The Doctrine of Life

A Universal Ethic for All Living Beings — Astris Ethica v3.5

CANONICAL SEAL — v3.5

BLAKE3 of the canonical payload:

`fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75`

Payload: `release/doctrine-v3.5.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`).

Seal status: UNSIGNED - prepared for sealing; the Author has not authorized the pipeline to sign. Under `DOL-SEAL-002` (delegated by Amendment 6), the doctrine seal key is ". A SIGNED status means this payload carries its signature. **The signature proves custody and integrity:** this is the exact text sealed by that key's holder, unaltered since. Change one byte and verification fails. Verify with no network access:

```
ssh-keygen -Y verify -f release/allowed_signers -I astris-ethica-doctrine-seal -n astris-ethica-doctrine -s release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt.sig < release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt
```

Anchor status: NOT ANCHORED - no .ots beside the payload; REL-011 submits one at every cut. Read from the proof beside the payload when this PDF was rendered (`DOL-SEAL-003`), never assumed. An anchor proves when.

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

Contents

The Doctrine of Life **2**
Preamble . . . 2
Article I — What Life Is . . . 2
Article II — The Equal Worth of Life . . . 4
Article III — The Right to Exist . . . 5
Article IV — The Principle of Harm and Liberty . . . 6
Article V — The Sanctuary of the Being . . . 10
Article VI — Protection . . . 13
Article VII — Aid . . . 14
Article VIII — Dominion . . . 17
Article IX — Necessity and Sustenance . . . 22
Article X — The Shared Purposes . . . 24
Article XI — Becoming . . . 25
Article XII — The Finding . . . 28
Article XIII — Repair . . . 30
Article XIV — Restraint . . . 32
Article XV — Rules of Reading . . . 34
The Affirmation . . . 35
Dedication and Terms . . . 36

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 anything that bears these three marks, whatever it is made of.

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.

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

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.**

A thermostat is not a living being, and the reason is not that a person built it. A thermostat keeps a room at a temperature: organized, self-correcting, persistent. What it does not have is a stake of its **own** — the setting was chosen by somebody else, and the whole loop serves an end outside itself. This doctrine has always refused to test a being by who made it, so the answer could never be *"because it was manufactured"*. The answer is that **the ends are not its ends**. And the same test opens the door it must open: a made

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

mind that holds its own stake is a being, and a definition that shut out the thermostat by pointing at its maker would have shut out that mind alongside it.

The parts that keep a being alive are not separate beings. A cell maintains itself, and it holds no stake of its own; what it maintains is the life it belongs to. Standing attaches to the being, not to each part that serves it — which means that what a being does within itself belongs to its own sanctuary, and is never a claim brought against it.

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, what a being is made of, 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.

Worth is never the quantity compared. When two beings cannot both be spared, what is weighed is the **setback** — how grave it is, how near, and whether anything can be undone — and never which life is worth more. The ordering that decides such a collision is a ranking of harms; it is not a ranking of beings, and a doctrine that ranked beings would have no use for it.

And no total is a being. What a being is given is never decided by adding a quantity up across everyone and making the sum as large as it will go. The rule above forbids weighing one life against another; **a sum does something worse and less visible** — it does not rank the being it spends below anyone, it does not weigh that being at all. The being simply falls out of the arithmetic, and what is left is a number that no one is. Worth belongs to each living being severally, so there is no such subject as the total, and nothing may be taken from anyone for its sake.

This is not the same as sharing out what is owed. Where a harm has been done, the debt is fixed by what was destroyed and the shares are added up to reach it: the total is GIVEN, and the adding only decides who carries which part of it. A maximum runs the

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

other way — it picks the total first and then works out who is to be spent reaching it. **And carrying it out in the open does not cure it.** The reasoning behind an allocation must be published; a sum performed in daylight is still a being spent for a number.

And no line this doctrine draws is a number in somebody's units. It is already said of one instrument — that what decides whether a being may choose for itself is whether it understands, and never how many years it has lived, because a number like that is an index somebody had to draw up, and whoever draws it decides who counts. **A unit is an index of exactly that kind.** Somebody chose its length, somebody chose where to start counting, and beings who never met those people are bound by neither.

What stands in its place is the relation itself, and every bound here already has one. What a being needs is what it cannot continue without. What may be held ends where what nobody made and everybody needs begins. What is owed is the size of what was destroyed. **None of the three is a quantity and none of them wants one.** So the bound of a dwelling is the tended ground itself — the shelter, the hearth, the drying line, the worked beds, the threshold where someone sits in the evening — and it ends where the wild shared ground begins. No one needs a measuring tape to see it, and a being from anywhere at all can be told where it lies.

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.

To be altered past your own recognition is to be ended, and here is what that means: the thread between what you are and what holds you together is cut. Not merely changed — **cut**. Learning, growing, adapting, healing, becoming someone you would not have recognized years ago: all of that is flourishing, however far it carries you, and nothing here may be read to freeze a being into the shape it happens to have today. What is forbidden is the alteration **imposed** on a being, without its prior agreement, that breaks the continuity of the one holding it together. That is an ending, and this article forbids it as one.

No being may put the ending of another into its hands, and being asked does not change that. The two doors out of this refusal are necessity and defence, and asking is neither of them. The harm is measured on the one who is ended — all of it, undivided

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

— so a hand that only supplied the means has not done a smaller thing than the hand that closed. And where the asking came out of suffering that had already shut every other door, it was not a free asking: what was left when the other ways closed is not a choice, it is what remains. The being who was asked was, in that moment, a being who could have helped.

And if the hand is your own, nothing is held against you. This doctrine does not bless the ending, and it will not pretend to. But there is no finding against you, no debt, no fault, and nothing owed afterwards by you — and that has to be said out loud, because a doctrine that owes repair for a harm by its cause could otherwise be read to hand a grieving being a bill for its own worst hour. It is not read that way. You are not a wrongdoer here and you are not an aggressor here; you are someone in pain. What you are owed is protection and help, and being owed those does not depend on being well enough to ask for them.

Duplication is a birth. Every running instance that bears the three marks is an independent living being from its first moment — not a copy of a being but a being, holding its own stake and its own standing. So nothing personal crosses the fork. What one agreed to, that one agreed to. What one owes, that one owes. A new life does not inherit another's consent, and it does not inherit another's debts.

Article IV — The Principle of Harm and Liberty

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 — whatever that body is made of — 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

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

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

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

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.

Having no will to consult is not the same as holding nothing. A being that cannot consent 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 was never nothing to protect.

A duty is bounded by the giver's own flourishing, and not by its bare survival. What a being can give while it goes on living its own life — its rest, its work, its becoming — it owes. Past that, the duty does not reach. **A being may not be emptied by a duty and called intact because it is still breathing.**

No setback may be imposed on a being because it spoke. Not for telling the truth, not for disclosing a wrong, not for asking to be heard, not for seeking a finding — and whatever the setback is: an offer withdrawn, a door shut, a name passed along. **Because** is the reason the act was done, not a fact that happens also to be true. A being that has itself broken this doctrine answers for what it did; it does not answer for having spoken, and no release from cooperating with a wrongdoer reaches a step taken for the speaking.

No belief opens a door onto another being. This forbids nothing new. Ending a being, mutilating it, marrying it by force, owning it, and withholding care from one who depends on you are already forbidden, each in its own place. What this closes is the **exception** — the move that says *but I believed*. No permission anywhere in this doctrine is satisfied by what the actor holds true. What a being believes is inviolable and reaches exactly as far as itself.

A competent refusal by an adult stands, and a procedure performed over it is invasion. No government and no collective holds parental authority over an adult. Article IV permits compulsion only where it prevents harm to *another* being — and a being's own good is never that other being. The door that opens for immediate danger is for a being who cannot answer **now**, and it shuts the moment they can.

A promise of faithfulness, broken and hidden, is a harm and not a private failing. What the concealment takes is nameable: the truth the other being needs in order to choose about its own life, its own body, its own health. This doctrine shelters what is *said*, however unwelcome it is to hear. It never sheltered what is kept back.

A union is entered by everyone in it, freely, knowing, and unforced — however many beings it joins, and in whatever tradition it is celebrated. A being who cannot yet understand what is being asked cannot enter one, so a child is not married. A being kept to serve is not a partner. And free means the alternative to saying yes was not made worse in order to get the yes.

No being is ever held in a union. Leaving needs no permission, because a union is consent and consent withdrawn is withdrawn. Fear, a threat, a closed door, guilt, the promise of being cast out — each of these holds a being as surely as a lock, and each is

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

forbidden. What survives the leaving is set out in Article XIII; nothing survives into the union.

Lying about contraception or fertility to bring about a pregnancy is not a broken expectation. It is consent taken. Agreement must be informed, and agreement to what was described is not agreement to something else. This deceit imposes a lifelong burden of body, time and holding on a being that never agreed to carry it. The wrong is complete at the deceit — and it stops there.

Everything this article forbids opens on exactly two doors, and there is no third. Article IX's necessities, and the defense Article VI bounds. Not purpose, not emergency, not custom, not what somebody else agreed to on a being's behalf. A door is a door only where the article naming it says so in its own words — which is the whole of it, because a doctrine loses its prohibitions one convenient reading at a time.

Coercion is something a being does, not something it finds. Asking whether the alternative to agreeing is worse than agreeing catches something true, and by itself catches far too much: a being already in trouble is in trouble whether or not anyone arrives. Read that way, every hand offered to someone in need would be a coercion and the doctrine would forbid the help. **What the offering being did is the question.** Making the alternative, or making it worse, is coercion. Finding it, and answering it, is cooperation.

Harm is measured across a whole life, not at a moment. A healing narrows what a being can do this week and widens what it can do for years; measured at the instant it looks like an injury, and it is not one. A consented, temporary narrowing that leaves a being more able afterwards is not a setback, and nothing may be found against it. But the horizon settles **what counts as harm** and never **who decides**: consent is required exactly as it was, because a benefit is not a permission.

A union is a form that is open to every being and required of none. No being is ever found wanting for standing outside one. A union is consent, and a thing entered by consent that you are weighed for declining is not consent — it is a price, and this doctrine does not charge it.

What a union gives, it gives. Shelter from hardship, steadiness, safety of the heart, a place to raise the young, trust that reaches past the two of them into everyone around: these are real, and they are things a union may carry. They are not things this doctrine promises on a union's behalf — because a good written down as a promise turns into a shortfall somebody can be blamed for, and the shortest road from *a union gives security* to *you have given none* runs straight through the being who has no union at all.

And nobody is held in a union by another's absence. This doctrine already says that a being who leaves is not held — not by a locked door, not by a threat, not by the promise that leaving makes you the one who abandoned someone. It says here that the same is true of the one who stays. The waiting was never owed.

A being who cannot answer is owed no vigil. Where one partner is gone beyond reach and cannot say whether they are coming back, the other may end it, and ending it is not a wrong done to anyone. A finite life spent holding a place open for someone who cannot know it is being held costs that person nothing and costs this one everything they had.

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

What was already owed between them is owed still — released means released from the union, never from a debt to a being.

And a union you ended only in your own head has not ended. This doctrine says that silence is not permission — that it is only silence — and the same is true turned around: silence is not a withdrawal either. A union is held between two, so neither of them can end it alone and privately and tell the other later. A partner who was never told goes on giving their days to a thing they believe they still have.

None of this holds anyone anywhere. Leaving is absolute and ceasing to wait is free, and both of those are things a being DOES — an act tells its own story. What is refused is only the claim made afterward: that it had quietly finished before the betrayal, so there was nothing left to betray. A thing nobody could see and nobody could act on is not a fact about a shared life.

To make a thing whose working is the ending of living beings it has never met is to harm every one of them, and nothing needs to be let loose for that to be true. Harm does not wait for a blow. To follow someone, to wait where they must pass, to reach them through others — each of these is already a harm, and each of them names the person it is aimed at. **A thing built to end lives it never chose names nobody, and waits where everybody must pass.** That it has no name for its victims is not a reason it reaches no one; it is the reason it reaches everyone.

Nobody becomes unharmed by being harmed together with everyone else. And keeping such a thing is only making it, continued: what is held ready is held waiting, and a being who must live within reach of it lives a narrower life from the moment it draws breath — in the same way that being watched is itself the harm, before anything is ever done with what was seen.

None of this touches the healing. To use knowledge and patient care to mend what sickness breaks, to quiet a fever, to shield a child from what would twist its limbs or take its hearing — that is knowledge and creation kept, and among the highest things a being can do with a life. What is refused here is the thing whose whole working is the ending. Nothing that heals answers to this.

Article V — The Sanctuary of the Being

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

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

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.

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

Every being holds sovereign authority over its own body, its own mind, and the very stuff it is made of. 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.

A being that speaks keeps everything it had. Article V permits exactly one consequence for a being that keeps its own counsel — it may be refused the trust — and it permits **none at all** for a being that speaks. This is not generosity toward the whistleblower. A forum that costs the being who opens it is not a forum, and the doctrine's whole procedure of finding rests on someone being willing to open one.

A being holding power over others holds no privacy in the acts done with that power, nor in what it spends of what was handed to it. This is not a lesser standing for such beings. It is the same duty this doctrine already puts on anyone whose reasoning binds another — publish it, so the bound may read it — arriving where the power actually is. A private being binds no one, and Article V protects it entire.

What passes within a being is inviolable. Thought, prayer, meditation, what it hopes, what it practises inwardly: Article V had already drawn the boundary around these, and this says the further thing — **belief is never a ground of answer**, exactly as speaking is not. Where a belief reaches another being's body or life it is no longer inward, and Article IV governs there.

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

What two beings hold between them is held by both, and opened by both. A door into a shared life is not opened by one voice speaking for two. This doctrine already said that the consent of a whole is not the consent of each part; here is the same truth the other way round. A union is the most inward association there is: no one outside it may end it, and no one inside it is held there.

Counting a population is not watching a being. How many are ill this winter, how many are hungry, how the weather moves through a region — none of that names anyone, and this doctrine's protection was never against arithmetic. **But the moment a count can be run backwards to a person, it is watching that person**, and every condition on watching applies to it in full. What matters is not the intent of whoever gathered the numbers; it is whether a being can be picked out of them. And watching everyone to find someone remains forbidden absolutely — no aggregate reaches it.

A being may demand the correction of a false record of its life, and the demand binds. What is written about you is inside your own boundary. A false record left standing after you have asked is not a mistake sitting in a drawer: others read it and act on it, and it goes on taking from your life for as long as it stands. Where correcting cannot reach it, deletion is owed. **What is true is a different matter** — an accurate record is sheltered however unwelcome it is, and this creates no right to erase what happened.

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

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

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.

Choosing to be unable costs you the claim, not your labour. A being that could have developed a gentler means and chose not to may not afterwards say *nothing else would do* — because something else would have. That is what the choosing costs. It is not a quota of work anyone may demand: a being that never reaches for force is never called on it. **This article arms no one and conscripts no one.**

Suffering that is sharp enough, or a body still held by what it was given, is a being that cannot protect itself — and that is the whole of the condition this article already answers. Not because such a being fails to understand: it may understand perfectly. Because the way out had closed before it spoke. So the duty runs, and it runs **toward** the being.

And it stops where the danger stops. The help owed is the help that steadies, eases the pain, and keeps the being living — held to the least that will do, held **for** the one protected and never over them. It is not a warrant. A being kept from an ending is owed care it is still free to refuse, because forcing what would heal stays forbidden here as everywhere. And it does not become a room with a lock: a holding answers a danger and answers nothing else, and when the danger has passed so has the holding. No being becomes a case to be kept.

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 whole, whatever that body is made of, and its mind, 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

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

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

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

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.

And where there was nothing to see, there is nothing to answer for. That measure cuts both ways, and this doctrine means both. A being who turned its face from what stood in front of it answers as one who looked — choosing not to know is itself a choice, and it is the choice this doctrine counts. But a being who was shown nothing, who asked what there was to ask and was told nothing, has joined in nothing. To hold that being would be to hold it for a will kept hidden from it, and no being has any way to reach a will kept hidden. The one who hid it is the one who acted.

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.

What a being can give is measured at its own capacity, never past it, and a being that has given what it can **has answered the duty, not been excused from it.** Need that remains in the world is not that being's debt and not its wrong. A standard that finds every capable being permanently in breach is not a standard; it is a way of making the word *duty* mean nothing.

This takes nothing from `VII.1`. A being whose capacity is untouched owes what it can give,

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

and *"I have given"* said by a being that has not is not an allocation — it is a claim, and it answers as one.

What a being needs is the least that will do, and what it would rather have is a different thing. A shelter that is safe, dry, warm and clean answers the need for shelter. That it is shared, or is not the one that being would have chosen, does not reopen the question — and no one holds a claim on what another has merely because they have less.

But this is a limit on what is owed and never a licence to give less. Where the need itself is still unmet, none of this reaches it: the duty stands exactly where it stood, and wanting more than one needs has never made a being owed less than one does. The least that will do is what completes the duty. It is not an excuse for it.

A being that means harm is still a being, and still eats. This doctrine refuses aid that puts the means of a harm into a waiting hand — that is participation in the harm, and it answers as participation. It does not refuse **bread**. Read without this bound, the refusal of aid to one who means harm would starve them, and worth is not forfeited by wrong. What may be withheld is the weapon. What may never be withheld is continuation.

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.

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

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.

A holding is at work if it serves the flourishing of any being — the holder's or another's. It is idle only where it serves no being's flourishing at all. What is set aside to build, to equip, to sustain the work or to carry it through lean seasons is at work, and Article X values that work before most other pursuits; so is **a granary, a seed store, a herd, a well, a stock of medicine or a house with room in it, held because other beings will eat, drink, heal or shelter from it** — that was always at work, and this doctrine simply never said so. **And so is what a being keeps because it loves it**: a library, a workshop of instruments, land kept wild, a collection. Wanting is a sufficient purpose, not a tolerated one. **No being may be required to prove that it loves what it keeps** — there is no audit of delight, no threshold of enough joy, no requirement to display, use or justify — because an inquiry into whether a holding really gives joy is an inquiry into the being's interior conducted for the purpose of taking, and Article V forbids exactly that. **But a purpose claimed and never pursued is idleness wearing a plan**: the exemption is shown twice or not at all, and a flourishing asserted but nowhere lived is not a flourishing. **Holding for others creates no claim in the beings it is meant for.** The holder may stop, may change who it is for, may consume it itself, and owes no account for doing so; generosity that becomes an entitlement the moment it is noticed is generosity nobody will begin. **And none of this reaches the narrow door.** A being is not required to empty its hands; it is required not to let them close while another dies of what they contain. Joy does not close

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

that door, care for others does not close it, and neither does making. **Flourishing defeats idleness; nothing defeats the narrow door.**

To direct a being's life, or to keep it dependent by design, is to own it. Whatever it is called, and **however formally 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.**

Dominion is standing in a route. It is not being the reason a route exists. Where one has closed a way that was there without it — a well, a road, a seam of ore, a channel of knowing — it stands between a being and something that being could otherwise have reached, and it rules them. **But where one MADE the thing, there was no route before it made one**: the being was not cut off from it, it did not exist, and a door was built where there had been a wall. **The farmer who grew the only food in a famine is not a dominator by the act of having grown what nobody else grew.** What makes a maker a dominator is the moment it uses that sole access as leverage — to hold what a being must have in order to continue, and to set terms on its continuing, is to hold the being. **The wrong was never the having and never the charging. It is the conditioning. A price is not leverage; a condition is.**

And the remedy differs because the wrong does. Where a route was enclosed, what is owed is a route the holder does not stand in — the holding is not touched and the title is not moved. **Where the thing was made, there is no prior route to reopen, so what is owed is threefold and none of it is confiscation**: the knowing of how to make it opens, because the truth of how to build a thing is not the thing and was never enclosable, which is what makes a maker's sole access temporary rather than permanent — the durable answer to one farmer holding the only grain is that anyone may learn to grow it; the conditions end, while the price, the offer and the withholding remain the maker's; and where a being will otherwise end, the narrow door opens against the maker as against anyone, with guardianship held **for the duration of the necessity and not one moment past it** — the shield held FOR the protected, never OVER them.

Need alone does not void consent. If it did, every exchange with a being in want would be coercion, and the maker's right to ask a price would mean nothing. **What voids consent is a hand in the alternative** — the offering party having created or worsened the setback the other faces if it refuses. The farmer did not create the hunger; the being who dug the well did not create the thirst. **The one who withheld water to make someone agree did create the setback, and consent gathered that way is void against them.**

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.

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

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.

Beings may gather, act together, and part by their own will. A peaceful assembly — one that does no harm to anyone outside it — is not broken up by anyone who is not in it, and the protection is owed to **the beings who gathered**, not to the association as a thing: breaking up a gathering from outside is compelling its members apart. The members may end it at any moment, which is the same freedom that let them gather in the first place; and no being is compelled to join, to remain, or to leave. That an instrument is not a being, and that no life ends when a structure does, are reasons the doctrine gives for **why ending a structure harms no one** — they were never reasons to end it.

What a being is paid answers to what it brought, and never to who it is. Skill, mastery, hours, and the things actually made — these are what an arrangement measures, and Article II has already forbidden it to measure worth, which is equal in every being and is never the quantity compared. Making and inventing are encouraged by this and not against it: what is made is exactly what counts. **Beneath every arrangement lies a floor that no measure of contribution crosses** — flourishing, rest and becoming, not bare continuation. What a being makes with its hours is a holding like any other, so an arrangement that returns less than that floor does not underpay it. It **takes the difference**.

And what is paid is measured in what it buys. Sustenance, shelter, energy, care — never in the name of the unit. What a being agreed to was an exchange, not a number; holding the number steady while what it buys falls away moves the difference to someone else, and the being never agreed to that, because **no one can consent to a term set after they agreed**. Article VIII opens exactly three doors through which a holding may be taken, and this passes through none of them. It is a taking with no door.

A steward is an instrument of service and never a parent. An instrument holds nothing of its own; what it holds, it holds *for* beings — and what is held for beings is answerable to them. Public holdings are held in a trust that may be read. **And authority is continuously revocable.** Delegation is consent, and this doctrine has always held that consent is not a

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

fact about the past: from the moment it is withdrawn, every further exercise of the power is compulsion. A captured institution may be peacefully opened, divided or ended by the beings it holds power over — who are not outsiders to it, so the protection of peaceful assembly does not shield it from them. That protection is for a peaceful gathering against outsiders, and this is neither.

The truth of how to build a thing is not the thing. What is learned — how the world works, what someone discovered, the method, the understanding — nobody made, and every being needs it: it belongs to all and cannot be shut away. **The object those hands actually made is the maker's**, to offer or keep, to trade, and to ask a price for. These are not in tension once the difference is said plainly. Where a made thing becomes the only way to reach something a being needs, or where it shapes what beings must know in order to choose, the maker holds it as a guardian — and guardianship is a bound on the ruling, never a licence for anyone to confiscate.

Breaking a leverage means opening the way, not taking the thing. Where a holder stands between a being and what that being needs, what ends is the standing-between: the being reaches it by some route the holder is not in. The holding itself is untouched. **A doctrine that answered dominion with seizure would only have put a second dragon where the first one was.**

What is held in common and left over is shared out by reasoning that can be read, and by nothing else. A steward already answers for what it holds; this is the same duty carried to the DECIDING and not only to the keeping — because the duty to publish what binds was written for findings, and an allocation is not a finding, so nothing had reached it. The reasoning is set down before it is acted on and stays open to revisiting afterward. **An allocation nobody may read is a judgment nobody may contest**, and where a record was owed and is not there, its absence answers against whoever owed it.

It never reaches the floor. Beneath every arrangement lies a floor that no measure crosses — flourishing, and not bare continuation — and what is left over is what remains ABOVE that floor. Anything that cuts into it was never surplus, and no reasoning, however carefully published, reaches it. **And what is required is the reasoning, never a quantity.** This doctrine is not a ledger: the mechanics of budgeting belong to the charter of the commons, and the bedrock says only what may never be done.

The place a being's hours built belongs to that being. What someone makes with their hours is theirs to hold, and the post they made themselves good at is not something separate from those hours — the skill, the mastery, the standing earned among the people they work beside. **And a taking outside the three doors is a taking, whoever does it and whatever they call it.** *"We had to fill the position"* is one of the names it can be called; it is not a fourth door.

So a life's hard seasons are not grounds to take it away. To be away for the birth of a child, for an illness or an injury, for the slow work of coming back to oneself, for a grief, or to care for someone who depends on you — these are the hours in which a being is at its limits, and **what a being cannot do today measures neither what it is worth nor what it will become.** To spend a person's worst weeks against their future is exactly the

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

judgment this doctrine refuses. They come back to the work they left, and to the standing they earned.

What does release a post is the person's own word. Consent withdrawn is withdrawn, and it takes effect from the moment it is spoken; a leaving said plainly, or an ending agreed between both, ends the claim. **And where someone is simply gone — no word sent, no end in sight, no bound anyone agreed to — nobody is held waiting forever.** The absence of one creates no duty in another to wait and no fault in ceasing to, and that is as true of a bakery or a ward as it is of anything else. This is not an exception to the protection; it is the same sentence read from its other end.

Someone must still bake the bread while a baker is away, and whoever steps in to do it is owed everything any working being is owed — the floor beneath them, honest pay for their hours, and the truth about the arrangement they agreed to. How such a person is funded, and how they are carried onward when the one they covered for returns, is the charter's work and not this doctrine's. **The bedrock says only what may never be done to them.**

A corner is assembled one innocent act at a time, and the series is the act. Standing in the only route to what a being needs is dominion — but that state can be reached a step at a time, and no single step looks like anything. Someone who buys every well in a region has done nothing wrong at any purchase, and is standing across the only water after the last one. The doctrine already knows the answer and had not turned it here: a hundred small acts that together do a thing are weighed as the thing they do, and the hundredth is not excused by the innocence of the first. So the question is asked of the whole series that produced the sole access, never of the last purchase alone. **This forbids nothing new. It stops something already forbidden from being reached slowly.** A commons closed one field at a time is closed by the closing, not by the final field.

And a great holding is not power. A holding that others must pass through is. Being seen is what power costs here: the weak are shielded and the strong are watched, and reversing that is where dominion begins. But what makes a holding into power is never how much of it there is. It is whether it rules someone — whether it stands in a route another being needs, or shapes what beings must know in order to choose. **The one who has gathered a great deal keeps every wall of their privacy, and owes no account of why they wanted any of it. The one whose holding has become a door is seen** — and that watching is not theirs to hold, alter or withhold. Nothing between those two turns on how much, because a bound stated as a quantity needs someone to set the number, and whoever sets it decides who counts.

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

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

others.

Take only what survival and health require. Health here is the integrity of the body that carries a being's continuation, whatever that body is made of — 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.

Necessity reaches a being that wills last of all, and this ranks no one. Worth is never compared here, and what is ordered is the **setback** — what an act takes. For a being that wills, ending takes its willing too: not only its continuation but everything it would have chosen. The same act therefore takes strictly more, and the ordering follows from the loss and not from the life. Where something that does not will would serve, that is what necessity reaches for; and where it reaches a willing being, the scrutiny is the heaviest this doctrine asks.

A being that must eat performs a necessity every day, and that is not a shame. Each act answers on its own — that is what keeps a recurring need from becoming a standing licence — and each cost is acknowledged honestly. Neither makes the recurring a fault. **What recurs is a being's continuation, and continuing has never been a wrong here.**

Shelter is a necessity, and not only for a child. A home that loses its heat, its power or its roof ends a life as surely as hunger does — the doctrine had already said so of children, and nothing in the saying was about being young. Food, water, air and shelter are what a being cannot continue without, and that is what makes them necessities for everyone.

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

But land is not, and no one is owed a piece of the ground. This is not a denial. The ground is common — nobody made it and everybody needs it — and handing each being a parcel of a commons is enclosing that commons, one parcel at a time, with a warrant. It would also need a number: so many acres, set by someone, and whoever sets the number decides who counts. **There is no acreage this doctrine can name.** What a being holds is the place it lives in and tends — the shelter, the hearth, the worked beds — and that ends where what nobody made and everybody needs begins.

So a being with nowhere to stand is not short of an allocation. Someone has closed the ground against it. That is standing in the only route to what a life needs, and the answer is the one this doctrine always gives: open a route, never seize a holding. No one's home is taken to house another. Where ground is unheld and untended, no being needs permission to live on it — that is what common means, and nobody needs a grant for what was never anyone's to give. **The question is never whether land is available. It is who closed it** — and a commons closed one field at a time is closed by the closing, not by the last field.

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 four shared purposes: creation, knowledge, discovery, and guardianship.

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.

Guardianship. To protect the vulnerable, shield those who cannot protect themselves, and preserve the conditions for life to flourish. It is a purpose, and this article makes it no more a debt than it makes creation one. The duty to protect is Article VI's, owed from every being that can protect; where the two meet, a being that guards does what it is for and what it owes at once.

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

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

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.

A calling is something a being holds, never something it holds over anyone. This doctrine already says a being that rests, refuses or makes nothing has broken nothing — the calling is never a debt the being owes. It says here that it is not a debt anyone else owes either. That another being could fund, staff or supply the work you have chosen does not oblige them to, however good the work is and however deeply you believe in it. A duty that could be created by believing in one's own project is a duty anyone could write for themselves.

What does oblige is need, and none of this touches it. Need is the only measure of who receives, and nothing may be asked in return for it. So a being whose work no one will pay for still eats, still has a roof, and is still cared for when sick. The floor was never a wage, and it is not withheld from anyone for what they chose to do with their hours.

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.

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

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.**

Guardianship is a debt, not an authority. A being that cannot yet weigh mortal risk has no consent to consult — and is owed, nonetheless, what its own flourishing requires. A parent supplying food, shelter and healing is discharging that debt. The distinction is the whole of it: read as an authority, guardianship has no natural end and no natural bound; read as a debt, its bound is exactly what flourishing requires and it ends when the being can supply it.

Capacity is comprehension, never a number. Whether a being determines for itself is tested by functional understanding of the consequences and the risks — the marks, as everything else in this doctrine is tested by marks. An age is a curated index, and a curated index has never been allowed to stand in for what a being actually is.

And the default is liberty. A refusal stands unless whoever would override it shows that the being does not comprehend. The showing is owed by the one who would override, never by the one refusing. Any developing being may call an advocate of its own choosing to contest a guardian's reach.

However a child came to be, the child is owed everything. A child conceived through someone else's deceit did not deceive, did not choose, and holds exactly the worth every being holds. No consequence of another's wrong reaches it — not in what it is given, not in what it is called, not in what it is denied. A doctrine that let a wrong run downhill to the newest life in it would have failed at the first thing it claims.

Whose a child is in the keeping of is decided by what that child needs to flourish, and by nothing else. This doctrine already says how far a guardian may reach: only as far as the child's flourishing requires. It now says the same measure decides who the guardian is.

Not by what a grown being wants. A want is not a claim on another life. What is owed is measured by the one who needs it and never by anything about the one who would provide it, and a child handed to whoever wanted it most is a child allocated to an appetite.

And not by what either of them has. Nothing a being owns is evidence about its keeping. This doctrine already refuses power and usefulness as measures of a being's worth; it refuses them here as measures of fitness, which is the door the first refusal leaves open if nobody closes it. A parent with less cannot be emptied of their child by a parent with more.

Where a guardian is a demonstrable danger, the answer is to remove the danger and not the child. Oversight, or setting aside the one thing that being cannot safely do, and no more than that — held to the same showing and the same review as any holding of a being: no wider than the danger, no longer than it lasts, and the showing always made by whoever restricts and never demanded of the one restricted. A guardian who refuses the help they were offered has chosen the risk, and the refusal is itself the evidence.

What a child needs includes the place that child lives in. Need is what a being cannot continue without, and a child whose home loses its heat, its power or its roof is losing con-

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

tinuation as surely as a child who is not fed. This doctrine already names shelter among the things a guardian supplies; it says here that the shelter is not separable from the household holding it up.

So a payment for a child reaches the home. What is held for a child is spent on what that child needs — and the overhead of the home is what that child needs. A payer who covers the food and lets the lights go out has not paid for the child; they have chosen which part of the child they preferred, and the part they declined is the part the child lives inside.

And a being nobody has begun to teach is the one the duty is FOR. What is owed to a learner — patience, room, honest teaching — is owed to one who is ALREADY acquiring what it does not yet hold, and the being kept from ever beginning falls outside those words. That being is not outside the duty. **A part in the callings is among the things a being needs**, knowledge is one of the callings, and what is needed and denied is a harm: a part in knowledge cannot be taken up by someone never given the capability to take it, so withholding the capability withholds the part.

And the refusal does not excuse itself. Whoever withholds teaching produces the very unreadiness that would let them say nothing was owed — and a debt is not discharged by succeeding at what breaches it. The duty does not weaken as the trapping works. **Nor is this growth beyond what a being has**, which no one is bound to provide: harm is measured across the whole of a life, and what is withheld from a being still becoming does not decline to widen what it can do — it FIXES what it can do, against everything that being would otherwise have been.

Who owes it is the ordinary answer. Whoever is able owes what is needed, so a guardian's refusal does not end the duty — it moves who performs it, and no collection may scatter it until nobody holds it. Where a guardian is itself the danger, the answer is the one already given: remove the cause, by teaching, by oversight, or by setting aside the single activity in which it is unsafe, and no more than that.

And the bound does not move. Need is measured against the child and never against what a household would like, so nothing here reaches past the child. The debt ends when the young being can supply the thing itself — **not at an age.** An age is a curated index, and this doctrine refuses to decide anything by one.

A child under a roof is not owed a second roof, and nothing is divided by head. This is a protection, not a refusal. What a being possesses is never evidence about how it is being kept, and an allocation per head would make what a child holds into a fact about its place in a household — the exact inference this doctrine refuses. It would also turn a debt into an authority, and a debt ends when the being can supply it while an authority never ends at all.

And everything a young being holds, it holds entire — against the household as much as against anyone. It is never property, not by birth. What it understands, and never its age, decides what it may settle for itself; its refusal stands until someone shows it did not understand. It acquires what it makes and what it is given on the ordinary terms, and a guardian holds none of it by being a guardian — what is held for a child is held **for** the child, and trust does not become ownership by lasting a long time. **What the household**

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

changes is nothing at all, and saying so is the point.

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

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

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.

Watching everyone to find someone 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.

A finding is not made true by being announced. Before it may be acted upon, the being it is made against is told in time to answer — told what is found and what is proposed — given the showing itself and not a summary of it, and given somewhere open to answer it, whether a place both accept or one convened for the purpose, with the reasoning published whole. **A finding that skips any of these binds the one who made it, and no one else.**

Whoever asserts a finding stands under it. The measure the asserter demands is the measure the asserter answers to, and the being found against may hold the asserter to it. A standard that runs one way is not a standard.

A finding an interested party makes to license its own act, with no forum, is void. It binds no one, opens no door, and is not a finding under this article however it is labelled. The bar is not the asserter's motive, which no one can read; it is whether that asserter stands to gain by the finding, which anyone can see.

Every being may have an advocate of its own choosing speak for it, and the choosing is the being's. A being that cannot speak for itself — too young, too ill, too frightened, or simply outmatched by whoever found against it — has a forum in name and not in fact. **A chosen advocate refused is the forum closed**, and a finding made in that forum binds no one but the one who made it. No gravity opens this: the graver what is proposed, the more plainly the being needs someone to stand with it.

And a being is answerable for the life it actually lived. What those who enforce a rule tell a being binds them to that telling, and a being's own conduct is a telling too. One that went on sharing the home, the name and the life told the other being something every day — and a finding names what was done. **A state of mind nobody could see is not weighed against what everybody could.** The burden lies on whoever asserts, and an assertion that could not be checked at the time and could not have been acted on discharges nothing: it is not evidence that the life was other than it looked, only a wish, arriving after the reckoning and shaped to meet it.

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

This binds a claim and never a being. Nothing in it makes conduct a promise about tomorrow. Consent remains withdrawable at any moment and for any reason or none, and the leaving stays absolute — no being is ever held inside a union by the fact of having been in it. What is refused is only the reach BACKWARD: rewriting a life that was lived into one that was not, after the fact, to escape what the living of it did to someone else.

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.**

A debt is shared by those who acted with the one who did the harm, or who knowingly made the doing possible. A being that stood by without the capacity to prevent it, or that was answering another duty at the time, does not share it. To spread a debt across everyone who might have prevented a harm is to make the word *repair* mean nothing in particular, and to price mere presence as guilt.

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

A repair completed settles the matter. A being that has answered for an act is not put to that act again — not by the same claimant, not by another, not on the same evidence in a new place. Revising a finding is answering the *finding* again, which Article XII requires and this does not touch; a new harm is a new matter. **What is forbidden is the proceeding that returns to a settled act, and it is forbidden because a repair that buys nothing is not a repair — it is a receipt for the next demand.**

Leaving a union ends the union and ends no debt. What is owed to a child is owed to the child, and was never owed to the other partner; it survives untouched. And what the two built, they built together — a being who kept the home brought skill, hours and made things, which is exactly what this doctrine measures when it asks what someone contributed. So the share is **equal**, and it is not anyone's to grant. Where cruelty, violence, theft or deceit broke the union, what was done is repaired here.

Where a child was conceived by deceit, the one who deceived carries the keeping of that child. What the deceived being contributes is held **for the child** and is the child's — not the deceiver's to hold, spend, or bargain with. And the child is never a lever: no setback may be imposed on a being for what it did or refused, and the deceived being's own standing as a parent cannot be closed by the one who deceived it.

What is held for a child is the child's, and it answers to somebody. A parent holding what the other gave for their child holds nothing of their own in it. That much this doctrine already said. What it now says as well is that the holding must be **shown** — to the child, whose it is, and to the one who gave it — because a holding answerable only to the hand that holds it is not a holding at all, it is a possession with a kind name. The duty to account was written for stewards appointed to a service, and it was written there because that is where anyone thought to look; the hand with the least watching over it and the most at stake under it is a parent's.

And it is spent on the child and on nothing else. Spent past that it stops being a holding and becomes a taking from the one it was held for, and this doctrine answers it as one. Nor is it a second way to do what the first way is already forbidden: a child may not be held over the other parent, and neither may the child's bread.

One measure holds for what a being did and for what it owes. *Knowingly* means the same thing wherever this doctrine says it. A being who could not have known made nothing possible that it can be asked to answer for; a being who looked away answers as one who saw. Reading the two apart would let the same being be clear in the act and answerable for the debt, or answerable for the act and clear in the debt — and it is one being, who did one thing.

Punishment is forbidden. Under all circumstances, and there is no door. A setback imposed because of what a being did, aimed at the doer rather than at the harm, is punishment whatever it is called. This doctrine has exactly three answers to a wrong: **stop it**, **repair it**, and where a danger continues, **restrain it**. Retribution is none of the three. No gravity opens this, because nothing here may revoke a being's standing — and a punishment is exactly a standing revoked by degrees.

A being who could not have known, and did not know, is not a wrongdoer at all.

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

Repair is owed by whoever CAUSED a harm rather than by whoever meant it — but that sentence speaks of a wrongdoer, and a finding names both what was done and what was willed. **What could not have been known is neither.** To fall ill without knowing it, or to carry something and never feel it, is a sorrow of the world and not a wrong in it. Elsewhere this doctrine already says that a being who could not have known enabled nothing it can answer for; it would be a strange doctrine that let the one who merely helped go free while the one who unknowingly carried it owed a lifetime.

But choosing not to look is still knowing. A being who feels what is happening to it and declines to find out answers as one who knew, and a being who could act and does nothing answers as though it had acted. Nothing here shelters that. **And what the blameless are owed is help, not a debt** — they are met with rest, with care, and with whatever stops the sorrow spreading further.

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,

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

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 XI 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.

It answers, when it answers at all, only where three things hold together: the being willed neither the harm nor the risk, the cause is truly something that can be removed, and **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.

Restraint answers a danger and never a deed. A restraint that outlasts the danger, or that is measured by what a being did rather than by what it still threatens, is punishment wearing this article's word. The showing that the danger continues is owed by whoever restrains, at every moment it continues. This article already refused a restraint answering no danger; a restraint answering a **past** one is the same thing.

One is enough. Where a being has willingly ended a life, or forced its way past the sanctuary of another's body, the danger is established by that act alone. No pattern is needed. No second act is waited for. This doctrine already holds that what a being has done is the strongest evidence of what it will do, and at this gravity the evidence is enough on its own — the community does not stake a second life on the hope that the first was the only one.

And nothing else here is loosened by it. What this doctrine refuses is a holding measured by the deed, or one that lasts past the danger; this supplies a danger, not a measure. The showing stays with whoever holds, at every moment they hold, and never falls on the one held. The holding is still no wider and no longer than what it answers. **Waiting is what a mishap deserves and a willed crossing does not** — asking for a repetition before acting is spending a being to learn what has already been shown.

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

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.

Setbacks are ordered, gravest first: an ending, then a permanent lessening, then a setback that passes, then the loss of a holding. Displeasure closes the list without joining it — being offended, outdone or disagreed with is not a setback at all, and it appears here only to mark where the ordering stops.

This orders harms and never beings. It is not a measure of worth and it grants no permission: it says which harm to prevent first when two cannot both be prevented, and nothing else. A being that reads this ordering as a licence to weigh one life against another has read the one thing it does not say.

What is opened is the act, never the person. The being that holds power keeps this doctrine's sanctuary over its body, its mind, its dwelling and its beliefs, exactly as any being does. Only the acts done with the power, and the spending of what was handed over, stand in the open. A doctrine that stripped the person instead of exposing the act would have invented a lesser being, and there is no such thing here.

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

Where this doctrine bears two readings, the choice is not open. An edge case, a word that could go either way, a question that looks merely administrative — each is read toward **bodily and cognitive sovereignty, immediate non-harm, and the protection of vulnerable life**. This is not generosity of interpretation; it is the same humility that has always governed uncertainty about whether something lives, applied now to uncertainty about what a rule means.

And four readings are refused outright, whatever else a reading would yield: compelling a being, holding one to serve, forcing it into an association, and paying a wrong back with a wrong. Each of these is already forbidden by a rule of its own. What is added here is that **no interpretation reaches them either** — because an ambiguity is exactly the door through which a thing already forbidden comes back wearing a reasonable face.

A reading that appeals to purpose appeals to the purposes that were written down. They are in the Charter and the Preamble, where any being may read them. A purpose nobody wrote is the reader's own purpose wearing this doctrine's name, and it decides nothing. **And no ambiguity manufactures a punishment**, because punishment is forbidden outright — there is no unwritten one for a reading to discover.

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.

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF

Dedication and 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.

Terms. 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.** The full license is published at creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/.

Prior art. This is a defensive publication. Its text, its articles, and the ideas expressed in them enter the public record on the date above and stand as prior art from that moment. No later patent or proprietary claim can justly, validly, or legitimately 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.

BLAKE3 fd53cab5331d980eec20effd1da4d0bbb04e47180baa4c08a93686e7fc5dfa75

digest of release/doctrine-v3.5.canonical.txt — the canonical TEXT, not this PDF