

Valuarchy

A Monetary Value Leadership System

Brendan Guest

Edited by: Barry Richards

Copyright © 2025 Brendan J. Guest

Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)

First Edition/2025

Chapter 1

Introduction

Systems work as designed, not as intended. A country's political system is no exception to this rule. We live in a world where politicians act as though they are above the law, elections produce incompetent leadership, and we are powerless while governments indulge in irresponsible spending at our expense. Unfortunately, this is the political system working as designed, and it is working very well for corrupt politicians, monopolies, and special interest groups. It is time to change the design of the system so that it works for us—and that new system is Valuarchy.

In the same way that Eastern Europe has been culturally revived after communist oppression and experiencing the hopelessness of their bondage to the state, we, too, can reclaim mastery of our own fate and cast off the corruption of politicians and governments. Make no mistake, we are not in a battle between classes: rich versus poor, aristocrat versus plebeian. Classes are not natural enemies, but become so by following destructive ideologies that work by dividing groups. Rather this is a battle against a flawed system. Both rich men and poor men can benefit from the idea presented in this book and find common ground within their communities. We can achieve a future where all citizens of a nation are respectful of each other, but this requires change.

If history was written by politicians, they would tell us that division was solely caused by the other political group. And then they'd tell us that if they held the seat of power all the problems of the day would be solved. Reality has seen all groups increase taxation, and pile on regulation. As a result the number of problems plaguing our nations have only grown. This highlights the fact that it is not political theory that is at the root of the problem, but the system which produces the same result regardless of political theory. The system we use is democracy—and democracy produces bad outcomes.

This is not new knowledge—Aristotle surmised this about democracy long ago. He identified three different classifications for government, each with their own good and bad version. The first government classification was rule by one, where the good version manifests as a monarchy and the bad a dictatorship. The second government classification was rule by a few, where the good version manifests as an aristocracy and the bad as an oligarchy. The third classification was rule by all. At the time of writing, Aristotle had not encountered the good version of democracy, though he did suggest one, which he called polity. He did, however, warn that democracy was the bad version of rule by all. Why democracy is the bad version was eloquently detailed centuries later by Alexander Fraser Tytler (*Tytler Cycle*) with the following quote:

"A democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover that they can vote themselves largesse from the public treasury. From that moment on, the majority always votes for the candidates promising the most benefits from the public treasury with the result that a democracy always collapses over loose fiscal policy, always followed by a dictatorship. The average age of the world's greatest civilizations has been 200 years. These nations have progressed through this sequence: From bondage to spiritual faith; From spiritual faith to

great courage; From courage to liberty; From liberty to abundance; From abundance to selfishness; From selfishness to apathy; From apathy to dependence; From dependence back into bondage.”

- Alexander Fraser Tytler

This observed pattern, where the majority of people vote for the candidate who promises the most benefits, reveals the problem that lies at the heart of democracy—that candidates are somehow able to promise anything and also extract any cost in order to win popularity. This problem is the *Funding Flaw*. It is no wonder then, that the funding flaw allows the soothsayers, double-speakers, liars, and actors become the most suited people to win the role of leadership. Dishonest men do not hold themselves responsible to their words, promising free services and feeling no guilt at pillaging the public treasury, inflating the currency, or imposing draconian taxes on the people. Fixing this design flaw creates a new system—potentially the good version of democratic rule by all that Aristotle was seeking centuries ago. A new system called *Valuarchy*.

Valuarchy: The system of evaluating a potential leader's worth, realized through the citizen's sum exchange of money under contract paid directly to the government.

Valuarchy levels the playing field for all ideologies to compete. Not just ideologies in their entirety, but each specific policy will have an associated cost whereby the people can assess the relative value of that idea and vote with their wallet. It replaces the current political landscape, where all ideas must be accepted to be part of the group, to one where only the most valuable ideas get enacted. Similar to how free market competition works between goods—only profitable goods (i.e., goods which people are willing to pay for) continue to be produced while unprofitable goods are not.

Valuarchy will require election and tax reform to implement, however, it can fit within all forms of existing government structures that utilize elections to determine leadership. This means that Valuarchy does not require an overthrow of the government to implement, but rather moderate reform that rolls a Trojan Horse carrying good incentives through the front gate, resulting in a rewiring of political values and subsequent demand for an efficient government. Where democracy is rule by the people, Valuarchy is rule by value—a fundamental distinction between the systems.

The simplicity of Valuarchy means that its integration and adoption do not need to be left to intellectuals. The solution at its core is rather simple—include price on the ballot and fund the government through direct payment. Its outcome is intuitive—if people saw the true cost of government, and had to pay it out of pocket, it would shrink today. But although the solution is simple, and the outcome intuitive, understanding why Valuarchy will produce efficient governments that are controlled by their citizens requires establishing fundamentals that are not common. Therefore, before getting into the details of Valuarchy, we must lay the groundwork for property and the role of government, followed by how money works as a communication medium and language, and finally, we must gain a deeper understanding of the funding flaw, which lies at the heart of the problem. In combination these will reveal why the world has gone so wrong, and how Valuarchy can right the ship.

Chapter 2

Sovereign Property and the Purpose of Government

Prosperity of a society is intricately linked with citizen's right to sovereign property. The definition of sovereign (*adjective*) is possessing supreme or ultimate power. The citizen must have this ultimate power—this supreme control over their own time, body, and property. Without supreme control over these, we become slaves to those who do possess that power. Owning our time and body are important, however we will focus on sovereignty of property.

Property (*noun*), as in a thing belonging to someone, is a critical advancement in human history and differentiates us from other animals. While animals maintain their own territories in the competition for resources with other groups of their species, it is different than the system humans have developed. A great example of how animals operate is the wolf tracking studies conducted within Yellowstone National Park (<https://www.nps.gov/articles/wolf-turf.htm>). What was observed was that each wolf pack stayed roughly within their own territory. However, the border lines were somewhat blurred between the packs. Each pack had to patrol their own hunting grounds and mark the boundaries with their scents. This defense of their territory takes a huge amount of time and energy, and they still face the ever-present risk of violent confrontations.

Humans have taken this natural phenomenon and developed it into a system called “property”, which we use to determine ownership of land and objects. Instead of individually marking territory, patrolling borders, and fighting off invasions by other packs, humans have abstracted away the need to go to these efforts. For example with land, we map out where the borders are and notarize with a third party (thereby creating a land title) so that our properties can be verified by a non-invested person and a fair judgment ruled without violence in times of contest. With the acknowledgment of who owns which property in any given area, the cost for each person to defend their territory is basically zero. No need for landowners to patrol borders physically. No need to constantly scent or mark. This reduction in energy and resources is a boon to people's ability to build and improve their surroundings over time.

Imagine two scenarios, one where if someone steals your car there are no consequences (i.e., you have no right to property), and one which has severe consequences for the car thief (i.e., you have a right to your property). With the former, the thief wins and you lose resources. Without property rights, you would be required to expend additional energy and resources in the defense of your own property. In the latter scenario, where there are severe consequences for the thief, he is deterred from theft. Therefore, you do not need to expend resources for the physical defense of your property. These resources, such as your time, energy, money, and materials, could instead be used on productive endeavours which improve your life. In the first scenario, we can predict that improvements to society would be slow or non-existent because too much energy is expended in defense of what already exists. However, in the second scenario, we can predict that there will be additional energy and resources for creation. This is the beauty of the property system—its link to prosperity. To summarize:

Property is an efficient system for defense.

Sovereignty of property, therefore, is about having ultimate control over our own property. In terms of land (e.g., our home), this means that a person shall be able to occupy that space without

being stolen from and have control of their privacy. No other person or entity shall have a say with what we do with, or what we do on¹, our property—we are the sovereign.

Intrusions on our ability to control our property effectively reduces our ability to defend ourselves. These intrusions include taxation, zoning, permitting (i.e., seeking permission), or any other manifestation that requires extra resources or permission to use our property as we see fit. Sovereignty is necessary to maintain the control required that makes property an efficient system of defense.

If it is known that property frees up resources, and intrusions on sovereignty so reduce property rights, why have we repeatedly found ourselves living in societies that erode these fundamentally important components of a well-functioning society? The short answer is we are vulnerable when we are isolated.

There is no such thing as a successful lone wolf. We are strong in groups and weak alone. The true but unfortunate fact is that there are many groups (e.g., criminal gangs) who will infringe on an individual's property, regardless of the rules or culture. It is unreasonable to assume that we can have a community where each individual has the courage and strength to defend their property against any and all bad actors. Even strong principled men will lose, as these groups will coerce the weaker property owners first, levy taxes against them, and use those ill-gotten resources against the stalwart property owners. No matter how strong the lone wolf, eventually the invading group will wield enough resources to overpower them, and the weak willed and weakly principled will stand idly by.

To solve for individual weakness, we have built institutions that deal in the uncomfortable, high conflict, and dangerous situations required for the common defence of our property. It is difficult for a person to take the risk of fighting to defend themselves or their neighbours without immediate reward (e.g., successful defense of their property). However, when we turn this principled defensive action into a paid occupation, more people would be willing to deal with these uncomfortable situations and take on the risk. To deal with a dangerous group, the people who take on this paid occupation must be capable of violence—in essence they are tasked with wielding violence to defend property and are paid to endure risk.

The institution that we use to provide this service of wielding violence is the government, that is its purpose. Government is meant to serve the principled citizens and prevent ill-intentioned groups (e.g., gangs) from destroying the sovereignty of property of those good citizens. Government has the monopoly on violence that is meant to be controlled by the citizens in service to the defence of those citizens. Each government must have a monopoly on violence so the people are not caught between warring factions within the same nation. If there are two or more violent entities, there will inevitably be conflict in a struggle for power—and the point is to reduce conflict efficiently.

The existence of this violent institution introduces a dichotomy: we need to retain ultimate control over our property, but also need a violent force which has the power to protect our property. How can we achieve a system where there is both a powerful collective institution and where the individual retains ultimate control over their property? How is it possible for individuals to keep that institution in check?

¹ There is a clear distinction between what one can do with one's property and what one can do within the domain of one's property. Non-consensual and non-voluntary actions which causes harm to someone else or their property—even if on the owner's property—is a violation of their sovereignty and should carry consequences. They have the right to their own defense, in the same way that we have a right to our own defense.

Current systems have not been designed well enough to balance these opposing requirements. The primary defence mechanism employed to maintain balance between the strong group and individual control has been the concept of nationalism—a body of people united by common descent, history, culture, or language, inhabiting a particular country or territory. Nationalism is a cultural mechanism, rather than a systemic one.

It works by the person in power believing in the nation in which they reside, thereby resisting the temptation to attack their own communities. However, nationalism has not been proven to be a reliable deterrent to corrupting forces².

Nationalism highlights that there are limits to the size of the nation—in terms of ethnicity and culture. Mixing ethnicities and cultures directly causes a rift between the people and results in the formation of separate factions, both between individuals and within the government. Splitting the monopoly on violence creates warring factions within the borders, until one side loses completely or there is a division of territory. Reality mirrors this very well—there are multiple governments, each representing their own people, and not a world government, though that is the wet dream of communists.

Property is a system developed to enable large groups of people to efficiently defend their own individual pieces of property. Government's purpose is to fulfill that defensive role, both internally and externally. Each nation is in competition with other nations (like the other wolf packs defending their territory). Governments must expend resources in its defense or risk all their resources being stolen by another (e.g., invasion). This is a draw on the resources of the people that could be used for more productive endeavours. The governments that can effectively defend its people in the most resource efficient manner have an economic advantage over the other groups.

Chapter 3

Money as a Language

The root word of Valuarchy is value in its verb form, “to estimate monetary worth or judge something as important.” Valuarchy evaluates leadership through the sum exchange of money. The sum exchange of money is able to evaluate leadership because money is both a communication medium and a language.

Firstly, money is a communication medium itself. Think of money as the internet (i.e., the communication protocol that transfers information between computers) and each individual is a computer. The quality of a decision on how an individual spends their money is similar to the computing power of a computer. The money is the infrastructure through which the computers exchange information, through the transferring of the money itself. Each person adds some computational power to the total of the network. This interconnection of people, through the trade of money, is what we refer “the economy.” The money, through its exchange, is the medium that communicates information be-

² *If you haven't noticed, nowadays, national identity has been decimated in two ways. The first was via a powerful coordinated propaganda push decrying that white people are inherently racist and that our nations must play host to other races, eroding respect for our own identity. The second being immigration. In the past, a land border could be hardened to resist invasion. An invasion would be obvious because the invading people would be concentrated along the border. With immigration, the invasion occurs in a highly distributed manner. At first, the number of invaders seems low as they are spread out and is only becomes notable when the invaders are apparent in large numbers throughout the country. The number of foreign people undermine the national identity. The people of a nation are unique and a foreign born person cannot assimilate just because they move there.*

tween people. Just like a computer uses binary as the language to communicate through its medium, money also has its own language—price.

Instead of a language that communicates information through combinations of different sounds, words or images—money’s language consists of a number—known as the price and/or cost. The price of an object (i.e., the number of units of money) communicates information on the sum total amount of work, energy, demand, and supply of that specific object or service. Money is an incredibly efficient language whereby a number only a few digits long can express all these factors. Imagine trying to barter for a knife whereby the blacksmith had to explain how the metal is prospected, mined, refined, the technological advancements in smelting, and the blacksmithing skill he developed to produce that knife. It would take forever to detail the work he did to make the knife and settle on a fair value of trade. Even the smallest objects have an inexhaustible list of technological advancements and nuance that it is impossible to comprehensively explain with words. Money, through price, can communicate complexity very well. Price is like a picture—worth a thousand words. Consequently, money is a very efficient communication medium.

Not only will the price communicate the value of the object it is attached to, it can also be used to assess relative value. Let’s use the example of choosing one of three steaks to purchase. The first steak is \$18, second \$22, and third \$45. Without seeing the steak or knowing any progeny (e.g., breed, grass-fed, organic, aged), we can assume that the \$45 is most likely the highest quality. The quality of the product can generally be inferred from the price. Knowledge of cattle is not needed to make an informed decision on the quality of the beef, just the price.

Continuing with this example, but now looking at how people interact with the price, let’s evaluate which steak is the best purchase for a person with modest savings, who can afford to eat well but is simply looking for a standard mid-week meal. Let’s say that the third steak is too expensive, thereby eliminating it as a choice. That leads to a closer look between the \$18 and \$22 steaks to confirm which one is the best purchase. It is here that we assess additional information by looking at the steak quality (marbling, colour, etc.), reading the marketing on the packaging, or asking the butcher for further information. We then combine that information with the price and our budget to make an informed decision. Perhaps the \$22 steak had the best colour and was grass fed, indicating that it is more nutritious (personal health being important) than the \$18 steak, and, therefore, is a better use of our money. We can make an informed decision on which steak is worth the price. What is important here is that the ability to evaluate a good or service and make an informed decision requires that we first know the price. Through price we can make this informed decision without expending stored time and energy (our savings), making it a less wasteful means to determine what to buy.

Continuing with the example still further to highlight the second function of money as language—it’s exchange causes action. In the first interaction with money, we have combined the price, our savings, and the observations to make an informed decision to choose the \$22 steak (the first interaction with money). We have decided which steak to buy, but this only exists in our mind and nothing has changed in the physical world (i.e., the steak is not in our possession). We have yet to obtain the steak. This is accomplished through the second interaction with money—the exchange. When we pay the butcher \$22, we receive the steak. It is the transfer of money (or at least the promise to pay) that powers (incentivizes) work in the physical world.

The exchange of money makes this communication medium the language of work. This is something that we all know, at least intuitively. There are some commonly used idioms in the English language that reflect this; when someone expresses their skepticism about something—“I’m not buying it,” or, when someone is talking but not doing—“talk is cheap.” Speaking about doing does not get the thing done. Words are just the movement of air through vocal chords that quickly dissipate. The

movement of money on the other hand, is the force that makes people willingly move—to work. Money is the largest driving force of human action.

Those two observations of how humans interact with money—price is needed to make informed decisions and the exchange of money is what causes work to be completed—imply that money is not the root of all evil, but rather a tool to communicate and create action in the world around us. It is through the exchange of money that enables humans to serve each other's interests.

This service to one another through money is fundamental to Valuarchy. But, this service through money generally only works to one degree of separation. The payment of money is what incentivizes the receiver to act in the payee's interest. More bluntly, the person who is getting paid serves the person who pays. One degree of separation means this service is limited only to the person whose money was transferred. The receiver of the money is going to listen and follow the opinions and orders of the one who pays them, and not anyone else. This is the other side of, "don't bite the hand that feeds." If we pay a barista for a coffee, that equivalent exchange of stored value (i.e., money) for coffee ends there. The barista listens to and serves our best interests to complete the exchange, to earn money.

But, once that money has changed hands and the service completed, the barista is now the owner of the money. When she spends it, we no longer hold any influence on her decision, even if she uses the money we previously gave to her. The person who she pays serves her for that exchange, not us. Even though it was originally our money just one transaction earlier, our opinion on the next transaction does not matter. So, money only works to one degree of separation.

This transfer of money only working to one degree has one additional nuance. Specifically, was the exchange of money voluntary or taken. If voluntary, then the receiver of the money will be in service and one degree of separation is observed. If the money was taken (i.e., through theft, taxation), then the receiver of the money never enters into service with the person who lost the money.

This is very important when it comes to our political system. What the people want from government are services for the defense of the common good (e.g., police, judicial system). Yet when we honestly look at some of these services, most notably police and the courts, they fall short of serving the people. Their track record shows that they step to the beat of the politicians. This isn't due to a grand conspiracy but rather due to money only working to one degree of separation. Our taxed money doesn't go directly to the police or judges, but is first taken by the government, who then pay for those services. The government is the hand that feeds these public services at one degree of separation.

Since we do not pay the government voluntarily—the government takes from the people in the form of taxes—the one degree of separation does not exist between the people and the state. Therefore, when taxation is present in any form, the government is never incentivized to serve the people in order to get paid. But, the one degree of separation still does exist between the government and the services because that payment is voluntary. The government becomes the *de facto* hand that feeds the institutions we trust with upholding law and order. This results in a broken chain where these institutions (e.g., police, judicial system) serve the government instead of the people, but are paid for by the people. The very taxation that the government chooses to levy against the people becomes the power which they use to dominate the people. The ability to print money may be source of the government's power, but to be the payer is one of their greatest tools to get people to serve them, even if they become evil.

The last component of money as a language relevant to Valuarchy is the payment of money also produces an emotional response, whereby the true cost of attaining that money is condensed into a

single moment. We feel the cost when we exchange our money for something because we know how much work that money took to acquire. When blowing a bunch of money on something stupid, there is an immediate feeling that we've made a mistake, so much so that there is a common term for it—buyer's remorse. Additionally, the idiom “buy once, cry once” comes to mind. It is a felt consequence for our actions, and it is an important feedback mechanism for correcting bad decisions.

Chapter 4

The Funding Flaw

Many different forms of democratic governments have been tried, however, as summarized by Tytler, they all reach a state of loose fiscal policy. The governments inevitably become so burdensome or corrupt that they collapse. This collapse can come in the form of revolution, civil war or economic collapse, which is then followed by a reset of the system. Each rebirth has a change of guard and new ideological leaders, but each has seen the return of this cycle. Objectively each political ideology, no matter how different from the prior ideology, has fallen into this trap of ever increasing government spending. The ideologies and people have all varied wildly, yet they have all failed. What isn't seen here is that this failure to maintain fiscal responsibility is within the design of democracy (though not intended) and not the people or ideologies. What is it in the design of democracy that produces this outcome, and what is the solution?

The root cause of the failure lies in a combination in how the government funds itself with how it chooses its leaders—thereby creating *the funding flaw*. The first component of the funding flaw is how the government receives the money. There are two primary methods through which the government receives money: taxation and money printing. For this discussion, money printing is used as a catch-all term encompassing all financial methods which create new units of money (thereby increasing the total supply)—mechanisms which result in the devaluation of the currency and the redistribution of the captured value at the will of the government through the Cantillon Effect (i.e., the closer one is to the source of money creation, the more one benefits).

A conflict of interest is introduced when the government has the power to levy taxes and print money for whatever it deems necessary. So the people who are in charge of spending are also in charge of dictating taxes. In no other exchange of services is the payment mandatory and the cost dictated by the provider of those services, regardless of whether or not the service is used. Sure, in the free market, sellers can demand any price they wish. But the buyer can say no to the purchase, holding sellers accountable to price their product fairly. In the free market, the buyer retains power over their property (money) and can deny others from taking it. But when it comes to the government, they get to take the money they wish to have.

The power to levy taxes and print money is only one part of the funding flaw. By pairing this flawed funding mechanism with a popular vote, the socialist ideology³ gains an upper hand in elections. This unfair socialist advantage is created because politicians have carte blanche to promise anything without needing to put a price tag on it, and yet still getting the money to pay for it (through taxes, money printing). Absent of price, the voter cannot begin the informed decision mak-

³ To oversimplify, the core tenant of socialism is that the individual is not capable of self governance and personal responsibility. Only the state has the capabilities to provide for them. Socialists operate under the idea that they have the right to take from and/or regulate private property to achieve their ends, or for the good of some other group.

ing process. This leaves the voter to make a decision based on emotional appeals or ideological bias —what sounds good has the advantage.

When this is the case, the political ideology that wields higher moral virtue has the advantage and the voter has very little to defend themselves with from emotional appeals. The socialist politician declares that health care is a human right. Disagreeing with a socialist on the topic gets turned back around, “how could you disagree? Do you not care about people!? What if you need it one day and couldn’t afford it?” These are loaded questions that are emotional minefields and are very difficult for reason to prevail against. Even if people understand that they do pay for it, going against the social pressure is too difficult for many. Socialist proponents are best at wielding this virtue signalling currency.

With this popular vote plus tax system of democracy, the cost of political promises comes later, after the government has been voted in. This phenomenon is the *time dislocation of cost*. Taxation and inflation separate the political promise from the delivery and the cost. By obscuring the price through indirect means (taxes, inflation) and in time (paid later [credit]) there is no longer an emotional feedback mechanism to counteract ideologies which best wield moral virtue and emotional appeals. A person may make a bad election decision, but could correct that if they were to feel the pain, or cost, of their decision. Time dislocation of cost removes the emotional weight of choosing a candidate because money isn’t exchanged at the time of the vote. There is no gut impact that follows the vote. Programs such as auto-withholding income tax further obscure the cost. The earnings of our work are never gained into our possession, so we don’t feel the cost of trading it away. It becomes very hard to feel the cost of the political promise without that exchange of money.

The time dislocation of cost also works to the disadvantage of politicians who attempt to decrease spending. A promise to cut taxes (and services) means that the savings come later. In this situation, people first feel the loss of the service but not the financial gain, which lags. This means that reducing the size of government is not appealing for voters in the short term. Without an immediate beneficial response to counteract the loss of services, there isn’t a broadly acceptable reason to vote for someone who promises to cut services (the exception being popularity movements).

With the lack of price and the dislocation in time between promise and cost, the voter does not have the necessary information to make an informed decision and does not feel the consequences of making a bad decision. This leaves the vast majority of voters to assess the political candidates only on an emotional basis in the moment. The socialists exploit this funding flaw present in democracy and, notably, if there is one thing that the socialists do well, it is emotional appeals.

Tangential to this, one thing socialists do is speak to the masses as though any new promise will be paid for by the rich—not the masses. This is the classic method for class warfare, dividing people who are not natural enemies. This “paid by the rich” further obscures the cost because the voter thinks that they aren’t going to be paying for the services they use. The combination of not feeling the money leave and thinking the service they receive is paid for someone else, leaves many blind to the reality of their voting decision.

When the cost is obscured, the currency of politics becomes “moral” virtue. Those who are best at virtue signalling carry the most political power—socialists and soothsayers have a distinct advantage. Trying to counteract this virtue signalling with reason and debate is not very effective at convincing people ensnared within these emotional minefields. Emotions are the right countermeasure. When the payment is made directly by the citizen, the money carries with it the emotional weight of the value they put into that money. That felt impact is the immune response to virtue signalling.

To highlight why these concepts are important, let us use a thought experiment and focus on how people interact with a popular vote (i.e., the electoral system we have today) in democracy.

Imagine there are two candidates. Candidate 1 is a libertarian and promises to reduce taxes but privatize health care. Candidate 2 is a socialist and promises to increase taxes on the rich and decrease public health care wait times.

Without price, the cost savings promised by Candidate 1 are unknown, so when the voter looks at the cost of paying for private health care, they cannot easily determine how much they would save (or potentially cost more). When the same voter looks at Candidate 2, they see that the taxes will only go on the rich, not themselves, and that there is a promise to improve funding for health care. The voter will compare the two candidates and conclude that with Candidate 1 the loss of public health care has an unknown savings, but with Candidate 2 they will get a marginal improvement to services at no personal expense. In this situation, the voter cannot differentiate the price between the two candidates, so they cannot start the informed decision making process to determine which method of health care is the most efficient use of their money. It is entirely justifiable to vote for the socialist, because it seems better, but that is an emotional decision.

In this scenario, the cost of the decision isn't directly felt either. For example, a tax on the rich oil companies trickles down to the consumer as an increased cost on gasoline—though only a few dollars per tank. Over a year, this may add up to hundreds of dollars, but it was spread out, ambiguous, and not directly felt as a cost related to politics. Consequently, people are never given the opportunity to feel the pain of payment caused by their voting preference which may prevent them from making that emotional decision to vote for socialists again in the future.

What we observe from the current system is that net consumers of public services (e.g., people on welfare) know that they are getting “free” services at the expense of the rich. They do not immediately and directly feel the cost so they think they are gaining an advantage from the system. This means these net consumers continue voting for more social services—more socialism. The proportion of the population that these net consumers consist of become a voter base who are going to vote for socialists no matter what. This “free” promise gives socialism a numbers advantage in popular vote elections. Competing ideologies either have to overwhelmingly convince the remaining two-thirds of the population or adopt socialist policies to try to pull some of these votes away from purely socialist parties. It's often too large a gap to close and what we observe is the adoption of some socialist policies from competing ideologies. This has resulted in an erosion of all other political philosophies towards socialism. This may be the most compelling reason why all political parties seem cut from the same cloth.

There is a sick joke in politics—that nobody lost an election by spending too much money. Politicians know that socialist policies win elections. This is because the design of democracy incentivizes people to attempt to extract perceived value from elections. Politicians play to this and consequently, this vote plus tax combination, the funding flaw, turns what should be a service to the people into a self serving machine. It was not the intention of democratic elections to give socialists the advantage of winning representative government elections. Democracy intended that the people be able to choose the candidate who best represents their ideas. That candidate was meant to be in service to the people and serve their interests. That was not how democracy was designed.

The solution should not be to tip the table in favour of the opposite ideology, but in the levelling of the playing field. All ideologies should compete fairly and openly and the people should have the ability to make an informed decision on which ideology provides the best value.

Chapter 5

The Core Principle of Valuarchy

In the last chapter, we discussed how socialism is the favoured ideological outcome from a system that combines popular voting with the government having the ability to levy taxes. This is because the voters are unable to make an informed decision on which political philosophy to choose. The price is unknown at the time of voting and the cost is obscured by using indirect methods such as taxation, inflation, and auto-withholding schemes. The lack of price leaves voters without the ability to make a good decision, and are only left with basing their decision on emotional and ideological predisposition. With no direct payment associated with the vote, the cost of a decision bares no weight and there is no felt consequence to correct bad decisions. Socialism thrives in that environment, and as we are seeing in practice, even competing political parties have to include socialist policies in order to remain relevant in elections. This cascade of issues following the missing piece, price, has resulted in ever growing self-serving bureaucracies. Valuarchy places price as its core principle.

What would happen if people actually knew the price of the politicians and their ideology? With what we know about money as a language, what can we confidently predict about how people would react if the yearly price was on the ballot beside the politician's name (to be paid in monthly installments)?

Let's explore this with the same thought experiment as in the last chapter: Two candidates in an election: Candidate 1 is a libertarian who is not promising public health care and Candidate 2 is a socialist promising public health care. This time, however, there are no taxes and the prices for each candidate are on the ballot.

Candidate 1, the libertarian wants a smaller government and gives a price of \$10,000/year per person for the provision of standard services (police, justice, border defense, public infrastructure). Let's assume that Candidate 2, the socialist, mirrors the base provision of standard services, but exclaims that public health care is a human right and should be provided by the government. Their annual price is \$13,750/year per person⁴.

An average voter working an average paying job with a spouse (who also works) and two kids is faced with a decision between the two candidates. This time, the voter has the price and they can begin to make an informed decision. The addition of health care, if they vote for socialist Candidate 2, would be an extra \$7,000 in expenses per year for their family (2 average incomes) compared to if they vote for Candidate 1. To see if this is a good value, the voter will likely start looking at prices of private healthcare services for comparison. As an example, let us assume there is a competitive private sector which provides family health care for ~\$230/month, or ~\$2,800/year. Armed with this information, the voter can assess the relative cost between private and public health care. The math is now simple, they know the extra cost for the socialist candidate (\$7,000) and the know the private health care cost (\$2,800). Private health care would save their family \$4,200/year. This would represent a significant saving for most.

⁴ The additional cost is based on Canadian health care costs relative to average income. The average Canadian earns approximately \$68,000/year (Stats Canada), of which \$17,000 goes towards taxes. In 2023, the Canadian government spent \$1,083.8 billion dollars total, and \$242.6 billion on healthcare (StatsCan, Government spending by function, 2023), or approximately 22% of the total amount spent. Relative to the average income tax, that is approximately \$3,750. If we were to consider total tax, this would be higher.

The additional information given through price enables the voter to make an informed decision for their specific context. A young healthy person can either forgo or choose a very inexpensive health insurance, saving extra money to help grow their savings at a time when they are starting out. Perhaps fair market competition becomes widespread, driving down the cost of health care through abundance of choice. Perhaps public health care becomes more efficient with proper financial accountability so that economics of scale produce a service that can compete on price with the private sector. The outcome is not certain one way or the other, however, either way works in favour of the citizens having access to cost-efficient services—which is the goal.

Returning to the example—as a result of this informed decision making process, even if the socialist heavily lays on the emotional appeal that health care is a human right, a difference of \$4,200 between public and private care will be enough to counteract that ideological minefield. Recall that the exchange of money carries strong emotional weight from the effort put in to acquire that money. The informed decision making process would lead the voter to perceive an additional loss of money by voting for the socialist, deflating the impact that any moral virtue signalling that “health care is a human right” may have. Money used this way is an effective countermeasure which can prevent people from being socially trapped. It is how people are willing to spend their money which reveals the truth behind what people are willing to act upon. Using price is how we defeat virtue signalling in politics.

Although this was a fictitious example, we can infer that the price would enable people to make an informed decision on the relative values between different political philosophies and the private sector. People are able to fairly evaluate the cost of each ideology and compare their relative value on a fair playing field. The use of money negates emotional appeals and makes signalling moral virtue less relevant to the success of the politician. Price on the ballot produces a predictable and desirable outcome—fair competition.

Price on the ballot should produce efficient governments. Previously, we identified that net consumers of welfare were stalwart socialists because the perception of “free” that results from thinking that some rich person would pay for services they use. They know they extract more from the welfare state than they pay into it. Adding price to the ballot removes the obfuscation and returns responsibility to where it belongs—on them. Net consumers of welfare would be forced to participate (rather than leech), and, in doing so, they will predictably seek out the most efficient candidate out of necessity, due to their low income.

Citizens who do not fall into the prior group will also benefit from improved decision making from the inclusion of price. Even though these people may have disposable income, the sticker shock from the price on the ballot combined with the emotional response from the perceived extra loss of money means we can reasonably predict that their voting behaviour will also trend towards seeking out the most efficient candidate (though this time not out of necessity).

Price will change which qualities people value the most in a politician. We can predict that the most sought-after quality will be offering the highest value in services for their money. As such, this will reshape the political landscape as politicians would then be incentivized to run on policies that are efficient uses of money, and/or provide a quality of service high enough to justify their cost, and/or reduce the size of government to decrease the price. The politicians that will win then, will be the people who are best able to accurately estimate costs and operate the government within a set budget and focused scope of services. So responsible, honest people who have low time preference (i.e., accurately look forward into the future) will rise to the top.

When each ideology has a price associated with it, the people can judge their relative worth. Political ideologies will continue to hurl insults and claim moral virtue, but it is how the money is spent that tells the truth of what people believe. Ideas that win will be the ones where people “put their money where their mouth is.” Using price is how we can enable ideologies to compete openly and fairly.

A secondary effect of the price on the ballot, through requiring the people pay that price in monthly installments, is a culture of constant vigilance concerning the cost of the government. Not vigilance in the sense of heroic effort and watchfulness, but rather the payment each month will be a constant reminder to check the cost of government (i.e., watch over what the government is spending). If a government were to try to increase their size, the people will quickly notice the increase on their next payment and ask questions. The people will operate in a natural state of vigilance (i.e., not requiring extra effort) and therefore should be sustainable. There may even be legally acceptable scenarios where the people can withhold the payment entirely, stopping a corrupt government dead in its tracks. That is a source of real power the people could use to hold the government accountable when necessary.

Politicians who wish to implement programs that go against our private property (e.g., centralized building permits) will be unfavourable because the additional bureaucracy required to implement those programs would be evident in the price. The government having to raise the price in step with increasing bureaucracy is how we prevent creeping government scope. We can achieve the strict separation between public and private property by correcting the funding flaw and realigning the one degree of separation between the people and the government.

Valuarchy's core principle is intuitive. We don't need to try to educate all voters—a herculean task—so that they may choose smaller, more focused governments. Instead, we should give everyone the information they need to make an informed decision, in that moment, in the polls, based on their own context and ideals. It is an intuitive conclusion that if everyone could see the price and have to bear the burden of the government, then the government would shrink tomorrow. Overspending would be questioned and fiscal responsibility would rapidly return. These changes will dramatically shift the balance of power from the government to the people, where it belongs. This is how we break free from this cycle of failure caused by loose fiscal policy.

The core principle of the Valuarchy system respects people to make their own personally informed decision. A poor man does not become a slave to the welfare state, exploited by a political class that considers them ill-suited to making their own decisions. A wealthy man who does not require more protection nor greater use of infrastructure than a poor person, no longer has to be unfairly targeted as a tax cow. The wealthy (a status typically gained from successful entrepreneurship) can return their skills to the community via additional job opportunities rather than be siphoned off to the government. This return of entrepreneurial capabilities to where they belong, with the people creating opportunities, and within the community. Potentially, Valuarchy could create the environment for a community where everyone pulls their own weight for the common things that each need, knowing they are not burdened by others, nor burdens themselves. Wealthy and poor would no longer be pitted against each other in class warfare. A community with mutual respect built from knowing each individual pulls their own weight—this is achieved through fairness.

Such a simple principle can change everything. However, as simple as the core principle is, the practical implementation of price requires some design complexity.

Chapter 6

Defining Valuarchy

This book is not meant to describe Valuarchy's completed design. That is not possible since it has not been tried, and there will be much of the design that can only be informed by real world application. Some things can only be learned by doing. This book is Valuarchy's introduction to the world and is meant to define the key elements of design. The definition of Valuarchy is, "the system of evaluating a potential leader's worth, realized through the citizen's sum exchange of money under contract paid directly to the government."

The core principle of Valuarchy is simple. However, if it were as easy to implement as it were simple, we would be able to apply it to democracy as a minor tweak and get on with it. There would be no need to distinguish between democracy and Valuarchy. But, just applying the core principle of price to the existing system of popular vote elections would fail. The failure would come due to under-funding of the government and the subsequent collapse of the defense of private property and borders—the very purpose of the government. Either gangs would rise up within and overtake the weakened forces of the government to form dictatorships, or foreign nations which had continued to use taxation would eventually conquer what remained of the failed government.

The collapse would occur because we cannot pair price on the ballot with a popularity contest (i.e., a democratic election). Price on the ballot is not the issue, it will still create the conditions necessary for informed decision making. The issue lies with popularity. In the economy, there is a cost to create a good, this becomes the minimum price that the seller can demand. There is a connection to real world work (the cost to create the good) that the price must hurdle. The price has a connection to something tangible. The services that the government is meant to provide also have a cost, but that cost is not accounted for, or connected to, popularity in any way. Without this tie to the real cost of service, the price on the ballot can plummet below that hurdle cost as the politicians seek more popular lower prices. When the price goes below what is necessary, the government fails.

Perhaps the people may understand that they need to pay something. But the services that a government provide are difficult to see and comprehend within a safe society that does not understand how dangerous some of humanity can be. We cannot expect society to continue to pay the appropriate amount to maintain a military if they don't understand why it exists. There must be a hurdle price tied to the services that is tangible and enforceable. This predictable failure is solved by Valuarchy, and why it exists separate from democracy.

In Valuarchy, direct payment is that tangible link connecting price to service. Not the payment itself, but what we can do with the payment. Direct payment means there is an exchange of money between each citizen and the government for the provision of services. This is the makings of a contract. The provision of services can be codified into the contract (i.e., constitutional defined minimum services). Citizens agree to a cost of the services through the election process. That makes two consenting parties agreeing to a contract, and each enforceable to uphold their end of the contract.

The government gets at minimum the hurdle price required to fund the provision of the services and an obligation from the people to pay, and the people get the minimum required services that a government is supposed to provide. A politician running for leadership cannot lie, cannot offer a price lower than their ability to provide the services they will be legally bound to. If the government breaks contract, the people have well established methods of legal recourse to hold them account-

able. A citizens' attempt to skirt responsibility by not paying can be held to the same standard obligated under contract. A contract treats the government and citizens as equals.

The contract can do so much more, it can also be used to place limitations on the power of government: such as prohibiting the government from issuing debt or money, prohibit the ability to levy taxes, protect the citizen's freedom of speech, the right to bear arms, or private property shall not be subject to regulation. The contract and limitations can reflect the culture of each nation that uses Valuarchy, giving it ultimate flexibility to compete and iterate across nations for the best ideas. When the limitations are hardened in contract, a government which breaks the limitation can be tossed out through the low-conflict and resource efficient resolution system that is a court (relative to revolution or civil war). A law that was imposed that breaks a limitation can be repealed by the citizens as a court can easily determine a result because the terms and conditions under contract were clear. The people can hold the government responsible to their actions. The contract should not be set in stone (other than constitutionally required services and limitations) so that the free market can iterate different combinations of services and limitations that compete through price. Informed decision making by citizens will judge which combination is most valuable through the wisdom of crowds.

Though the contract sets the hurdle rate and limitations, we still have the issue of how to select quality leadership. Popularity is an inadequate measure of quality. Leadership is earned through resilient action in the face of hardship which inspires others to follow. A good leader acts, and their actions are right, and the men behind them develop a trust that during times of doubt, they can look to the leader for guidance. There is a proof of right that underlies organic leadership. Democracy doesn't produce good leaders because a vote, a zero hardship action, is based on the perception of a person's likability. Popularity is not an accurate measurement of a person's ability to act pragmatically. Given, a test of hardship is not a realistic solution either. Putting leaders through a version of the Hunger Games so that we can determine their ability to lead, is humorous but ultimately wrong. There is a better way of determining whether a person is worthy of following.

The key operative here is worthy—or worth (*noun*), defined as, “the value equivalent to that of someone or something under consideration; the level at which someone or something deserves to be valued or rated.” Assessing equivalent value of someone under consideration? That sounds an awful lot like using price to determine a good's relative value and subjective to the person making the decision. There is hardship in the accumulation of money, and there clearly is emotion involved in letting it go. Again, the answer lies in how we use money.

When an individual decides to make a purchase, they are making a decision on the value of that good or service relative to their needs. Therefore, when large groups of people make a personally informed decision between competitors (i.e., between a single good or service), the competitor which receives the greatest amount of money is the one that provides the most value as determined by robust distributed computation. Money is the communication medium and language that makes this broad assessment of value possible. We can apply it to choosing leadership. In an election with price on the ballot, the sum of money that each candidate has supporting their platform (i.e., number of contracts multiplied by their individual price) represents an assessment of their relative value by the people. The sum of money associated with each politician is the collective evaluation of each leader's worth. That is how Valuarchy chooses quality leadership worthy of following.

A politician who specifically undercuts price to gain more votes, may garner more popularity, certainly, but may not bring in more money. Money is the language of human action. The politician who garners the highest sum of money is judged to be the most valuable leader. When the politi-

cian's are competing for the greatest sum of money through the voting process, it changes their interaction with the process. Leader's need to provide what is most valuable, not what sounds popular.

Leveraging these elements of money is why Valuarchy stands apart from traditional democracy, or any of the monarchy, dictatorship, aristocracy, and oligarchy attempts of the past. Valuarchy communicates what the people need in a fundamentally different way from the methods of the past. In the past, people connected through written or spoken language, and reductive debate, to mold a collective vision. Valuarchy connects people through a powerful network that combines their ideas. The sum of money represents the collective will of the people. The money is that distributed computation network which is additive and also provides the resources needed to drive the real world action as determined by the people.

This comes with a warning: because Valuarchy relies on money as the communication medium and the language, if any centralized entity has the power to create the money, that entity can disrupt how money works in both these aspects. A centralized entity can dictate the political system by creating new units of money and spending those how it deems necessary. The size of their spending can make the amount the people can spend irrelevant. Or, the money becomes a tool for the government to print and pay itself to do what it wants. Even outside of this blatant manipulation, changes to the total supply of money causes ripples that reverberate through the money, distorting the information it is meant to carry. Products, services, and prices become disjointed creating confusion. This breaking of the money's ability to communicate information could also topple a nation which uses Valuarchy. What Valuarchy requires is that the people choose a money which has no centralized issuer and a fixed total supply that can easily be verified at all times by the people. There is only one money which has these attributes—Bitcoin.

To summarize, the key design elements of Valuarchy consists of:

- The government shall not have the power to levy any tax against it's citizens and residents
- The government shall not have the power to issue it's own currency
- The money shall have a fixed total supply
- Preceding an election, each candidate must produce a draft contract and annual price (which is then included on the ballot). The contract must contain the minimum services and limitations codified in the constitution
- Only citizens can vote, and subsequently are the only ones who may hold a contract with the government
- The leader is determined by the candidate who receives the largest sum (number of votes multiplied by contract price)

Chapter 7

Contemplations

Up to this point, we have discuss the core principle and key design elements which define Valuarchy. However, there are several ideas which are not foundational per se, but are indirectly important to Valuarchy or speculations on how it could be used.

Valuarchy ties the revenue of the government with the total number of people in a location. This introduces the potential for slum-lording if all residents are able to vote and sign a contract. There is a financial incentive for the government to immigrate people to boost their profits. The ability to vote and sign a contract must be reserved as a privilege of citizens, and citizens only. Contracts exclusively held by citizens breaks the link, breaks the incentive, for government to immigrate people to raise revenue.

Valuarchy can be used to create a distributed government structure (more-so than a republic); for example separating the judicial branch from the executive branch. The judicial branch is meant to be a check on power of the government, but it is currently funded by them—a conflict of interest. Countries can become destabilized when the judicial system stops working correctly through ideological capture of the judges (soft on crime liberalism), corruption of the judges (judicial dictatorship), or capture by the political class (lawfare against citizens, two-tier policing). Judges are not paid by the people directly—meaning judges serve the government. Additionally, judges are typically appointed by the federal government. There are two conflicts of interest present in the judicial system as we know it.

We can use Valuarchy to fund and choose leadership of the judicial branch in a separate election. This solves the funding issue by direct payment under contract. The best judges are chosen through evaluation of their sum of money, and the contract binds them directly to the people to uphold the law. Money working to one degree of separation can return the judicial branch into service of the people. Additionally, giving the people the power to choose their own lead judges means that the path to power can only be satisfied through service to the people, and not popularity with federal government officials. This properly distributes the power of government by placing the judicial system outside of the reach of the government. And if that is the case, then the judicial system can pursue corruption within the government without fear of a funding backlash.

Using the sum of money to determine the leader within Valuarchy poses one significant hurdle. A problem would occur if all citizens had to sign the contract of the leader. For example, if the leader was not the lowest priced option, but we forced the group that voted for a less expensive politician to sign a more expensive contract, those people would probably riot. At best it would be very contentious. This puts strain on the contract, it would be a forced signing, and technically may be nullified. Using the same process as democracy would amplify the tyranny of the majority under Valuarchy.

The solution to this problem is not certain. We will need to try different methods of interfacing how people choose leaders with the structure of the government. The solution likely is one which allows people to pay the price they voted for, regardless of which politician is ultimately the leader. This could look like a system where there is a leader (who had the greatest sum of money), and opposition (candidates who placed second, third, etc.). Interestingly with this dynamic, all people will

be represented at all times. The leader shall have the power to run the government, but the people who did not choose him still have an active voice.

This leader-opposition interplay has immense potential—from eliminating the Tyranny of the Majority problem to creating a dynamic state of competition between politicians, bringing free market dynamics to leadership. However, this is not something that can fit within our current government systems. Perhaps, after implementing the basics and the size of the government decreases can we entertain restructuring the government. We can then seek efficiency by removing checks and balances that are no longer needed when the people have the power of contracts and courts. Maybe the people stumble upon the most efficient structure by themselves. Maybe intellectuals who typically try to control the outcome need to do the hardest thing of all—nothing, and let the system work. Perchance the core principle and key elements are all that are needed for Valuarchy to unite the people and government in creative synergy.

Chapter 8

Conclusion

The goal is to return fiscal responsibility to our governments. Unfortunately, socialism has become the dominant ideology as it has an inherent advantage in popularity based election systems like democracy. Other ideologies have attempted to dethrone socialism within the existing system by trying to convince people with reason to reign in the power of government. But these attempts have required educating masses of people to change their minds on contentious topics. Healthcare, welfare, roads, environment, downsizing government—each of these are emotional minefields where there is no changing minds with reason. Ideology has been the wrong battleground to solve the funding flaw and bring financial responsibility back to our government. Instead, the focus should be on fixing the systems we use.

Valuarchy is not another ideology, it is a new system. It does not have political bias to the left or right, it is a system of fairness and honesty. A neutral system where ideas can be pitted against each other on a fair playing field—price. When ideas can compete fairly on their own merit, we have system that works. We don't need to convince people to change their ideological opinion on the size and role of the government or its services, we need to give them the information that turns them into informed decision makers. Citizens don't have to align with what sounds popular, they can choose what is most valuable. Valuarchy's strength is enabling citizens to become informed on each ideology fairly, and aligning the cost with their decision.

Valuarchy's design enables people to evaluate each idea on its own merit. Socialist and libertarian ideas alike can compete for people's money on a fair playing field—may the best ideas win. Just because one idea within a philosophy is valued by the people doesn't mean that all other policies within that philosophy are also valuable. There may only be a few ideas from each ideology that the people choose. Instead of having to pick a side, people choose select ideas based on their specific value. Just because a person has a socialist opinion on emergency services will no longer require that they support socialist ideology on welfare. Or any other combination. This reduces ideological bias and in-group politics. The design of Valuarchy enables the most valuable ideas from each ideology to be mixed and matched in a new competitive political game where the freedom to iterate contract terms and communicate that iteration through price can be evaluated by the citizens. The inter-

play between contract and price predictably means only the most valuable ideas will be chosen, as less valuable ideas would bloat the price of the candidate and likely result in less sum total support. It is a dynamic system that can improve over time as more valuable combinations are discovered.

The flaws of democracy has resulted in socialist policies being adopted by most parties to appeal to the welfare class in pursuit of popularity. This welfare class becomes the focus of most political parties, who promise that spending will go to them—this is the warning given by Tytler. But what this also does, is create a sameness of all political parties. A significant number of people have intuitively figured this out and treat politics with apathy. There is no point voting if there is no real different. This is revealed by the lack of voter turn out. This politically homeless group could prove to be a significant source of support, as long as there is something that makes sense for them to vote for. Valuarchy can fill that void, we just need to build it.

Valuarchy's intuitive nature means it can be discussed and propagated without the fine philosophical details underpinning the uniqueness of money as a language to people who don't care about political and monetary theory—yet they can understand the impact of “price on the ballot.” Not only is the fair playing field attractive, but there is significant appeal in knowing the price of the government prior to voting. The vast majority of people understand basic household finances—spend less than you earn and save the excess. Valuarchy enables people to anticipate the cost of the government, but it also constrains the government to spend only what they are given by the citizens, like a household is constrained by their income.

The outcome of Valuarchy is predictable, smaller governments and more efficient services. The outcome is predictable because we intuitively understand that people will choose to elect more efficient forms of government when they know the cost. The sticker price of our current forms of government is a shocking number even for the wealthy. These are certainly similar to the ideological goals of libertarian and monarchist philosophies, but it achieves this outcome not because Valuarchy tips the scale in the favour of those ideologies, but rather removes socialism's advantage. Ideologies must compete on value and justify their expense to the people.

There is no doubt that we live in a time where governments have become greedy—their size, taxes, and spending are only increasing. We have already lost our freedoms. Unfathomable amounts of debt have been taken out in our names—possibly the greatest betrayal. After all this, the idea of revolution is tempting, but while that may change the players and reset the rules and costs, the increasing trend remains as it is inherent to democracy. Even if we cast off the current shackles, our descendants would find themselves on the same collision course with an iceberg. Valuarchy enables us to get from where we are, to where we want to go—an efficient government that serves the people—but nations are big ships that we need to turn. We can use the fundamentals of Valuarchy to avoid what lurks beneath the surface.

Wrestling the ability to tax or print money from governments when they are at the height of their power is an insurmountable task. But we can start with the core principle of Valuarchy—including price on the ballot represented as a government budget per person, though funded through taxes. That will force politicians to budget before elections and inform the people what their cost is. People will likely not vote for governments that increase that number. At the least, price will halt the increasing trend. At best, people are shocked by the price and start electing politicians who decrease the cost each election. One small change could change the trend and begin the process of decreasing government spending, size, and debt organically. As the size of government decreases, taxes can decrease, the economy improves and people see a better future. That's real hope.

At the same time, Valuarchy can be implemented within the smaller local governments. Municipality and county governments are more adaptable due to their limited size. Implementing Valuarchy in those situations will give people the broader experience of interacting with an election that gives them the price. They will experience a clarity in local elections that will contrast against the opaqueness of larger state/provincial/federal elections. That contrast could become the a majority advocating for Valuarchy, for taking away the power to levy taxes and print money from the government.

Valuarchy presents a unique idea to cast off this bondage to the state down the road of bankruptcy. The government is supposed to serve, and we can achieve that purpose. We can break free of cycles that foretell of financial collapse, whether it be the Tytler Cycle or the Four Turnings. Loose fiscal policy is a choice we make by accepting the status quo. Valuarchy is a simple idea that works on sound fundamentals that we can use to shape better incentives and remove the boot from our necks to produce a hopeful future with opportunity.