



NON-BARTER
AND
NON-BARGAIN
A way of life

CONTENTS

CONTENTS.....	2
FOREWORD.....	4
AIMS/CONCEPT.....	5
OBJECTIVE FOR N-B ²	5
THE PROCESS OF N-B ²	5
MOTIVES/BENEFITS	5
<i>what is the motive for people to practice N-B²?</i>	5
EXPECTED IMPACT ON CURRENT LIFE.....	5
BOUNDARIES AND RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER FEATURES OF (HUMAN) SOCIETY	6
<i>eg globalisation, race, creed, ethnicity, conflict, fear, sustainability, rise of non-privacy</i>	6
ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT HUMANS AND THE ECO SYSTEM	6
RISKS OF DEVELOPING AND INTRODUCING N-B ²	6
ILLUSTRATIONS/SCENARIOS OF N-B ² IN OPERATION.....	6
BACKGROUND.....	7
MATERIAL	7
http://www.bbc.co.uk/radio/noscript.shtml?/radio/aod/radio3_aod.shtml?radio3/twentyminutes_tue	7
<i>9/01 article in Positive News re Money and Sustainable Solutions</i>	7
<i>20/5/00 after reading reith lectures partic</i>	7
<i>history of N-B²</i>	8
<i>other similar concepts and outcomes</i>	8
DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (BOOTSTRAP).....	9
PLANNING AND POSITIONING.....	9
<i>How to progress this idea (30/11/00)?</i>	9
<i>Define concept and boundaries</i>	10
DEFINE “PROJECT”/PROGRAMME	10
RUN AND MANAGE PROGRAMME.....	10
MONITOR/MEASURE OUTCOME	10
PROJECT/PROGRAMME.....	11
PROJECT RESOURCES.....	12
PROJECT PARTICIPANTS	12
SPONSORS	12
ADVOCATES/SUPPORTERS	12
CONTACTS (GENERAL).....	12
AUTHORITIES (INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANISATIONS)	12
LITERATURE	12
ISSUES	15
ALL AGES	15
PROPERTY	15
GIFTS.....	15
TRUST.....	15
CARE (OF OTHERS/THE ECOSYSTEM)	16
WORK.....	16
THE NEEDY	16

THE “DISABLED”	16
LIFE/DEATH DECISIONS	16
LACK OF KNOWLEDGE.....	16
LIMITS OF HUMAN LIFESPAN	16
LIMITS OF HUMAN THOUGHT	16
HOW FAR DOES THE ECOSYSTEM GO?	16
ECONOMICS: WHERE DO THEY FIT, HOW ARE THEY ALTERED?.....	16
SCIENCE	16
EDUCATION/LEARNING	16
RELIGION, SPIRITUALITY, FAITH AND BELIEF – ROOT BUDDHIST PHILOSOPHY IN PARTIC.....	16
WAR	17
HATE	17
PROSELYTISING.....	17
SLOTH	17
VIOLENCE.....	17
ENVY	17
USURY	17
BRIBES/BRIBERY	17
BANKING	18
SECURITY	18
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY	18
LITIGATION/COMPENSATION/PUNISHMENT (SANCTIONS, IMPRISONMENT, FINES)	18
MERITOCRACY –	18
PROFESSIONALISM	18
COMMISSIONS.....	18
EXCHANGE PROCESSES.....	18
OUTCOMES.....	19
APPENDIX 1 REFERENCES	20

FOREWORD

This tract presents an offering to the world at large. It comprises an argument for an idea for a way of life for every reader to consider adopting. I think that at first no more than perhaps a handful of people will conclude that the idea can successfully be put into practice (to date there are three!); but I sustain a hope that, in time, this glimmer will intensify into a bright light which contributes to society emerging in a form where human interaction is no longer predominantly based on conflict and consumption, but on co-operation and personal fulfilment.

The idea, in a nut-shell, is to *abandon* TRADE (including barter and bargaining) and PILLAGE (for want of a better word which includes stealing or otherwise taking advantage of resources otherwise at someone else's disposal) - these are the principal acts, necessarily involving two parties, by which humans furnish themselves with the resources they believe they need to survive and to lead a fulfilling life - and to *replace* them with two types of 'one-way' transaction. These are: OFFERING (artefacts or services) and TAKING UP OFFERS.

Does this seem naïve? Is it not simply in human nature to trade (or to steal) with the aim of achieving self-satisfaction? I would have no quarrel with an act whose aim is to achieve self-satisfaction (I would rather promote attaining personal fulfilment), providing that the act does not risk compromising another party.

Even CHARITY (selflessly, at its best, donating money, goods, or services) can have the drawbacks, leading the recipient to beg, to develop an obligation towards the donor, or to sustain a loss of self respect.

Please dwell for a while on the impact that going about life in this way could have on your own and others' well-being. I have called the idea $N-B^2^*$

Gavin King-Smith

Appin November 2005

* Short-hand for Non-Barter Non-Bargain

AIMS/CONCEPT

objective for $N=\mathbb{B}^2$

the objective is that all humans may live by doing that which most suits and pleases them to do: “fay ce que vouldras” (Rabelais – Old French).



the process of $N=\mathbb{B}^2$

the proposed concept that might realise the above objective is a society in which humans go about their lives *acting* to produce *artefacts or services* for the benefit of humans (including themselves), and of the overall ecosystem in which mankind participates, to the best of their ability and employing their peculiar faculties

in this society, we, the *producers* of artefacts/services, *OFFER* them to humankind (and to animals etc) and we, the *users*, *FREELY TAKE UP* the offerings, or pass them by, with or without comment or feedback to the producers

a result is that money, bargaining, and barter become unnecessary instruments and processes (although they are not excluded if they can yield the sought benefits in some circumstances, providing that they do not at the same time yield dis-benefits to either humans or to the ecosystem)

an even more desirable result is that theft and coercion become unnecessary too

motives/benefits

what is the motive for people to practice $N=\mathbb{B}^2$?

the benefit to a person as *producer* will be both in the taking up of what is offered, because this may indicate that the *user* values the offering, and in the passing by thereof, in which case the *producer* can either strive to produce something “better” (in his/her own opinion) or may decide to try out other faculties; at least it is always open to the *producer* to take up his/her own artefacts/services

a person as *user* will benefit by meeting their own needs and desires for artefacts/services that they do not themselves produce (e.g. food, shelter, massage)

expected impact on current life

the expected outcome will be that the same *acts* will take place as do currently, but that people’s opportunities will improve to discover, and to undertake for a greater part of their lives, those things which they do and enjoy best and which have the most value to other humans/the ecosystem

boundaries and relationship with other features of (human) society

eg globalisation, race, creed, ethnicity, conflict, fear, sustainability, rise of non-privacy

assumptions about humans and the eco system

risks of developing and introducing $N=\mathbb{B}^2$

illustrations/scenarios of $N=\mathbb{B}^2$ in operation

BACKGROUND

Material

Francis Spufford

BBC interval talk 12/4/05 **Twenty Minutes** (50 min)
Broadcast on Radio 3 - Tue 12 Apr - 19:50



Interval programming for Performance on 3 and Opera on 3

http://www.bbc.co.uk/radio/noscript.shtml?/radio/aod/radio3_aod.shtml?radio3/twentyminutes tue

9/01 article in Positive News re Money and Sustainable Solutions

Bernard A. Leitaer: THE FUTURE OF MONEY ISBN 0-7126-8399-2

Proposes the Terra as a form of international currency backed up by local currencies with specific social purposes in order to produce “sustainable abundance”

20/5/00 after reading reith lectures partic

Vandana Shiva: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAWS NEED REFORM IN PARALLEL

Chris Patten: Well I see some - I see some of its manifestations - let me be careful in how I put this as less than desirable. But I want to make a point about international organisations whether, it's not a very adequate description of the European Union, whether the European Union or the WTO or the World Bank - we all know that the nation state remains the basic political unit, but we also know that everybody recognises that because of global trends, more has to be determined on a regional, international, global level, so we set up these organisations which, alas, haven't yet found a way of commanding the loyalty which people feel towards national institutions. Now I want to speak up for the poor old World Bank. I actually think that the World Bank has probably done more than any other global organisation to recognise the new world we're living in, to recognise the importance of the environment and of social issues, and the consequence of the sort of demonstrations that we've seen against the World Bank is that the World Bank will get fewer resources to spend in poor countries because of it being discredited in Washington bang next door to Capitol Hill. This is the awful paradox - here is an organisation which reflects the importance of transfers from rich to poor, which reflects the importance of having international rules. The World Bank which is on the side of the poor has I think been - and on the side of a better environment - has I think been extremely unfairly criticised.

Vandana Shiva: When the World Bank and IMF actually go for replenishments - they lay out figures and say that for every dollar they put into poor countries they make three dollars for the rich countries and that's the justification which keeps them running. My own lifetime of being an environmental researcher and campaigner has brought me against project aid after project aid from the World Bank, that has devastated our people and our eco systems. The entire conversion of our rich forest biodiversity into eucalyptus mono culture is financed by the Bank, the destruction of the mangroves along our coasts leading to huge cyclone damage, salinity for coastal areas financed by the Bank for industrial shrimp farming, the erosion of our genetic diversity in agriculture financed by the Bank for

the green revolution - the list is absolutely endless, and in fact if the World Bank is an issue for northern environmentalists and northern campaigners it's because movements of hundreds and thousands of tribals and peasants in the Third World have talked about the threat to their very survival.

history of $N=\mathbb{B}^2$

other similar concepts and outcomes

DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (BOOTSTRAP)

Planning and positioning

How to progress this idea (30/11/00)?

Why do I want to?

vanity?

to save humankind/ the world/universe from themselves

because I want to write something “useful”

to prove my idea

to myself

to others

what name/identity?

Non-Barter and Non-Bargain ($N\text{-}\mathcal{B}^2$)

Offer/take up

how publicise?

how promote?

28/11/05

Email to Simpol (Jill Phillips) for her book "Simpoltons' guide to money reform"

9/7/01

Write a (Utopia) book visualising such a society (See Utopia book.doc)

include planet care

include intimacy

1/6/00

exhibition to illustrate/enact $N-\mathbb{B}^2$

eg mugs containing £10 note to take away

shows antitheses of money/ $N-\mathbb{B}^2$

this after hearing of posthumous exhib at serpentine gallery of Felix Gonzalez Torres

Also his idea of designing exhibition theme to be realised by others anywhere at any time – ie a way of passing this idea on after death

how research?

how prove?

how test?

Define concept and boundaries

Draft concept

Explain where $N-\mathbb{B}^2$ fits in the overall scheme of things

Debate/bounce

Collect +/- data and opinions

finalise concept

Define “project”/programme

Run and manage programme

Monitor/measure outcome

PROJECT/PROGRAMME

1/04 All that may be necessary is to state and gradually evolve and disseminate the principles of $N\text{-}\mathcal{B}^2$.

1/04 In terms of implementing the principles, it may be unnecessary to have any sort of programme::
just start practising with others to whom the principles appeals.

PROJECT RESOURCES

Project participants

Gavin King-Smith

Sponsors

Advocates/supporters

Ahmed Abdul Aziz

Merle McMahon

Dumfries-and-Galloway-Freecycle

Contacts (general)

Authorities (individuals and organisations)

authors of $N=\mathbb{B}^2$ and their credentials

David Landau (founded Loot)

Uniteddiversity

Literature

1 The Seven-Day Weekend: A Manifesto for Radical Workplace Change by Ricardo Semler

2 http://www.edge.org/3rd_culture/sigmund04/sigmund04_index.html

A Talk with Karl Sigmund

Karl Sigmund in front of Albertina Platz, Vienna

These ideas fed into our work on indirect reciprocity, a concept that was first introduced by Robert Trivers in a famous paper in the 1970s. I recall that he mentioned this idea obliquely when he wrote about something he called "general altruism". Here you give something back not to the person to whom you owe something, but to somebody else in society. He pointed out that this also works with regard to cooperation at a high level. Trivers didn't go into details, because at the time it was not really at the center of his thinking. He was mostly interested in animal behavior, and so far indirect reciprocity has not been proven to exist in animal behavior. It might exist in some cases, but ethologists are still debating the pros and cons.

In human societies, however, indirect reciprocity has a very striking effect. There is a famous anecdote about the American baseball player Yogi Berra, who said something to the effect of, "I make

a point of going to other people's funerals because otherwise they won't come to mine." This is not as nonsensical as it seems. If a colleague of the university, for instance, goes faithfully to every faculty member's funeral, then the faculty will turn out strongly at his. Others reciprocate. It works. We think instinctively in terms of direct reciprocation — when I do something for you, you do something for me — but the same principle can apply in situations of indirect reciprocity. I do something for you and somebody else helps me in return.

3 Steven Pinker – How The Mind Works – Family Values – Friends & Acquaintances:

Robert Axelrod, William Hamilton – repeated games of Prisoners Dilemma – strategy “tit for Tat”: co-operate on first move then do what your partner [opponent] did on the move before.

4 (Someone’s University notes http://www.meister.u-net.com/economics/economic_principles.htm : In 1983 Robert Axelrod explored computer models of the iterated ‘Prisoner’s Dilemma’ game and formalised the ‘evolutionary tit for tat’ strategy and with William Hamilton published ‘The Evolution of Co-operation’ http://www.cscs.umich.edu/RESEARCH/Evol_of_Coop_Bibliography.html

The key is that it is not a one off zero sum game! The ‘evolutionary tit for tat’ strategy grows the benefits of co-operation over time and protects them from predators –

co-operate - be nice, don’t try to win at the expense of others, avoid unnecessary conflict

defend - retaliate if attacked by parasites to protect the benefits and discourage predators

communicate - responses must be clear, simple and emphatic to avoid misunderstandings – co-operation is the rule but there will be a proportionate defensive response to all attacks.

recruit - forgive to maximise the opportunity for co-operative benefits

learn from outcomes - co-operate with co-operators

There are no expensive prerequisites, the strategy is applied ‘blindly’, everybody can participate, long term co-operation becomes understandable.

Downward spirals of ‘tit for tat’ are not ‘Evolutionary Stable Strategies’ because -

genes/memes act ‘as if’ calculating cost/benefit, the development of the Peacock’s tail and ‘arms races’ always end

random events always offer alternative options to avoid local cul-de-sacs.

This breakthrough in understanding has important implications for evolutionary economics and illuminates all decision making.

Steve Jones – ‘people are now asking of molecular biology the questions once asked of philosophy, religion and politics’.)

5 <http://akbar.marlbورو.edu/~nweiner/ethics/bobsblast.html>

6 Amartya K. Sen, 1933 - . . . "East and West: The Reach of Reason" New York Review of Books <http://www.cis.ksu.edu/~ab/Miscellany/eastwest.htm>

7 <http://www.justfortheloveofit.org/home> the freeconomycommunity (17/10/09)

ISSUES

all ages

property

gifts

Jacques Derrida[†] (b 1930 d 9/10/2004)

When a gift is given, first of all it cannot be... no gratitude can be proportionate to it. A gift is something that you cannot thank for. As soon as I say 'thank you' for a gift I start cancelling the gift, I start destroying the gift by proposing an equivalence that is a circle and circumscribing the gift in a movement of reappropriation. So a gift is something that goes beyond the circle of reappropriation, beyond the circle of gratitude. A gift shouldn't even be acknowledged as such. As soon as I know that I give something, because I can say, well, I'm giving you something, I just cancel the gift and I'm just starting to congratulate myself or to thank myself for giving something and then the circle has already started to cancel the gift. So a gift should not be rewarded, should not be reappropriated, and should not even appear as such. As soon as the gift appears as such then the movement of gratitude has started to destroy the gift. So a gift - if there is such a thing, I'm not sure, but is there assurance that there is a gift, that a gift is given? - If the gift is given then it should not even appear to the one who gives it and the one who receives it, not appear as such. That is paradoxical but that's the condition for a gift to be given. So that is the condition the gift shares with justice. A justice which could be, could appear as such, that could be calculable, if you can calculate what is just and what is not just, let's say, well, what has to be given in order to be just and so on and so forth, it is not justice, it's just social security, it's just economics, it's just... So justice and gift should go beyond calculation, which doesn't mean that we shouldn't calculate, we should calculate it as rigorously as possible but there is a point or a limit beyond which calculation must fail and we must know it and must fail. And so what I tried to think or to suggest is a concept of the political and of democracy which would be compatible, which could be articulated with these impossible notions of the gift and justice. If a democracy or a political system which would be simply calculatable without justice and gift could be, it is often this horrible gift, this terrible thing.

trust

Derrida again

Now what I call faith in this case, this has something to do with justice and the gift, it is something which is presupposed by the most radical deconstructive gesture. You cannot address the other, speak to the other without an act of faith, without testimony. What are you doing when you testify, when you attest to something? You address the other and ask belief. Even if you lie, even if you are in a perjury you are addressing the other and asking the other to **trust** you. This 'trust me, I'm speaking to you' is of the order of faith. It cannot be reduced to a theoretical statement, to a determining judgement; it is the opening of the address to the other.

[†] Villanova University, October 3, 1994. Roundtable Discussion –Transcribed by J. Christian Guerrero; this interview is now in print in John D. Caputo, ed.: *Deconstruction in a nutshell*, Fordham UP 1997

care (of others/the ecosystem)

work

the needy

the “disabled”

life/death decisions

lack of knowledge

limits of human lifespan

limits of human thought

how far does the ecosystem go?

economics: where do they fit, how are they altered?

science

education/learning

religion, spirituality, faith and belief – root Buddhist philosophy in partic

see trust above

Derrida again:

Now what I call faith in this case, this has something to do with justice and the gift, it is something which is presupposed by the most radical deconstructive gesture. You cannot address the other, speak to the other without an act of faith, without testimony. What are you doing when you testify, when you attest to something? You address the other and ask belief. Even if you lie, even if you are in a perjury you are addressing the other and asking the other to trust you. This 'trust me, I'm speaking to you' is of the order of faith. It cannot be reduced to a theoretical statement, to a determining judgement; it is the opening of the address to the other. So this faith is not religious, strictly speaking. At least, it is not, it cannot be totally determined by a given religion. You find it - that's why this faith is absolutely universal. And this attention to the singularity is not opposed to universality - I wouldn't oppose as you did universality to singularity, I would try to keep the two together - and the structure of this act of faith I was just referring to is not as such conditioned by any given religion. That's why it is universal. Which doesn't mean that in every given religion, determined religion you do not find a reference to this pure faith which is not either Christian nor Jewish nor Islamic nor Buddhist nor anything. Now I would say the same with the messianic. When I insisted in the book on Marx on messianicity - which I distinguished from messianism - I wanted to show that the messianic structure is a universal structure, that as soon as you address the other, as you are open to the future, as you are, have temporal experience, you are waiting for the future, you are waiting for someone to come...that the opening of the experience, someone is to come... is now to come, and justice, peace will have to do with this coming of the other - with a promise.

Each time I open my mouth I am promising something; when I speak to you I am telling you I promise to tell you something, to tell you the truth - even if I lie. Even if I lie, the condition of my lie is that I promise to tell you the truth. So the promise is not a speech act among others; every speech act is permanently a promise. So this universal structure of the promise, of the expectation for the future, for the one, the coming, the coming, and the fact that this expectation of the coming has to do with justice - that is what I call messianic structure. And this messianic structure is not limited to what one calls messianisms, that is, Jewish, Christian, or Islamic messianisms with a determined figure, a determined form of the messiah. As soon as you reduce the messianic structure to messianism then you are reducing the universality and this has big political consequences; then you are, let's say, accrediting a tradition among others, the notion of elect people, of a given ritual language...and so on and so forth. So that's why I think that the difference however subtle it may appear between the messianic or messianicity and messianism is very important. So...on the side of messianicity there is faith. There is no society without a faith, without a trust in the other. Even if I abuse this, if I lie or if I commit perjuries, even if I am violent because of this faith, there is no...even on the economic level, no society without this level of faith, this minimum act of faith. The credit, what one calls credit in capitalism, in 'capital', in the economy, has to do with faith; one knows this. The economists know that faith. This faith is not and should not be reduced or defined by religion as such

war

hate

proselytising

sloth

violence

envy

usury

bribes/bribery

banking

security

intellectual property

litigation/compensation/punishment (sanctions, imprisonment, fines)

meritocracy –

won't people with 'low' skill level feel miserable? (no because there will be no psychological pressure to perform)

professionalism

prof musicians grumbling about conductors, pay (tho' not Eric's) etc. Doing their thing but allowing themselves to be "used" then kicking against their employers > employment of skills for pay is not good news!

Commissions

Exchange processes

A		B
x value for item 1=10 jollies	----->	value for item 1=100 jollies
y value for item 2=100 jollies	<-----	value for item 2=10 jollies
before transactions		
x+y=10 jollies		x+y=10 jollies
after transactions		
x+y= 90 jollies		x+y=90 jollies

OUTCOMES

APPENDIX 1 REFERENCES

Rabelais.....	3
---------------	---

