourages the user to commit illegal acts to afford them is just stupid.

The primary issue with drugs is that most drug abuse is a side effect of an individual self-medicating untreated mental illness, especially mood disorders. You can't have an effective drug policy until you have an effective mental health system, and you can't have either when irrational SDAs are allowed to define the policies based on their instinctive preference to discriminate and punish over actually solving problems. That is, SDAs actually prefer a system that puts users of illegal drugs and individuals convicted of DUI in jail rather than spending far less money on anything that would prevent these crimes in the first place.

The second major issue with drugs is impairment while driving, operating machinery, etc. Again, technology and social engineering are the best solutions (e.g., self-driving cars, testing level of impairment prior to allowing operation of the machine, etc.), and they also highlight how deeply flawed our current behavioral and social engineering practices are: How does it make sense to try to restrict only an individual's right to *drive* when they're convicted of DUI? Driving isn't their problem, drug use is! Expecting them to make the correct decision not to drive when their thinking is already impaired by drug or alcohol use is lunacy, and of course largely ineffective (e.g., <http://www.madd.org/drunken-driving/about/drunken-driving-statistics.html>). Instead, the public Credential system would prevent an abuser from even buying or possessing the drugs that caused the problem in the first place (e.g., a scanner at the bar or checkout stand does the Credential check and then payment with a wave of your smart card, or even an RFID tag imbedded in your hand). Of course a little social engineering will also be necessary: Buy a drug for a non-Credentialed individual makes you liable for anything they do while under the influence (i.e., we'll probably see a lot more BYOB parties).

In addition to these Credentials, technology, education, and social engineering can be applied to minimize or eliminate the dangers of these substances to both the individual and The People. For example, drugs can be developed that have reduced addictive properties and other side effects. "Soma" is included in the list below as a placeholder for a whole class of mood-stabilizing and enhancing drugs that can be developed once Puritanical restrictions on research in this area are removed. So instead of having to take large doses of prescription painkillers in order to achieve mood stabilization (a practice that is a virtual epidemic in the US) much smaller doses of much safer psychoactive narcotics would be available instead. Providing education on mood stabilization as part of the Standard Adult Set (i.e., when to self-medicate vs. when to seek professional help) will also greatly reduce drug abuse.

Regulating the prices of drugs, directly or via tax rates, will allow social engineering pressures to direct individuals away from particularly dangerous drugs and toward safer alternatives. It will also greatly reduce the risk and incidence of drug overdose: Why would someone risk taking a drug of unknown strength or composition that's more expensive when they could buy something cheaper that they know will provide them with the benefits they need with little or no risk and fewer side effects? Controlling dosages by combining the drugs with food or beverages could be used, as could adding adulterants that would make small doses have the desired effects but large (dangerous) doses would reduce the effect or cause discomfort.

Level 1: Low dose alcohol (3.2% beer), THC (marijuana), mild stimulants (caffeine, nicotine)

Level 2: All alcohol, smokeables, hallucinogens, "soma"

Level 3: Standard narcotics and stimulants

Level 4: Medical grade drugs

- 7) Gambling
- 8) Business management
- 9) Driving

THE PLAN: DEPRECATED AND INSTRUMENTAL INSTINCTS (DIS AND IIS):

Tribalism/nationalism

By far the most dangerous of our instincts is our inherent need to classify individuals as being either in-group or out-group, with the in-group being provided with our protection and other benefits, and the out-group being deprived of these things and perhaps even being made a target for violent aggression. While this instinct had tremendous survival value in an environment of small bands competing for scarce resources, it now only ensures unnecessary and constant suffering and indeed threatens the very survival of our species. While it may be impossible to completely eliminate this instinct, it can be sublimated by changing the criteria used to make the divisions to rely on superficial or impermanent features. So, instead of dividing based on race or religion or native language, divide based on current location (especially useful for sports teams), interests (golfers vs. goths), or merely an individual's position on a particular political issue.

Displays of patriotism or nationalism should be met with the same shunning behavior that we use for displays of racism, such as the use of racial or ethnic slurs. The same instinct underlies both classes of behaviors and so they should be treated with the same disdain.

Fearmongering and fear-based decisionmaking

The key to the rise of authoritarian leaders and the resulting commission of acts of aggression and violence is fear. Deliberate attempts to instill fear in a population, especially with the goal of manipulating them into action, must be met with scorn and ridicule. A good example of this is the dynamic between Fox News and "fake news" outlets such as Comedy Central and The Onion, the latter groups to be praised as an essential component in the advancement of civilization. When (hopefully

short-lived) eras of resource shortage return, these sources of “reality checks” may play a critical role in the very survival of our species.

Religious expression

Human inclinations toward religious belief evolved as a means of control and to facilitate aggressive behavior when fear or moral concerns would tend to leave an individual with insufficient internal motivation. Although many will argue that religion also offers a means of sublimation of these instinctive behaviors, there is no possible resolution to the issue of consistency and compartmentalization: Religious expression *requires* compartmentalization because all religions are not only internally inconsistent, but frequently conflict with modern concepts of morality (for example, as the founding documents of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam allow slavery yet aggressively condemn any sort of homosexuality). A good example of this being the passage of Proposition 8 in California, where large numbers of religious blacks conspired to deprive another group of individuals (homosexuals) of their civil rights, all with the “blessing” and encouragement of their religious leaders.

Although religious leaders often seek to deprecate the problematic clauses in these governing documents, in some cases even invoking irrational (and cynical) justifications like “divine revelation”, the end result is still just an example of behavioral engineering by leaders who lack the necessary qualifications to do it properly. Rather than allow these feeble attempts to revise obsolete documents to continue, it is clearly safer and more efficient for The People to define their moral codes based on science, reason, and those instinctive preferences that have been determined to be compatible with the civilization we have created.

Attachment to land

Defending the land you grew up on, even to the death, would have a very high survival value for our ancestors. Indeed, our attachment to the land often takes on a religious quality, especially in those areas where ancestor worship is still common. Unfortunately in an era of regulated real estate transactions these instinctive behaviors are not only obsolete, but highly destructive. For example, it should be not only possible, but completely obvious that the Israeli/Palstinian conflict could be resolved in a matter of months by simply having one group buy the other out. Not insisting on or even seriously contemplating this option makes us all complicit in a system that values Deprecated Instincts over civilized behavior.

Reproduction

Control over our reproduction is without a doubt the single most important advancement in human history. Previous advancements, including the development of agriculture and other technology and social systems merely increased the environment’s carrying capacity, delaying the inevitable resumption of hostilities toward competing populations. Birth control is the only advancement that provides a *permanent* solution to the problem and an escape from the Malthusian trap. It is the advancement that will allow civilization to actually become successful when judged by the standards we define for it. Reproduction is necessary for the continuation of the species, but all decisions on reproduction must be made without regard to our instinctive drive toward it.

Hatred/revenge-seeking

An “eye for an eye” seems to be built into our genes, and murder or maiming a standard Pleistocene method for dealing with problematic individuals. This instinct continues today even in the US, where proponents of the death penalty favor it even when it can be shown that there is no deterrent or economic value to the policy (Ellsworth and Ross, 1983). But there are better ways of dealing with social problems in a modern civilization, so these instinctive behaviors must be identified and suppressed.

Deceit and display (or encouraging display) of emotion in an attempt to manipulate others

The evolution of blushing, which is one of the few behaviors that we humans have little or no control over, was only necessary because we have become so adept at faking most of the others. Deception and manipulation are the instinctive behaviors that blushing developed to assist the group in controlling (Boehm, 2012). Unfortunately blushing is a much less effective tool in an era where electronic communication has largely replaced face to face interaction. Controlling these deprecated instincts now will require better access to information (e.g., gossip) to identify the perpetrators, forms of censure that operates properly without access to physiological responses, and increased moral education in the form of teaching people how to use these systems and how they will be used against them if they attempt to deceive or manipulate people.

Note that this deprecation does *not* apply to “white lies”, which are told as a form of social lubricant. Telling someone you can’t go to the movies with them because you’re busy when in fact it’s because you simply don’t want to go should not be considered a moral offense (though you do of course need to be careful that the gossip doesn’t come back to damage your reputation). This is just how human social interaction works and although it’s probably a good idea to minimize this type of lying, it’s too deeply ingrained, and in fact may even be necessary for individual welfare, to make suppressing it a viable goal.

Acquisitiveness and Possessiveness

Derived from fear of shortage, behavior that we attribute to the emotional states of Greed, Gluttony, Jealousy, Envy, and Guarding are instinctual but no longer necessary in an era where resources are efficiently managed. While it may not be possible to suppress the underlying emotion (i.e., it’s not a sin to “covet” your neighbor’s wife), the resulting behaviors can effectively be controlled through education and other social engineering.

Persecution of the weak or disabled

In an environment of scarcity, allowing individuals who cannot contribute more than they require to survive puts all members of the band at risk. So we developed instinctive behaviors to identify such individuals and arrange for their demise. These instincts are not only no longer necessary, but obsolete because a person with a serious injury or weakness can frequently be rehabilitated, a possibility our ancestors, and therefore our instincts, never had to account for.

Hiding or denying one’s own weakness or infirmity

The converse of persecution, our instinctive need to appear normal had great survival value in an era before disease and mental illness were actually treatable. Now, this instinct is a danger not only

to the individual, who may refuse treatment until their condition becomes much worse, but a danger to The People as a whole when individuals who have hidden their disability cause disruption or greatly increased costs (e.g., mass murder and/or long term medical care or incarceration). Openly sharing ones mental state and accepting honest feedback is not a part of any current culture, but must be an integral part of the next one. Part of this process will be education concerning the prevalence of mental illness: Everyone who has been depressed, fallen in love, had that religious feeling of “awe”, or experienced blind rage as a result of something that has happened to them has been mentally ill. Our current conceptions of mental illness generally categorical: Either you have it or you don’t, whereas in fact it is much more a matter of degree and of duration.

Judging based on appearance

Our survival used to be highly dependent on the quality of the individuals around us. We therefore instinctively seek out means of assessing that quality, physical appearance being highly correlated with fitness in an environment of scarce resources. But this technique is obsolete in an environment of managed resources because physical appearance is no longer an accurate means of assessing quality. The underlying instinct must therefore be deprecated because it results in prejudice, and behavior should always be governed by objective measures rather than prejudice.

Certain cognitive biases

Humans have instinctive biases that come into play when they are forced to make decisions, especially when they involve low-probability events. For example, they reliably overestimate both the odds of winning while gambling and the odds of catastrophic events such as plane crashes. Many of these biases had significant survival value in an era of scarce resources and low information but lead to suboptimal or even bad decisions in the modern world (frequenting casinos and choosing private over public transportation, respectively, for the above examples). Most of these biases can be reduced through education, but our current education systems make little to no effort to do so.

Instrumental Instincts (when expressed in moderation):

Problem solving

Most humans like a good puzzle and will invest a lot of time and effort in solving one for the mere enjoyment they get. This instinctive behavior extends to all of science, and is the basis of philosophy, a search for “truth”. It is the driver of progress in technology, which is the process that has brought us our relatively high standard of living and promises continued gains in the future.

A certain amount of tolerance for incomplete solutions, particularly in government and economic policies must be developed, however. Too often people insist on definite solutions, and will prefer a definite but wrong solution to one that is incomplete or calls for experimentation. The “truth” in many of these arenas is simply beyond our ability to determine and we must learn to be satisfied with the process rather than insisting on having “the answer” and preferring any proposal that promises that even if it is unlikely to be able to deliver on that promise.

Curiosity and appreciate of new technology

Humans love cool new things. It's instinctive, and something that The Plan delivers in bulk, although some marketing is going to be required to classify voting systems, social customs, and a new language as "technology".

Competition

Humans, like all animals, are naturally competitive, both with each other and with their environment. It's what drives both evolution and the capitalist economic system. Harnessing these instincts in new domains (specifically child rearing) will greatly increase the level of progress in these domains.

Egalitarianism and sharing/helping

Punish free riders as an altruistic behavior (Fehr & Gächter 2002), *require* everyone to work.

Gossip

Gossip is information. Although many fear that the purpose of gossip is merely to harm other people, its true evolutionary purpose is to provide information on other individuals to improve one's own chances of success by helping them minimize relationships with selfish or otherwise problematic individuals. It did this in two ways. First, it provided the group with the information necessary to identify sociopaths and other incorrigible individuals who were then banished or executed. Secondly it provided a deterrent to individuals to discourage them from lying or cheating, lest *purpose one* be exercised against them. Although the first use is much restricted in modern civilization (we can still isolate problematic individuals), the second purpose is still viable because our instinctive fear of *purpose one* is still sufficient in most cases to allow purpose two to remain effective.

The key to gossip working, however, is that anonymity not be the standard for public interaction: If an individual or corporation lies or cheats or commits other acts that The People have decided are immoral or otherwise unacceptable, these acts must be attributable to these individuals or corporations who must then suffer the consequences of having their acts exposed to public scrutiny.

There is of course a fine line between gossip and bullying. But, again, gossip itself is the solution to ensuring the proper balance: By exposing the behavior of the bully, the same gossip system being used by bully to harass an individual would be used to bring social pressures to bear on the bully.

Conformity and deference to authority

A system of government that relies on neurotypical behavior from a large majority to compensate for the authoritarian behavior of the minority SDAs must cultivate an independent spirit among its citizens. While any tendency toward anarchy would be a significant risk to a tribe that depended on collective action, particularly during warfare, for its survival, diversity of opinion is an indisputable benefit in an era of managed resources and globally-collective decisionmaking. Nevertheless, the fundamental instinct toward conformity is something that must be preserved and utilized when the situation calls for it, such as when The People, after adequate debate, have established a rule and need people to follow it, or have identified (through gossip) an individual that warrants censure.

As with our tendency toward conformance, blind allegiance to leaders too had great benefits in an era of constant warfare, but only leads to unnecessary and inefficient action in a more advanced civilization. Nevertheless, the instinct to follow “authority” must be preserved and utilized with the difference that the authority will no longer be an individual or small group, but rather the collective will of all The People.

Mood-regulating

All humans have an innate ability to detect when they’re not feeling right and to make changes necessary to bring their mood back into equilibrium. There are a wide variety of options that they have to achieve this, from eating “comfort” foods, to playing games or chatting with others, or escaping into another world via books or movies. But sometimes it takes more than that, whether it’s a cup of coffee to get started in the morning, or a beer to relax when you get off work. But sometimes and for some individuals it takes even more than that, which calls for an engineered system of education, professional support, and specially designed drugs to achieve mood stabilization. See more on this last option in the section on Credentials for drug use.

Appreciation for nature

Aesthetics (appreciation of music, art, etc.)

THE PLAN: HARD PROBLEMS AND UNRESOLVED INSTINCTIVE BEHAVIORS

Many of the ideas in The Plan will seem radical to people who've never taken the time (or had the ability) to take an unbiased look at our current civilization. But they're all actually relatively straightforward and things that we are clearly ready and culturally mature enough to implement now. The *really* radical stuff comes later, and will take a lot more time before we are ready to systematically address them.

To be sure, there are a lot of things missing even in this list: Acts that we consider barbaric today such as torture and slavery were commonplace in hierarchical civilizations for tens of thousands of years. Although there were undoubtedly people (probably low RWA people) throughout history who felt these things were wrong, the vast majority of the population apparently had little trouble with them. Only with increased education and living standards did a sufficient number of people become convinced that these things were in fact immoral and so must be abolished (and of course the SDAs would quickly revert back to these things if the Neurotypicals did not keep them in check). The people a century or two down the road will look back at our current standards and will in turn be appalled at how ignorant and brutal we were.

To provide some perspective that shows how ideas in The Plan are merely the low hanging fruit, here are a few examples of some harder problems. Many of these are derived from Unresolved Instincts, those that have benefits in some cases or which may be too difficult to suppress:

- a) The way humans use, and frequently abuse, animals needs to be reconsidered.

- b) Although The Plan does address the issue of the quantity of human beings, it includes nothing about changing the *quality* of them (i.e., eugenics). This will be a necessary part of the debate in a truly engineered civilization. This is not a call for mass sterilization as was the proposed (and in many cases implemented) method aimed at improving the species during the early 20th century eugenics movement (for a review, see Black 2003). That was just a stereotypical example of authoritarianism (identify a threatening population and discriminate against them) rather than a useful application of science (e.g., had they actually bothered to do the science they would have discovered that Jews and Asians actually score *higher* on intelligence and sociality tests, meaning these groups would have been screened *in* instead of out).

We have no particular genetic goal to reach or timetable to reach it, which means individual freedom must take precedence over any goal of improving the species. Nevertheless, there is an issue here because there is credible evidence that our species has been rapidly evolving even over the past few thousand years (see Wade 2014 for a review), a process that continues today. The Credential system will have a strong selection pressure that will undoubtedly reduce unplanned reproduction, but future Goals may include applying social engineering tools to the need to reduce the incidence of genetic disorders because there are few things that bring about higher costs or greater suffering. It is worth noting that the Jewish community has already embarked on one such widespread eugenics campaign by screening for Tay Sachs.

- c) The issue of euthanasia, for both humans and other animals, needs to be sorted.
- d) There is major work to be done in figuring out our sexual nature and the laws and policies that we need to balance individual freedom with the needs of The People (prostitution, age of consent, obscenity/pornography, monogamy/bigamy/polygamy/polyandry, etc.)
- e) How big should our social groups be for optimum efficiency, minimum stress, and/or maximum happiness? Do cities need to be replaced by smaller communities, or should we all live in megastructures and use technology or social engineering to work out the group size issues? We evolved to perform best in groups of 30 or so, with extended families being the “home” environment and common hunting/foraging parties being where we “worked” and with whom we spent most of our free time (Boehm, 2012). Our current penchant for smaller and smaller “families” including an explosive growth in single-person households not only results in a highly inefficient utilization of resources, but also results in skyrocketing rates of loneliness, depression, and general unhappiness. Although the thought of living with our co-workers in a communal environment would seem to many to be a great leap backwards in civilization what with its constant gossip and bickering over petty things, this in fact is how we evolved to live and although most of us would find such a living situation very annoying nearly all of us would be happier overall in one. As is the case with the loss of our ability to keep SDAs in their place as a side effect of the development of civilization, we ignore our inner natures at our peril.
- f) Medical and computer technology (e.g., life prolongation, cloning, cyborgs, AI, etc.) are developing rapidly and will soon reach a point where they have the potential to destabilize civilization. We'd better have policies in place *before* this happens such that we don't have to kludge up solutions in a time of crisis.

- g) Our fascination with violence deserves further scrutiny. To the extent it has no negative effects displays of violence (including many sports) should be tolerated as an expression of freedom, but if those displays increase our tendency to act violently or to tolerate violence directed at others these practices and instincts must be suppressed through social engineering.

SIMILARITY TO OTHER "ISMS"

It will undoubtedly be pointed out that The Plan is in many ways closer to forms of government individuals living under representative democracies have rejected or indeed waged war against on principle. Although there are good points to be made to support this, overall, The Plan does not fall into any of these categories so much as it represents a synthesis of the best ideas from each of them, a syncretic political system.

The Plan does superficially probably most closely resemble communism. Many of the fundamental concepts, such as common ownership of the land and resources, prohibition of inheritance, and government by people working in small groups (i.e., soviets, as in the original design by the Bolsheviks) could have been drawn directly from the works of Marx and Lenin (although in this case they were actually derived independently from common source material, and noting that a key tenant of The Plan, the prohibition on inheritance, although proposed by Marx in the Communist Manifesto was one of the few key ideas that was *not* included in the Soviet implementation of it). The communist maxim "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need" is a good description of the Standard Income and the requirement that the unemployed and disabled work (for the State if necessary) to secure this income. One might even observe that by insisting that the vast majority of the economy consist of public companies, shares of which will all be owned by individuals, that even the requirement of public ownership of the means of production will be satisfied.

Still, the differences between The Plan and communism, at least as it has ever actually been implemented, are far larger and more significant than these similarities. Most notably is that The Plan requires a robust and competitive capitalist economic system at the highest level, which is the antithesis of the planned economies of traditional communism. The Plan also does not require collectivization, the botched implementation of which was the single greatest failure of the Soviets and communist Chinese, resulting in millions of deaths due to disease and starvation. But the biggest difference is that Lenin's design was for a dictatorship, where a few SDAs (his "Vanguard of the Revolution") would wield unlimited power. This proved the most disastrous component of the Soviet design, since it stifled criticism and therefore innovation and so set the development of the people living under this rule back by decades or more.

Many liberals and progressives will make the opposite complaint, that by turning the economy over to untaxed corporations and individuals, therefore virtually *ensuring* an unequal distribution of power and wealth, and by insisting on a seamless path between developed and undeveloped Localities that The Plan will bring back the worst of 19th century capitalism (e.g., robber barons, who dominated railroads and other heavy industries in the US in the late 1800s, and carpet baggers, which invaded the South after the US civil war, snatching up war-torn resources at cut-rate prices).

The risk of robber barons arising is minimal, based primarily on the specific prohibition on monopolies (and especially natural monopolies) found in The Plan. Although "robber baron" behavior will tend to arise in all corporations, the prohibitions on inheritance, requirement of shareholder empowerment, and inability to corrupt leaders into passing laws that favor them will prevent them from becoming overarching problems.

The possibility of "carpet baggers" taking over a newly-added Locality is a more serious issue and must be a carefully regulated part of the Locality-creation process. Because there can be no protective tariffs between Localities, nor any regulation of the movement of the People, if the standard of living is lower in a new Locality than in the Globality as a whole, there will be a natural influx of capital into a new Locality and migration of the people out. The primary means of control will be the multi-year Implementation Agreement, which must be approved by both the Globality and the new Locality. It will govern all aspects of conversion, and must include specific investment and emigration targets and policies and a staged elimination of protective tariffs.

Also of concern to liberals and progressives will be that The Plan makes no allowance for "affirmative action" or other reparatory reverse-discrimination policies. These will have to be phased out as part of the Implementation Agreement, which could possibly include any last-ditch efforts to render them unnecessary.

On to dictatorships, which The Plan also closely resembles in its high reliance on powerful Managers at both the Global and Local levels. It cannot be disputed that a "benevolent dictatorship" is by far the most efficient form of government, and when it eventually comes to pass that computer and software technology develops to the level we can create one, we ought to try this. Until that time, however, it should be clear that no human being is suitable for that role and so we must ensure that our dictator-equivalent (i.e. Manager) only possesses the ability to execute the laws rather than create them or confirm that they comply with The Plan and the tenets of social engineering. This is one area where the framers of the US constitution got it right: Separating these three powers is key to preventing a real dictatorship (or other tyranny) from developing. Unfortunately, they badly botched the definition of the process of selecting the executive: It's nearly incoherent, and not the way presidents are selected now anyway. Voting on a President as a type of popularity contest is actually about the worst way to select a good executive, since it almost completely ignores the crucial issue of their actual management skills and experience.

There are certain proposals in The Plan that resemble those made by libertarians and some fiscal conservatives especially the requirement of a robust capitalist economy, but also on the need to reduce the size of government and especially expenditures on national defense. There is also much overlap on libertarian prescriptions for individual freedoms, particularly with respect to drug use. But each of these freedoms come restrictions (i.e., the Credentialing system) that libertarians may find objectionable as being "coercive". Which of course is a bogus objection, because "coercion" is defined as persuading an individual to do something by threat of force. Requiring an individual to choose between having the freedom to drive a car and the freedom to not take the driving test is not coercion because it lacks this key characteristic (i.e., there is no threat of force directing you either way). The

same applies with all other proper social engineering tools: For example, putting a higher tax on cigarettes isn't coercive because there is no threat involved, and as long as the cost is in proportion to the actual costs assumed by The People (i.e., the actual projected cost of the additional health care, disability payments, and janitorial and fire protection services that will be required by a smoker), it is completely fair. If the taxes are higher than that, they tread into the area of "behavioral engineering", which while still not coercive may be considered unfair by some because they rely on a merely moral justification.

Libertarians also tend to be fond of the concept of "land ownership" rather than merely ownership of improvements to the land. As explained above, however, this is an outdated concept that only leads to dishonest, illogical, and inefficient policies.

Libertarians and fiscal conservatives also frequently profess that if government welfare programs are shut down or never created, individuals and private organizations will step in to make up the difference. Unfortunately this argument is completely bereft of any experimental support, and thousands of years of starvation and poverty render it an illogical (and of course heartless) proposal. Even in times when the Church had the authority to coerce tithing there was never enough to even feed The People, let alone provide them with a comfortable standard of living. Charity is by its very nature unfair, with people who can be made to feel guilty contributing far more, both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of their income, than those who are resistant to this type of manipulation. Libertarians would argue that the great benefit of these types of contributions is that they are made "by choice" and so not coercive, but this logic only displays a stunning ignorance of human nature, where social pressures can be a far more powerful force than any government could muster. And of course such charity is frequently unfair on the receiving end as well, with people who are more closely aligned with the giver's "tribe" (i.e., church, political affiliation, race, locality of residence, etc.) gaining preferential treatment over those who differ. The Plan avoids this systemic inequality by explicitly making support for all The People the responsibility of all of The People.

Finally libertarians and fiscal conservatives are more generally comfortable with inequality than our evolutionary ancestors would have been: There were no libertarians in Pleistocene-era bands because those who would have been "alpha males" and denied resources to others would have been taken out by the group, and those in the group of course would not have refrained from participating in this process due to their ideology. As such, pure libertarianism and fiscal conservatism are simply incompatible with human nature.

The Plan's proposed drastic reduction in population and emphasis on rebuilding nature through the expansion of wild land (Parklands) resembles the philosophies of Green Anarchy and Primitivism. And the compatibility actually goes much deeper than that: The System at its core is a way to implement the Pleistocene-era egalitarian decision-making process that many Anarchists promote, although it does so by *using* technology rather than eliminating it. By allowing each person to have *direct* control over the process of establishing government policy it is a way to provide not only the practical benefits of restraining SDAs the same way our Pleistocene-era ancestors did, it also directly addresses the issues of

alienation, apathy, social stratification, and coercion that plague our current civilization and that are the primary motivators of Anarchists.

The insistence on equality all around, and the rejection of the concept that the government should run by powerful leaders (who are almost always men) might strike one as being derivative of feminism. There is some common cause, and in fact The Plan may have identified a fundamental flaw in the radical feminist strategy: It is not *all* humans that should be the targets of their efforts, it is merely the SDAs who are their adversaries. This being the case, implementation of The Plan will enable major advances in feminism, the SI will eliminate wage discrimination at least at the low end of the economic scale, and an equivalent to the US ERA comes for free. Nevertheless, The Plan is certainly not an endorsement of the proposal of electing or promoting women into positions of power in an effort to provide balance and equality: Authoritarianism is not a sex-linked trait, and so one might even say "Behind every great Authoritarian man there is an Authoritarian woman working to marginalize herself and any other identifiable outsider".

As for The System being an oligarchy, this is a fair description (or criticism, if you prefer). Until such time as our machines are powerful enough to eliminate all the drudgery from human existence, thereby allowing each individual the free time to fully contribute to The System, we are going to have to rely on some subset of the population to do the actual work of governing. Since this is what we do now in all representative democracies, one can't really criticize The Plan as just another way for the rich and powerful to exploit everyone else unless you can also prove that it is *worse* in this respect than any other system. Given what we now know about SDAs, and how The Plan *systematically* constrains their biases towards prejudice and aggression, proving something like that is going to be a tough row to hoe.

What The Plan hopefully resembles least is the type of hierarchical government where the "chosen people" get complete control over both the economy and the private lives of all of The People. Proponents of this type of system are sometimes called "Social Conservatives", but of course that is in most cases just a euphemism for "Social Dominators and Authoritarians". Although The Plan's capitalistic features would seem to be compatible with their general economic inclinations, in fact with Social Conservatives Capitalism isn't considered a necessity, but merely a tool that can be used (or misused) as needed to achieve their real goal, which is SDA domination over The People, freedom to impose their religious beliefs on others, and the facilitation of increasing their own wealth (as was demonstrated in Altemeyer's Global Change Game experiment in which Authoritarian players put more than twice as much money in their own pockets as the Neurotypicals did).

Always keep in mind that our current hierarchical governments are a relatively recent invention, evolutionarily speaking. Human beings and their direct ancestors lived primarily in egalitarian groups for millions of years and so that is the environment we have evolved to function best in. Only with the advent of agriculture and a resource-sharing system that relied on storage did the even older (and more primitive) hierarchical form of organization reassert itself. Given the technology available up until very recently that was indeed the best form of government we could hope for. But now we finally have the ability to implement something better.

SIMILARITY TO OTHER UTOPIAS AND DYSTOPIAS

From Plato's *Republic* to *The Giver*, the most striking aspect of novels about Utopias and Dystopias is that they (nearly?) all assume authoritarian and hierarchical government. Indeed the very word "Utopia" is from a 16th century novel where Thomas More proposes a generally democratic and egalitarian society, but with "Princes" who are "elected" for life. Most of the rest propose systems where individual citizens are highly controlled and deprived of access to any ideas or information that The State deems unsuitable but there is an elite group or individual who has access to all the "old ways", usually in the form of books or other original documents.

Perhaps the most surprising (and therefore disappointing) of these utopian novels is BF Skinner's *Walden Two*. Although that community proposes an almost completely egalitarian economic system supposedly built on sound scientific principles, all political power in *Walden Two* is held by a group of 6 "Planners" who make and enforce the rules without any specific accountability to the "citizens". Rather than being elected, outgoing Planners are replaced by a vote of the remaining Planners, perhaps the ultimate expression of cronyism. Skinner's proposal for how to prevent corruption that would seem inevitable in such a system is merely to insist that the economic system lacks any means of producing "wealth", so there are no spoils to be divided. Left unanswered is the question of how the community could grow without capital to invest, or how it could survive any interval of scarce resources without any provision for savings or other reserves.

Since they fail to deal with the key fact that it is SDAs who most likely to assume the leadership roles in these hierarchical "Utopian" governments, nor do they specify any sort of compensation for SDAs inherent tendency toward bias and aggression, it would seem that the authors of these proposals have built their fantasy worlds on sand. If anyone tried to implement them as described, they would quickly discover that there are a lot of characteristics of human behavior that the authors simply did not take into account in their designs. Of course if a dystopia is what you're creating, a hierarchical and SDA-led oligarchy is a very good starting point.

Another common theme in Utopian/Dystopian novels is behavioral conditioning (i.e., behavioral engineering or as Skinner sometimes refers to it "cultural engineering") of the population. This again makes it important to distinguish behavioral engineering, where the goal is to change the organism to fit the environment (or indeed to help create that environment), from true social engineering where the goal is to change the environment to function best with the individuals as they come to it. Perhaps the best real-world example is the work on this sort of engineered environment is Temple Grandin's work with livestock handling systems. Many of the designs used prior to her work resulted in the animals being severely stressed or even injured, were of low efficiency, and required a great deal of human input (including very common use of cattle prods, a very brutal behavioral engineering tool). But through her understanding of the natural fears and inclinations of the livestock she was able to design systems that operated far more efficiently and with minimal stress to the animals and need for human intervention. Grandin did not propose to change the animals, but instead to change the environment to better suit them. Now it's time to take this philosophy and apply it to systems that humans use.

SUMMARY

You can think of The Plan as a major software upgrade. Call it "Civilization 2.0". While we can't change the hardware we're using (i.e., we human beings), it is certainly possible to upgrade the software. And as anyone who has developed software can tell you, after several years of making small improvements and fixing bugs in an application, it always starts to become unstable. Even small changes to add a feature or fix a bug cause new bugs to appear in seemingly random locations. The application gets slower and slower with each new revision, and it is impossible to even consider making large changes required to substantially add to the feature set. What has to be done at that point is a complete rewrite, taking into account everything that has been learned about how people use the application and how the old version supported (or failed to support) that use and designing a whole new architecture to do it more efficiently and reliably.

For those unfamiliar with software development, perhaps a more familiar analogy is old buildings. Say you've got a multistory brick building, built in the late 1800s. It was not designed to be earthquake safe, and so a lot of bolts and steel have been added to reinforce it, much of it which is visible. The electrical and plumbing systems all had to be replaced when they stopped working over the years and most of that work is visible too, with pipes and wires running all over the place, and much of the original moldings and tile work having been destroyed or patched in the process. The building is cold in the winter and hot in the summer because there is no practical way to add insulation or seal air leaks without completely rebuilding the interior.

Now the heating system is failing and your contractor says that it's unsafe and must be replaced (this being analogous to what The Plan has to say about SDAs). Worse, because the new system would require major changes to the structure to install, building code will require that the rest of the structure be upgraded to code, meaning the addition of fire sprinklers and other improvements that will bring the total cost to somewhere near the value of the entire building. What do you do: Ignore the problem and keep using the old system and hope no one dies? Continue to patch the old building, throwing good money after bad? Or do you just tear it down and replace it with a new, modern, comfortable, energy-efficient building?

Fortunately, The Plan is more like software than a building: We can build it and test it in parallel while we continue to use our existing system. Then when it's ready, and we're sure we've got all the major bugs fixed, we just press a button and the old system will instantly be replaced with the new and better one. And while one should always have some skepticism that a major overhaul like this will be trouble free, it is reasonable to have a certain amount of faith that this process will go a lot smoother than any government or corporate-run project has: For every failure like the US "Obamacare" website or billion-dollar defense department weapon system boondoggle, there is a successful open source project that shows that even large scale projects are possible with relatively modest numbers of people and resources. As a project that every human being has a stake in being a success, and can actually participate in the design and testing and funding of, The System should not suffer for lack of resources. And after all, who do you trust more to do a good job, the kinds of people who brought you

smartphones and social media, or the people who brought you the Viet Nam and Iraq wars, massive budget deficits, and tax and legal systems that they themselves don't even understand?

CONCLUSION

If you've read this far and have even the slightest inclination to think that The Plan may in fact be a better design than anything we've got now and that it stands even a small chance of succeeding, it would seem that you are now morally obligated to support it. Even if it is a no-cost, low-effort expression of qualified support, it is still necessary to make some public statement (e.g., "I think The Plan could work"). If a more robust faith is generated, see the Talking Points and Kickstarter sections below for additional ways to support it. To do nothing is to repeat the mistakes of Neurotypicals throughout history of standing silently by while the SDAs commit acts of brutality against our fellow human beings in the name of protecting us.

TALKING POINTS AND RULES OF ENGAGEMENT

- 1) The human weaknesses SDAs can use to manipulate each other and the Neurotypicals, including tribalism, docility, and ability to compartmentalize, are instinctive and therefore very difficult to overcome. But in the long run they are no match for rationality, education, and persistence. The sheer numbers of Neurotypicals, who have the ability choose one set over the other, is also an insurmountable advantage.
- 2) You will never win an argument with an Authoritarian on an issue of morality: Their minds are already made up and are sometimes pathologically resistant to change. So the primary goal of any debate with them must be merely to ensure that other Neurotypicals in the room do not uncritically accept their arguments. A secondary goal is to instill doubt in their minds that their positions are mainstream: The instinctive docility of Authoritarians, which is even greater than in Neurotypicals, makes them more susceptible to peer pressure than they are to logic. This being the case, it is therefore worth the time and effort to challenge their facts and their reasoning, and point out that their positions are in the minority. Your individual effort counts: The more people who do this, the stronger the effect will be. Even if you don't win the argument, you'll make it less likely any of us will have to have it again with that individual in the future.
- 3) The key to the success of The Plan is framing the debate as the distinction between true democracy and representative democracy. Once the former has been accepted as the better option, adoption of the key features of the Plan is inevitable because crowd sourcing is the only way implement direct (true) democracy. This means that you don't even need to mention The Plan in environments where doing so could put your personal safety at risk. It is sufficient to complain about corruption/oppression/etc. and point out that it is the direct result of the way the current government is organized and leaders chosen. Once there has been acceptance of that fact, implementation of The Plan ceases to be a political problem (which are somewhere between hard and impossible to solve) and becomes merely an engineering problem (which are somewhere between quick and timeconsuming to solve).
- 4) The Plan, being a complete system, is possible to implement. This distinguishes it from most (all?) other direct democracy proposals which assume some sort of incremental adoption path. The

latter are simply not implementable because it is the sworn duty of existing representatives to uphold their existing constitutions which of course prohibit or dramatically constrain direct democracy. Many of them would refuse to share this power even if they were legally allowed to: Remember, it is the defining characteristic of SDAs that they believe that it is their duty to protect their tribe from threats, whether they be external or internal, and any attempt to relieve them of this duty will meet with fierce resistance. Instead, the entire system must be replaced in one act by popular vote or the existing systems will continue to operate largely unaffected by the will of The People. Although much effort and years of elapsed time will be required to solidify popular opinion on some of the issues that have not yet achieved a majority mindshare (such as the positions on inheritance, national defense, the rights of children, and religion), these are inevitable cultural evolutionary steps that The Plan will be positioned to take advantage of when they come.

- 5) Always refer people to the Plan documents: If they don't read them, they are not the target audience and so not worth expending too much effort on.
- 6) If at all possible, respond to questions about or criticism of The Plan in writing and only after calm reflection. Rapid-fire emotional arguments play to the strengths of Authoritarians. Calm rational thought drives them nuts and therefore is most likely to expose their weaknesses.
- 7) The Plan is a design for a leaderless organization. Therefore anyone who wants to speak with a representative or spokesman for the cause is missing the point: There *is* no representative or spokesperson and that is by *design*. If a great orator is required to convince the masses that The Plan is the way forward, we've adopted the design for the Nazi party as described in Mein Kampf, the end result being that the great orator becomes our Fuhrer.
- 8) If you hear a good question or expression of skepticism, put it into The System: The Plan gets better every time someone does this. In the meantime, however, don't speculate: There is a very fine line between revolutionary genius and wing nut, and a few quotes taken out of context may set the movement back months or years.
- 9) Always keep in mind that political change proceeds at a glacial pace. Even the smallest local changes take years to achieve. Although it may seem like revolutions occur overnight, it was over 60 years between the publication of the Communist Manifesto and the Bolshevik Revolution. The American colonies all existed for 40 years (the longest for 170 years) under sometimes contentious British rule prior to declaring independence. If we can have a Plan Globality and Localities established by 2030 that must be considered rapid progress, and will be a credit especially to middle-aged and older individuals. But the longer it takes, the greater the responsibility of the young for the delay: Anyone over 50 years old, especially if they live in a developed country, is unlikely to see much direct benefit from implementation of The Plan. On the other hand, the very survival of people younger than that is at stake.
- 10) On the other hand, nothing is as powerful as an idea whose time has come: The entire world could easily be living under The Plan in 30 years. No heroic acts or acts of genocide will be required this time: All it will take is continuous pressure to ensure success, so the Planish must not give up.
- 11) It is a breathtaking irony that a fundamental component of The Plan (maybe *the* fundamental component) is to include in the design ways to marginalize Authoritarians, a group that for tens of thousands of years has been the major instigator in the marginalization of other groups. Piled on top of that is the irony that the structure and implementation of The Plan will be derived using

science and reason, tools that Authoritarians typically reject as being invalid in favor of religion, instinct, or other a priori sources of authority. Layer on top of that the fact that “Political Correctness”, that philosophical promotion of equality and tolerance of diversity, that the SDAs have long railed against, cannot be called upon to save them from this fate now that they could really use it. Neurotypicals should not lose any sleep over this turnabout, as it is indeed fair play, and can rest assured that we will treat them far better than they have ever treated us. Although it may seem merely convenient to have a boogiemaster to direct our anger at and many will dismiss this proposal as almost cliché (i.e., just as Hitler had his Jews and the communists their intellectuals and bourgeoisie, we’ve got our Authoritarians), it’s different this time because we’ve actually *scientifically* identified the source of our problems.

- 12) The Plan is not a call to purge SDAs from our society nor even to try to identify them so that we can attempt to “fix” them or at least distance ourselves from them. Some of your best friends are probably Authoritarians! Besides the unsolvable problem of making a 100% accurate identification of which individuals will display authoritarian tendencies in a critical situation, a Final Solution that involves rounding up SDAs and gassing them, besides being inhumane, would also be ineffective: Because all humans carry the genes for these tendencies these “roundups” would have to occur every few years as each new generation comes of age. Better we just design and implement a system that removes the ability for them to assume leadership positions and includes built-in corrections for their antisocial tendencies.
- 13) Although identifying and attacking SDAs will not be acceptable when we’re living under The Plan, it is an essential component in the process of getting there. It is fair play when applied to anyone running for or serving in public office because they have implicitly consented to this treatment by doing so. Maybe set up a website to “out” them, like www.spottheauthoritarian.org.
- 14) As for the issue of whether or not SDAs should be classified as mentally ill, this should probably remain an open question for a long time. As is the case with mild form of autism (e.g., Asperger's syndrome) it will be difficult to clearly show that these characteristics have a significant negative impact on the individual's ability to function in society. As such, they do not meet the criteria of “illness” and so should not be forcibly treated the way one might endorse forcibly treating schizophrenia or bipolar disease, for example. That is, we cannot deprive individuals of their freedom by forcibly treating those who are potentially harmful to The People but do not put themselves or other individuals in any physical danger. Instead, we must change society to accommodate them by designing systems that allow them to be themselves while also protecting the rest of us from their antisocial tendencies.
- 15) Another irony: As protest songs like Lady Gaga’s *Born This Way* seek to instill self-confidence in individuals who are traditionally subject to prejudice, what about Authoritarians, many of whom were simply born to be prejudiced? Does this sort of Political Correctness apply even for those with innate personality characteristics that the Political Correctness is intended to suppress? How is it fair that a man who likes to dress as a woman is to be allowed the freedom to do so without fear of disparagement, but if an Authoritarian expresses instinctive and deeply felt discomfort with that kind of a display, it’s a hate crime? Part of the process of reconciling these contradictions will involve figuring out ways to allow expression of feelings that may be unpopular (and so cannot become part of law) but are not directly harmful to The People as a whole. This sort of a “relief

valve” may cause discomfort in others in some cases, but it would seem necessary to prevent authoritarians, who are the traditional keepers of the moral codes in our societies to feel that at least their positions are at least being taken into account as public policy is formulated. This not only improves their morale, but could very well prevent them from seeking a secretive and more harmful outlet for these feelings (e.g., joining the KKK). And of course these expressions of discomfort also serve an additional purpose: They serve to bind The People together because everyone has feelings that conflict with societal norms, and suppressing them not only doesn’t make them go away, but can cause them to fester and grow to the point that they eventually emerge in inappropriate or even dangerous behavior (see the Deprecated Instinct regarding hiding one’s imperfections).

- 16) It should not be necessary to describe in detail the fundamental flaws in the design of representative government as everyone has seen countless examples of its failure, but here are the most important points to make, noting that The System suffers from none of these flaws:
- a) It takes money to get elected, and with money comes influence. A strong bias toward corruption is therefore built into the system, a bias that SDAs are particularly susceptible to due to their unhinged moral code. In some supposedly democratic countries, the power derived from this corruption is actually larger than the power of the democracy itself.
 - b) The processes of running for office (and holding it once elected) is fraught with opportunities to exploit human maladaptations and with very limited opportunity for social engineering corrections for this. The end result is that it allows less-than-competent individuals to eventually be elected if they are willing to use these techniques. A good example of this is SDA politicians using fearmongering, which exploits human’s natural susceptibility to scare tactics, to differentiate themselves from their opponents. For many examples of how this is has been done in the US over the last few decades, please read John Dean’s “Conservatives Without Conscience”.
 - c) The money and organizing required to get elected favors the formation of political parties, with the result that these parties often end up being the deciders of who even gets to run for a particular open seat. There is nothing more undemocratic than not even giving the people a choice of candidates, as the people in "democratic" dictatorships such as North Korea and the former Soviet Union can attest.
 - d) Representative government is susceptible to manipulation by “single issue” voters, who will vote based on a representative candidate’s stand on a single issue, most commonly those issues of particular concern of authoritarians (abortion, gun rights, taxation, etc.), never mind that the candidate who provides the proper “litmus test” answer may be completely incompetent in the wide variety of other areas they would be required to operate in.
 - e) "Representative" is a full time job, a job that many (probably even most) Neurotypicals would not enjoy and so simply avoid volunteering to do. Leaving SDAs, who *do* like telling people what to do, in charge. This fact also rules out the proposal of many political and social scientists that the representatives be chosen at random from a pool of prequalified individuals. This proposal can easily be rejected by noting that SDAs are far more likely to volunteer to join that pool, with the result that this type of representative government may even be *worse* than our current form, where the relatively rare qualified Neurotypical candidates who are willing to

- do the job have a high chance of being elected merely because they appear to be rational human beings in comparison with their SDA opponents.
- f) Most of the actual work of a representative is done outside the review or even awareness of the public. From backroom deals to swap votes (I'll vote for that bill that benefits your financial supporters and/or constituents if you'll vote for mine) to accepting bills written entirely by special interests and voting to approve them without even understanding them, to gerrymandering (dividing up districts to ensure victory by one's party, a tool the US Authoritarians have used quite successfully to ensure Authoritarian (i.e., TEA Party) leaders get elected), the representational system is *designed* to constrain The People's input into the process.
- g) Unlike their demonstrated ability to determine the strengths of individual ideas, human beings cannot hope to be able to determine which candidate would best represent them. That is, which candidate most likely vote the way they would vote if they themselves had the time, information, and skill to properly research the issues. This is, after all, the main benefit representative government is supposed to be providing. But because they lack the skill and information necessary to make this determination they end up using name familiarity, physical appearance or likability of the candidate, dislike for opposing candidates, party affiliation, and/or other superficial criteria to make their decision about who to vote into office. With the result that they frequently end up voting for Social Dominators, Authoritarians, and frequently even sociopaths to represent them, even though those sorts of people will ultimately end up working against their best interests.
- 17) The Plan spreads the workload of winnowing ideas among a large pool of Neurotypicals. It also eliminates the threat of unfair criticism and other characteristics of a hostile work environment that they would face if they volunteered to serve in a standard representative government. It therefore allows these Neurotypicals to participate on an as-time-is-available basis which is the only way most of them will be willing to contribute.
- 18) If low RWA individuals are so capable why not just design a way to choose our representatives exclusively from this pool? Although Altemeyer's Global Change Game experiment is pretty good evidence that we'd be a lot better off if we took this route, there are a number of insurmountable problems with it:
- a. It's unfair to those individuals: How can we force a random subset of that 25% of the population to do a job they don't even want to do?
 - b. It's unfair to the rest of the population who won't feel that they are being represented and so are likely to disobey laws and policies established by the low RWA government. This is particularly problematic for the 25% who are SDAs and so feel that they are especially qualified for the job and who are particularly prone to prejudice and aggression and therefore are the most likely to revolt.
 - c. There may be reasons why using only low RWA individuals would result in sub-optimal decisions. For example they may make changes too easily and quickly and the other 75% of the population may be unwilling or unable to adjust to them rapidly enough. A common analogy used by conservatives is that liberalism is the gas pedal and conservatism the brakes on a car. Carrying that analogy one step further, authoritarians are the wobbly steering

wheel threatening to send us all into a ditch. But by removing them from positions of authority we can improve directional control and perhaps actually have them contribute in the role of brakes. For example, Graham, Nosek, Haidt, Iyer, & Koleva (2011) reported that liberals had a relatively poor grasp of conservative beliefs, and to the extent that there is a correlation between liberalism and low RWA and conservatism and high RWA, it would seem prudent to include both groups in some useful role.

- 19) Sure The People will make mistakes and make bad law, The System will get hacked into on occasion and votes will be invalidated, and a group of Authoritarians will do something like arrange to all wake up at 4am and pass a law that discriminates against some group they see as a threat (maybe Neurotypicals!). Don't Panic! Remember, your vote never really mattered in the old system (especially if you weren't wealthy or a high-level participant in a special interest group, in which case even if it was properly recorded it probably didn't matter!). And even in this new one even changing lots of votes probably won't make a difference. But even if it does, always remember that unlike representative government, which has proven to be extremely resistant to revisiting bad or even illegal decisions they made in the past, The System is designed to make it quick and easy to undo the damage and so invalid votes and bad decisions will be reversed soon after they are discovered, in most cases probably within weeks.
- 20) While it is true that the System will be highly dependent on technology, it also includes specific policies designed to increase the reliability of the technology it depends on. Far more people die every time there is a storm and the power goes out now than will be even be put at serious risk under The Plan.
- 21) The Plan will take many years to implement: Any objections to The Plan based on security vulnerabilities, lack of working prototypes, or lack of access to or familiarity with the required underlying technologies are therefore invalid. To say that The System can't work because of limitations in current technology is fundamentally making the claim that these problems *cannot* be solved by technology at all, which is a very weak argument. For best efficiency, we need to design The Plan and technology in parallel so that we'll be able to implement The Plan when both are ready.
- 22) We can't predict when the next era of scarce resources will come, nor even the cause. We can, however, predict with great accuracy what will happen when the era arrives (i.e., the rise of the Bolsheviks, Hitler, and Mao all occurred during an era of resource scarcity for the people who allowed them to come to power). Although the likelihood of any one of the things on this list is small, collectively and over a long period of time one or more of them is virtually inevitable. Always remember that these events wouldn't even have to affect any of us directly, they merely have to affect some group of people that is a major supplier or is in competition for resources. These events also don't have to kill many people directly or even be existential threats at all: It is the *perception* of resource scarcity that is the trigger for the rise of authoritarian behavior and authoritarian leaders:
 - a. Disease: Pathogens spread with uncontrollable speed due to our technology for mobility. Always remember that direct exposure to the pathogen is really our least worry, it's the supply chain that supports us that is most at risk.

- b. Food shortages: There are a wide variety of threats to this most fundamental of resources, including plant and livestock diseases, genetic engineering gone bad (direct or indirect via application of herbicides and other selective environmental conditions), climate change, war or social unrest, and competition from wealthier/more powerful/more aggressive groups.
 - c. Water shortages: We currently extract groundwater at higher rates than it is being replenished. What happens when that runs out? Climate change and competition are also significant risks here.
 - d. Natural disasters: Climate change, particularly drought and rising sea levels, tops the list here. But we must also include earth based events, such as large earthquakes/tsunamis and increased volcanic activity. And of course events outside the earth including coronal mass ejections and other lethal emissions from our sun and other stars, or impacts from asteroids or comets.
 - e. Depletion of natural resources: Fossil fuels tops the list here, but our standard of living is highly dependent on materials, particularly minerals, produced in other countries, many of which will want to utilize what remains of these resources themselves in the future. Eventually these resources will run out or be cut off for political reasons.
 - f. Economic instability: Just as the Great Depression was a cause of WWII, any major disruption in the economy leads to perception of scarcity.
 - g. War: It's on this list several times, because it operates at so many levels! War, and preparations for war, are themselves a cause of resource scarcity and so a primary cause of more war.
- 23) The Plan is for a leaderless *political* system. Strong leadership will still be required within Corporations, the Military, and even in managing the local and global governments. Therefore Social Dominators (albeit hopefully non-Authoritarian Social Dominators) will still have many places where their worldview may be useful instead of just harmful. But at the highest level in all of these domains, power must be held by the Neurotypicals. In business, it will be the shareholders who have the power to choose executives (and specify their compensation), and for the Military and government management it will be The People.
- 24) While there is undoubtedly such a thing as talent, and some individuals will grow to be richer or more powerful than others because of this, luck plays a vastly larger role than talent in determining how high the peak of an individual's wealth and power is. People are instinctively comfortable with this outcome so long as there is a guaranteed floor, such as the Standard Income (Frohlich and Oppenheimer, 1992). For every Lincoln or Roosevelt (or Rockefeller or Jobs, for that matter) there were thousands of other people in the world that could have done as well or in many cases even better if only they had found themselves in the exact same situation. The ability to leverage all this heretofore untapped talent will allow The Plan to bring all The People into a world of peace and prosperity hundreds if not thousands of years sooner than if we wait for the SDAs to get around to it.
- 25) The Plan will generally be opposed by Authoritarians. Worse, they will most likely attempt to marginalize anyone who expresses an interest in The Plan, probably by accusing them of treason. Please pay no attention: This just what they do. The Plan can only be adopted by majority vote of The People, a vote that will simultaneously invalidate any existing government. Therefore,

although it is a subtlety that Authoritarians may fail to grasp due to their relatively weak grasp of logic, this proposal is merely to develop a system *capable* of replacing our current governments, and not an actual plot to do so. Fortunately long before The People are ready to hold a vote on adopting The Plan the Authoritarians will have been marginalized to the degree necessary to prevent them from acting on any proposals to "hang the traitors!". There are many features of The Plan that will help ensure this:

- a) The System, because it relies on new technology, will be harder for most Authoritarians to use effectively because they are generally reluctant to accept new things in general.
 - b) The System will be designed to make it difficult for them to screen out points of view that conflict with their own, or to maintain their delusions that their positions are somehow in the mainstream.
 - c) As concepts in The Plan begin to gain traction, we will start to see the Authoritarians start to use them to attempt to marginalize *each other*. It will be a delicious irony when the Authoritarian leaders of one country start accusing the leaders of another country of being Authoritarians and therefore unfit to govern.
- 26) The Plan will generally be opposed by the wealthy and powerful, who will use a variety of arguments against it, most of which will boil down to some derivative of "divine right", and furthermore will ignore the fundamental fact that much of the wealth and power they possess has been essentially stolen from others, and the most of the rest accrued to them via luck. This being the case, it is not unreasonable to expect them to do a certain amount of belt tightening as part of the process if necessary. And it may not be: They might also even be wrong that their wealth or power will be substantially reduced under The Plan:
- a) "Divine right" is the concept that the wealthy and powerful have been chosen by God for that role. It has been used by monarchies since the dawn of civilization as a primary tool to keep the Neurotypicals from overthrowing them: To act against those in power is to commit blasphemy and risk retribution from God. Any such act can also therefore be punished by the rulers themselves with the implication that they are just doing God's will. The modern form of "divine right" is that the wealthy and powerful somehow deserve their status because they worked harder, or merely smarter, neither claim having any scientific evidence to support it. The vast majority of them merely inherited their position directly, or at least benefited from a much higher starting point (education and other resources).
 - b) As for the wealthy and powerful having committed theft to get it, it's not just them, most of us are doing the same thing, or planning to. The classic example is that in the US both Social Security and Medicare pay out far more in benefits than they take in. Both systems are relying on increases in population to (at least partially) compensate for this fact, increases that are a best unsustainable and most likely will reverse in the near future. Seniors therefore have been stealing from the young (including future generations), and most middle-aged people (which of course includes most of the wealthy and powerful) are fixing to do the same.

A similar situation exists with respect to national debts, the practice of "borrowing" money to finance expenditures that we can't afford. Clearly we have no intension of ever paying these debts back or we would have arranged a payment schedule and stuck to it. Since we haven't,

national debt can only be considered theft from our descendants. The wealthy and powerful may object to being required to set up a payment plan to have to repay this money (i.e., their taxes are going to go up), but it is not reasonable to just pretend this problem doesn't exist and go on not solving it. Note that this is not a "balanced budget" amendment or other superficial attempt at a fix: At times it may be necessary to allow deficit spending to compensate for economic slowdowns. But in the long term, budget surpluses that result in debt being repaid must be one of the Goals.

But both of these are small-potatoes examples compared with the far more important issue of resource extraction and consumption: A large percentage of the wealth and power in the world today has been derived from the rapid extraction and consumption of non-renewable resources (some "consumption", such as species and habitat loss and impending climate change merely being collateral damage in this process). As such, it represents unfair and selfish enrichment, if not outright theft, of those resources from future generations, who will necessarily be relatively impoverished for not having access to them. The finite limits of these resources will also eventually lead to social and economic instability as we reach them: Raising today's living standard by sacrificing tomorrow's has been a very effective social stabilization technique (The People are far less likely to insist on revolutionary change when their bellies are full) but when those resources start to run short so too will the social stability they have provided.

- c) A common argument will be that by distributing power and wealth more evenly that the wealthy and powerful will necessarily have less of it. This assumes that civilization is zero-sum game (i.e., for every winner there must be a loser), an assertion which also has been proven to be false. Indeed by removing the parasitic load of "national defense" and most of the enormous waste due to government corruption and inefficiency, The Plan allows for everyone, including the wealthy and powerful, to gain both power and wealth: Yes, it is possible for everyone to win or to at least come out far ahead of where they'd be if we *don't* implement The Plan.
- 27) On the issue of balancing freedom, security, and privacy/anonymity, The Plan clearly ranks their relative value in that order. Since SDAs will not be in power to make and enforce laws that restrict the former, the latter two simply become less of an issue. That is, there is no risk of the secret police coming into people's houses in the middle of the night and "disappearing" them because The People simply will not authorize a secret police force, nor even if there was one would there be any laws on the books to support that kind of action (i.e., there could be no laws against sedition or other dissent). And even if they did it anyway, the complete freedom of the press and transparency of government actions The Plan requires would mean The People would immediately become aware of such an event occurring and would take action to right the wrong and prevent it from occurring again. To be sure, this requires placing a great faith in the built-in moral code of Neurotypicals, but there is already plenty of scientific evidence that is merely the moral codes of SDAs that we need to worry about. We can trust ourselves to do the right things as long as our systems are engineered to prevent SDAs from doing the wrong things.
- 28) The Plan is a revolution, but unlike any previous revolution it is designed so that nobody has to die in the process. Unfortunately people probably will die, most commonly at the hands of their SDA

brethren who will resist the conversion. There is a good chance that the devoutly religious will also introduce their own mayhem, as they frequently have via terrorist attacks in the name of their god, once it becomes clear that they are being marginalized. The potential for bloodshed of course is not a reason for failing to implement The Plan, as the death toll will be vastly higher over the years, perhaps even including the possibility of our entire species becoming extinct, if we simply do nothing.

- 29) The Plan also provides something sorely lacking in today's civilization: Common Goals. The appeal of nationalism has greatly waned over the last generation, and for good reason. Whereas we used to have "the commies" (or "the imperialists") to beat, whether it be in the areas of technology (the space race being the best example of this) or economics, our main goal and competitive arena now seems to be "keeping up with the Jones'". Rather than organizing to sign petitions or stage "occupations" that our leaders mostly just ignore, The Plan is a project and a competition that The People can really sink their teeth into.
- 30) It is no longer necessary or even desirable to support or even be affiliated with a particular political party as it is now clear that in the inherently-corrupt representative form of democracy the only significant difference is between SDAs and Neurotypicals: Although there is a high correlation between authoritarianism and (in the US) the Republican party, an authoritarian Democrat is far more likely to go along with a proposal that will lead to global Armageddon than a true conservative Republican, let alone a Neurotypical Libertarian. Therefore the primary short-term goal must be to ensure that SDAs are identified and their danger to The People made known to prevent them from getting elected. If they get elected anyway, no problem, just apply the same analysis to their activities in office to restrict their power as much as possible. We'll never get most of the positive effects The Plan will provide from our representative governments, but we should at least try to prevent as many major disasters as we can until we're ready for the conversion.
- 31) Never forget George W Bush or his partner-in-war-crime Dick Cheney or hesitate to discuss their legacy (an immoral (and pointless or even counterproductive) war in Iraq based on fabricated evidence, the financial crisis and recession of 2008, turning the budget surplus they inherited into a massive deficit, intentionally instilling fear in the population to legitimize authoritarian acts including organizing and legitimizing torture and unprecedented spying on American citizens, etc.). Both are Double Highs in Altemeyer's classification, and although they did a good job of avoiding public displays of their prejudices you can be sure that they didn't lose much sleep over the tens of thousands of Iraqi civilians who died as a direct result of their actions. They are the perfect examples of why we can't have SDAs in office, or even tolerate a system where people like them may be elected to serve in the future by SDAs who support their agenda (e.g., see McFarland, 2005). Ironically, they may have ultimately saved the human race from extinction by setting off the chain of events that will lead to the elimination of all representative democracies and the permanent removal of power from the hands of SDAs.
- 32) Stay active in politics. Always vote, especially if there are referendums on the ballot as some of that stuff will come along with us as Locality laws. And pay attention! People get the government they deserve. If you think we deserve better, you're going to have to work for it over the long haul.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

- The implementation of The Plan should proceed as follows:
Translation of The Plan into other languages, and refinement of The Plan based on public input.
- Create the Internet-based proposal+voting system (The System)
- Promote the use of The System by other organizations to find and address the flaws in it, including for shareholders in corporations (both non-profit and for-profit), land use and planning boards, and city and county governments. The ultimate test cases will be shadowing local governments, taking the same information they have but letting Plan followers in those areas do the voting instead. Comparing the Plan vote with the "official" vote, particularly after time has elapsed which will enable the quality of the decision to be assessed; will be key in convincing people that The Plan is ready for adoption. The goal would be to have the "official" government get into the habit of providing the public with *all* of the information needed to make decisions (which, really, they should be doing already), then let The System do the work, then have the official government merely ratify the output of The System.
- The local and global statute packages should be written by proponents of The Plan, drawing from the best available source material, using The System to refine and approve it. They will do the same for the various Credentials and the tests necessary to implement them.
- Develop prototype budgets and tax/land lease rates.
- Design and implement "virtual world" simulations of The Plan, and test them to find exploits and to help refine reasonable Goals and preliminary tax rates (i.e., these might be games like SimCity or Second Life, but with challenges from the real-world thrown in such as natural and human-caused disasters, child-rearing, sickness/accidents/deaths, etc.). Develop and test military and international political simulations to help refine Planish policies and tactics.
- Develop a "Plan Readiness Scale", to help determine how ready existing Localities are to adopt the Plan, and encourage reforms and competition between them to increase their scores.
- Develop and begin education in Planish: The first adoption can be done in the native language of the first localities, but subsequent adoptions by localities with a different current language must be done in Planish.
- Promote The Plan to the international community, develop the resources to aid a first adopter in preparing an Implementation Agreement, and locate that first adopter. Followers of The Plan will provide administrative and financial assistance as part of the Globality, but most of the actual work will have to be done within the Localities who have adopted The Plan

The US is actually *not* a good candidate for first adopter. Per capita public debt is relatively high (twice what it is in Scandinavian countries), as are under-funded pensions and other "hidden" debt. Religious fundamentalists make up far too high a percentage of the population, and there is that unholy alliance between the 1% and the poor and undereducated Authoritarians that will oppose it (and remember, the social engineering countermeasures to the corrupting influence of Corporate political advertising won't come into effect until *after* The Plan is approved). Mix in groups like lawyers, the military-industrial complex, and family-dynasty corporations that stand to lose the majority of their wealth and power as direct result of Plan policies, and it becomes clear that the US

will get dragged into adopting The Plan only when Neurotypicals react to continued failures in US policy that Plan Localities don't seem to suffer. US citizens must also become willing to tolerate having their expenditures cut back some to enable them to pay back the massive debt they have accrued. And should certain "blue" states try to secede from the US and adopt the Plan independently, it is likely that the "red" states would take action to prevent it (ironic as that would be, of course).

But there are far worse candidates, including any other country with a large fundamentalist population, which, probably not coincidentally, are apt to be those countries that lack the traditions and infrastructure to ensure a highly educated population and also the Internet infrastructure necessary to implement The System. Should the population of one of these countries decide to adopt The Plan, perhaps after a coup d'état, it would put the entire proposal at serious risk. Having the Globality include Credentialed individuals from outside the Locality will certainly help, but it would still take a huge amount of money and effort to start with an undeveloped and war-torn country.

Other poor candidates for early adopters are India and China, even though their rampant corruption and systemically-enforced socioeconomic stratification will make the people of these nations among those who will benefit the most from the adoption of The Plan. Unfortunately this very socioeconomic stratification is the thing that makes them poor early candidates for implementation: A little freedom is a dangerous thing and granting a large amount of it to a large population that is not accustomed to it would most likely cause social instability and in turn threaten the viability of The Plan. They will be good candidates for early implementation of The System, particularly at local levels, however.

Therefore, the best candidates for first-adopter and other early adopters are northern-European countries and Commonwealth countries (Australia, New Zealand, Canada), all of which boast high levels of education, robust Internet infrastructure, a tradition of democracy and progressivism, and low to moderate debt levels. After a few of them have shown The Plan to be viable, picking up some of the more developed countries in SE Asia (e.g., South Korea, Japan (although Japan's public debt ratio is extremely high and so conversion will be more difficult for them), Taiwan, Singapore) and southern and eastern European countries with a history of Authoritarian problems (particularly including Russia) will be a logical progression.

One issue that will come up that should influence the order and rate of acceptance of Localities from countries currently classified as "Third World" is how infrastructure funding from the Globality will be apportioned. There will come a time when The People will have to choose between approving funding for a high speed rail system between two developed Localities, or putting this money into a new water treatment plant for a new Locality where the residents lack basic sanitation. By utilitarian philosophy the latter would be the clear choice, but utilitarian philosophy is not social engineering.

PLANISH WAR SCENARIO

A scenario: Suppose the people of Taiwan vote to convert to The Plan a few years after the first adopter and then begin implementation of it. Many of The New People would already have training on The Plan and The Plan's military tactics, and would immediately begin training the rest of the population. The government of China, which has publicly claimed that an act of independence like this could be taken as an act of war, may after some period of (failed) negotiations attempt to occupy Taiwan. With a small Locality force and little immediate backup from the rest of the Planish, the aggressor could achieve this relatively quickly and easily and with minimal cost in human lives or property damage. Unfortunately, running the country would prove to be far more difficult: With no leadership to replace, the actual government would remain Planish and the occupying force would find it extremely difficult to change or implement any policies.

Guerilla attacks would be commonplace and impossible to stop. For example, suppose as part of the proposed peer-to-peer cell phone system upgrade a targeting app could be installed such that any cell phone could be used to call out the location of an occupying force leadership target (be it by GPS, pointing it out on a map, or taking a photo and having the phone determine the location by matching it up with street view and aerial photography). A companion mortar-aiming app would allow any other citizen within range to hit that target. Or perhaps a micro-drone targeting app could be used to deliver a bomb to that location instead of the usual pizza or package from an ecommerce company. These would be huge advances over the current "drones and IEDs" technologies, and would render an occupied country ungovernable and yet with minimal risk to the civilian population.

But it gets worse: Because every official or employee of the occupying government would be a target of the Planish the world over, they would have to shut down all of their embassies and recall all of their officials to prevent them from becoming targets. But they wouldn't be safe at home either: Because among the Planish would be a significant number of their own countrymen, each of whom would be duty-bound to take action and some of whom would not hesitate to take on the role of assassin if given the opportunity. It might take no more than a handful of highly publicized assassinations to cause widespread defections and unrest, and a few dozen of them would surely cause mass panic and political instability.

This scenario does bring up another important issue: What would the US military's response to this sequence of events be? Although as self-proclaimed "Policemen of the World" they have pledged to protect Taiwan in the past, would they intervene on behalf of a Planish Taiwan? The expectation should be, based on Authoritarian behavior in the past, that they would not: As soon as the Planish become a distinguishable group within the US, these Authoritarians will attempt to marginalize them as traitors, just as they have any other group that they can separate out from the herd (e.g., in the 1940s with Japanese interment, and in the 1950s with communist sympathizers). And what better way to do this than to attempt to drive a wedge between them and the unconverted Neurotypicals over the issue of war? Indeed, the Authoritarians in the US government might even *encourage* the Chinese government to take this sort of action: They would prefer the world to be black and white and to portray the issue as good vs evil and us vs them and to have an actual enemy rather than having to make

one up. Supporting any Planish Locality would put them in the very uncomfortable position of having to support a group in a foreign country that they consider to be committing treason in their own.

Not that the US military's response in this scenario is of any practical significance: It is not out of fear of the Taiwanese or even the US military that the government of China does not invade Taiwan, it is merely fear that their relationships with other nations, and indeed their own people, would be sufficiently damaged by such an act that their own country could become unstable, and why risk losing their own positions of power when there is so little to gain? And note that all of these issues exist even with respect to all of the countries in the UN as well: Not only are they unlikely to be able to make any difference militarily, the Authoritarian leaderships of those countries would also likely refuse to do anything to support a group that they see as a threat in their own country.

Bottom line: The military viability of any Planish conversion may depend more on the activism of the Planish in other nations (specifically the ability to override the Authoritarians in those nations) than in anything intrinsic to the new Locality.

This scenario also gives some insight in to how the military will be organized and budgeted. As primarily offensive tools, the Marines will cease to exist entirely, as would all nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons systems. The Navy will be reduced to at most a small defensive submarine fleet, with a logistical section that will develop policies and plans for commandeering and coordinating the use of pleasure, fishing, and merchant fleets in time of war. The Air Force would be relegated to surveillance, and even that primarily or even exclusively with drones, but would also have a logistical section that would enable use of civilian aircraft as needed (and as with the Navy, they might also have specification power over civilian equipment, for example requiring airdrop capability be built into cargo planes). An Army (the Global Security Force), composed of citizen soldiers and their professional leaders will make up the vast majority of the military.

Planish weapons systems would consist primarily of small and portable devices, probably nothing larger than could be hidden in a garage and towed behind a pickup truck, such as small drones or cruise missiles, and other low-cost, high-accuracy systems. Design and tactics for these would be crowdsourced to avoid the big problem the US has with its current weapons systems: Despite having spent billions of dollars on their development and production, the era of 3D printers and crowd-sourced designs and tactics has rendered many of them obsolete.

The result would be a resistance force far more formidable than any the US faced in their "adventures" in Vietnam, Iraq, and Afghanistan. Those resulted in small wins in relative kill ratios (US soldiers to enemy combatants), but if you look at collateral damage (civilian casualties and damage to infrastructure) or absolute numbers of US killed or wounded they can only be considered major disasters. And those are supposedly cases where the civilian population was on the US's side: An occupation of a country with a well trained and equipped and highly motivated citizen guerilla army would be unimaginably more costly. Not even counting the antiwar movement an action like this would generate among Neurotypicals in the aggressor country: Now that we know what's really been

going on with SDAs, any war of aggression against a Planish Locality would spawn an antiwar movement that would make the antiwar protests of the Vietnam era look like Veteran's Day parades.

As to the objection that relying on a deterrent-to-occupation defensive force could lead instead to atrocities like the Nanking Massacre or the firebombing of Dresden (during WWII), one must also keep in mind that social engineering is a part of the process of deterring wars. The very discussion here that the only viable means of subduing a Planish Locality would be to totally destroy it means that any proposal by a potential aggressor to attempt this would necessarily mark them as a madman and therefore almost certainly cause them to be removed from power before a single shot was fired (sort of a psychological version of the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction).

KICKSTARTER CAMPAIGN

The purpose of this campaign will be to allow people to contribute toward implementation of The System and The Plan in general. Noting that no existing government or company has any financial incentive to develop something like this, and that most actually have vested interests that will cause them to work *against* the project, it can only be developed either by volunteers or by grass-roots level funding by The People. Due to the scale of the project, and the need for large computing and communication resources, it is not reasonable to assume the volunteer route will be practical. Therefore crowd-funding is the only viable option.

To encourage The People to provide funding, The Plan Foundation, a nonprofit, has been incorporated to manage the process. The Plan Foundation will stipulate to the following policies:

All employees of the startup will agree to be paid the Standard Wage as a test case for its viability.

The System implementation will be Open Source and built solely on other Open Source tools.

Public interviews by the Planish will be limited and conducted in writing. No individual compensation will be accepted for these interviews, although donations to The Plan Foundation may be negotiated.

The System will necessarily be engineered such that it can assume the role of any other social media platform, but because it will be an open source project will not face the same design constraints as platforms run by private companies. For example, they need space to sell ads (or whatever) whereas The System, being publicly funded, does not. But the potential is far greater than that: The corporate systems must be *designed* to prevent access to information that could be used by competitors or to bypass whatever revenue-generating features those companies require. The System will not have those constraints and so could very easily (and very quickly) gain break-out features that will allow it to displace any or all of those alternative platforms.

Besides System infrastructure, the Plan Foundation will organize and fund basic research into the linguistics and design of Planish, research into SDA, and foundations of Social Engineering.

Unfortunately the existing The Plan is going to make that doing research on SDAs themselves harder: By popularizing the concepts in *The Authoritarians* it will become increasingly difficult to even do the initial screening necessary to do the classification. As they begin to release they are being marginalized, SDAs

will attempt to hide their true natures by merely lying on the tests (lying being something that SDAs are particularly comfortable with doing). Fortunately the work to date in this area is solid and so we don't need (and indeed can't wait) for it to be brought up to date with the current generation of politicians.

Some possible areas of research:

Demographics of SDA: How does it vary by location (nationality), education level, race, religion, socioeconomic class, occupation, criminal conviction rate, experience serving in a leadership role, etc.

Behaviors of SDA: Besides biases toward organized religion and prejudice, are there other behaviors common in this group that perhaps can be explained as responses to evolutionary pressures? For example, is the bias toward large families (and therefore against birth control and social engineering for population control) inherent in SDA, or is it instead a result of the viral nature of religion? Is their rejection of science and rationalism merely a side effect of the fact that they're just not very good at it, or is there a more fundamental process at work?

Origins of SDA: relative contribution of nature vs nurture, effect of specific experiences, course of development, etc. Can it be reduced with specific types of education, and starting at what age?

Social Engineering foundations: Relative responsiveness of SDAs to peer pressure, monetary incentives, reward vs punishment, etc.

EPILOGUE

I think I started working on this book as a child. I've always been fascinated by technology and how it works, and spent many hours taking broken things apart, trying to understand how they work, fixing them, and then putting them back together. From a very early age it was also clear to me that politics and government were broken, the Vietnam War and the Cold War being two major influences on me, since both reached their peaks when I was in elementary school.

But these problems always seemed intractable to me and so I never made any effort to do anything about any of them. I suppose I was keeping a mental inventory of "bugs" and design flaws in the system, however, as this is just an occupational hazard of being a software engineer (which is the career I eventually settled on, near the end of my undergraduate education). And my list was probably more specific than most people's because much of my undergraduate training was in psychology which provided me an appreciation for the great many flaws in human cognition (although my undergraduate degree ended up being in Math/CIS, I eventually went back to school for a PhD in Cognitive Psychology, University of Colorado at Boulder).

If anyone had told me 30 years ago that my eventual career goal would end up being "revolutionary activist", I would have told them they were crazy. And I would have been in a position to be pretty sure about that because my undergraduate degree was from the University of California at Santa Cruz and so I had a lot of contact with people who were so inclined and knew that I was about as different from most of them as I could possibly be.

But then many years later I happened to buy a condo in a complex that, unbeknownst to me at the time, was in deep financial and organizational trouble. Since figuring how things were broken and doing what I can to fix them is just in my nature, I set out on that path again. What I discovered was pretty horrifying: Not only had the complex been mismanaged for its entire 40 year existence and had millions of dollars in accumulated deferred maintenance, but the Board was stuffed with people who were not only incompetent, but seemed to take an almost perverse pride in the fact that they were the ultimate authorities and that, right or wrong, *their* opinions and decisions were the ones that mattered. They also apparently had no qualms about committing irrational or even unethical acts including willful hiding and misrepresentation of information to protect their authority, which is how my pre-purchase due diligence failed to discover these problems.

And no sooner had I managed to "persuade" many of these people to resign and let somebody new take a crack at it, but a whole new crop of the same sorts of people stepped up to take their place. They seemed almost pathologically resistant to accepting ideas that conflicted with their existing prejudices, and when I was eventually *elected* to serve on the Board on a platform of "and now for something completely different", they took it as their first task to vote to remove me. Although during this process I eventually did stumble into a design for a system that would allow the other Owners, most of whom were as frustrated by this situation as I was, to wrest control from the Board and run the place a little more rationally, I quickly discovered that there was no technological support for actually implementing it.

About two years after that Association went pear shaped I eventually realized that it was a lost cause and so took action to extract myself from that situation. Afterwards, having a little time to reflect, I started reading (or rereading) the important works in politics and economics in an attempt to gain some perspective on these issues. As part of that research I happened upon Bob Altemeyer's book *The Authoritarians* and as I was reading it had a "Well, there's your trouble" epiphany: The research on authoritarianism held the keys to understanding not just how our representative-based political systems led to the failure of that HOA, but to many or most of the failings of our governments in general. Within a couple of weeks of reading his book, I became aware that the description that I'd heard from many authors of how they came to write their books was based on fact: Somehow this book had formed inside of me and I really had no choice but to write it all down.

REFERENCES

Altemeyer, B. 2006. *The Authoritarians*.

Black, E. 2003. *War against the weak: Eugenics and America's campaign to Create a Master Race*.

Boehm, C. 2012. *Moral Origins: The Evolution of Virtue, Altruism, and Shame*.

Boldrin, M., & Levine, D (2010) *Against Intellectual Monopoly*.

Cochran, G. Hardy, J., & Harpending, H. 2006. Natural History of Ashkenazi Intelligence. *Journal of Biosocial Science* 38 659-693

Corning, P. 2005. *Holistic Darwinism*.

Duckitt, J. 2009. *Social Psychology of Punishment of Crime*, edited by Margit E. Oswald, Steffen Bieneck, and Jorg Hupfeld-Heinemann.

Ellsworth, P. C., & Ross, L. 1983. Public opinion and capital punishment: A close examination of the views of abolitionists and retentionists. *Crime & Delinquency*, 29(1), 116.

Fehr, E. & Gächter, S. 2002, Altruistic punishment in humans. *Nature* 415 137-140.

Frohlich, N. and Oppenheimer, J. 1992. *Choosing Justice: An Experimental Approach to Ethical Theory*.

Gerber, G., Huber, G., Doherty, D., & Dowling, C. 2013. Is There a Secret Ballot? Ballot Secrecy Perceptions and Their Implications for Voting Behaviour, *British Journal of Political Science* 43, 77–102

Gerber, G. Huber, G., Doherty, D., Dowling, C., & Hill, J. 2013. Who Wants to Discuss Vote Choices with Others? Polarization in Preferences for Deliberation. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 77:474–496

Graham, J. Nosek, B., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S. 2011 Mapping the Moral Domain, *Journal of personality and social psychology* 101 (2), 366-385.

Grandin, T. 2005. *Animals in Translation: Using the Mysteries of Autism to Decode Animal Behavior*.

Herring, D. 2012. Evolutionary Perspectives on Child Welfare Law. In *The Evolution of Violence*, Springer, 2013

Irons, W. 2001. Religion as a hard-to-fake sign of commitment. In R. Nesse (Ed.) *Evolution and the capacity for commitment*.

Keil, F.C. The Feasibility of Folk Science. *Cognitive science* 34, 826-862 (2010).

Kessler, T. and Cohrs, J. C.. 2008. The Evolution of Authoritarian Processes: Fostering Cooperation in Large-Scale Groups. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice* 12:73–84

McFarland, S. 2005. On the eve of war: Authoritarianism, social dominance and American students' attitudes toward attacking Iraq. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31:360-367.

Mueller, D. 2003. *Public Choice III*.

Pinker, S. 2011. *The Better Angels of Our Nature*.

Rawls, J. 1971. *A Theory of Justice*.

Sipes, R. G. 1973 War, Sports and Aggression: An Empirical Test of Two Rival Theories American Anthropologist 75:65-86.

Sosis, R. 2003. Why aren't we all Hutterites? Costly signaling theory and religion. *Human Nature* 14:91-127

Sosis, R. 2006. Religious Behaviors, Badges, and Bans: Signaling Theory and the Evolution of Religion. In P. McNamara (Ed.) *Where God and Science Meet: How Brain and Evolutionary Studies Alter Our Understanding of Religion*.

Wade, N. 2014. *A Troublesome Inheritance: Genes, Race, and Human History*.

Waller, J. 2002. *Becoming Evil: How Ordinary People Commit Genocide and Mass Killing*.