

Sovereignty



The classic image of [sovereignty](#) is a few kooks in camos going off into the wilderness to live by their own rules. While this image is accurate – those individuals are surrendering their sovereignty to a sovereign collective, it is wholly inadequate to express the fundamental nature that sovereignty plays in [land-based capitalism](#).

A more adequate statement of sovereignty is that the individual is sovereign and the state is not. The individual can go into debt and has eminent domain ([can treble land](#)). The state can do neither. Inasmuch as trebling land and acquiring debt are basic components of sovereignty, readers might be interested in the module, [Are Corporations Sovereign?](#) That question will not be answered here.

A sovereignty can manage its subjects almost any way it pleases. As a sovereign individual, one can chop off one's arm or leg. One can commit suicide or sell an organ. On a more positive note, one can eat only healthy or ethically-raised food, exercise, study, work and play, at one's leisure.

The most common unit of sovereignty, both under today's [debt-based](#) and tomorrow's land-based capitalism is the family. The family is sovereign. "No talking about politics or religion at the dinner table" would be a violation of freedom of speech outside of a sovereignty. Spanking would be battery and grounding would be kidnapping.

Adults have the right to surrender and reclaim their sovereignty at will. This is called [exit rights](#). Children under the age of majority (14 is suggested) have no right of individual sovereignty. Because they have no exit rights, the [Federation Constitution](#) affords children with the purposely ambiguous [right to life](#). Judicial interpretation of this right should optimize the balance between freedom and security.

Families and other sovereignties must respect the exit rights of adults and the right to life of children. They also must [not subject animals to unnecessary cruelty](#). This culturally malleable dictate is even more purposely ambiguous than the "right

to life” of children. I believe judicial interpretation of this right will lead to an optimal balance of ethical treatment and food security.

Beyond these basic constraints, are sovereignties free to do whatever? Not completely. There are land-based rights that we, as the inhabitants of Earth, demand.

The right of [the most efficient user](#) to [exclusive use](#) of the land is primary. Does this mean the sovereignty cannot have land titles or land taxes? Does it mean that land cannot be inherited by the first-born son within the sovereignty? Does it mean that land within the sovereignty cannot be distributed equally to the poor or worked collectively by everyone or sold to the highest bidder? No, it does not!

Land within a sovereignty is sovereign land. All of the rules governing sovereign land are determined by the sovereignty. In a family, for example, the largest bedroom could be given to the youngest daughter, or the child that does the most chores. It is no different in a sovereign city-state, or a much smaller sovereign collective.

Does this violate the right of the most efficient user to exclusive use of the land? No. A son might not be able to treble his sister’s bedroom, but the property itself can be trebled, leaving the bedroom question moot. The same is true of a sovereign city-state where modern day Huns, Vandals, and Visigoths could be trebling at the border.

There are, however, other [land-based rights](#) that do restrict the activities of the sovereignty. The [Federation](#)-wide right to clean air and clean water forces the sovereignty to abide by Federation laws regarding these resources. It is expected the right to pollute will be a treble-able resource and the sovereignty must treble for these rights in competition with everyone else.

All restrictive land-based rights are preconditioned on [a reasonable person](#) believing that a negative externality outside of the sovereignty or irreversibly to sovereign land will result from sovereign action. No action that is permissible or negotiable outside of a sovereignty can be forbidden within the sovereignty.

Cellular Democracy

The sovereignty is the building block of the [cellular democracy](#). Although it is convenient to picture individuals as leaf nodes of the cellular democracy at level 0, that is not technically true.

The actual cellular democracy definition is that every leaf node is sovereign and every sovereignty is a leaf node. Most individuals are members of families. As a family member, the adult individual sacrifices their sovereignty to the family.

It is the family at level-0 (a level-0 [district](#) in the verbiage of the cellular democracy) that forms the leaf node of the cellular democracy. Associated with the node is a family size (a sovereignty size). This determines the amount of per capita [Earth Dividend](#) distributions into the sovereignty.

Earth Dividend distributions are [earmarked](#) for certain purchases, independent of sovereign status. However, those distributions can be freely moved from one earmarked account to another within the sovereignty. This right does not exist outside of a sovereignty.

In a family, the [food distribution](#) might all be moved to the account of the family shopper. In a sovereign city state, the [housing distribution](#) might all be moved to the account of the king. The latter is realistic.

In a sovereignty, the most common use of the housing distribution will be for ground rent on sovereign land to [defend against foreign invaders](#) (treblers). Sovereignities, or any large land holders, can position their [ground rents](#) like defensive armies in the game of [Risk](#).

Logical extensions of the food and housing distributions will have appeal to family farms, mixed-use collectives, and larger sovereignities. The food distribution can be used for tractors, other farm equipment, fertilizer and seeds (GMO seeds are likely free to maximize [IP royalties](#)). The housing distribution can be used for any on-site construction. For a large sovereignty, that would include roads and buildings, just as it would include a driveway and garage for households.

Forming a Sovereignty

Sovereignities will typically be created by a group of like-minded people who treble some rural or semi-rural land. However, it is possible, but difficult, to create a sovereignty in an existing community. This is done with a [class III](#) ratification of a sovereign constitution.

Objectors can vote “no” with the [treble option](#). In order to begin the sovereignty, residents must treble all objectors. Because the right to treble is a constitutionally protected right, unanimous consent for a sovereignty is always required.

The Panarchy

Today, there are thousands of viewpoints on what would be the perfect world, perhaps millions. Since none are very good, people avoid discussing the contradictory details and try to reduce those viewpoints to two, us and them. The old joke, "Ask any two (fill in the blank) about an issue and you will get three opinions," has given way to polarization, intentional ignorance, and violence.

[AFFEERCE](#) is superior because it does not rely on forced ignorance, elections, education, or revolution to bring about land-based capitalism. It is a [business plan](#) that succeeds if it fully accounts for human nature, or fails if it does not.

One of land-based capitalism's strongest points is that it allows everyone who thinks they have a better way to run the world to do just that, under the most ideal of conditions. This collection of different types of cultures and governments is called the panarchy.

An objectivist sovereignty can forbid a 2/3 plurality from modifying the objective rights of the property owner, or redefine objective rights to suit their needs. An anarchist sovereignty can rule by consensus and the no-force doctrine. A communist sovereignty can take from each according to their ability and distribute to each according to their need. A Georgist sovereignty could respect title to the land and tax it.

These sovereignties have the advantage of operating in a utopian environment where, depending on size, they receive from \$700 to over \$1,000 per month for every one of their citizens or subjects.

If their ideology is successful, the sovereignty will grow. Ultimately, it would grow to replace all of land-based capitalism, or be adapted into land-based capitalism. The panarchy thus leads to "permanent embryo" where the new world is nurtured within the old. It could happen.

Land-based capitalism has no repressive mechanism to stop permanent embryos. Larger sovereignties will function well as test societies for new ideas in political economy, but in the end, I believe the non-sovereign cellular democracy will prevail, with leaf-node sovereignties no larger than an industrial kibbutz.

The panarchy is a nice idea, but most of the ideologies are reactions to the contradictions and brutal tyranny of [debt-based capitalism](#). With the end of debt-

based capitalism, the ideologies will briefly find a spot in the sovereignty sun, and then wither away within 100 years of their nemesis.