

Avatar Update

Personal Opinion of Sofia Smallstorm

August/September 2015

email: smallstorm@earthlink.net PO Box 698, Cardiff CA 92007

Legal Growth Spurt
Prospering with Contracts
New Cities for New People
Techno-war Against the Universe
Living By Code
Controlled by the BAR

*A subscription newsletter
to bring you bits and pieces
that clarify understanding
as I come to learn more
in my own Rabbit Hole
discoveries*

Legal Growth Spurt

Providence often works through parking spots, or so I have found. Not so long ago I happened to park in a different part of the strip mall where I use a local mail drop, and this little deviation took me by a rack of the free *San Diego Reader*, the cover of which showed a plump young woman holding a toddler by the hand, and the headline “Child No More.” A sub-header read: “Before turning 16, Sherry Sotelo won the right to adulthood in juvenile court.” So I picked up a copy of the magazine.

I have written in the past about *parens patriae* – the legal doctrine that makes the State the guardian of our children, and of us (adults) too if we should be deemed, by their certified experts, unfit to be our own advocates. So here was a minor being awarded adult status by the legal system – very strange indeed! As I read the piece, wheels began turning and whirring in my mind.

Sherry Sotelo was one of five children growing up in south San Diego with a Hispanic single mother who could not speak English. When Sherry was 12, her mother found a job in Tijuana, and took the family there. But at 15, Sherry missed her American education and came back to San Diego. She enrolled at Hoover High, staying where she could – which meant sofa beds and cots offered by friends and relatives. Then she got pregnant and had a baby. Now things got harder – as the *Reader* puts it: “pure chaos.” She switched to taking classes and programs at Garfield High, a California Model Continuation high school catering to teen mothers, but after school there was nowhere peaceful to study, especially if you had an infant child. And as a minor separated from her mother, Sherry Sotelo found things even more restrictive:

“Everywhere I go I have to sign papers, and I can’t do it. Because I have no adult with me, and I’m not an adult yet.”

...

At Garfield, Sotelo had met [Lana] Cooper-Jones, who counted all the strikes against her: she was living on her own, she couldn’t sign papers, she couldn’t rent a place, she couldn’t get a car, she had a daughter, both were hungry, she had no way to get a job, and without legal status she couldn’t qualify for cash aid from the state. The world closes up like a bank vault when you don’t have the power your signature entitles you to. Cooper-Jones—case worker, counselor, advocate and networker—got the ball rolling with Legal Aid, which in turn secured a date for a court hearing with judge Carol Isackson.

The article tells us our adult signature has *power*, but what this really means is that our adult signature validates our entry into the world of *making legal contracts*. Sherry Sotelo convinced her mother to give permission for her early emancipation, and thus, at 16, Sherry was “adultified.”

“[The judge] asked me how long had I been on my own. What were my grades? What did I plan to do after I was emancipated? You have to show that you’re responsible, that you’re not going to get emancipated just because you want to.”

...

To emancipate a teen, the court is turning the parent’s obligation to support the juvenile until 18 to either the teen herself, a new guardian, or, if warranted, the financial wherewithal of the court. If the judge deems it necessary, the state may then pay benefits. [Legal Aid’s Barbara Davis] says it used to be [that] teens had jobs—fast food workers, for example—but lately they don’t, which means the state steps in to save them.

From what I gathered from the article, it costs \$430 to “get [legal] representation” to get you emancipated – a sum most teenagers don’t have. Legal Aid is willing to fund them, and so might the State Bar, the County, or a private foundation.

Teens learn about early emancipation from pamphlets, Juvenile Court and their peers, and of course many of them immediately want it. Says Davis, “They’re mad at mom and dad and they think, Hey I can get emancipated without knowing what that means. Or someone wants to get married ... [or] move in with [their] boyfriend.” The stuff of real emancipation, however, is about making contracts, which the article makes no secret of:

It is often necessary that an adolescent whose parents aren’t around needs to apply to college, rent an apartment, or get a job. In other words, enter into a contractual agreement with someone or an institutional someone when a parent’s signature is not forthcoming. It’s a key reason why emancipation is law. In an email, Encinitas [California] family attorney Larissa Bodniowycz writes: “Under most circumstances, minors are considered to lack the ‘capacity’ to enter into binding legal contracts.”

Signing On the Dotted Line

This is the important stuff, I have learned, and it relates to Hammurabi’s law, frequently thought of as “an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth.” But Hammurabi’s law is much more than that. It is actually a large body of codes, and one of its tenets is that *only equals can contract*. For example, an adult cannot make a contract with a dog or a baby—obviously because a dog or a baby would not understand the terms of the contract. From Wiki:

The Code of Hammurabi is a well-preserved Babylonian law code of ancient Mesopotamia, dating back to about 1754 BC. It is one of the oldest deciphered writings of significant length in the world. The sixth Babylonian king, Hammurabi, enacted the code, and partial copies exist on a human-sized stone stele [or slab] and various clay tablets. The Code consists of 282 laws, with scaled punishments, adjusting “an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth” (*lex talionis*) as graded depending on social status, of slave versus free man. Nearly one-half of the Code deals with matters of contract, establishing, for example, the wages to be paid to an ox driver or a surgeon. Other provisions set the terms of a transaction, establishing the liability of a builder for a house that collapses, for example, or property that is damaged while left in the care of another. A third of the code addresses issues concerning household

and family relationships such as inheritance, divorce, paternity and sexual behavior. Only one provision appears to impose obligations on an official; this provision establishes that a judge who reaches an incorrect decision is to be fined and removed from the bench permanently. A handful of provisions address issues related to military service.

The code was discovered by modern archaeologists in 1901, and its *editio princeps* translation published in 1902 by Jean-Vincent Scheil. This nearly complete example of the Code is carved into a diorite stele in the shape of a huge index finger, 2.25 meters (7.4 ft) tall. The Code is inscribed in the Akkadian language, using cuneiform script carved into the stele. It is currently on display in the Louvre, with exact replicas in the Oriental Institute at the University of Chicago, the library of the Theological University of the Reformed Churches ... in The Netherlands, the Pergamon Museum of Berlin and the National Museum of Iran in Tehran.

Contracts and their importance, then, go way back to the days of Babylon, and with some 140 Hammurabi codes addressing them, people must have felt they needed to be properly maintained and understood. This is why our parents must sign for us until we reach maturity, when we are presumed to be capable of signing for ourselves. *Signatures are instruments of contracting*, and I have just begun to get a better understanding of this enormously important reality.

I did a podcast interview with Anita Whitney last month (please see AbouttheSky.com/podcasts), from which I finally grasped what it means when people talk about *corporate government* or the fact that our government is a corporation. I have seen videos about this, one rather hilarious one from Australia (see YouTube “What the FUQ: Frequently Unanswered Questions of the “Australian Government”), wherein the narrator found his government to be listed on the U.S. trademark registry. Americans too will find surprises on the Dun & Bradstreet roster of commercial enterprises, for their local towns and agencies are listed there as commercial entities, down to the local police. So, Watson, what does this all mean?

I’ll summarize what I learned from the podcast with Anita, who found all this out by accident, you could say, and has since begun to plumb the depths of this dark ocean so as to

explain it lucidly to others. Yes, there are many who have extensively studied this topic and written and interviewed on it, but the activist audience nonetheless does not seem to really get it until it is broken down into very simple concepts, which I will attempt to lay out here. Sure, ask anyone who's "awake" if they know our government is a corporation and they'll say yes; ask them what they think that means and you get a range of interpretations: "It means our country is run by corporations like General Electric and the media" or "It means we lost our republic" or "It's U.S.A., Inc." ... but no one is able to explain it any further. So here goes, from my notes during the podcast ...

Back in 1871, the United States and Washington, District of Columbia were incorporated and became the mothership of a federal corporation franchise system. As time went on, other large incorporations emerged: in 1913 the Federal Reserve; in 1920 the Treasury Act by which Congress gave the country's money to the private U.S.A., Inc.; and 1933 when U.S.A. the corporation was put under the control of the Trustees of Bankruptcy, resulting in all of our current agencies (450 of them), listed in Dun & Bradstreet for your reading pleasure. All the above sounds like a bunch of boring history, but these were the steps to our lives being governed by corporations (that phrase again!), which are *not* companies like Monsanto and General Electric. The incorporation of local governments and agencies was initially sold to those elected and hired to serve/work in what used to be representative government to "protect" them personally from liability: meaning that if someone fell on a city sidewalk and sustained an injury, the mayor himself or the builder of the sidewalk would not be held personally liable for the mishap. This made good sense: better to set things up so the town could be sued rather than the people who worked for it, and this way towns and cities could do more with their money – invest it, for example, and even prosper. Agencies and cities were thus made into "a body politic" – capable of suing and being sued, of contracting and being contracted with.

Prospering with Contracts

Corporations are bound by the laws of contracts. They exist to do business and engage in commerce, and doing business is about making profits. Corporations are not living entities; they are *legal constructs* heavily protected by their attorneys and their endless contracts: They are *all about conducting business through contracts*.

So when the people of Anytown vote for city council members, faces become installed in what is an actual

corporation, and the living people who have won the election become officers of a corporation. They now have to *adhere to the rules and regulations of the corporation*, and this is made very clear to them. They do not represent the public at all, and they know it. They are in their positions to conduct business using contracts. (This is why we, the public, get only three minutes to speak at city council meetings ... it's a way to placate us and have us believe that our voices are being heard.)

So then what? I'm going to race to the top of the pyramid, to the mothership corporation—the federal government—which we know by now is trillions in debt to the private Federal Reserve, and which we also know is brimming with uncountable individuals who lie outright, care nothing about the condition of or welfare of the American people, take huge bribes, behave reprehensibly in their private lives, and on and on. Money, that thing everyone and their brother can never get enough of, is "lent" to the mothership in huge amounts, to be offered to all the little fishies and guppies of towns and cities in the form of *corporate grant contracts*. The federal government says: "Hey everyone! We have this many million dollars for ten super-duper fluoride treatment plants. Who wants to be the first in their state to have one?" And all the towns and cities jump up and down and say "We do! We do!" and competition ensues for the contracts. The contracts might be for projects, programs, buildings, parks, roads – just about anything. Those cities that receive the subsequent grants then begin the planning and strategy to implement what has been contracted for – hiring, reviewing, and eventually creating. City councils approve the projects and programs based on glossy descriptions by their engineers, who rely on information provided by resources (e.g., government agencies) that are not necessarily truthful. By the time the contract money (grant) is received and residents find out what is going to happen in their community, it is too late to change things. Business – the only purpose of their local corporate government – has already begun, and city officials only serve the corporation they are officers of.

We have all heard of that "hidden money" that every bankrupt city seems to have, but never admits to. Various references like "the CAFR" are made to this stash, but the CAFR is not a fund per se; it is the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for each government entity and can be found online. Activists discover "millions of dollars sitting in the CAFR!" – while those very cities are telling us they have no money, are going broke, roads and schools are deteriorating ... we will just have to raise taxes, collect more in fines and permits and licenses and fees. All that is

actually true, if you can believe it, as I learned from a friend who was high up in the County Board of Education that the CAFR reports *reserves* which consist of *funds set aside for specific uses*—like projects and programs. You can't plan a conference and spend three years setting it up and then turn around and find there's no money ... so a budget has to be created and the funds acquired or set aside for this particular expense *beforehand* so the money is there when the checks need to be paid. So yes, a city can declare itself "broke" and have no money to fix roads but have plenty of money reported in the CAFR because *this* money is for *other* things — namely all the programs and improvements that arrive in the way of hefty corporate grant contracts.

This is how the police state, New World Order and Agenda 21 are hurtling into our lives. We regular folk make the mistake of thinking that it is "taxpayer money" going into fancy train stations, buildings and parks ... but it isn't. It's NWO money in the form of contracts, rolled down at our corporate local governments by the billions, and every city wants this. Sure, why not invest this money too and try to make it grow so we can enlarge our pension funds, why not see if we can build the new community park with electric-car-charging stations on the cheap ... we can invest the leftover and prosper!

This is also why everyone and his brother (e.g., builders and developers) loves government contracts because you *can* overcharge and you *will* get paid ... because the money is just created digitally upon being "borrowed" and the whole idea is to get changes installed that make our world look better, seem better ... but are slowly taking away our lives. The \$42-million community park with swimming pools, skate park, basketball courts, picnic tables and dog park will be our consolation prize for losing our private homes and back yards—all coming soon, thanks to global "sustainability" and Agenda 21! Ordinary people don't have a clue that the elite are buying them, through their governments and on the commercial/business level of life with fiat (fake) money and community "improvements" (changes) that will one day seriously alter—perhaps even ruin—the quality of their lives. I'll mention a couple of European countries now.

Take Sweden. As a young teenager, I had a chance to live there. It was lots of fun — liberal, progressive, the younger Swedes spoke English (the NWO language-to-be), they loved rock music, had long hair and blue jeans, American movies showed in the cinemas, no one was hung up about about sex, and it all seemed so open and free! Coming from restrictive, Arab-populated North Africa, where I had just

lived, which only had nice weather and beaches to offer a 12-year-old, Sweden was like living in a dream. Back then, in the 1970s, the deterioration (debasement) of Swedish society was already occurring, although no one thought of it that way. There were topless sun lotion ads on billboards in the city and government socialism took care of many of the people's needs. Denmark and Norway were similar.

New Cities for New People

Fast forwarding to the present day, Sweden is a big mess. Minorities from Africa and Asia are moving in by the thousands, displacing Swedes and Swedish customs, and I learned from Red Ice Radio (run by Henrik Palmgren, a Swede) that tremendous housing projects are going up — veritable shoeboxes — 600,000 new homes for all the incoming immigrants. "Where's the money coming from?" he and his radio guests have wondered on the air. Well, once you know about corporate government and the vast social changes that are intended, it's pretty clear where the money is coming from. It is not taxpayer money, of course, but the Swedish people are allowed to think that (for this breeds more resentment toward the foreigners). It is New World Order money, paid through the Swedish government to contractors (builders) who want and need the work. Never mind the ugliness of the plain, boxy apartments ... to impoverished newcomers from Somalia and Senegal these will be fantastic!

The same with Spain, which we have all heard is on the brink of national bankruptcy. A British friend who lives there tells me the Spaniards wait on long lines to buy food and many have lost their jobs, yet southern Spain has put in 100 kilometers of sparkling new roadway, flanked with bike paths and parks, and his city (Malaga) is being restored to its original Moorish architecture, with more parks and bike paths and scenic overlooks ... What is this all reminiscent of but Agenda 21? My overactive little mind tells me the immigrants flooding into Spain from North Africa will just love the Moorish architecture, for the Moors were Arabs, in case we all have forgotten. So Spain and Sweden and god knows where else are being prepped for other nationalities and ethnicities to become wholly comfortable—if in restrictive spaces and lifestyles—but as refugees fleeing economic destruction in their own countries, they will be all too grateful for these accommodations. As for the original residents, of European stock, they will be sidelined in all imaginable ways — socially, culturally, economically — until they expire (you can interpret this) or are driven out ... perhaps to the Third World, where they will be told there are jobs to be had, homes being built for them, a welcome

committee and budding economy waiting for a new, educated work force.

All this is funded by New World Order money, created digitally (in other words, out of thin air) by the world's ruling elite, who have drawn up these long- and wide-ranging plans to mix the world cauldron thoroughly so that no one will know or care where they came from or what their forefathers did.

The Powers That Be – elite, NWO, bankers – effectively use these fake-money grants as bribes and awards to build the New World they are envisioning. This is really how and why our planet is changing so fast, and why our protesting voices make no difference at all. School shootings, I am willing to bet, are all *paid for by federal grants*, as the Department of Homeland Security and FEMA are government agencies, and therefore corporations under the mothership. These entities might be approaching or choosing certain towns and cities for the staging of Integrated Capstone Events (exercises and drills involving multiple players like police and news teams, receiving hospitals, role-playing participants), which ICE events are *contracted and paid for in advance*. Now that should make the people of America sit up!

For instance, I am making an educated guess that Newtown, CT received a large sum of money to build the fancy Sandy Hook firehouse that the public was told would serve as its principal fire-fighting center, but its real starring role was to serve as the hub for the Sandy Hook Capstone Event. The Sandy Hook Elementary School was allowed to deteriorate because the plan was to have it torn down and replaced with a spanking NWO super-school to serve as the template for all the police-state and mental-health controls that will be in all American schools in the future. No *wonder* all those “Sandy Hook families” with sketchy backgrounds (lots of them in acting and broadcasting) were moved in to those neighborhoods shortly before the event, to blend in and play the part of residents. Contracts and more contracts, my friends! The scripting of those implausible public statements after the massacre was also done by contract, and now we know why town and city officials keep their lips sealed, have nothing to say, no questions to ask about how a 20-year-old weakling like Adam Lanza could pull off such a stunt. Now we know why the bereaved families in Charleston received such huge compensation (\$29 million), and why the first four responding policemen to Sandy Hook were prior sex offenders (rather unusual for “normal” police) and also appeared at the Boston Marathon bombing ... they do love their contracts!

Indirectly for Sale

In the old days, politicians could be bought directly. The word for that is “bribe,” as we know; today bribing is scandalously verboten, although donations and lobbying are not. Nor is accepting money through grants, and because the federal government has been incorporated and has essentially become a never-ending borrowing machine that trades money for NWO projects and programs, cities and their “representatives” can be bought and paid.

It was the Southern Pacific Railroad that donated public land to robber baron Amasa Leland Stanford, its president, an active freemason who was also elected eighth governor of California. That year was 1861. Stanford had come to California in the Gold Rush (beginning in 1848), which transformed San Francisco from a tiny settlement of 200 to a boom town by the middle of the 1850s. Leland Stanford's vision was to build “a school or institution for civil and mechanical engineers on my grounds in Palo Alto.” It was at this school that two young graduates, Bill Hewlett and David Packard, began the first “technology relationship” between Stanford University and outside firms, whose growth over the past 100-plus years has become what we call Silicon Valley. Google has spent more lobbying the federal government than nearly any other entity, and Stanford's Office of Technology Licensing tells us the U.S. government funds 85% of the university's research.

It was the 1886 court case brought by Santa Clara County against Southern Pacific Railroad resulting in the ruling that “defendant Corporations are persons within the intent of the ... Fourteenth Amendment.” Thus we now have this thing called *corporate personhood*, derived from a case about local taxes owed by the railroad to the county. Individuals had been allowed by California law to deduct mortgages and debts from their taxable property's value, but corporations (dead fictitious entities) could not do so. The judge, a “friend” of the railroad, deemed the Corporation to be a “person” as per the 14th Amendment, and the railroad – which had not yet paid its government loans – was thus able to save a lot on its county tax bill. (I have also heard that the clerk of the court was a former railroad employee and entered a false ruling in favor of the railroad. One might conclude that either the judge or the clerk, or both, were rewarded by the railroad for their helpfulness ...but that part of the story I don't know.)

The Fourteenth Amendment was passed in 1868, its first section reading as follows:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

It seems the judge generously applied the meaning of “person” in this section to the railroad corporation, which was thus allowed to enjoy the same tax protection that people did. Corporations were at that time *public charters*, which meant they were formed to manage activities that benefitted the public – e.g., building railroads, canals and other utilities. Corporate charters were created only for brief periods of time, and legislators granted very few of them. Corporations were heavily restricted: they could only engage in activities related to fulfilling their chartered purpose, and the people governed corporations by spelling out their operating conditions not only in the charters but also in state constitutions and state laws. The penalty for charter abuse was the end of the corporation.

Today, corporations are as free as birds (a metaphor). They have grown into giants, punished by a fine or two when they are caught doing terrible things, which fines they rarely pay, thanks to their wealth and many attorneys, put to good use in fighting off annoyances like lawsuits. Profit and satisfying shareholders is their reason for being. The word “person” in legal contexts is now actually used to refer to incorporations, if you can believe it. Our great-grandfathers would roll in their graves. But where I am really going with this is into the land of the future, where corporations will be running human life, in the form of *codes* – a whole new kind of corporate code/rules, and a lot more infinite and scary.

What is a D.A.O.? We are familiar with the Chinese word *tao*, a hard-to-define term tackled so by Wiki:

Cosmologically, Tao signifies the primordial essence or fundamental nature of the universe. In the foundational text of Taoism, the *Tao Te Ching*, Laozi explains that Tao is not a “name” for a “thing” but the underlying natural order of the universe whose ultimate essence is difficult to circumscribe due to it being non-conceptual yet evident in one’s being of aliveness. The Tao is “eternally nameless” (Dao De Jing-32. Laozi) and

to be distinguished from the countless “named” things, which are considered to be its manifestations—the reality of life before its descriptions of it. The concept of Tao differs from conventional (western) ontology: it is an active and holistic conception of Nature, rather than a static, atomistic one.

That’s nice, and if you think about it a bit, you can understand it. Actually, *tao* is pronounced “dow” and so is DAO, this new word soon to be heard a lot more, so tackled by Wiki:

A decentralized autonomous organization (DAO), fully automated business entity (FAB), or distributed autonomous corporation/company (DAC) is a decentralized network of narrow-AI autonomous agents which perform an output-maximizing production function and which divides its labor into computationally intractable tasks (which it incentivizes humans to do) and tasks which it performs itself. It can be thought of as a corporation run without any human involvement under the control of *an incorruptible set of business rules*. These rules are typically implemented as *publicly auditable open-source software* distributed across the computers of their stakeholders. A human becomes a stakeholder by buying stock in the company or being paid in that stock to provide services for the company. This stock may entitle its owner to a share of the profits of the DAO, participation in its growth, and/or a say in how it is run. (My italics)

Um, who thought up this term, I wonder? Would it be what I call the Silicon Valley Google geeks – the singularitarians and visionaries featured in a January 2015 *Harper’s* magazine article titled, “Come With Us If You Want to Live”? For these are the smartest, snappiest fixers of the future, who pride themselves in spending over 100 hours a week on “world optimization.” These are the human minds that will lay out the machine intelligence that will run our society as we ourselves cannot. Says one: “Imagine if you wrote some program that could render a service, and it generated enough of a profit that it could cover its own costs. It could perpetuate indefinitely ... because it’s just the code running itself.”

Now you’re getting it! From *Harper’s* (by Sam Frank):

[For] decades, cyberpunks, cypherpunks, extro-

pians, transhumanists, and singularitarians have imagined a world made out of code, one in which politics is an engineering problem and every person is a master of atoms and bits. The promise is a future in which we become more than human. The threat is a future without us.

“So you’re going to go from one D.A.O. to ten D.A.O.’s to one hundred D.A.O.’s to ten thousand D.A.O.’s ... Then, just based off of profit maximization, they’re going to start merging and acquiring one another.”

Techno-war Against the Universe

Continuing ... and a lot of this comes from Amasa Leland’s technical school graduates (we need to keep that thread connected) ... from the *Harper’s* piece by Sam Frank:

Some months later, I came across...Blake Masters, who was then a Stanford law student and tech entrepreneur in training. His motto—“Your mind is software. Program it. Your body is a shell. Change it. Death is a disease. Cure it. Extinction is approaching. Fight it.”—was taken from a science-fiction role-playing game. Masters was posting rough transcripts of Peter Thiel’s Stanford lectures on the founding of tech start-ups. I had read about Thiel, a billionaire who cofounded PayPal with Elon Musk and invested early in Facebook. His companies Palantir Technologies and Mithril Capital Management [were named] from Tolkien. Thiel was a heterodox contrarian, a Manichean libertarian, a reactionary futurist.

“I no longer believe that freedom and democracy are compatible,” Thiel wrote in 2009. Freedom might be possible, he imagined, in cyberspace, in outer space, or on high-seas homesteads, where individualists could escape the “terrible arc of the political.” Lecturing in Palo Alto, California, Thiel cast self-made company founders as saviors of the world: “There is perhaps no specific time that is necessarily right to start your company or start your life. But some times and some moments seem more auspicious than others. Now is such a moment. If we don’t take charge and usher in the future ... there is the sense that no one else will. So go find a frontier and go for it.”

The future being planned, even ushered in, by these techno-

saviors is discussed at conferences all over the world with names like “Towards a New Strategy for Human Evolution.” Keynote speakers are visionaries like Ray Kurzweil, now director of engineering at Google. Attendees have their own start-ups and are bent on re-engineering and untangling our complicated and misdirected (in everyone’s judgment) forward path. Some call it “my personal war against the universe.” They are dedicated – and competitive.

They commonly agree that what must be applied to this sick society, hatched within a nonsensical, swerving universe, is *rationality*. They believe they are all “incomprehensibly smart.” Many were sent to for-geeks-only summer camps as teens to study number theory, game theory and other super-geeky stuff. As described by the writer, they are all predominantly skinny, with glasses, raggedy T-shirts and unkempt beards—what you would expect from such brainiacs. They desperately want to head off “wild AI,” meaning an artificial intelligence that runs off on its own and decides to destroy humans.

What happens if an artificial intelligence begins improving itself, changing its own source code, until it rapidly becomes ... orders of magnitude more intelligent than we are? A canonical thought experiment devised by Oxford philosopher Nick Bostrom in 2003 suggests that even a mundane, industrial sort of AI might kill us. Bostrom posited a “superintelligence whose top goal is the manufacturing of paper clips.” For this AI, known fondly ... as Clippy, self-improvement might entail rearranging the atoms in our bodies, and then in the universe – and so we, and everything else, end up as office supplies. ... What is urgently needed, then ... is an AI that shares our values and goals. This, in turn, requires a cadre of highly rational mathematicians, philosophers and programmers to solve the problem of “friendly” AI—and, incidentally, the problem of a universal human ethics—before an indifferent, unfriendly AI escapes into the wild.

Now that corporations have been granted personhood and its accompanying protections, and we are on the brink of a debate on *machine personhood*, when that arrives, AI will be included as a person too. The definition of “person” in the State of California’s statutory code – a legal definition – is this: “*Person*” includes any person, firm, association, organization, partnership, limited liability company, business trust, corporation, or company. Of note is the grouping or classification of “person” with fictitious

organizations – legal constructs consisting of rules on paper (e.g., articles of incorporation). “Person” is not defined as a human man, woman or child. Person in this grouping is another “dead” thing, a thing on paper, an assembly of rules, regulations in the form of words, which are a kind of code. AI is made up of code, corporations have codes, the legal system is all about codes ... so codes one day will inevitably rule the world.

Living By Code

Thanks to code(s) and their built-in self-correcting efficacies, even consciousness can be engineered—and engineered ethically. Meet Andres Gomez Emilsson, age 23, with a Ph.D. in computational psychology. Emilsson is half Mexican and half Icelandic, and heads the Stanford Transhumanist Association. One of his ideas:

... building a brain dashboard, more profound than any drug, on which one could “play different permutations of keys, and that instantiates different states of consciousness.” He was also a panpsychist, which meant that he thought consciousness was a universal property of matter, and a negative hedonic utilitarian: he wanted to minimize the world’s suffering before maximizing its pleasure. “Once that’s done we then can go on and actually party really hard.”

Of course he was a vegan, he said, but he went further. “If you think it through ... when a zebra is being eaten alive by a lion, that’s one of the worst experiences that you could possibly have. And if we are compassionate toward our pets and our kids, and we see a squirrel suffering in our backyard and we try to help it, why wouldn’t we actually want to help the zebra?” We could genetically engineer lions into herbivores, he suggested, or drone-drop in-vitro meat whenever artificial intelligence detects a carnivore’s hunger, or reengineer “ecosystems from the ground up, so that all the evolutionarily stable equilibriums that happen within an ecosystem are actually things that we consider ethical.”

That *we* consider ethical. One of the worst experiences *you* could possibly have. Ai yai yai! How does the lion feel about being reengineered as a herbivore? Or to have drones flying overhead slinging gross laboratory meat at him? If that’s a panpsychist, the animal world doesn’t need more of them. One idiot panpsychist is enough!

Regardless, there seem to be a lot of brainiacs who believe themselves qualified to save the world, and they are busy designing software – code – to carry out the task.

As software eats everything, prices will plunge. You won’t need much money to live like a king; it won’t be a big deal if your job is made obsolete by code or a robot. The rich will enjoy bespoke luxury goods [superfine things made expressly for certain clients and never reproduced] and be first in line for new experiences, but otherwise there will be no differences among people; inequality will increase but cease to matter. Politics as we know it will lose relevance. Large, gridlocked states will be disrupted like any monopoly. Customer-citizens, armed with information, will demand transparency, accountability, choice. They will want their countries to be run as well as a start-up. There might be some civil wars, there might be many new nations, but the stabilizing force will be corporations, which will become even more like parts of a global government than they are today. Google and Facebook, for instance, will be bigger and better than ever: highly functional, monopolistic technocracies that will build out the world’s infrastructure. Facebook will be the new home of the public sphere; Google will automate everything.

...

The Internet is built around hubs controlled by corporations; we trust Dropbox to store things for us, Google not to read our email [really?]. (In this way, the Internet resembles society generally: power is centralized, and we either trust the governments and the institutions in control or we are coerced into obeying them.) The leap that technologies like Ethereum ask us to make is to imagine a new, decentralized Internet—one in which every user has his, her, or *its* own node. We will make a constant stream of micropayments to one another and pay for storage and computing power, not through corporate middlemen (Dropbox, Google) but by means of a blockchain [public ledger], a cryptographic verification system like Bitcoin’s that anyone can inspect.

But what is this good for? Ethereum’s developers are building distributed storage and secure messaging systems ... but the primary innovation is allowing users to execute contracts without the need for a trusted third party. These can be

simple: say, a betting pool in which the bookie has been automated away and the stakes are put in escrow until a predetermined event triggers the release of money to the winner. More complicated contracts could allow connected devices to manage their own interactions: your appliances could run when power is cheaper; your self-driving car could negotiate with the smart-road system, which sets tolls dynamically in order to manage traffic. But Ethereum's true believers ... are more interested in remaking society itself. As the Internet continues to blend with the real world, decentralized contracts might become the building blocks of many decentralized forms of human governance, along libertarian or perhaps anarchist lines.

A group of friends or strangers ... could set up a mutual-aid society without involving an insurance company. Each person would pay into a contract that would automatically release money to an injured or unemployed party when certain mutually agreed upon conditions were met. This ... [might in turn lead to] a digital community currency, with units distributed to all members on an egalitarian basis ... the group could vote to accept new members, which would make the mutual-aid system more robust and the community currency more useful. As real and virtual imbricated [overlapped] further, these modest cooperative entities could and would scale up.

...
[Next:] an opt-in system of organizing human behavior with rules that can be made radically egalitarian.

...
What [is] really naive [is] trusting corruptible humans and opaque institutions with concentrated power. Better to formalize our values forthrightly in code. ... [At present you] have a number of agents that are following specific rules, except that the rules of the system are enforced by the laws of physics instead of the laws of cryptography. "The cryptography approach," [Vitalik] Buterin [founder of Ethereum and co-founder of Bitcoin] added, "is superior because you have much more freedom in determining what those rules are."

There are a lot of unfamiliar terms and names for me in this article, but the concepts are beginning to sink in. Someone

wants to turn our world into and over to code – that's very plain. Code is considered superior to flawed human thinking, and code will be more egalitarian because it will apply to everyone (I presume). Code plays no favorites. Code is not alive; it's simply a bunch of symbols. When we eliminate control by people, we will eliminate bribing, favoring, sympathizing, siding with ... all those behind-the-scenes things that power can do without the public seeing it.

Back to Hammurabi and those ancient codes, which were also inscriptions (cryptography) having to do with how people interacted with one another, and their golden rule: Only Equals May Contract. The age of technology and transparency would seem to reflect this tenet: Let's put those opaque institutions to bed and start a new system of no middlemen or organizations and going one-to-one instead. Code will hold our "new money" and release it; our mutual agreements (*contracts!*) will dictate when and how much to release. Decentralized contracts means contracts between one another without agencies (corporations) hitching us together. Yet the hidden reality in the new system will be that we ourselves are corporations, now engaging (contracting) as such, whether we realize it and enjoy it or not. Also, the code writers will be the new lawyers of the future, as ordinary folk will have no notion of what code is or how to write and read it; we will again be haplessly dependent on those with special skills – in this case, pimply geniuses—to do this for us. And by then we may be even more dependent on our Legal Fictions, for which all that code is really written.

Our "John Hancock," as they call a signature in America, enjoins our real flesh-and-blood self with our legal self, which is a fiction created for us by our short-form birth certificate, I am now learning. The long form b.c. attests to our live birth, whereas the short form is a document bearing our name in all capital letters (the designation of a corporate name, according to the United States Printing Style Manual). The short form b.c. is issued several days after one is born, and without our realizing it, our bank statements and accounts, credit cards and other "official" documents and dealings bear our name in capital letters. (Notice when your bank sends you letters about lower interest rates or various specials, your name is not in all caps – because they are writing to a real person who might decide to avail herself of such a favorable opportunity, whereas a dead fiction cannot.) Citizenship papers and legal documents show the same: all caps – for it is the legal entity that is being referred to here, and our signature on these items binds us to those fictitious creations.

I have heard people dismiss this as rubbish, but I do not see how so many who have dug deep into this rabbit hole (including some who were part of this [legal] system) could be wrong. The monetization of so much of the physical world in so many endless forms leaves me with little doubt that people too have bonds and securities attached to them, and the booklet *Lawfully Yours*, available at Anita Whitney's website, AntiCorruptionSociety.com, helps explain all of this. I suggest you read *Lawfully Yours* (pdf or printed/ bound booklet available for a modest sum) at least once to soak it all in, and there are lots of source materials that go with the content, should you want to dig deeper.

Controlled by the BAR

If you go to AntiCorruptionSociety.com, there's a top-menu tab called "Lawfully Yours." The pdf and doc versions of the booklet, which consists of the combined writings of a number of people, are to be found toward the bottom of the Lawfully Yours page, before the comments. (Another useful little booklet is "Who is Running America?" subtitled "The Bankruptcy of America, the Corporate United States and the New World Order"—permanent link at www.barefootsworld.net/usfraud.html.) Then there's this thing called the BAR, which stands for British Accreditation Regency, and is a non-governmental professional association of lawyers paying union dues. Quoting an article "The BARCard" from AntiCorruptionSociety.com:

The American BAR Association is an offshoot from London Lawyers' Guild and was established by people with invasive monopolistic goals in mind. In 1909 they incorporated this traitorous group in the state of Illinois and had the State Legislature (which was under the control of lawyers) pass an unconstitutional law that only members of this powerful union of lawyers, called the American BAR Association, could practice law and hold all the key positions in law enforcement and the making of laws. At that time, Illinois became an outlaw state, and for all practical purposes, they seceded from the United States of America.

The BAR Association then sent organizers to all the other states and explained to the lawyers there how much more profitable and secure it would be for them ... to join this union and be protected by its bylaws and canons. They issued to the lawyers in each state a charter from the Illinois organization. California joined in 1927 and a few

reluctant states ... waited until the 1930s to join when the treasonous [Bankruptcy] Act became *de facto* and the citizens became captives.

Under this system, the lawyers could guarantee prejudged decisions for the privileged class against the lower class. This was all made possible by the American BAR Association to favor codes and unlawfully substitute them in place of Constitutional Laws. ...

The public in California was shocked to learn that the state government has no control or jurisdiction over the BAR Association or its members. The state does not accredit the law schools or hold BAR examinations. They do not issue state licenses to lawyers. The BAR Association accredits all the law schools, holds their private [BAR] examinations and selects the students they will accept in their organization and issues them so-called licenses, but keeps the fees for [itself]. The BAR is the only [entity] that can punish or disbar a lawyer.

They also select the lawyers that they consider qualified for Judgeships and various other offices in the State. Only the BAR Association, or their designated committees, can remove any of these lawyers from public office. The State Legislature will not change this system as [it] is also a designated committee of the BAR.

... This is a tremendous amount of power for a private union that is incorporated and headquartered in Illinois to hold over the citizens of California or any other state.

And here I will send you to a long interview (over 3 hours) done with a woman called Joyce Rosenwald, no longer alive, whose research of 45 years into the true nature of "legal system" probably went deeper than anyone else's. You can access this long series on YouTube by typing in "parens patriae Joyce Rosenwald" ... there's that term again, that I introduced in a past newsletter! For it is only through our legal-fiction self that the government or courts can lay claim to us, dictate to us, tell us what to do. A shocking revelation, but it is apparently the truth, and it has made me invent a new acronym: LCFB (or lcfb, perhaps), which stands for "lower-case-flesh-and-blood." Next time an authority asks you to state your name, say "I am el-see-eff-bee So-and-So" so as not to become enjoined ...