

The Dominion Theory

The Dominion Theory is this, that only free citizens have rights and only those who have rights have authority and the only authority we can have as free citizens is authority over what we create. The proviso being the only thing humans are able to create is value and the only value we can create is attached to something that belonged to God.

In other words, we either add to the things of God, or we follow a different master.

The rights of the free citizen are the rights of dominion. The rights of dominion are given by an act of creation. Free citizens earn their freedom through an act of creation, the free citizen produces things with value, and this produces their freedom.

This incidentally is what is meant by building the church. The church being the kingdom we erect on top of the things that God created. The church is man's portion of reality. The rest is God's.

The free citizen does not believe freedom is a right. This is the most controversial aspect of the theory. Freedom is not free and it can be lost, it can be given up. One must understand our situation as human beings. We are on a planet not designed for us. We are in a reality and on a planet that is not friendly to us. This is not Eden. This reality compels us to work for a living. If we will not work, we will not eat, we starve and we die.

Subsistence is not really living.

There is another hard fact of reality we must face. No one owes us a living. We are compelled by nature to work if we wish to live. Nature however, does not require us to work for the life of someone else. The life of another does not put a burden on us. This does not mean we are selfish. The parasite is selfish, and it is the free loader who has a sense of entitlement.

This is the most repugnant aspect of the theory of dominion, but it does not contain any path to its deconstruction. The life of another does not impose any burden on us. Any obligation we feel for the life or situation of another, is totally subjective and self-imposed.

The Theory of Dominion postulates there are free citizens and subjects. Subjects are parasites and live as domesticated beasts of the state. Subjects have no natural rights because they are not free citizens and have given up the right to what they create. The power of creation has been taken from them, given up in fact, to gain the protection of the state. This is a scam and protection racket of the state. Like all protection rackets is threatens the citizen with harm if it does not agree to be protected by the state. But it is the state that represents the greatest threat a free citizen faces.

Democracy is an inverse relation technology, created to turn free citizens into subjects by a mark of the pen, the mark of the beast.

The state is a broker in that as a broker it does not use its own money to purchase what it purchases for its clients. Unlike a conventional broker the state holds the power of attorney over its clients. This is why they are subjects. They have no rights pursuant to the

state. By law our rights are privileges given to a subject by the state. What is given by law can be removed by law. This is because the state does exercise power of attorney over its subjects and cannot claim anything that the state does not decide to provide them with.

Democracy is the greatest evil to have befallen man. By the mark of a pen the state is given all rights and powers over the free citizen, making him or her a virtual domesticated animal, a subject of the state's largesse.

The slave has struggled with his master seeking more freedoms, even the freedom to speak and to associate, rights not often granted to slaves. To keep peace on the plantation the slave owning state has loosened its rules pertaining to its subjects, but the power is always there to rescind any right given.

The free citizen is free because the free citizen abides by the right of dominion. Freedom cannot be given; it must be taken. Freedom is not a gift nor a benefit to be handed down from on high.

Freedom is inherent in the right of dominion. There is no freedom and no rights if what we create can be alienated.

In this universe there are only two modes of creation and two created substances. These two things are viewed of in economics, assets and equity. Assets comprise the value we have been given. Assets comprise the substrate of reality. Some call this class of things, physical reality but this way of thinking leads to confusion. No human being has ever created a single molecule of physical reality. Matter cannot be created or destroyed because humans cannot add or subtract from what exists. We have only one mode of creation, and that is as assistants. We can add value to assets to produce equity. That is all we are able to do.

No one truly wants assets in their raw form. These belong to God, and most of it has little or no value to humankind. We have dominion over the earth, meaning we have responsibility over the natural world and we are accountable for what happens to the things under our care. We do not really have authority over assets in any real sense because we cannot destroy physical reality nor add to what exists. We can add value to nature and we are able to consume the value that adheres to created things, but this does not actually change the asset in a fundamental sense.

Our actions do change assets relative to our kind. That is we can modify assets to better suit our needs or deconstruct them so they are less useful. We can poison the water and dirty the air or we can deliver potable water to our homes and cool and heat the air. Those are options available to us. But these changes to the world are important to us, not to nature.

Nature is not designed for our use; we must redesign it to make it habitable. Other than being artists using nature as our canvas, we live as parasites on the earth. Therefore,

the two classes of actions we have is additive and subtractive. Our actions are creative and add value to assets, or they are destructive and remove value from assets.

But no one adds value and then leaves the value unattended, in the sense they fail to exercise dominion over it. We do not build gardens without a sense of ownership over it. Dominion is the right to what we create, but we have to right to what others create. This has created a problem for mankind because he has always viewed the earth as an unclaimed land, open to the most aggressive claimant.

Reality is not unowned. We do not get to do what we wish, with it. When we see a continent, it is not there as a thing for us to do with as we please.

We understand there are physical laws, these are physical limitations on what we can do in and to nature. This ought to be enough to prove we do not own the physical world and that something higher than us, has possession of it.

However, we seem to assume the law came out of no where and if we cannot circumvent it or overcome it, we can harness it to our own needs.

But the question always was, under what authority do we claim the land we are on. Under what office do we claim a licence to the geography of our nation? But there is no answer to the question but the power that comes from the barrel of a gun. Power is what gives us our rights.

The right of dominion was turned into the right of might, or the law of the jungle. In nature, might makes right and the end justifies the means.

Legal rights come out of the barrel of a gun. The only other, uncontestable right, is the right of dominion. It is on the right of dominion that personal property rights exist. Personal property is property that is required for life and is generally the product of one's work, once removed. That is, we work and create some of what we possess but often purchase what we have using the income we get through the work we do.

The problem of ownership comes to the fore when considering private and public ownership. However, we need to open the discussion up to one about all forms of ownership, because if the ownership model is up for debate, then there will be those who reject the ownership model in use and seek to apply their own standards.

This is especially true if we are of the opinion the earth is an unowned asset. If no one owns the planet, how do we arbitrate conflicting claims?

Is it first come first served? Does the group with the greatest number of persons have the best claim? Or is ownership determined by which group has men still standing after a violent clash of arms?

The question is moot because regardless of what one thinks the answer is, if someone with a greater capacity to destroy those who also make a claim on the property, it is the one who forces their competitor to abandon their claim, that will end up being the owner.

In other words, if the law of the jungle prevails, martial prowess will ultimately determine the outcome of a competing ownership claim.

Associations of groups who have a shared interest in the outcome of a conflict can be formed to give them an advantage vis-à-vis other contenders, but the rule still holds. When a disagreement about ownership emerges, the only way to settle it, beyond one side or the other abandoning their claim, is through a test of strength, in which the stronger side wins.

This ought to suggest that ownership claims by private and public agencies rest on shaky ground. That the claims of the parties cannot be resolved by any other than violent means, ought to suggest that neither claim has judicial standing. When there is no judicial resolution, conflict is the only alternative. Fictitious claims have no path to resolution, but force of arms. The claim of an author to his created works is easily settled in favor of the originator against those who played no role in the production of the work.

Everyone claims they have rights, but they have no path to the resolution of their claim, other than violence. We claim we have a right of free speech and a right of association, a right to life and so on, but where is the objective evidence of these things? Mostly these rights come down to the government promising not to infringe on these rights. On the other hand, it is the government that is tasked with protecting these rights, or at least, with the task of not infringing upon them. So, what sort of rights are these if they exist only conditionally?

How do we demand our rights not be infringed, if the one that infringes them is the same one charged with their protection? The Jews could explain what this means better, having been slated for extermination by the state that ought to have been protecting them.

The rights of dominion means that if we create something of value, the value belongs to us. If we have that right and we ensure that this right is respected, the power becomes concentrated at the base. This is why Dominion economics is founded on Dominion Exchanges, which are small groups of under fifteen persons. It is the small group that administrates the resources tied to the jurisdiction it represents.

The Exchange operates as a department of Aprioria. This is a model community based solely on the Bible. Aprioria is the living testament of Sola Scriptura. It abjures all that cannot be founded in or deduced from, Scripture.

Aprioria is better considered a civilization, that is a model civilization, a model of what civilization would be if it had reached its apogee.

Aprioria is an association of all of the Dominion Exchanges. Exchanges are the building blocks of Aprioria. At this juncture it ought to be pointed out that Dominion operates in accordance to the Principle of Subsidiarity. Which means that no power is exercised by a higher office that is not expressly assigned to it by a lower agency.

Thus the rights of dominion and the Principle of Subsidiarity work together to ensure what we create cannot be expropriated by a higher administrative level.

We need to remember that if the rights of dominion are contested there are no rights. If the community does not ensure some level of protection for personal property, there is no protection and the law of the jungle, in which might makes right and the end justifies the means, is the only operational principle in force.

Think of the rights of dominion and the law of the jungle as the two ends of a scale with a pointer and a dial that turns the pointer towards the right or left. Turn the dial to the right and personal rights are protected, turn the needle to the left and more rights are added to the mix but in so doing, the rights of dominion are proportionally reduced.

If we have an absolute right to what we produce, no other rights are possible. We can postulate them, but we cannot issue them, that is, enforce the possession of them.

How do we have a right to life, if everyone has a right to what they created, and no one has any right to acquire what belongs to anyone else? There is no path to the establishment of an authority higher than the producer of the nation's wealth. There is no way to administrate rights without access to the wealth produced by individuals.

Everything that we own, is either produced by the owner or purchased through the mechanisms of the free market.

This means that the person who takes what he did not create is guilty of an offense equal to the value of the expropriation. What we take we need to pay for, what we do not pay for willingly, the councils have the obligation and authority to force payment of.

Under the rights of dominion everything is simple. These are the major points.

- We own what we create.
- No one has the right to claim what they did not create.
- We each pay for what we get.
- All transactions are through the mechanisms of the free market.
- We are all free citizens because we have no master above us.
- The authority of the higher administrative levels, is specified by the lower echelons.
- No office has any authority not given to it by the lower.
- All power ultimate rests with the base.
- The Principle of Subsidiarity is applicable here.
- Free markets operate according to the labor theory of value.
- If someone takes what they have no claim to, the appropriate Council imposes a lien on them to extract the full penalty by whatever means necessary.

- The key principle free citizens subscribe to is that no one has a right to impose costs onto another. Defrauding or otherwise removing value from what someone else rightfully possesses is the only infraction Aprioria recognizes. The penalty for all infractions of the right of dominion, is the restoration of what was taken.
- Cases hinge upon the provision of evidence that a value was created by a free citizen and that by the actions of the accused, what had been possessed was removed. Therefore, punishment consists of the restoration of what was lost to the one who suffered the loss by the person who was responsible for the loss.

In Aprioria there is no unemployment, because everyone needs things doing and everyone has the ability to do something. Dominion credits those who work the full value of the work done. Thus there is no unemployment.

Because work creates value and money represents the value created, the worker creates the backing for the issuing of his wage.

In short, if you create an hours worth of value, your labor created one hour's worth of equity. Equity, issued as preferred shares, can be issued in the form of a currency. In this case, prefers, a contraction of preferred shares, designated by the symbol ₧.

The backing of an issue of prefers by the work that created them, means there is no inflation. All money issued is always fully backed by the value it represents.

Because there is no expropriation of the value created by others, the higher administrative levels do not have the means to supersede the authority of the free citizen. Thus there are no power disparities or steep administrative gradients. All power remains at the base.

The upper administrative levels have the authority specifically assigned to them but cannot attach any additional authority to their office. Thus, free citizens are not subjects of the state but masters of their fate. Aprioria do not suffer the fate of democracies which often have governments over them, which do not represent their interests.