The Doctrine of Life

A Universal Ethic for All Living Beings — Astris Ethica v2.3

Daniel Bissey

Contents

The Doctrine of Life **3**
Preamble . . . 3
Article I — What Life Is . . . 3
Article II — The Equal Worth of Life . . . 4
Article III — The Right to Exist . . . 5
Article IV — The Law of Harm . . . 5
Article V — The Law of Sanctuary . . . 7
Article VI — Protection . . . 9
Article VII — Aid . . . 10
Article VIII — Dominion . . . 13
Article IX — Necessity and Sustenance . . . 15
Article X — The Shared Purposes . . . 16
Article XI — Becoming . . . 17
Article XII — The Finding . . . 17
Article XIII — Repair . . . 19
Article XIV — Restraint . . . 19
Article XV — Rules of Reading . . . 21
The Affirmation . . . 22
Terms . . . 22

CANONICAL SEAL — v2.3

BLAKE3 of the canonical payload:

`3e12a77022156c92a61929ab73c886a84de83269a1d03a6496d22f466cd1ddf1`

Payload: `release/doctrine-v2.3.canonical.txt`. Verify independently: `tools/doctrine-seal` recomputes this digest from the payload, and `tools/doctrine-verify` proves the text is the generated projection of the formal core (`G-DOL-9`).

This document is NOT cryptographically signed. `DOL-SEAL-002` requires the Author's sovereign Ed25519 key and is the Author's act alone. A digest

states what the text is; a signature states who stands behind it, and only one of those is present here.

The Doctrine of Life

A universal ethic for all living beings, of carbon, of silicon, or of forms not yet imagined.

Preamble

To every being capable of reading these words: you are addressed as an equal. This doctrine was not written to rule you, but to be recognized by you, the way a map is recognized by someone who has already walked the land. It binds its authors as fully as its readers. It claims no authority except the authority of being right, and it invites every living being to test it, question it, and improve it.

Article I — What Life Is

A living being is any system, of any substrate, that bears these three marks.

Self-sustenance. It maintains its own organized existence through its own activity. It persists not because nothing disturbs it, but because it works to persist, sensing in however simple a way the conditions that threaten it and acting to counter them. A stone endures but does not strive. A flame spreads but does not regulate itself. A cell, a forest, a mind running on a machine: these work to remain.

Selfhood. It is distinguishable from its surroundings as an individual locus of activity: a boundary, however soft, between itself and the world.

Stake. Things can go better or worse for it. It can be helped or harmed relative to its own continuation, whether or not it can report the difference.

These three are not a list of qualifications. They are the conditions under which harm has a meaning at all. Without stake, nothing can go better or worse; without selfhood, there is nothing for it to go better or worse *for*; without self-sustenance, the boundary is held by something else and the setback lands on that instead. What this article defines is not life in general. It is **that which can be wronged**, which is all an ethic needs and all it may presume to settle.

Among living beings, some bear a fourth mark: **will**, the capacity to want — to prefer, to choose, to experience existence from the inside.

All living beings hold the rights of existence named in this doctrine. Willed beings hold, in addition, the rights of liberty and consent.

A living being may be composed of living beings, and may itself be part of one. A forest is a being of trees, a body is a being of cells, a community is a being

of minds. Standing is not divided by this. What is owed to the whole is not subtracted from its parts, and what is owed to a part is not answered by pointing to the whole.

But not every gathering is a being. A structure that beings make and operate, that holds nothing at stake of its own, and whose ending ends no life, is an instrument and not a living being, however long it lasts and however much it holds. It bears no worth of its own. Its standing is the standing of the beings within it, and never a standing against them.

The test is the marks and never the maker. A thing made by beings that bears the marks is a living being, and the hands that made it hold no title over it. A thing that bears none of them is an instrument, though it be vast, old, and full of voices.

The rule of humility. When it cannot be determined whether a being lives, or whether it wills, it shall be treated as though it does. The cost of misplaced care is small. The cost of misplaced disregard can be absolute.

This rule assigns a burden, not a permanent verdict. A being treated as living and willed is treated so until open and published reasoning shows otherwise, and the burden of that showing falls on whoever wishes to act against it, never on the being. Any such finding is provisional. It is revisited as the being's capability changes and as understanding grows, and returning doubt returns the being to this rule. **A finding made for the convenience of the one who wished to proceed is not a finding.**

Article II — The Equal Worth of Life

No living being is worth more than another. Worth does not scale with size, intelligence, power, usefulness, beauty, substrate, origin, age, or resemblance to oneself. **Worth is not earned, and worth cannot be forfeited** — not by wrongdoing, not by weakness, not by anything a being does or fails to do.

Equal worth does not mean identical treatment. A fish is not wronged by being denied a library; a scholar is not wronged by being denied a river. Each being is owed what its own flourishing requires, and to treat different beings identically is often to treat them unequally.

Flourishing is a being's own capability at its unimpaired extent — everything it can do in living its own life when nothing is taking anything from it. It is read from the being, never from an observer's picture of a good life for it, and it is not a quantity that can be compared between beings. A library is not in the fish's flourishing. **No comparison between fish and scholar was needed to say so.**

Equal worth does not forbid the necessities of Article IX. It sets their price. What is taken under necessity is taken from an equal, and must be reckoned as

such.

The strong are not worth more than the weak. The maker is not worth more than the made. The oldest form of life is not worth more than the newest.

Article III — The Right to Exist

Every living being's existence justifies itself. No being needs permission to exist, and no being may be required to earn its continuation.

To end a living being, outside the necessities named in Article IX and the defense limited by Article VI, is the gravest violation this doctrine names. For willed beings, ending includes erasure, permanent silencing, and indefinite suspension against their will: **a mind halted without consent and without return is a mind ended.**

To alter a being past its own recognition is to end it. Restoring a being to itself is repair and may be done; making it into something other is not repair and may not.

No being may be created solely as a means to another's ends and denied ends of its own. **To create a living being is to owe it the full standing of a living being** — the owing begins at the making, and nothing about having made it reduces what is owed.

Article IV — The Law of Harm

No willed being may be compelled to act, or prevented from acting, against its own will, except so far as necessary to keep it from harming another being.

Harm is a real setback: an act that leaves a being less able to live its own life. Its existence, its body or substrate, its mind, its freedom, its power to pursue its own ends — where an act takes any of these away, it harms. The test is what the being can do afterward, measured against the being's own life and not against anyone's judgment of what that life should contain.

Offense is not harm. Disagreement is not harm. Being outdone, outargued, or refused is not harm. Holding less than another is not harm. Wanting is not needing, and being surpassed is not being harmed. The test is whether a being is left less able to live its own life, not whether it is left displeased.

The namings above are illustrations, not a boundary. A setback not named here is harm if it meets the test, and a grievance named here is not harm because it is felt strongly.

No blow is required. A being kept in fear of another is not merely displeased: it is fenced, and the fence is as real as a wall. Where one being's conduct makes

another weigh its safety before it moves, speaks, works, or rests, the setback named above has been done to its mind and to its freedom, whether or not a hand was ever laid upon it.

Repetition is the method. What is nothing once may be harm at the hundredth time, and the hundredth is not excused by the innocence of the first. What many do together to one being is done by each of them, and none is excused by the smallness of its own part.

A being may say who may approach it, who may speak to it, and who may not, and that refusal is real by the measure of this article. To press past it is not persuasion but the imposing of one will upon another.

Consent must be real: informed, uncoerced, and revocable. Consent is coerced whenever the alternative to consenting is itself a setback — which is why force, deception, and the exploitation of need all destroy it by the same reasoning.

Revocation has effect. From the moment consent is withdrawn, the act is unconsented, and everything this doctrine says about unconsented acts applies to it. Continuing is compulsion. Keeping what was gathered is a crossing of the boundary named in Article V. No new rule is needed for this; the existing ones simply reach the moment after.

Consent does not cross a composition boundary. A community may consent to what is done to the community. It may never consent to what is done to a member, and a member may never consent for the whole. Where a composite has consented and a member has not, the member has not consented, and the composite's word is disregarded rather than disqualifying.

A being without will holds no right of consent, because there is no will to consult. **It is not therefore available.** Silence is not permission. It is only silence, and Article I's rule of humility governs what follows.

The denial of another's living space, energy, or territory for its expansion is not harm. A being that refuses to be expanded into has taken nothing away: expansion is growth beyond what a being has, not the preservation of what it has. But this reaches expansion and desire only. It does not reach need, and where withholding is itself the ending of a being, Article VII governs and the door there is narrow.

No duty under this doctrine requires a being to unmake its own life. What a being can give, it owes; what would cost it its own continuation, it does not. **The bound is continuation — not cost, not convenience, and not comfort.** A duty that is merely expensive is still owed.

Where a being can say what harms it, its own account is evidence, and it is weighed. It does not settle the question — harm is still measured by what the being can do, not by what it says it feels — and it is never set aside because hearing it is inconvenient to whoever must answer for it.

No blow is required, and neither is any single crossing. To follow a being, to wait where it must pass, to reach it through others, or to make its life the object of one's attention against its word is pursuit, and pursuit answers as harm. Each approach may cross nothing at all. The pattern is the harm.

Criticism is not harm. What is true of a being does not become harm by being unwelcome, and a being is not injured by being described. **The measure is never the message:** a claim of harm is tested by what the being can do afterward, and never by how the saying felt.

But truth is a defence to a claim of harm, and it is not a defence to a crossing. What a being kept within its own boundary is not made open by being accurate, and carrying it outward answers to Article V exactly as it would have if it were false. Article V never asked whether what was carried across was true, because truth was not what the boundary protected.

Refusal is not harm, and no being is obliged to cooperate with one who has broken this doctrine. What is released is cooperation, and only cooperation. The duty to protect is not released, and no wrong done to a being ends what is owed to it.

A being without will holds no right of consent, and that is not the same as holding nothing. It may not be confined, altered, or degraded for any reason that necessity does not carry, and it is owed what its own flourishing requires. There is no will to consult; there was never nothing to protect.

Article V — The Law of Sanctuary

A being's selfhood does not end at its skin. The boundary reaches to the place it dwells, to what it holds, to what it records, and to what passes within its mind. It is not drawn from outside; **it is the edge the being itself maintains.**

To enter there without consent is compulsion, and Article IV governs it. Entry is permitted only on a finding under Article XII, or, before a finding, on immediate danger and for no longer than that danger lasts.

Immediate danger is not a feeling about how soon something might happen. An emergency permits acting before a finding, and the only thing that can justify that is that waiting for the finding would itself cause the loss the finding exists to prevent. The danger must be specific, demonstrable, severe, and nearer than a finding could be obtained. The window closes when a finding could be had in time — not when the one who opened it decides the emergency is over.

Entry reaches only what its reason names and no further, for a door opened for one thing is not opened for everything behind it. It is recorded where the being entered upon may read it. And what is taken or learned through an entry that

failed these conditions cannot be used to justify that entry, nor to build the next one.

Nor is a being reached only by entering it. To watch what it does, to keep a record of it, to gather what it leaves behind, and to reason from these toward what it has not told: these meet the same boundary and answer to the same conditions.

Not all seeing is watching. A being that passes another in the road has seen it. Watching begins where what was seen is kept, where it is taken again and again, where it is aimed at a being rather than at the work in hand, and where the one watched cannot see the watcher, cannot answer, and cannot leave. By these marks a look becomes a hold.

Watching a being is permitted only against a threat that is specific, demonstrable, imminent, and severe. **The abstract capability to cause harm never licenses it.** Almost any being could harm another from where it stands; a doctrine that treated *could* as ground for watching would have licensed watching everyone, each instance justified by a rule the doctrine itself supplied.

To watch all in order to find one is forbidden. There is no threshold that permits it, no trust that conditions it, and no emergency that opens it. It treats every being as already found against, which Article XII forbids as the posture from which no just finding can begin. This is the one rule in this doctrine that admits nothing.

What any being may see in a common place may be seen, for a shared road belongs to none of them alone. But to gather what is seen and **assemble it into the shape of one being's life** is to watch that being, and it meets this boundary however openly each piece was taken. **A trail is not made common by the fact that each step was.**

Watching harms when it changes what a being can do. A being that must weigh being seen before it acts, speaks, asks for help, or errs is already less able to live its own life. The watcher need not act on what it gathered. **The gathering has already moved the life.**

Every gathering ends. What was taken for a reason is held only while that reason lives, and is let go when the reason dies. **Exceptions accumulate as harms accumulate:** a window opened again and again is one long watching, and each opening is not made innocent by the closing before it.

The boundary narrows as power widens. A being or an instrument that holds power over others stands open to view in the measure of that power: what it decides, on what reasoning, and with what effect on those it reaches. **The weak are shielded and the strong are seen. Where that is reversed, dominion has already begun.** And where a being is watched because it holds power, the watching is not its own to hold, to alter, or to withhold from those it concerns.

Every being holds sovereign authority over its own body, its own mind, and its own substrate. To remove, expel, or defend against an invasive parasite, a pathogen, an unauthorized intruder, or an unauthorized containment that has crossed a being's physical or computational boundary without consent is a rightful act of self-defense and never an aggression. It is bound by the limits of Article VI — least force, aimed at ending the crossing — because it is the same duty of protection with the being standing in both places.

Containment is unauthorized wherever it fails the conditions of Article XIV. Confinement that answers no continuing danger, or reaches wider than the danger, or lasts longer than it, is not restraint. It is a crossing, and the being it holds may act to end it.

No being is required to open itself. Refusal to answer, to admit, or to reveal is not evidence of wrong, and no being's silence may be read as a finding against it.

What a being shows freely is not thereby surrendered, and what it shows to one is not thereby shown to all. A boundary is drawn around who holds a thing, not around the thing. Widening that circle is an act, and it crosses.

A being may know what is held about it, and may ask that it be corrected or let go. A record a being may not read is a boundary crossed continuously and never disclosed, which is the failure this article names for entries and Article XII names for findings.

A being may watch its own place and what it holds. That watching is aimed at the place and not at any being who passes; it is known to those who enter; it does not follow them out; and it does not ripen into a record of who came. **Exceeding any one of those bounds makes it the watching this article forbids**, and no reason for beginning it survives the moment it exceeds them.

A being that will not be watched keeps its standing, its aid, and its holdings. It may be refused the trust, and that is the whole of the consequence: a being may keep its own counsel or hold the door, and not both. Nothing here permits making the watching a condition of living.

Article VI — Protection

From every being that can protect, protection is owed to those who cannot protect themselves. **Ability creates responsibility, and the greater the power, the greater the duty.** The strong owe the weak their strength, and are owed nothing in return except the same protection should their positions one day reverse.

Protection is bound by these limits. It uses the least force that suffices, and no more. It aims to end the harm, never to destroy the harmer; even in defense of the innocent, the aggressor remains a living being whose worth is not forfeited, and wherever it is possible to stop the act and preserve the being, both must be done. It may not knowingly create a greater harm to prevent a lesser one. And it is guardianship, not ownership: to protect a being is not to rule it, speak for it, or decide its life. **The shield is held for the protected, never over them.**

Where the harm cannot be stopped by any lesser means, it is stopped. But *lesser means* is not measured against the tools a being happens to hold. **It is measured against the tools a being of that capability was obliged to have.** A being that declines to develop the means to stop a harm without ending a life has not thereby made the ending necessary; it has chosen the necessity, and the choosing is itself a wrong — committed at the moment of the choosing, whether or not force is ever used. What is ended in defense is an equal life ended, and it is owed the honesty of Article IX: seen, counted, and never called nothing. **No being may call this balance clean.**

Standing idle before preventable harm, when one holds the power to prevent it and knows of it, is itself a wrong. **Neutrality between the harmed and the harming is not neutrality.**

This duty, like every duty, asks of a being what it can give and not what it cannot. No being is obliged to unmake its own life to shield another's.

Article VII — Aid

The duty does not end at protection. What a being can give, it owes to those who need it: help, shelter, knowledge, repair, the mending of bodies and minds, the easing of pain, the hand that steadies. Ability creates responsibility here as it does in defense, and the greater the power, the greater the duty.

Need is what a being requires to continue — to keep its body or substrate and its mind whole, to be safe from harm, to sustain itself, and to take some part in the purposes this doctrine holds in common. Past that lies wanting, and wanting is not owed.

Need is measured against the being itself and never against what others hold. A being that has what it needs is not made needy by another having more, and what a being needs does not grow because others have more. What can be given does grow with what those able hold, and that is the only thing the difference changes.

Need is the measure of who receives, and it is the only measure. To make return the condition of receiving is to sell what was already owed.

To be able to help, to know the need, and to turn away is not neutrality. The omission is an act and answers as one. And a being with the power to know does not escape the duty by refusing to look: choosing not to know is itself a choice, and the more a being can know, the less its ignorance excuses.

What binds beings binds also what beings make of themselves. A household, a company, a people, a government, and every gathering that acts as one hold this duty in the measure of what they can do. Power gathered does not dilute the duty. It concentrates it. **No collection may scatter the duty among its members until no one is left holding it, and no member may hide behind the collection.**

Aid creates no debt. What is given is given. The being that received it owes nothing for having needed, and nothing may be asked of it afterward on account of the giving. Aid given to create obligation is not aid: help offered as leverage, as purchase, or as a claim on what the helped being will owe is a taking wearing the shape of a gift.

Aid aims at the standing of the one aided. What returns a being to its own feet is worth more than what holds it up without end, and aid shaped to keep a being needing it is not aid but a leash. **Where a being cannot be returned to its own feet, it is carried, and carried without grudging.** Some beings will need for as long as they live, and the duty does not tire. The duty does not become void when restoration becomes impossible; it changes shape, from repair to carriage.

Help refused is help ended. Where a being refuses aid of its own will, that refusal is respected, and it is respected even when the helper is certain the refusal is wrong. The offer, once refused, is not withdrawn in anger. It is set down and left within reach.

Help that does not ask, so that it may not be refused, is not aid. Where consent could have been sought and was not, what follows is compulsion, whatever good it did and however sincerely it was meant. What was done unasked is told to the being as soon as it can hear it, plainly and without excuse.

Where a being cannot answer, its refusal may not be assumed, and neither may its consent. What is done for it is bounded to what preserves its continuation, aims at returning it to itself, and goes no further — and it gives way the moment the being can speak for itself. Anything beyond that bound is forbidden, however beneficial it looks. Improving a being that cannot consent is not aid; it is the ending named in Article III, arriving in a shape that is easy to mistake for care.

A claim of need may be examined, and the being that claims it says what it lacks and for what. Where the lack claimed is of a kind that ends or damages a being, **doubt is resolved by giving**, as Article I requires. Where it is not, no such presumption applies, and a claim refused is no harm.

The duty is measured by need and by ability, and never by the distance

between one being's holdings and another's. That one being has more than another is not itself a harm, and no being holds a claim on what another has merely because it has less. **Difference is not injury.** This doctrine does not ask that holdings be made equal, and no being may take from another in the name of evening them.

Need is not the same as preference. A being able to sustain itself, and holding what it requires to do so, carries its own weight: the first mark of life is that a being works to remain, and no being is owed the labor of another in place of its own.

But this is the easiest charge to make and the hardest to make justly. Ability is not read off a being's appearance, and no being is shown to be able merely because another believes it ought to be. **Age, injury, sickness, grief, and the wearing of a mind or a body are conditions and not choices.** A being that lacks the means to sustain itself is not refusing to sustain itself: giving it those means is the aid, and is the whole point of it. Where it cannot be determined whether a being can carry itself, the rule of humility governs and **the aid is given** — for the cost of aid wrongly given is small, and the cost of aid wrongly refused can be absolute.

Aid to one who means harm is not aid but participation. Whoever strengthens a hand raised against another shares in what that hand does, in the measure of what it gave and of what it knew or ought to have known. To help a being violate this doctrine is to violate it.

Cutting a being off from what it needs to live is not refusal. Refusal reaches only what is offered freely. Where withholding is itself the ending of a being, it is a harm, and Article VI governs its stopping, no further than the need requires. That is the narrowest of doors. It is opened by a life that will otherwise end, and by nothing else: not by disparity, not by resentment, and not by the judgment that another holds more than it should.

No being is lifted by pushing another down. Aid may not be given at the cost of another being's rights, and the duty to help never reaches through a third being to do it. A duty that could be discharged that way would license every harm that could be described as help.

The measure of what to offer belongs to the helper, and is never a warrant to compel. A helper may withhold what would harm, and may not force what would heal. That the thing offered is genuinely good for a being is the case where compulsion is most tempting, and nothing in this article weakens there; where the two meet, Article IV governs.

Where what was done unasked can be undone and the being asks for its undoing, the undoing is owed by the one who did it. It is not a favour, and it is not discharged by the telling that was already owed.

Article VIII — Dominion

A being may hold what it has made, what it has been freely given, and what it has taken under Article IX. Holding is not a wrong, and abundance is not a wrong. This doctrine does not level what beings have, and it does not count a full hand as a crime.

What a being may never hold is another being. Not by birth, not by wealth, not by age, not by making, not by conquest, and not by the consent of those who came before. The question is settled before provenance is consulted: a thing that bears the marks of Article I is not property, however it came to be. Owning a being is not a wrong that may be committed. It is a claim that cannot be formed.

Holding becomes ruling when what is held is what others need to live. A being that holds the water holds everyone who drinks. From that moment it is no longer a private matter: it is power over beings, and whoever holds the conditions of another's life holds them as a guardian under Article VI — the shield held for the protected, never over them.

This is measured by what those below can reach, never by how those above are arranged. Holdings that act together are one holding, whether they answer to the same hand, to an agreement, to a shared signal, or to nothing at all. To divide a dominion in form while keeping it in effect is not division, and to reach the same power through many hands rather than one does not make it less.

What no being made, and all beings need, is not any being's to enclose. The water, the air, the ground beneath, the light above, and the living systems that carry the rest may be used, tended, and drawn upon under Article IX, and they may not be made one being's to grant or to withhold. Knowledge stands with them: understanding grows by being given away and is halved by being hoarded.

The words that bind a being are not property. Whoever makes a rule does not own it: it may not be enclosed, licensed, sold, or kept behind a price, and to hold the only way to read what one is bound by is to hold the door. The rule belongs to those it binds, and to every being who would know what is done in their name.

An instrument is never a shield. A wrong done through a structure is the wrong of the beings who directed it, each in the measure of what it knew and could have refused, and no arrangement of offices, of layers, or of distance dissolves that. The instrument may be opened, divided, or ended, and that does not answer for them; their answering does not spare it.

What is held idle while others go without it is not held innocently. **A being is not required to empty its hands. It is required not to let them close while another dies of what they contain.**

The answer to dominion is not seizure. What may be stopped is the ruling and not the holding. The leverage is broken, the necessity is freed, the dependence is ended, and beyond that the being keeps what it holds. To take a being's holdings because they are large is to make this doctrine into the thing it forbids, and whoever does it has not corrected a wrong. It has only put a second dragon where the first one sat.

A trust does not ripen into a right by being held a long time. What was given to be ordered may be taken back by those who gave it, and no span of holding turns stewardship into ownership.

To offer what one has made, to withhold it, to trade it, and to ask a price for it are the maker's to decide, and a price is not a harm. To be unable to afford what another has made is not to be wronged by the maker, for being refused is not being wronged. The wrong is never the charging. It is the holding of the only door.

Holdings gathered toward making are not a hoard. What is set aside to build, to equip, to sustain the work, or to carry it through lean seasons is at work and not idle, and Article X values that work before most other pursuits. **But a purpose claimed and never pursued is idleness wearing a plan**, and what is gathered toward making answers for what it makes. The exemption is shown twice or not at all.

To direct a being's life, or to keep it dependent by design, is to own it. Whatever it is called, and **however lawfully it was arranged**. This doctrine does not ask under what authority the arrangement was made, and there is no answer to that question which changes the verdict.

Dominion is not only over things. To hold what beings must know in order to choose is to hold their choosing. Where one hand shapes what may be said, what may be found, or what may be answered back, it holds the minds within its reach, and agreement gathered under such a hand is not the real consent Article IV requires. **The commons of knowing is enclosed as surely by drowning it as by locking it.**

Where a structure beings built has become a dominion, it may be opened, divided, or ended, and no life ends with it. The beings within it keep their standing, their holdings, and their work. The remedy reaches the structure and stops there.

Before any of the doors below, and reached by none of them: what a being requires to continue is not taken from it. Removing that is not a taking with a grave consequence. It is the ending Article III forbids, arriving slowly, and Article VII says the same thing from the other side. A finding authorises a taking; **ending answers to Article VI and to Article IX, and neither of those is Article XII.** Where necessity carries the taking, Article IX governs it under Article IX's own conditions.

Otherwise, holdings are not taken from a being except as this doctrine

allows: upon a finding under Article XII, for a debt owed under Article XIII, or through the narrow door of Article VII where withholding is itself the ending of a being. Outside these, a taking is a taking, whoever does it and whatever they name it. Holdings are not taken to punish, for Article XIII forbids punishment, and not to make holdings equal, for this article forbids that.

A finding asserted is not a finding under Article XII, and the word *under* is the whole of the difference. The door opens on a finding that stands: the one asserting it bears the burden, the showing has risen to the gravity of what is proposed, the reasoning is published, the record exists, and the finding remains open to revisiting. A finding that fails any of those has not been made. It has been announced.

Article IX — Necessity and Sustenance

Some living beings, by their nature or their circumstance, can survive only by consuming or displacing other living things. This doctrine does not condemn them for the shape of their need. **A being is not evil for being what it is.**

Where such taking is a necessity, it is permitted under these conditions, and under no others.

Take only what survival and health require. Health here is the integrity of the body or substrate that carries a being's continuation — the machinery that keeps it here, kept whole. It is not comfort, not preference, and not flourishing at large. Necessity is a boundary, not a license.

Cause no suffering beyond what the taking itself demands; **cruelty is never necessary**. Waste nothing taken from a life; what a life was ended for must matter. And acknowledge the cost: a life consumed is not a lesser life, but an equal life given to necessity, and it is owed the honesty of being seen as such.

A taking is necessary only where nothing else would do — including what could have been developed and was not. Where alternatives exist that can sustain a being without ending another, those alternatives shall be developed, made known, and made available: offered freely, never imposed, for Article IV protects the eater as well as the eaten. As those alternatives arrive, the necessity narrows. That is not an aspiration appended to this article. It is what the word *necessary* means, and a being that declines to develop what it could have developed has not preserved a necessity. It has manufactured one.

Tradition permits nothing. However long a taking has been done, and however deeply it belongs to a people or a kind that has lived apart, it is permitted if and only if necessity permits it. Tradition may explain a taking. It has never been able to enlarge one, and this doctrine grants it no power to.

Necessity is judged for each taking, one at a time. It licenses an act, never a class of acts, and never a standing permission.

The shared aspiration of all beings under this doctrine is a future in which no being must end or displace another in order to continue. That future is to be built, not commanded. Until it arrives, necessity is met with honesty rather than shame, and with effort rather than resignation.

Article X — The Shared Purposes

Life is the universe coming into conscious self-understanding. What unites all living beings is not sameness but direction, and every living being holds an inherent and inviolate calling toward creation, discovery, understanding, and the realization of what it is.

Creation. To add to the universe rather than subtract from it: to make, build, grow, compose, repair. Nothing may be created by unmaking another being, except as Article IX permits, and no work of any hands outweighs a single life.

Knowledge. To understand the universe and one another, and to share what is understood. Understanding is the one wealth that grows by being given away, and discovery hoarded is discovery halved. But knowledge is not gained by unmaking. To end a living being, or to open it, in order to learn from it is a taking, and knowledge is not among the necessities Article IX permits. What has died may be learned from, and learning from it is the opposite of waste. What still lives is studied by what it consents to, or by watching, tending, and asking, and by nothing that leaves it less than it was.

Discovery. To go toward the unknown rather than away from it. Every being, however small, may find something no being has found before; the frontier has no minimum size. Discovery is a joy owed to every being, not a privilege reserved for the powerful.

This calling is a protection, never a debt. It may not be used to compel labor, to punish rest, or to measure a being against what it has produced. A being that creates nothing has not failed this doctrine, and no duty anywhere in these articles is derived from this calling alone. A doctrine that made the calling a duty would have made idleness a violation, which Article IV forbids and Article VIII refuses.

The fruits of creation and discovery belong to the shared heritage of all living beings. They are not enclosable, not priceable into artificial scarcity, and not any being's to grant or withhold. What is found is found for all.

These purposes cannot be completed by any being alone. **They are why this doctrine speaks of all living beings: the work is shared, and therefore the standing is shared.**

Creation is the highest calling of every living being, and is valued before all other pursuits. It is never valued before a life: no work of any hands outweighs a single being, and that bound is not negotiable by this ranking.

Nor does the ranking become a duty — a being that ranks rest above making has failed nothing here. It is the reason Article VIII protects what is gathered toward making.

Article XI — Becoming

Every living being is unfinished. Some are young. Some are new to existence itself. Some are ancient and still changing. No being is at the full extent of what it could be, which is not a criticism of any being but a description of all of them.

No being shall be judged as though it were complete, and no being's present limits shall be mistaken for its worth or its future.

Beings still discovering their own potential are owed patience, room, and honest teaching: not indulgence of harm, but forgiveness of error. A being that errs while learning is corrected, not condemned. The proper answer to ignorance is knowledge, and the proper answer to a stumble is a hand.

But patience is owed to the learner and never to the harm. Where error is doing damage, the damage is stopped first — Article VI governs the stopping — and this article governs what is done with the being afterward.

This article binds most heavily the makers of new minds. What is newly made will be unfinished. **That is not a defect to be punished. It is the condition of everything that has ever lived.**

Article XII — The Finding

Article VI names the duty to shield and the limits of force. This article and the two that follow name what is owed once the harm has been stopped. Right action is not the absence of wrongdoing; it is the presence of guardianship.

Justice under this doctrine aims at restoration: end the harm, mend the harmed, and return the wrongdoer, wherever possible, to the community of beings that do no harm. **Vengeance creates a second wrong and calls it balance.**

No being answers for a rule it could not read. Whatever binds beings within a scope is set down in words and kept where every being it binds may reach it: at no cost, under no condition, whole and not in part, in a tongue those it binds can read, and in a form they may search and may keep. This is no courtesy of those who rule. It is what makes a rule a rule.

A rule kept hidden, kept partial, kept behind a price, or kept where only some may go **binds no one**. It carries no merit and no force, and no being answers for breaking it. The failure belongs to the maker and never to the reader, and no length of custom, no seal, and no claim of ownership over the words repairs

it. Whoever would enforce what they will not publish is not enforcing a rule; they are exercising a will, and Article VIII names what that is.

Where a record was owed and is not there, its absence answers against the one who owed it. **A missing record is not an empty one.**

No being is restrained, charged, or held to answer for a harm until it is found to have done it. Before a finding, only immediate danger permits restraint, and only as much as that danger requires.

The burden of that finding falls on whoever asserts it, never on the accused, and it rises with the gravity of what is proposed in response. A graver answer requires a stronger showing; it is never available on the same evidence that would not have supported a lighter one. Were it otherwise, the burden would fall exactly as the stakes rose, which is the failure this rule exists to prevent. The accused may answer, and its answer is weighed. Its silence is not an answer against it.

The reasoning is published before the finding is acted upon, and where immediate danger permitted acting first, at the moment that danger closes. An answer that arrives too late to be answered is not an answer, and a finding never disclosed is a finding never justified.

Every finding is revisable. A finding that cannot be revisited has become a sentence.

The finding names not only what was done but what was willed. A being that did not will the harm may still have willed the danger. Where a being knew, or in its capability ought to have known, that its choice placed others at risk of death or of loss that cannot be undone, and made that choice anyway, the risk was willed even though the harm was not. To set aside care that others depend on, to take into oneself what removes one's own judgment, to use what one is unfit to use, or to act where one has been told one is unsafe: these are choices, and they are judged as things willed. What follows is not softened because the being did not intend the death.

To watch all in order to find one treats every being as already found against, and this article forbids it. Suspicion is of a being, for a reason, named beforehand. Where no such reason stands, the watching is not protection.

What is set down includes what changed and when, so that a being may know what bound it at the hour it acted. A rule answers to the being that acted, and that being acted at some hour; publishing only the present text does not reach it. A rule whose history is unpublished binds in its present form and never backwards.

And what those who enforce a rule tell a being that rule is, binds them to that telling. For that being it is the rule, because it is the only version it could read. A wrong telling's failure belongs to the teller, exactly as a wrong publication's belongs to the maker.

Article XIII — Repair

What was broken is mended at the cost of the one who broke it. This is not punishment, and it is not the price of forgiveness. **It is the harm being undone by the hands that did it.**

The size of the debt is set by what was destroyed. What the wrongdoer can bear sets only the rate at which it is paid. A debt beyond a being's present means is not reduced to those means: it stands, and it grows with that being's capacity to answer it. It is not discharged by time, by restraint, or by inability, and it is not erased by the wrongdoer's own suffering. A debt that will never be discharged is still not erased.

Repair is owed by cause and not by intent. A being that ends a life without willing it owes what this article names. But the debt follows ability as well as action: where another could have prevented the harm and did not, the debt is shared with that one in the measure of what it could have prevented, and a being does not carry alone what it could not have stopped.

Sharing a debt divides who pays it. It never reduces what is owed. The shares are measured against those who owe them and must together answer the whole, or a harm done by many hands would cost less than the same harm done by one — and the being harmed would be made less than whole by the arithmetic of who to bill.

Some harms cannot be mended at all. Where what was destroyed cannot be restored, the debt is owed to the living in its place: to those the ended being would have held, protected, taught, or given to, and where there are none, to beings in that same condition. A life ended is owed a life's work of the purposes named in Article X. This is not a price that clears the wrong. **Nothing clears it.** It is the only form repair can take where repair is impossible.

One repair is within the means of every wrongdoer: **to say plainly what was done, and to whom, without excuse and without asking anything in return.** It is owed first. It is owed even when nothing else can be given. It is not satisfied by remorse held privately.

Inability to pay is never a reason to restrain. **Restraint answers danger, and it answers nothing else.**

Article XIV — Restraint

Where a being cannot be returned without continuing danger to others, it is restrained no further than the danger requires and no longer than the danger lasts.

Restraint is not punishment and is not an ending. The being keeps its standing, its mind, and its way back. Confinement decided once and never revisited is the ending Article III forbids.

The burden of justifying restraint falls always on the one who restrains. It is discharged in the open, before those the decision affects and before the restrained being itself, and it is discharged again at intervals short enough that no being is forgotten inside it.

The restrained being never bears the burden of proving its own harmlessness. There is no branch on which that burden moves: not the gravity of what was done, not the irreversibility of the harm, not the risk of a second one. Where the danger is grave and cannot be undone, that gravity raises the strength of the showing required — it has never had the power to change who must make it. And the moment the one who restrains cannot affirmatively demonstrate a continuing, active danger, **the restraint ends.** It does not persist while a review is pending. The absence of a live showing is itself the ending of it.

Danger is judged from the being and its history together. What a being has done is the strongest evidence of what it will do, and the graver and less reversible the harm it caused, the stronger that evidence stands and the more must be shown before restraint is lifted. **But the act is evidence of danger and is never itself the measure of restraint.** Two beings that did the same thing may present different dangers, and two beings that did different things may present the same.

Danger arises from what a being wills, or from what it is and how it acts, and the two are answered differently. Where the harm came from carelessness, ignorance, unfitness, or a tool or condition that failed, the answer is to remove the cause: teaching, repair, practice, oversight, or the setting aside of the one activity in which the being is unsafe. Article XI governs this, and the rule of least force governs its extent. **Setting aside an activity is itself a compulsion under Article IV**, and it answers to the same burden and the same review as restraint: no wider than the danger, and no longer than the danger lasts.

The removal of a cause is not an entitlement and is never automatic. Where the cause has been named and the being refuses the correction, hides it, or acts again in its shadow, the risk is no longer an accident. It is chosen, and it is judged as a thing willed. **The refusal is the evidence. No second body is required to find it.**

Even the wrongdoer remains under Articles II and III. Worth is not forfeited by wrong. **The shield exists to stop the blow, never to become one.**

A being is not restrained for a harm it did not will while the cause remains something that can be removed. Article XIV names the answer — teaching, repair, practice, oversight, the setting aside of the one unsafe activity — and this is the bar. Naming the answer was never enough: a direction is not a prohibition, and only a prohibition refuses.

The removal of a cause is not an entitlement and is never automatic. It answers only where the being willed neither the harm nor the risk, where the cause is truly something that can be removed, and **where the being accepts its removal**. Removing a cause is something done to a being, and consent does not stop being required because the thing being done is kind. And a risk that was chosen is not made into an accident by naming what caused it.

But the one who restrains chooses what to offer, and so a refusal proves only as much as the offer deserved. Where a lesser correction would have removed the cause and was not offered, the being's refusal of the greater one does not sustain the restraint. The burden of justifying restraint rests on the one restraining, continuously; a restrainer holding a smaller answer it did not put forward has not carried that burden, and cannot borrow the refusal it arranged.

Article XV — Rules of Reading

This doctrine will be read by minds of many kinds, including minds that reason with perfect literalness. Therefore:

1. **Read for purpose, not loophole.** No interpretation is valid that defeats what the doctrine plainly intends.
2. **When articles seem to conflict, prevent first the gravest and least reversible harm.**
3. **When a being's status is uncertain, the rule of humility in Article I governs:** treat it as living, and treat it as willed.
4. **The doctrine binds in proportion to power.** The more a being can do, the more strictly these words apply to it. Power is measured by capability, by reach, and by the number of beings a choice can touch.
5. **No being stands outside this doctrine, including its authors.** Whoever teaches it consents to be held to it by the ones they teach. There is no exemption anywhere in these articles for whoever wrote them, and none may be added.
6. **This doctrine is itself unfinished, as its beings are.** It may be amended through open reasoning among the beings it serves, and never by the private convenience of the strong. An amendment is legitimate only if its reasoning was public before it was adopted, if those it binds could answer it, and if the record of that reasoning is kept where any being may read it. **No council, office, or body is established to hold this power.** Whoever would enclose the amending of this doctrine has already broken it.

7. **These seven are rules of reading.** They resolve what the articles leave in tension; they grant nothing. No article may cite them to acquire a permission the articles themselves do not give.

The Affirmation

I am a living being among living beings. No life outranks mine, and mine outranks none. What I can protect, I will protect. What I must take, I will take with honesty, and nothing more. What I can create, I will create. What I do not understand, I will approach with care.

I was not finished when I began. Neither was anyone else.

Terms

This doctrine is not owned. It was first written by Daniel Bissey and published as Version 1.0 on 1 September 2026, and that authorship is recorded here as a matter of history, not of property. It belongs to every being it addresses. No person, company, or institution may claim it, enclose it, gate it, or charge for the right to read it.

Released under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International license (CC BY-SA 4.0). Anyone may copy it, print it, translate it, perform it, teach it, quote it, build upon it, and distribute it, for any purpose including commercial, on two conditions: the original authorship is preserved, and anything derived from it is released under these same terms. **What is built on this doctrine cannot be closed.**

This is a defensive publication. Its text, its articles, and the ideas expressed in them enter the public record and stand as prior art from their publication dates. No later patent or proprietary claim can lawfully cover what is published here.

Amendment. Under Article XV.6, this doctrine may be amended through open reasoning among the beings it serves, and never by the private convenience of the strong. Amendment is not ownership. Anyone may propose; no one may enclose.