



DELUISM

Introduction

The contemporary moment finds humanity at a critical juncture, confronted with a decision that will determine the course of our species. It is evident that throughout the world, there is an increasing demand for action to address issues of injustice, division and exploitation. The prevailing order, characterised by systemic racism, elitist bias, and a relentless pursuit of profit, has been found to compromise human dignity. Deluism arises as a unifying doctrine for our time: a philosophy and revolutionary call to action for all peoples, in every nation. The fundamental premise underpinning this assertion is the enduring truth that human beings are a social species, deriving their existence and well-being from community and cooperation. Aristotle's long-standing observation that "man is a social animal" is a welldocumented assertion that individuals are unable to fulfil their potential in isolation. Contemporary scientific and experiential evidence substantiates this assertion: the absence of community is concomitant with human deterioration, a phenomenon that is as indispensable to life as respiration itself.

However, in the contemporary era, the prevalence of materialism and narrow self-interest has led to the fracturing of communal bonds. It is evident that substantial disparities impede millions from attaining the liberty and egalitarianism that are their inherent rights.

Prejudice and hate, most notably racism, have the capacity to create division between individuals, thereby eroding the cohesive forces that bind communities. The prevailing socio-political structure, characterised by an oligarchy and tyranny, has been shown to exert a significant detrimental effect on the human spirit, effectively treating the populace as a means to the enrichment of a select few. This manifesto asserts that the perpetuation of these injustices will no longer be countenanced. The present study sets out the argument for the advancement of Deluism as a new path, combining the moral fervour of a political manifesto, the rigour of a philosophical treatise, and the bold vision of a revolutionary doctrine. The work is both idealistic and pragmatic, encapsulating a "pessimism of the intellect, optimism of the will" (Gramsci, 1929) by being simultaneously realistic about the present evils and hopeful about humanity's capacity to overcome them. This manifesto is directed not at a specific class or nation, but rather, it is intended to address humanity as a whole. The Deluist movement is predicated on the notion that every culture, community and individual has a place within it.

In the following pages, the fundamental principles of Deluism are set forth, along with the organisation's vision for a just and free world community and a call to action. These principles are proposed as a living doctrine, intended to evolve in accordance with collective wisdom and diverse experiences, rather than as immutable dogma.

Deluism is not an idle utopia; it is a rallying banner for all who yearn for solidarity, freedom, and equality. Readers are invited to participate in this endeavour as members of the human family. It is asserted that a unified purpose, in conjunction with a conscientious approach, has the potential to effect profound and transformative change on a global scale.

“Concern for human dignity demands that all citizens be equal before the law... The conscience of all mankind demands that this be true for all the peoples of the earth.”

1. Community as the Foundation of Human Life

Community is the bedrock of human existence. Deluism is founded on the principle that human life is inherently social; no individual can survive, develop or flourish in isolation. From our earliest moments, we are nurtured and shaped by those around us. Language, culture, knowledge and identity all emerge through communal relationships rather than solitary thought. The first principle of Deluist thought asserts that community is not merely an adjunct to individual life, but it's very foundation – the soil in which humanity takes root and grows strong. Without community, the individual withers; with community, however, we become fully human.

An Ancestral Truth: Humans Are Communal by Nature

Both history and anthropology affirm that community is central to human evolution and survival. Early humans who came together enjoyed significant advantages: by sharing resources and responsibilities, they could hunt large game, defend themselves against predators, care for the young and injured, and survive in harsh environments that would have been fatal for anyone alone. In short, there was strength and safety in numbers. Biologists note that humans have unusually large brains, in part to handle complex social bonds, indicating that navigating community life was crucial to our survival. In short, our

species evolved to live in groups. Social connection became a basic need, as vital as food or water for our ability to thrive.

Some anthropologists even argue that the first sign of true civilisation was not a tool or weapon, but a caring community. While an injured creature in the animal kingdom is left to die, scientists have found evidence of healed thigh bones at ancient human sites, indicating that someone tended to an injured person until they recovered instead of abandoning them. This simple act of mutual aid, one human helping another through hardship, marks the dawn of civilisation itself. It shows that, from our very beginnings, we have relied on each other. Community is literally lifesaving; it is the context in which we learned to become human.

Philosophical Foundations of Community Over Individual

Throughout history, great minds have recognised the primacy of community. "Man is by nature a social animal," Aristotle declared, observing that society precedes the individual and that anyone who needs no community must be "either a beast or a god". In other words, to be human is to live among other humans. This truth is echoed in Indigenous philosophies across the world. The African concept of Ubuntu, often translated as 'I am because we are', professes a 'universal bond of sharing that connects all humanity'. ("On Bridging |

Othering & Belonging Institute”) We discover our humanity through one another, not in isolation.

Enlightenment and modern thinkers likewise affirmed community as the supreme value. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, for example, argued that a just society must be guided by the 'general will' – the collective good common to all – rather than by the clashing self-interests of individuals. He insisted that true freedom is found in obedience to a law that is created in partnership with fellow citizens, uniting the individual and the community. Karl Marx, in turn, maintained that real human freedom and development are possible only in a communal society. 'Only in community with others does each individual have the means to cultivate their gifts in all directions; only in the community... is personal freedom possible.' Marx warned that under capitalism's extreme individualism, people become alienated from their 'species-being', but in a restored community, each person's flourishing contributes to all.

Similarly, in recent decades, communitarian philosophers such as Alasdair MacIntyre, Charles Taylor and Michael Sandel have emphasised that individuals are not isolated entities, but rather products of social bonds and shared traditions. Our identities and moral values are 'largely moulded by community relationships', not forged in isolation. Across cultures and ideologies, the message resounds: the individual alone is nothing; it is in community that we become whole.

The Modern Crisis of Hyper-Individualism

If community is our lifeblood, then today's world is suffering from a self-inflicted wound in the form of modern hyper-individualism. Over the past century, particularly in industrialised Western societies, an extreme ethos of 'personal freedom' and private gain over public good have corroded the bonds that hold society together. The pursuit of individual success at all costs, which is lauded by neoliberal capitalism and cultural norms of self-reliance, has led to the erosion of community and collective responsibility. The fallout is evident in an epidemic of alienation. Neighbours barely know each other. Families are smaller, more scattered and fragile. Social networks have shrunk and become less robust; many people have no close friends or confidants. In the United States, for instance, one third of households consist of a single person living alone, and only 16% of Americans say they feel strongly connected to their local community. Trust among citizens has plummeted – barely a third believe that most other people can be trusted. Civic engagement has also collapsed: as Robert Putnam famously documented in *Bowling Alone*, late 20th-century Americans stopped joining clubs, associations and public groups, leading to a drastic decline in 'social capital' and community participation.

The consequences of this hyper-individualistic shift have been dire. Loneliness and social isolation have reached record levels, a trend so alarming that the US Surgeon

General recently declared a 'public health crisis of loneliness and isolation'. Psychological distress, 'deaths of despair' (from suicide or substance abuse) and polarisation have all been linked to the weakening of social ties. When people feel, they do not belong to any larger caring community, despair and division fill the void. Indeed, excessive individualism feeds social breakdown: as individuals become obsessed with personal gain and private life, our shared civic life withers. Voter turnout, volunteering and other acts of collective responsibility diminish. The sense of mutual obligation fades, leaving a void of meaning and belonging. Society fragments into isolated units, which are easy prey for consumerism, demagogues or despair. In short, hyper-individualism has proven to be poisonous, driving the social decline that Deluism identifies. A culture that teaches us to look out only for ourselves ultimately tears itself apart.

Rebuilding Community: The Deluist Vision

Deluism offers an alternative approach: a wholehearted return to community as the centre of political, economic and cultural life. In a Deluist society, communal bonds would be actively rebuilt and prioritised at every level. This would involve designing institutions, policies and social norms that encourage solidarity, mutual aid and a sense of shared belonging, rather than competition and selfishness. The well-being of the community would become the measure of success, based on the

understanding that individual well-being is inseparable from that of one's neighbours. In practice, this vision involves revitalising the structures of everyday life to make community the heartbeat of society. Key features would include:

Local Councils and Public Assemblies: Political power is rooted in the community. Decisions that affect the public are made through face-to-face deliberation in town councils, neighbourhood assemblies, and popular forums open to all. By practicing direct democracy and consensus at the local level, people regain agency and responsibility for communal life. These institutions ensure that government is not a distant ruler but an expression of the community's shared will. They revive the ancient ideal of the polis, the community of citizens governing together, in a modern, inclusive form.

Mutual Aid Networks: Instead of leaving individuals to fend for themselves, a Deluist society weaves dense networks of mutual aid and cooperation. Communities establish systems for people to help one another with childcare, elder care, healthcare, education, and emergency support – not as charity but as reciprocal obligation. In times of need, whether personal crises or natural disasters, neighbours and fellow citizens mobilize to provide relief. Mutual aid networks strengthen social trust and ensure that no one is abandoned or forgotten, embodying the mantra “we all rise together.”

Cooperative Living and Work: Economic life under Deluism is organized around cooperation rather than competition. This means promoting cooperative living arrangements and workplace democracy. Communities might encourage co-housing developments, eco-villages, and extended family households that pool resources and responsibilities. Workplaces are reimagined as worker cooperatives and communityowned enterprises, where labourers collectively own the business and share its profits and decision-making. By replacing the hierarchical, profit-driven model with cooperative economics, Deluist society aligns prosperity with the common good. The goal is that livelihood and shelter are secured through solidarity, not predatory individualism.

Cultural Centres and Communal Traditions: Deluism also renews culture and education to celebrate community. Each locality would have vibrant public spaces – community centres, parks, halls – where people gather for festivals, dialogues, art, and worship, forging a shared local identity. Communal rituals (harvest festivals, neighbourhood meals, public art projects, intercultural exchanges) are supported as ways to bind people together across differences. Schools teach not only technical skills but the importance of cooperation, empathy, and civic duty, raising new generations steeped in communal values. A Deluist culture honours the wisdom of Indigenous and ancestral traditions that stress kinship and collective belonging. It tells stories of “us” rather than just “me.” In media and the arts, heroes are those who uplift

their communities. Pride and purpose are found in serving the common good.

In all these ways, a Deluist society seeks to mend the torn social fabric and put community back at the heart of human life. All aspects of society, including politics, the economy and culture, are redirected towards one goal: recreating the bonds of solidarity that give life meaning and ensure our survival. The Deluist vision is unapologetically communitarian, it asserts that true freedom and progress are measured by the strength of our communities. Rather than being suppressed, individuals are empowered by belonging to a thriving collective that cares for them. When we stand together, we discover a greater sense of liberty and dignity than any individual could achieve alone. Community is the cradle of liberty, creativity and peace, the arena in which we realise our full potential through our relationships with others.

Deluism thus proclaims a new ethos of togetherness in place of the failed religion of hyperindividualism. Being a Deluist means believing that we can only overcome social decay and build a humane future by reclaiming community. This principle is not merely abstract; it demands concrete action, such as building local assemblies, cooperatives and cultural commons right here and now. It calls on us to prioritise relationships over wealth, service over ego and mutual care over ruthless competition. By doing so, Deluism rekindles the oldest

truth of all: that we need each other and that our strength lies in that need.

To summarize this principle, Deluism offers a few guiding maxims that capture its spirit:

Community is life.

No one flourishes alone.

We are all each other's keepers.

We belong; therefore we are. Together we thrive.

In the Deluist view, the community is the essence of humanity. Every individual triumph and joy are made possible by the hands of others, every injustice and sorrow stems from a failure of community. Thus, Community as the Foundation of Human Life is the first principle of Deluism and the wellspring from which all other principles flow. Only by restoring community can we hope to create a world in which everyone belongs and humanity, as a whole, truly lives.

2. Freedom and Equality as the Ideal State of Humanity

Twin Pillars of Human Aspiration

Throughout history, humanity has yearned to be both free and equal. From ancient struggles against tyranny to modern civil rights movements, people have sought freedom from oppression and equal dignity in society. These twin aspirations are deeply intertwined: true liberty implies that each person is respected as an equal, while genuine equality empowers each individual to live freely. Enlightenment revolutionaries recognised this unity when they declared that 'all men are born free and equal in rights'. The great motto of the French Revolution, 'Liberté, égalité, fraternité', encapsulates the idea that a just society must uphold both liberty and equality in solidarity. In short, the human longing for freedom and equality must be pursued together, or not at all.

Philosophical and Historical Foundations

For centuries, philosophers and reformers have insisted that freedom and equality are inextricably linked. Enlightenment thinkers such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Thomas Paine maintained that political liberty would be meaningless if gross inequalities in wealth or status allowed some to dominate others. The 1789 Declaration of the Rights of Man, for example, proclaimed these values simultaneously, affirming the natural right to

liberty alongside equal justice under the law. The rallying cry 'liberty, equality, fraternity' expressed a revolutionary commitment to individual freedom and communal equality as the foundation of a new society. In the 19th century, Alexis de Tocqueville observed America's democratic passion for equality, noting that people "call for equality in freedom; and if they cannot obtain that, they still call for equality in slavery". However, Tocqueville was concerned that an overzealous pursuit of equality alone could lead to oppression, famously warning that 'while democracy seeks equality in liberty, socialism seeks equality in restraint and servitude'. Conversely, radical thinkers such as Karl Marx and Mikhail Bakunin insisted that liberty and equality are inseparable. 'Liberty without socialism is privilege and injustice; socialism without liberty is slavery and brutality'. Marx's vision of a classless society was one in which 'the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all', a powerful formulation linking individual freedom to collective equality. Thus, from the Enlightenment through to the 20th century, a rich intellectual tradition has held that freedom and equality must advance together. The Deluist principle builds upon these historical insights by rejecting the idea that we must choose one or the other.

Rejecting the False Dichotomy

Modern ideology often portrays liberty and equality as opposing forces, suggesting that expanding one requires contracting the other. This is a false dichotomy, a

misunderstanding that Deluism categorically rejects. Properly understood, freedom and equality are not mutually exclusive; they are mutually reinforcing. The supposed conflict between them usually stems from narrow definitions. For example, if 'liberty' is defined merely as the absence of government restraint, it can be pitted against 'equality', which is defined merely as levelling economic outcomes. However, Deluism asserts a broader, more humane understanding of both concepts. We see liberty as freedom not only from coercion, but also to live a fulfilling life, which requires a fair society. Similarly, equality is not about forced uniformity, but equal rights, equal opportunities and equal human worth. Under these definitions, liberty and equality support one another. Indeed, many thinkers have realised that 'no real liberty could exist without equality'. L. T. Hobhouse, a British liberal, put it succinctly: 'Liberty without equality is a noble name and a squalid result.' Without a foundation of equality, formal freedoms are meaningless, they become privileges for the few. Conversely, equality without genuine liberty is deceptive and leads to stagnation and state tyranny. Deluism rejects both of these extremes. We believe that liberty and equality must rise together, each giving substance and meaning to the other. In a truly free society, people govern themselves as equals, and in a truly equal society, the freedom and uniqueness of each individual are respected. Far from being at odds, equality gives liberty meaning by ensuring that freedom is enjoyed by all, not just a privileged few,

while liberty gives equality meaning by guaranteeing personal rights and agency within the social whole.

Lessons from One-Sided Systems

History provides stark lessons in the failure of pursuing liberty or equality in isolation. While liberal capitalism champions individual freedom, including private property rights, market choices and civil liberties, it often results in liberty for the few and hardship for the many. In the 19th-century liberal order, political rights were extended to some, but vast inequalities in wealth and power undermined any notion of "equality of opportunity". As one observer noted, early capitalist society prided itself on free competition, yet in reality 'large masses of people were excluded from the very possibility of significant social choice'. The laissez-faire ideal of purely 'free' markets produced extremes of exploitation that undermined both equality and freedom: when a tiny class monopolises wealth, the rest have little real choice in life. Even today, we see that liberty without equality leads to privilege, with the wealthy and powerful enjoying outsized freedoms while others struggle. Economic inequality translates into unequal political influence and social status, thus eroding the democratic ideal of equal citizenship. In such a system, freedoms of speech, work and initiative exist in theory, but in practice, a poor person's freedom is curtailed by a lack of resources, a condition that Franklin D. Roosevelt warned against when

he said: 'True individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence. Necessitous men are not free men'. The error of liberal capitalism was not its embrace of liberty, but its failure to secure the material and social equality needed to make liberty meaningful for all.

Conversely, authoritarian socialism pursued equality in form, often through state-enforced economic levelling, but denied basic liberties. In regimes that promised a 'classless' utopia, political dissent was crushed, civil rights were suspended, and power was concentrated in the hands of a new elite. The result was equality without liberty: shared misery under an oppressive state. As Bakunin presciently observed, 'Equality without liberty is the despotism of the state', which inevitably creates a bureaucratic class with special privileges. 20th century history bore this out. Societies that sought to abolish class hierarchy while forbidding freedom of speech, thought and association ended up with neither true equality nor true liberty. Forced egalitarianism became a hierarchy in itself, with party officials or technocrats acting as a superior caste. Without liberty, there was no check on authority, and even material gains were fragile and hollow without democratic voice or rights. People were made equal only in their powerlessness. These experiments demonstrated that equality achieved at the expense of freedom is self-defeating — it strips away the human agency and creativity needed to empower the masses. Just as liberty without social justice becomes privilege, so too

does equality without rights become oppression. Deluism learns from these failures. We reject the 'either/or' of these two flawed models. A Deluist society is neither a plutocracy masquerading as freedom nor a dictatorship masquerading as equality. Instead, it is something new: a genuine synthesis in which freedom and equality reinforce each other at every level of social life.

True Freedom and True Equality Defined

What do we mean by 'freedom' and 'equality' in the Deluist vision? We mean freedom in its truest sense: not just freedom from arbitrary authority, but the positive freedom to fulfil one's potential alongside others. We also mean equality in its deepest sense – not the suppression of individuality, but an equality of rights, opportunities and dignity that enables everyone to flourish. True freedom is more than the libertarian cry of “leave me alone”. It is each person's ability to think, speak, create and choose their path without fear of domination, and the assurance that their material circumstances, social background or identity will not impede those choices. This concept of liberty encompasses the traditional political freedoms (such as speech, conscience, association and movement) and extends to freedom from hunger, ignorance and indignity. In Deluism, freedom is both personal and social. It is guaranteed by law and enabled by social conditions. Likewise, true equality goes beyond mere legal equality or numerical egalitarianism. It means that all members of society have equal political power and access to

fundamental welfare. Every citizen has an equal voice in governance, and every person is equally valued and protected under the law. This also involves reducing significant disparities in wealth and privilege, not to make everyone the same, but to ensure a foundation of justice and mutual respect. In a truly equal society, one's life chances would not be determined by race, class, gender or birth. Equality does not mean we are all identical; it means we each have an equal claim to freedom and an equal share of society's opportunities. Where liberty and equality prevail together, individual diversity thrives within a framework of common rights. According to Deluism, justice is precisely that state in which each individual is free to develop fully because everyone enjoys the same guarantee of freedom and access to society's resources. In short, true freedom is universal – it exists only when everyone shares it – and true equality is liberating, creating a society in which status hierarchies give way to shared empowerment.

The Deluist Balance in Society

In Deluism, the ideals of 'freedom and equality for all' are not just abstract concepts; they are embedded in the institutions and daily life of society. We strive to balance these ideals in every area: law, governance, economics and culture. Some practical pillars of a Deluist society include:

- **Rights and laws:** The constitution guarantees extensive individual liberties, such as freedom of speech, religion, the press, assembly and personal autonomy, alongside robust protections for equal rights. Anti-discrimination laws and equal protection under the law ensure that freedom is not the preserve of the wealthy, and social rights to education, healthcare, decent housing and work guarantee that everyone has access to these freedoms. Laws would forbid both state and private wealth tyranny. The rule of law prevails, meaning that no one is above the law and that everyone, from the poorest to the most powerful, is equally accountable to the rights of others.
- **Democratic Governance:** Politically, Deluism establishes a robust participatory democracy. Power is decentralised and shared. Citizens have an equal voice through free elections, referenda and local councils, embodying the principle that 'all persons alike share in government to the utmost'. This democracy is not merely formal; it is enriched by civic education and inclusive institutions, ensuring that every community member can actively participate in shaping collective decisions. Even when the majority governs, minority rights are protected, ensuring that democracy never becomes the tyranny of the majority. A Deluist government is transparent and accountable, with robust checks and balances in place to prevent any authoritarian tendencies. The

guiding premise is that no one is truly free unless they have an equal say in decisions affecting them.

- **Economic Arrangement:** In economic matters, Deluism rejects extreme capitalism and bureaucratic statism in favour of an equitable, cooperative commonwealth. The economy is structured to serve the well-being of all. This involves worker participation in management, fair wages and the equitable distribution of wealth. Key resources may be held in common or in public trusts, and markets operate within bounds set by social justice. Economic rights, such as the right to a decent livelihood, to form unions and to access basic services, are enshrined so that nobody is trapped in poverty or exploitation. By narrowing the gap between rich and poor, material barriers to freedom are removed. In a Deluist system, prosperity is shared, with wealth inequality being restrained and channelled into the public good. This prevents concentrations of private power that undermine equality. In this economy, liberty means the freedom to pursue meaningful work, to innovate and to cooperate, not the 'freedom' to dominate or hoard. Likewise, economic equality means that everyone has a fair chance and security; it does not mean that everyone has exactly the same, but that everyone has enough and that no one has unchecked power.

Social and cultural life in a Deluist society is characterised by a culture of mutual respect and pluralism. Socially, all groups – regardless of ethnicity, gender, religion or background – are treated as equals and diversity is celebrated as part of our shared freedom. Cultural freedom flourishes, and people are free to speak their languages, practise their traditions and develop their talents. Education and the media promote the values of both individual initiative and social responsibility, emphasising that we are all guardians of one another's liberty. Community institutions, such as neighbourhood assemblies, cooperatives and cultural associations, give people the opportunity to exercise their freedom together and strengthen the social bonds of equality. On an interpersonal level, hierarchies of domination are replaced by partnerships. The Deluist ideal of fraternity, or solidarity, complements freedom and equality, reminding us that we rise or fall together. In such a society, everyone is empowered to contribute and thrive, creating a lived reality of daily freedom and equality. Each person can say, 'I am free because we are equal, and we are equal because we are free.'

Through measures relating to law, governance, the economy and culture, Deluism achieves what earlier systems could not: the harmonious integration of liberty and equality. Freedom is expanded by levelling the social playing field, and equality is realised by safeguarding personal liberties. The result is the ideal state of humanity we envisage: a society in which every individual is free,

and no individual is the master of another; a society in which opportunities and rights are shared by all.

Guiding Maxims

In the spirit of a manifesto, we distill Principle 2 into a few core maxims that guide us:

- ***“No one is free until everyone is free.”***
- ***“Equality makes liberty real.”***
- ***“Freedom without equality is mere privilege; equality without freedom is mere pretence.”***
- ***“Let each of us be free together – only in our togetherness are we truly free.”***

All of these maxims emphasise the same truth: freedom and equality must be pursued together as the ideal state of humanity. This is the Deluist promise: a world in which everyone is equal and free in a just community, at last. Together, these twin ideals illuminate the path towards human emancipation and solidarity.

3. Control as a Tool, Not as a Master

Freedom First, Necessity Second

Deluism cherishes freedom as the natural state of society. Yet it recognises that moments of dire necessity may require temporary control. In the third principle of this manifesto, 'Control as a Tool, Not as a Master', we declare that authority must always serve liberty, being invoked reluctantly and constrained by law, relinquished as soon as its purpose is fulfilled. Deluism prioritises the free, self-determined lives of individuals and communities, but accepts that, in exceptional emergencies, a limited and time-bound exercise of control can act as life-saving medicine for the body politic rather than as a permanent regime. This section explores why Deluism permits control only as a temporary tool and never as a permanent master, drawing on lessons from philosophy and history to strike a balance between tyranny and anarchy.

Philosophical Perspectives: From Leviathan to Liberty

Since ancient times, political philosophers have debated how much control is necessary to prevent chaos. Thomas Hobbes, who was writing amidst civil war, argued that only a powerful, centralised authority could save society from the 'war of every man against every man' that rages in a state of anarchy. In his *Leviathan*, Hobbes portrays unchecked freedom (the state of nature) as a violent and

insecure nightmare – 'solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short' – and thus concludes that peace requires strong control by an absolute sovereign. At the opposite pole, anarchist thinkers have insisted that all state control is inherently coercive and illegitimate. Anarchism views the state as a violent and domineering institution that must be abolished. It is a political philosophy and movement that targets all forms of authority and hierarchy, primarily the state, as undesirable and harmful. Between these two extremes lie more moderate theories. John Locke, the great Enlightenment theorist of liberalism, acknowledged the need for government, but only in the form of limited, accountable governance. Locke argued that political authority arises only from the consent of the governed and must be bound to the protection of individuals' natural rights. Any ruler who exercises 'absolute, arbitrary power' over the people thereby loses legitimacy, thrusting the populace into a state of slavery or war. According to Locke, people never surrender their fundamental freedom; if a government becomes a master instead of a protector, the people are morally entitled to resist and overthrow it.

The ideas of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and the classical republican tradition on emergency power are equally instructive. Rousseau, a champion of popular liberty, nonetheless recognised that law itself could falter in a crisis. 'The inflexibility of the laws,' he wrote, 'can make them disastrous in extraordinary times, since no legislator can foresee every contingency.' According to Rousseau, it is wrong to make political institutions so strong that they

cannot be suspended in an existential emergency. He cites the example of the Roman Republic: when the nation was in mortal danger, the Romans would temporarily suspend ordinary law and entrust a dictator with absolute power to save the state. Importantly, this did not abolish the social contract or the authority of the sovereign people – it was understood to be a short-term extreme measure to preserve the republic, not to empower the dictator. 'Only the greatest dangers can outweigh the danger of changing the public order,' Rousseau warned. Even then, the suspension of law must solely aim to 'prevent the ruin of the state' and last no longer than is absolutely necessary. Once the emergency has passed, the dictator must immediately step down; otherwise, the exceptional power will become tyrannical or idle.

Indeed, in Rome, the office of dictator was limited to six months, and most dictators abdicated early once the crisis had been resolved. Rousseau notes that this built-in brevity made it 'impossible for the dictator to go beyond his limitations and harm the city' – those entrusted with dictatorial powers found them 'burdensome' and got rid of them as soon as possible.

The republican tradition (from Rome to Renaissance thinkers such as Machiavelli) reinforces this balance of civic freedom and civic virtue. Republican theorists held liberty to be the ultimate political virtue, yet they also endorsed the idea of a temporary dictatorship as a constitutional measure in times of crisis. In his *Discourses*

on Livy, Niccolò Machiavelli observed that the Roman Republic remained free for centuries not by avoiding authority, but by carefully harnessing it when necessary. He praised the Roman dictator, an extraordinary magistrate appointed in times of crisis, noting that experience had shown that this institution was always useful and one of the sources of Roman greatness. Why useful? Because normal republican governments, though virtuous, were often too slow and weighed down by deliberation to address imminent threats. The temporary dictator could provide unity, speed and decisive action at times when the usual checks and debates would court disaster. However, the Romans imposed several limitations on this office: a short duration, a defined scope, and a cultural expectation that power must be relinquished. Machiavelli recounts how the quintessential dictator, Cincinnatus, saved Rome from invasion in mere weeks and then immediately relinquished his authority to return to his farm – a story celebrated as the epitome of republican virtue. According to Machiavelli, the Roman model succeeded because it combined absolute power with absolute self-restraint. The principle was that emergency control exists only 'to overcome the peril and restore normal conditions', and that the controller 'hand back this power to the regular authorities as soon as its purpose has been fulfilled'. If a republic ever fails to enforce that swift return to normality, it courts tyranny. Machiavelli notes that even good reasons for breaking the law can set a deadly precedent: if a state becomes too comfortable with extralegal control, an ambitious man

will eventually use it as a pretext to seize permanent power. The fall of Rome itself illustrates this danger: Julius Caesar was appointed dictator during a time of chaos, but he refused to resign and made himself 'dictator for life', after which 'Rome was never again free'. The dilemma, then, has always been how to reconcile necessary authority with enduring liberty. Too much control held for too long becomes authoritarianism, while too little collective authority during crises can lead to anarchy. Deluism confronts this dilemma head-on by treating control as medicinal: potent in emergencies but tightly regulated and discontinued once society stabilises.

Between Authoritarianism and Anarchy: The Scylla and Charybdis

Permanent control is poisonous. Both history and philosophy warn that allowing control to become entrenched without limit leads to the loss of everything a free society holds dear. Authoritarian regimes often begin by invoking necessity and emergency, but when they make emergency powers permanent, they strangle the liberty and civic life they claimed to be protecting. If unchecked by law or the people, Hobbes's absolute Leviathan can all too easily become the devouring monster of tyranny. As Locke observed, citizens under a despot have no rights or recourse; anyone who claims absolute power over others effectively "makes an attempt to enslave" them and puts themselves in a state of war against the people. In practice, such a state is

indistinguishable from an ongoing civil war between ruler and ruled. Therefore, Deluism denounces any ideology or system that seeks to normalise control, whether that be an autocrat's lifetime rule or a party dictatorship that perpetually suspends freedom 'for the public good'. The fate of the Roman Republic under Caesar is a cautionary tale: a temporary office, unbounded by time, became a permanent dictatorship synonymous with the betrayal of the Republic. More recently, many nations have suffered from 'emergency' measures that were never lifted — martial law or states of emergency lasting decades and calcifying into oppression. To Deluism, such permanent authoritarianism is anathema; control must dissolve as soon as liberty can flourish again.

Total anarchy is perilous. Yet Deluism also diverges from naïve anarchism in recognising that a complete absence of authority can be equally deadly. A society with no agreed-upon mechanism for collective decision-making or defence in times of peril invites another form of tyranny: the tyranny of chaos, where the strong prey on the weak. Hobbes's nightmare of the state of nature, a condition of lawless violence, illustrates this opposite extreme. Without any 'common power to keep them in awe', Hobbes wrote, humans revert to a state of perpetual conflict where each individual must rely on force for self-preservation. Modern examples bear out Hobbes's warning: in failed states or regions of total disorder, we often see warlords, gangs or fanatical groups filling the power void and imposing their will through brute strength.

In practice, total anarchy tends to negate freedom: life and property are perpetually insecure, and ordinary people cannot truly enjoy liberty amid constant fear and violence. Thus, just as unchecked control devours freedom, so does the absence of any coordinated control. Deluism seeks to strike a balance, aiming for a society that is free in its ordinary course but capable of uniting and taking collective action in extraordinary moments. The aim is to avoid both extremes: never allowing the tool of control to harden into a master and never leaving liberty's house undefended when fire breaks out.

Emergency Powers: Lessons from History and Modern Practice

In order to chart this delicate balance, Deluism draws on historical precedents of emergency powers that were both effective and temporary. The gold standard is the Roman Republic's use of the office of dictator. As previously mentioned, the Roman dictator was a constitutional office, involving a lawful concentration of power for a strictly limited time (usually six months) in order to address a specific crisis. The Romans treated this tool as a last resort, appointing a dictator only when the survival of the Republic was at stake, for example in the event of a foreign invasion or domestic insurrection. Because the Romans valued their republican freedoms, they ensured that the dictator's mandate expired before power could corrupt. The story of Cincinnatus is a prime example of this: according to legend, Rome called the retired general

Cincinnatus from his plough to serve as dictator when an army threatened the city. He accepted absolute control, defeated the enemy in a matter of days, celebrated a victory, and then voluntarily surrendered power well before his term ended. He returned to his farm as a private citizen. This self-abnegation was hailed for centuries as the pinnacle of civic virtue – the idea that a true patriot uses power as a tool to serve the common good rather than as an opportunity for personal rule. Reflecting on this, Machiavelli urged later republics to institutionalise such emergency measures with clear limits. He observed that, because Rome had established the office of dictator through law and tradition, the city survived extraordinary dangers that would have overwhelmed a government operating at a slower pace. By contrast, when republics lacking these provisions face a mortal threat, they often blunder or succumb either they act too slowly or invite a strongman to take over outside of the law. Machiavelli's verdict was stark: 'Those republics which have no recourse to a dictator or similar authority during the most pressing dangers will always come to ruin during serious misfortune.' In other words, a free state must pre-emptively design a controlled form of control – a framework for emergency authority – to avoid permanent ruin in the event of an ad hoc crisis.

Modern democracies have in fact adopted versions of this idea, which scholars such as Clinton Rossiter have termed 'constitutional dictatorship'. During extreme crises such as world wars or natural disasters, even liberal societies have

temporarily centralised and expanded governmental powers – precisely to preserve those societies in the long term. For instance, during World War II, the United States and Britain (along with other Allied democracies) assumed emergency powers that would be unthinkable in peacetime. The US government rationed food and fuel-imposed wage and price controls, conscripted millions of citizens into military service, censored communications and directed industries – actions that, in isolation, resembled the policies of authoritarian regimes. These extraordinary measures were accepted by the public as necessary evils required to win the war. Crucially, however, they were enacted with sunset clauses and with an understanding that the normal legal order still existed in the background. Once victory was achieved, the vast majority of these controls were indeed lifted. Rossiter notes that, after WWII, the Allied nations had "fought a successful total war and remained a democracy" by the time it was over. The pattern was clear: emergency powers were invoked to address the emergency and then promptly relinquished to restore the liberal constitutional order. This demonstrates that, in practice, a democracy can survive and even imitate dictatorial methods for a time without becoming dictatorial permanently, provided it has the discipline to revert to openness and freedom once the emergency has passed. Other examples abound: constitutions around the world include emergency provisions, such as allowing a government to declare a state of emergency or martial law for a limited period, precisely to formalise this concept of temporary extra-

legal power. In federations, local and national authorities coordinate during disasters, such as when states unite under federal agencies to respond to hurricanes, pandemics or economic crises. However, such coordination is dissolved once the crisis has been managed. These cases teach us a key lesson: emergency control can be federated, democratic and temporary. When designed with foresight, control measures need not destroy liberty; they can be the tourniquet that stops the bleeding in an emergency, saving the life of the republic at some cost, and then be removed to allow healthy circulation to resume.

The Deluist Vision: Federal, Democratic, and Revocable Control

Deluism's response to the challenge of control is a system in which authority is fundamentally bottom-up rather than top-down, and all powers are revocable, transparent and temporary. In the Deluist social order, freedom is the norm and control the exception. Day-to-day governance is highly decentralised, with local communes, communities and federated regions enjoying broad autonomy to manage their own affairs according to their citizens' will. This federal structure means that power is distributed — the antithesis of a permanent Leviathan — and the legitimacy of any governing body stems from the grassroots (i.e. the consent of the free people in each community). However, Deluism also allows these communities to come together in times of necessity. Much

like the ancient Latin league or the early American confederation, the Deluist federation has a mechanism for forming a unified front in the face of grave danger or collective need. For instance, if war, a natural disaster, a pandemic or an economic collapse threatens the equilibrium of the whole, Deluism allows for the temporary establishment of an emergency council or leadership, elected from the federated units. This council would be entrusted with extraordinary powers to address the specific emergency alone. Its authority would be defined by a clear mandate (e.g. to repel the invader, relieve the disaster or stabilise the currency) and it would be bound by law to that purpose alone.

Several key features characterize Deluist emergency control:

- **Democratic delegation:** Emergency authorities are designated through democratic procedures, such as a vote by local councils or a referendum, rather than through selfappointment or a coup. This ensures that the activation of control is a conscious, collective decision and not an arbitrary seizure of power. Through their federated representatives, it is the people who loan the necessary powers to a central authority, always intending for those powers to be returned. In Deluism, sovereignty ultimately resides with

the people. Even when they temporarily entrust it to a delegate, they remain in control.

- **Transparency and oversight:** Any use of emergency powers must be transparent. According to Deluism, robust oversight committees (comprising members from the federated regions and, ideally, citizens' assemblies) should be established to monitor actions taken under emergency authority. Emergency leaders must publicly justify their actions, frequently reporting on why each extraordinary measure is needed and how it will resolve the crisis. Secrecy should be limited to the extent necessary for safety, with a bias towards openness. This transparency not only deters abuses but also serves as a reminder to everyone that the situation is exceptional and why sacrifices are being made. As the Brennan Center for Justice aptly observed, a functional emergency-power system enables leaders to "address emergencies — without giving them the tools to dismantle democracy". In Deluism, any indication that emergency powers are becoming entrenched or irrelevant would immediately provoke public backlash and legal reversal.
- **Strict time limits (sunset clauses):** All emergency delegations in Deluism have short, fixed deadlines. If the crisis continues, the temporary authority must seek renewal from the federated democratic bodies at regular intervals

(for example, a special authority might expire after 30 days unless renewed by a supermajority vote, even then with a maximum duration limit). This is based on the Roman practice of sixmonth dictatorships and modern emergency statutes that expire if not renewed. The ticking clock serves liberty by forcing a return to normalcy unless the people agree that the danger truly persists. Authority must either justify itself or dissolve. Furthermore, even during its term of office, the emergency government is expected to prepare for the transition back to ordinary law – it should actively plan to restore equilibrium and transfer competence back to regular institutions. In a Deluist system, something akin to Cincinnatus's example would be enshrined in the constitution: to wield power virtuously is to know when to relinquish it.

- **Limited scope (proportionality):** Under Deluism, the scope of emergency measures is limited to what is necessary. Just as Rousseau distinguished between emergencies where intensifying ordinary administration is sufficient versus those requiring the suspension of laws, Deluism insists that control be proportional. For example, if a natural disaster strikes, the emergency authority may coordinate the distribution of resources and rescue efforts, but this would not give it the right to censor speech or postpone elections in unaffected areas. The

aim is restoration, not expansion. Every act of control must aim to restore the conditions of freedom as quickly as possible and no further. Emergency officials are not permitted to exploit the crisis to advance unrelated agendas. In Deluist doctrine, 'In necessity we unite' – but only for the duration of the necessity. The moment unity of command is no longer required, diversity and freedom in command should resume.

- **Accountability and revocability:** Perhaps most importantly, Deluism incorporates mechanisms for accountability, even during an emergency. If the emergency leadership oversteps its authority (for example, by abusing power, failing to act effectively or remaining in power for too long), the federated legislature or a special convention of the communities can revoke its mandate before its term ends. This is akin to a recall or a vote of no confidence in wartime. The knowledge that they can be stripped of authority keeps emergency rulers accountable to the public interest. Additionally, after the crisis, Deluism calls for a full public review of the emergency period – an evaluation of whether the powers were used properly, with consequences for any official who violated the trust. This post-crisis accountability is intended to prevent the 'precedent' problem identified by Machiavelli: if leaders know they will be judged (and potentially

punished) once normal order is restored, they are incentivised not to set negative examples or implement permanent changes during the emergency.

In short, the Deluist system ensures that control remains a means, never an end. It is federal, based on the agreement of many communities, and democratic in both its initiation and operation. It is limited by design and carries within it the seeds of its own dissolution. Equally importantly, Deluism nurtures a culture alongside its institutions: a culture that esteems the civic virtue of restraint. Children raised in a Deluist society would learn tales of those who willingly gave up power. Leaders would be taught to regard the moment when they can return rights to the people as the pinnacle of their service. The ethos 'authority must dissolve as soon as liberty can breathe again' would become a social norm. In this way, the psychology of power is also addressed: holding on to control would be considered shameful and dishonourable, whereas relinquishing it in good time would be considered heroic. By aligning honour with mastery of control (through relinquishing it), Deluism makes the temptation of tyranny easier to resist.

Guiding Maxims

To capture the essence of Principle 3, Deluism offers a few core maxims as constant reminders of our ideological stance. These aphorisms distill the wisdom gained from

history and enshrine the values that must guide any exercise of authority:

- ***“Control is a tool, not a master.”***
- ***“In freedom we live; in necessity we unite.”***
- ***“Authority must dissolve as soon as liberty can breathe again.”***

These maxims are not just slogans; they are ethical imperatives for leaders and citizens alike under Deluism. They remind us that freedom is the norm to which we must swiftly return and that any concentration of control is a temporary support structure, a crutch to be discarded the moment we can stand independently again. By embedding these principles in our laws, institutions and collective conscience, Deluism ensures that control remains a useful tool in times of need and never becomes our master.

In Deluism, liberty is the beating heart of society, and control is but the helping hand that guards that heart in moments of peril – only to release it unharmed once the danger passes. Each generation is called to be vigilant that the hand never becomes a fist that refuses to open. In this way, Principle 3 charts a path toward a society that is both free and secure, rejecting the false choice between the two. It proclaims with firm conviction: *we govern ourselves in liberty, we entrust power only as an emergency tool, and we reclaim that power to live in freedom again.* The master we recognize is *freedom* alone

– and all control exists to keep that master safe, never to supplant it.

4. Human Nature as Adaptive and Cooperative – Unlocked by Incentive and Structure

Humanity's true nature is cooperative, not irredeemably selfish. According to Deluism, human beings are not inherently competitive; rather, we are highly adaptive social creatures whose capacity for empathy and solidarity can be unlocked through wise incentives and structures.

This principle starts with the optimistic idea that, given the right circumstances, people will support each other. Deluism thus rejects cynicism about 'human nature' and embraces the belief that the vast cooperative potential of our species can be realised through enlightened institutional design.

Cooperative Traditions in Philosophy and Science

The idea of an inherently cooperative human nature has deep roots. For instance, Enlightenment philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau argued that humans in a state of nature possess an innate compassion that 'hurries us without reflection to the relief of those in distress', restraining cruelty unless survival absolutely requires it. In contrast to Thomas Hobbes, who believed that humans were driven solely by self-interest, Rousseau saw pity and empathy as fundamental. He insisted that "it is certain that compassion is a natural feeling" which moderates selfish impulses and prevents us from harming others except in dire necessity. According to this view, early humans were not savages in constant conflict, but simple beings inclined to peaceful coexistence that were only corrupted by complex society later on. Centuries later, Russian naturalist Peter Kropotkin reinforced the cooperative thesis from an evolutionary perspective. In *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* (1902), Kropotkin documented how mutually beneficial cooperation is prevalent in both animal groups and human societies, serving as a key survival strategy. 'Sociability is as much a law of nature as

mutual struggle,' he observed, criticising social Darwinists for overemphasising competition. Kropotkin provided numerous examples, ranging from animals joining forces to combat harsh climates to medieval guilds and village commons, where 'mutual support' guaranteed prosperity and resilience. These insights have since been echoed by modern anthropology and biology: many evolutionary scientists now view cooperation as 'core to the evolutionary success of our species', deeming it as important as intelligence or tool use in enabling humans to thrive in every habitat. Early human hunter-gatherers survived the Ice Ages and predators by banding together, coordinating hunts, sharing food and collectively raising offspring. These behaviours left a deep imprint on our instincts. Indeed, archaeological evidence of prehistoric campfires, communal dwellings and care for the injured suggests that altruism and mutual aid have been present throughout human history. Communitarian ethical traditions further affirm that individuals are intrinsically social, with our identities being "largely moulded by community relationships" rather than by isolated self-interest. Thinkers such as Alasdair MacIntyre and Charles Taylor argue that the moral life grows out of communal practices, and that humans become moral by living in just communities. In short, a convergent picture emerges across diverse fields: *Homo sapiens* is not a lone wolf, but a creature wired for collaboration when circumstances encourage our better impulses.

Acknowledging Dark Visions – and Reframing Them

Deluism does not deny that humans can behave selfishly or cruelly. We acknowledge the darker aspects of human nature as described by thinkers such as Hobbes and Freud. Having witnessed the chaos of civil war, Hobbes famously described life in a state of nature as "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short", arguing that only a strong sovereign could restrain our violent instincts. Likewise, Freud, from a psychological perspective, asserted that humans harbour a 'primary mutual hostility' towards one another – an aggressive drive at odds with civilised order. In *Civilisation and Its Discontents* (1930), he wrote that civilisation must 'set limits to man's aggressive instincts' and enforce the commandment to 'love thy neighbour' precisely because nothing is more contrary to our 'original nature' than universal love. These grim assessments contain an element of truth in that humans do possess impulses such as greed, anger and fear. However, Deluism departs from the conclusion that such impulses are immutable or primary. We argue that context is decisive. Crucially, what thinkers like Hobbes saw as 'natural' selfishness may in fact be the product of hostile environments and broken structures. Even Rousseau contended that Hobbes had mistakenly attributed the vices of 18th-century society to nature, improperly admitting the competitive passions that arise only after the introduction of property and social inequality into natural man. Rousseau's argument was that humans are not inherently cruel: it is oppression, want and artificial

hierarchy that warp our originally compassionate nature. Modern evidence strongly supports the idea that human behaviour reflects its incentives. Social psychologists have observed that the same person will behave either cooperatively or selfishly, depending on the structure of their situation. In a famous experiment, researchers found that students playing a Prisoner's Dilemma game acted far more cooperatively when the exercise was described as the 'Community Game' rather than the 'Wall Street Game', despite the rules being identical. Simply changing the name (and thus the implied norms) led participants to share and trust more, whereas the 'Wall Street' framing prompted twice as many to defect and act greedily. In related studies, priming people with words such as 'fair' and 'team' increased altruistic choices, whereas priming them with words such as 'competition' or 'cutthroat' made them choose selfishly. The lesson is clear: structure shapes instinct. Humans respond to the cues and rewards around them. If our systems pit us against each other, fear and egotism will dominate. However, if they reward empathy and mutual aid, our 'better angels' can readily prevail. Real-world crises provide dramatic evidence of this. After natural disasters or tragedies, when authority and routine disappear, the expectation according to Hobbes is a descent into rioting and violence – yet this rarely happens. In fact, sociological research shows that disasters produce groundswells of prosocial behaviour and feelings of community, as survivors form 'communities of mutual aid' almost instantly. Following earthquakes, hurricanes and wartime bombings, it has been documented that stranger's

band together to share food and shelter, rescue neighbours, care for the vulnerable and organise relief efforts with astonishing solidarity. This 'catastrophe compassion', evident after events ranging from Hurricane Katrina to global pandemics – shows that, when faced with common peril and freed from divisive routines, ordinary people can become extraordinary allies. The darker impulses of distrust and opportunism are not our default; they are activated by particular pressures, such as scarcity, lawlessness and extreme stress. Even then, they are often outweighed by cooperation if a spirit of shared fate takes hold. Human nature is deeply adaptive: we are capable of unspeakable selfishness in one kind of world and remarkable altruism in another. The difference lies in whether our environment fosters competition or fellowship. We become what we practise together.

Designing Institutions to Inspire the Best in Us:

Given this malleability, Deluism asserts that the key to realising humanity's cooperative potential is to redesign our economic, political and cultural institutions to promote empathy, trust and shared responsibility. As Nobel laureate Elinor Ostrom urged, we affirm that a central goal of governance should be to 'facilitate the development of institutions that bring out the best in humans'. Rather than assuming that people are inherently selfish and must be coerced, we must build systems that assume people are inherently good and give them the incentives to act accordingly. Ostrom's own research on

common-pool resources demonstrated the power of well-crafted cooperative structures. She documented traditional communities around the world that successfully manage forests, fisheries and irrigation water through collective agreements, thereby avoiding the infamous 'tragedy of the commons' without the need for top-down control or privatisation. The secret lay in local institutions: clearly defined rules, community monitoring of use, graduated sanctions for rule-breakers, and inclusive decision-making forums all contributed to the sustainable sharing of resources. Ostrom found that trust and communication were more effective at governing commons than cynical policies based on pure self-interest. Extensive empirical work in economics and political science likewise confirms that humans have far greater capacity to solve social dilemmas cooperatively than classical theory assumed, provided frameworks foster communication, fairness, and accountability. Inspired by these insights, Deluism proposes redesigning economic life to prioritise cooperation over competition. This involves supporting models such as cooperatives, mutual enterprises, and commons-based production. Worker-owned companies and cooperative banks, for example, align incentives towards group success and equitable reward. Such models uphold ethical values and have demonstrated pragmatic strengths: studies indicate that worker cooperatives are often more productive, have lower staff turnover and are more resilient during recessions than traditional firms. By giving employees, a stake and a voice, cooperatives transform work into a

community, fostering trust and dedication that surpasses the results of narrow profit motives. In a Deluist economy, solidarity is efficient. Profit and competition would no longer be the sole drivers of progress. Instead, shared prosperity and mutual accountability would become both the means and the end.

Political and Cultural Renewal through Cooperation

The Deluist vision also extends to our governance and culture. Democratic institutions must be reimagined to encourage active cooperation among citizens, rather than fostering a sense of cynicism and disengagement. This could involve far more participatory decision-making, ranging from local town halls and citizens' assemblies to national participatory budgeting. The latter is already practised in cities worldwide and allows residents to directly deliberate on and vote for portions of public spending. The results have been promising: participatory budgeting boosts civic engagement and can increase trust in government by giving people real ownership of decisions. When citizens see that their collaborative input matters, they develop a stronger sense of community and responsibility for outcomes. Similarly, Deluism favours electoral reforms that reward coalition building (such as proportional representation) over zero-sum, winner-takes-all contests, thereby reinforcing the idea that politics is about achieving common goals, not defeating opponents. Culturally, we aim to foster a public ethos that values empathy, cooperation and mutual respect. This means

celebrating stories of collaboration and public service as examples to follow. Just as past eras celebrated rugged individualism, we will celebrate teamwork and compassion as heroic virtues. Educational curricula would teach social and emotional skills, conflict resolution and teamwork from an early age, ensuring that cooperation becomes second nature to each generation. Research in pedagogy supports this approach: cooperative learning exercises (such as group projects and peer teaching) improve academic outcomes and “build resilience, social competence, empathy, and communication skills” in students. A Deluist school is a microcosm of the society we seek, where students learn with and for each other rather than against each other. In the media and arts, we envisage the encouragement of narratives that highlight mutual aid, such as how communities overcome disasters by pulling together, and that offer visions of solidarity in diversity. Public campaigns and community programmes could actively cultivate empathy through intergenerational and intercultural dialogue, service learning and recognition awards for cooperative achievements, for example. Over time, these cultural practices generate shared values, such as the idea that helping others is fulfilling and that we all succeed best when we succeed together. In the ideal Deluist society, trustworthiness becomes the default assumption in daily life because our institutions continually reinforce and reward that trait. Just as pessimistic systems can make people cynical, a society organised around cooperation can make people kinder.

Finally, Deluism offers a set of **guiding maxims** that encapsulate this principle and serve as reminders of our philosophy in practice:

“Human beings thrive through mutual aid.”

“Structure shapes instinct.”

“We become what we practice together.”

Deluism therefore demands a profound shift in societal incentives, replacing fear with trust and the mindset of "me versus you" with "us together". We view human nature as a spectrum of possibilities heavily influenced by environment and culture, rather than a fixed war of instincts. By consciously designing environments that reward empathy, fairness and collaboration, we can activate humanity's innate capacity for goodness on a large scale. The promise of Principle 4 is a world in which institutions encourage cooperative creativity rather than competitive anxiety – a world in which the structures of everyday life constantly remind us that we are all members of one human family rather than rivals competing for advantage. Deluism dares to imagine political economies in which “loving thy neighbour as thyself” is the ordinary way of things, not a heroic exception. By embracing 'Human Nature as Adaptive and Cooperative', we affirm that the arc of history can be bent towards community, and that by unlocking the latent solidarity in our nature, we can build a future worthy of our best selves.

5. Federated Self-Governance

Communities in Harmony with a Shared Authority

The Balance of Freedom and Unity

Deluism is based on the belief that true freedom cannot flourish in isolation and that unity cannot endure if it is based on domination. Human beings are social creatures. We do not live as solitary individuals, but as members of communities — villages, towns, neighbourhoods and associations — where solidarity is learned and practised. However, in a connected world, these communities cannot remain entirely self-contained. The challenges we face, such as ecological crises, pandemics, technological upheavals and questions of justice and peace, do not respect the boundaries of one village or city. They demand cooperation on a wider scale. Deluism therefore proposes a model of federated self-governance: a political structure in which every community governs itself directly yet unites with others in a federation that coordinates common efforts.

This principle forms the political backbone of Deluism. It seeks to avoid two great dangers: the suffocation of liberty by an all-powerful central state and the vulnerability of fragmented communities lacking bonds of solidarity. Instead, it charts a middle path: a network of selfgoverning communities bound together by a

coordinating authority that serves, but does not rule, them. The federation is not a pyramid of command, but rather a circle of equals.

From Proudhon to Ostrom

The concept of a federation is not a new one. In the nineteenth century, the thinker Pierre-Joseph Proudhon argued that a true federation is a contract in which communities retain more authority than they delegate. According to Proudhon, the central authority is merely an agent, restricted to common functions, while the bulk of sovereignty remains at the local level. However, if the central authority oversteps its boundaries and reduces its members to provinces, the federation dies, and centralism takes its place. Deluism takes this warning seriously, maintaining that the federal principle must be structured in such a way that liberty always outweighs central authority.

Modern political science has reinforced this perspective. Elinor Ostrom, a Nobel Prize winner in economics, demonstrated through decades of research that communities can manage shared resources, such as forests, fisheries and water systems, without a centralised authority imposing order. Her work on polycentric governance showed that multiple centres of authority, overlapping and coordinated, often outperform both rigid central states and fragmented markets. This vindicates the

Deluist belief that, given the right institutions, people can govern themselves collectively.

Drawing from the principle of subsidiarity, a concept that features in Catholic social teaching and federalist political design, Deluism asserts that decisions should be made at the most local level possible and only elevated when necessary. When combined with Murray Bookchin's communalist ideas, which envisaged confederations of municipalities sending mandated, recallable delegates to regional councils, Deluism creates a vision of a world order in which communities govern themselves while remaining linked in solidarity.

Lessons from Confederations Past and Present

History provides examples of federated self-governance, both ancient and modern.

- **The Iroquois Confederacy (Haudenosaunee)**, for example, united six nations under the Great Law of Peace. Each nation retained its autonomy yet joined together in a council of chiefs to make decisions regarding war, diplomacy and matters of shared concern. This system endured for centuries and inspired early European federalists.
- **The Swiss Confederation** demonstrates how cantons speaking different languages and practising different religions-maintained sovereignty while uniting for defence and

common law. Swiss federalism still preserves remarkable local autonomy today.

- During the **Spanish Civil War** (1936–1939), workers and peasants in Catalonia and Aragon formed collectives that governed industry and agriculture through assemblies. These collectives federated regionally, coordinating through congresses of recallable delegates. Though ultimately defeated by authoritarian forces, they demonstrated that millions of people could live and work cooperatively without a state bureaucracy.
- In our century, **Rojava in northern Syria** has pioneered Democratic Confederalism. Towns and villages govern themselves through councils, which federate into larger assemblies. Power flows upwards from the people, not downwards from the state. Coleadership, gender equality and ethnic pluralism are guaranteed by design, making Rojava one of the most radical democratic experiments of modern times.

These examples demonstrate that federated self-governance is a real possibility, not a fantasy. When communities trust themselves and come together, they can solve problems collectively while preserving freedom.

Centralism vs. fragmentation:

Why is a federation necessary? Because every other option has failed.

- **Centralism:** When authority accumulates in a single centre, liberty withers. States become bureaucratic machines that dictate uniform laws and policies, erasing local diversity and stifling innovation. History is full of empires and centralised republics that collapsed under the weight of their own control.
- **Fragmentation:** Yet the opposite danger also looms. Purely isolated communities' risk being overrun by stronger powers or failing to address global crises. Without coordination, inequality between communities increases, conflicts escalate, and solidarity breaks down.

Deluism addresses both of these dangers by proposing unity without domination and diversity without division. The federation ensures that communities retain their freedom but are never alone. It creates a framework in which solidarity can grow across regions and even the whole world without imposing a single culture or ruler.

How Federated Self-Governance Works

In the Deluist design, governance begins at the grassroots level. Every community, whether a village, town or urban neighbourhood, holds assemblies where all members can deliberate and make decisions. These assemblies have supreme authority over local matters.

For wider issues, assemblies send delegates, not representatives with independent power, but recallable envoys carrying specific mandates, to higher councils. These councils exist at regional, national and global levels and handle tasks that local assemblies cannot, such as coordinating infrastructure, managing natural resources, ensuring human rights, defending against aggression and combating climate change.

Delegates are strictly accountable: if they breach their mandate, they can be recalled immediately. Authority is therefore always reversible. The higher councils do not create policy; they administer what the assemblies have decided. Their role is coordination, not command.

This model guarantees both freedom and solidarity. It ensures that no community is forced to abandon its culture or self-rule, while also preventing any community from becoming a haven of oppression or exploitation. Basic rights and ecological responsibilities are enshrined in the federal pact and upheld collectively.

Communities under One Flag of Solidarity

In the world of Deluism, states dissolve into a network of communities bound by federation. Rather than nations competing for dominance, we envisage councils of communities deliberating on global issues, with each voice carrying equal weight. Under one shared identity, humanity's common flag, local diversity can flourish within global unity.

This is not a utopia, but a goal towards which humanity can strive. By federating from the ground up, we can build institutions that embody freedom while coordinating progress. The Deluist flag is not the banner of a state, but the symbol of a movement: people everywhere joining forces to govern themselves and the planet.

6. *A Guild-Based, Non-Exploitative Economy with Social Goals and Free* **Rejecting Profit-Driven Capitalism for Solidarity**

Deluism is predicated on the dissolution of the profit motive inherent in capitalism, with the objective of establishing an economic paradigm that is founded on solidarity and social need. In contradistinction to a system that prioritises private gain, a Deluist economy is founded on cooperation and mutual aid. Within the neoliberal paradigm, characterised by the principles of capitalism and competitive individualism, the concept of 'the other' is frequently regarded as an impediment to the pursuit of personal gain. Conversely, Deluism posits that the wellbeing of each individual is inextricably linked to that of the collective. The principle of profit is eschewed in this vision, with production and exchange being organised "without exploitation or profit motives". Instead, emphasis is placed on care, equity and community benefit. The capitalist ethic of greed-is-good is rejected; in its stead rises an ethic of all-for-one and one-for-all, aiming to replace competition with economic solidarity.

In the context of Deluism, the primary focus of economic activities is on achieving social objectives, rather than the converse. The prevailing paradigm, in which human needs are subordinated to the pursuit of corporate profit, and in which workers and the environment are often sacrificed for the benefit of shareholders, is set to be replaced by a new model. The manifesto contends that the capitalist profit system is inherently prone to exploitative and

divisive practices, as it incentivises entities to prioritise cost-cutting measures over human welfare, propelling relentless accumulation of wealth and its subsequent concentration in the hands of a select few. Deluism cannot accept such a system. The objective of the initiative is to establish economic arrangements that benefit all participants, thereby ensuring that community prosperity, as opposed to private profit, is recognised as the primary measure of success. In a solidarity-based economy, neighbours and guild members share skills and resources freely, helping each other meet needs "without exploitation" and absent the tyranny of the profit motive. The fundamental principle of the economic order is the prioritisation of people over profit.

Philosophical Foundations: Socialist, Cooperative, and Guild Traditions

The Deluist economic vision is deeply rooted in a rich lineage of socialist, anarchist, and cooperative thought that has long sought an economy of the people, by the people, and for the people. Throughout history, radical and reformist groups have conceptualised alternative economic structures, such as guilds and communes, as a response to the perceived injustices inherent in capitalist systems.

Early Socialist Thought: In the early 19th century, Robert Owen, a pioneering thinker, advanced the concept of self-sustaining cooperative villages, communities characterised by shared ownership and labour that

functioned without the need for a coercive state. This vision can be seen as a precursor to the Deluism guild communes, which emerged as a result of the ideas put forward by Owen and his contemporaries. Concurrently, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon propounded a doctrine of mutualism, delineating a "cooperative market economy" comprising worker associations that exchanged goods and services in an equitable manner without the pursuit of profit. The early socialists shared a common objective of collective worker empowerment, thereby laying the foundation for a guild-based economic model.

A Marxist critique is presented, along with a proposed vision for the future. As Marx articulated, "Workers of all lands, unite!" Marx's critique of capitalism is fundamental to Deluism's philosophical underpinnings. Marx's condemnation of capitalism as an inherently exploitative and alienating system is well-documented. In Marx's view, this system is characterised by the estrangement of labour and the accumulation of wealth by a ruling class. He conceptualised socialism as a domain of autonomous and collaborative producers, no longer engaged in competitive labour markets, but instead working in concert to organise production for the collective good. According to Marx, this would entail the rational regulation of production in accordance with a common plan, thus eliminating anarchy in the market. Deluism is predicated on this theoretical foundation: namely, that the economy must be a democratically planned association in which workers collectively determine the utilisation of the surplus they create.

The influence of anarchists and guild socialists is evident in this context. Anarchist philosophers such as Mikhail Bakunin and Peter Kropotkin advanced the concept of stateless socialism, emphasising the value of voluntary federations of workplaces and communities. Kropotkin, in particular, provided an ethical and scientific foundation for an economy of mutual aid. In his seminal work, *Mutual Aid* (1897), he demonstrated that cooperation, rather than ruthless competition, is a potent force in both nature and society. He argued that the groups that thrive are those that practise solidarity and provide mutual support. In his seminal work *The Conquest of Bread*, he asserted that the well-being of all is not merely a utopian ideal, but a tangible possibility. It is possible, given modern productive capacity. Kropotkin's belief that free cooperation can yield abundance and his insistence that no authority is needed to organise economic life have had a profound influence on Deluism. Similarly, the Guild Socialists of early 20th-century Britain (such as G.D.H. Cole and Samuel Hobson) directly inspired Principle 6. They envisioned industries to be run by democratic guilds of workers, rather than capitalist owners, with the state only as a coordinator if needed.

A contemporary exploration of cooperative economic principles. Contemporary thinkers and economists have revived and expanded these ideas for the 21st century. For instance, proponents of a Participatory Economy, such as Michael Albert and Robin Hahnel, advocate a model that is characterised by the absence of private shareholders or markets, and the absence of top-down central planning. In

this model, productive resources are collectively owned, with workplaces being self-managed through democratic councils. These councils, representing both workers and the community, are interconnected through bottom-up federations, facilitating a cooperative economic planning process. This vision is redolent of the Deluist perspective, insofar as it substantiates the hypothesis that democratic ownership and planning have the capacity to supersede both the profit motive and state bureaucracy. In a similar manner, contemporary cooperative movements and solidarity economy networks emphasise principles of people-over-profits, communal ownership and workplace democracy. Deluism is a philosophy that has been developed over the course of two centuries of socialist and anarchist thought, and which calls for an economy that liberates rather than enslaves.

Guilds, Collectives, and Cooperative Economies

Contrary to the notion of a utopian abstraction, the principles of a guild-based, nonexploitative economy have real historical precedents. Throughout history, various societies and movements have implemented elements of economic solidarity, shared ownership, and worker self-management, thereby demonstrating the feasibility of such concepts.

The following essay will explore the economic solidarity of medieval guilds in pre-capitalist Europe. It will argue that guilds were organisations that united craftsmen and merchants into associations for mutual aid, fair practice,

and collective governance of their trades. This was long before modern capitalism. A guild could be considered as a form of professional networking, but it also functioned as a community institution that protected its members and upheld standards. Medieval craft guilds were integral to the economic and social structure of the time. The organisation established quality standards for goods, regulated prices so that no member could undercut the others, and provided support when members encountered difficulties. The master, the journeyman and the apprentice were bound by oaths of loyalty and a shared calling. By determining their own working conditions and training new generations, guilds gave workers a measure of control and dignity that was largely absent under later industrial capitalism. It is evident that medieval guilds were subject to certain limitations; they operated within the confines of feudal hierarchies and frequently exhibited exclusive characteristics. Nevertheless, their existence serves as a testament to the capacity for collective labour organisation. It was demonstrated that economic activity could be governed by solidarity and tradition as opposed to raw profit. Deluism is predicated on the guild principle that work should be dignified, cooperative and rooted in community, rather than a brutal contest of each against each.

We can examine the Spanish Anarchist Collectives of the 1930s, focusing on the period from 1936 to 1937. The focus of this study will be to analyse the practice of Workers' Self-Management in action. It is submitted that the most dramatic example of a guild-like, non-

exploitative economy in practice was the Spanish Revolution during the Civil War. In 1936, as fascism threatened Spain, the working class and agricultural labourers, led by anarcho-syndicalist unions (CNT-FAI), seized control of farms, factories, and public services and operated them collectively. It has been argued that this was "arguably the 20th century's greatest experiment in economic democracy". In Catalonia and Aragon, approximately 18,000 enterprises – representing nearly all industries in Catalonia – and some 1,700 villages were collectivized in a matter of weeks. The factories continued to operate, albeit now under the management of workers' committees, while the land was cultivated by communal peasant cooperatives. For a concise and noteworthy period, the administration of the economy was in the hands of "ordinary people – not capitalists or bureaucrats" (Wortel-London, 2023). The introduction of egalitarian principles concerning the distribution of food and resources, the establishment of supply chains through federations of collectives, and the demonstration of the capacity of workers to manage complex industries autonomously were pivotal. This social revolution was not without its challenges, as evidenced by the eruption of debates surrounding coordination, autonomy, and equity between collectives. Ultimately, the revolution was suppressed by the prevailing war conditions and the presence of political opposition. However, the Spanish anarchist collectives provide a compelling case study, demonstrating the viability of worker-run guilds as a viable alternative to capitalist ownership. Furthermore, the concept of production for use, whether in a war

context or for the sustenance of the populace, has the potential to supersede the focus on profit-driven production. The achievements of the Soviet Union, including the increase in productivity on many collectivised farms, the elimination of unemployment in collectivised cities, and the promotion of egalitarian fraternity among workers, continue to resonate with Deluists as a tangible historical validation of Principle 6.

The Mondragón Cooperative Movement – Modern Guilds in the Market: The Mondragón Corporation, a federation of cooperatives, has been identified as a significant contemporary antecedent to Delucism's economic model. This corporation is located in the Basque region of Spain, where it has been observed to thrive. The Mondragón cooperative was established in 1956 by a Catholic priest, and it underwent significant growth from its inception as a small worker-owned workshop to become a substantial network of worker cooperatives. These cooperatives encompass a wide range of sectors, including industrial manufacturing, finance, retail, education, and more. In the contemporary era, Mondragón constitutes a "voluntary association" encompassing approximately 95 autonomous cooperatives, which collectively employ approximately 80,000 individuals. The entity in question operates factories and businesses on a global scale, yet it radically differs from a conventional company in that it has no external shareholders and capital has no vote – only the workers do. Each cooperative is governed by its members on a one-member-one-vote basis, with democratic assemblies responsible for electing management and

determining major policies. The pursuit of profit is secondary to the fulfilment of social objectives. In periods of prosperity, members of the cooperative share in the financial rewards. Conversely, during challenging times, cooperatives provide mutual support by redistributing financial resources and personnel, thereby preventing the occurrence of layoffs. It is important to note that Mondragón effectively limits income inequality within each enterprise – the highest-paid manager is capped at a maximum salary that is no more than six times the lowest-paid worker's salary. This is a significant improvement over the wide pay gaps, which can be dozens or hundreds to one, often observed in capitalist corporations. This built-in equity mechanism has been demonstrated to contribute to the maintenance of broadly distributed wealth and decisionmaking, thereby hindering the emergence of a capitalist elite. Collaboration replaces competition among the Mondragón co-ops: if one cooperative is experiencing difficulties, others may voluntarily reduce work hours or pay to help save jobs. Following seven decades of "creative destruction" in global markets, Mondragón stands as a living testament to the efficacy, innovation, and resilience of worker-run enterprises. The Mondragón co-ops are engaged in a wide range of economic activities, including the production of appliances, automotive components, and sophisticated industrial machinery. They also possess research and development centres, a university, financial institutions, and supermarket chains. With an annual revenue in excess of €11 billion and a portfolio of hundreds of patents, Mondragón competes successfully on a global scale

without engaging in the exploitation of labour. To Deluists, Mondragón's actions demonstrate the capacity for the guild principle to thrive within a market environment, thereby foreshadowing a future where such cooperatives become the prevailing norm rather than the exception.

Now we will examine the period of Yugoslav Self-Management, which lasted from 1950 to 1990. The focus will be on the nation of worker-run enterprises that was established during this time. In a broader context, the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia sought to initiate a pioneering experiment in guild-based economics at the national level. Following the ideological schism with Stalin in 1948, the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia under Josip Broz Tito proceeded to implement a system of "socialist self-management", whereby the control of enterprises was transferred from the state to the workers themselves. The system was established by law in 1950 and remained in effect until the early 1990s. In the context of Yugoslavia, the ownership of factories and businesses was typically held collectively by the entire society, a concept referred to as 'social ownership'. However, the governance of these entities was entrusted to elected Workers' Councils within each individual workplace, thereby ensuring a democratic and participatory management structure. The objective was to establish a third alternative between Western capitalism and Eastern bloc central planning: neither private profiteers nor state bureaucrats would dictate economic policy, but rather, the workers collectively would "self-

manage" production. The workers of each enterprise were responsible for determining production plans, investment decisions, the distribution of profits, and hiring practices, within the context of a market-socialist economy. The concept of profit was acknowledged, yet it was regarded as social property that ought to be reinvested or distributed among the workers, as opposed to being appropriated by the owners. The Yugoslavian economic model demonstrated both the potential and the difficulties of implementing economic democracy. It has been demonstrated that large-scale industries – ranging from mining and steel mills to academic institutions – can be managed by worker councils over extended periods. The country experienced periods of robust growth and higher living standards than many Soviet-style economies, suggesting that decentralised decision-making energised productivity and innovation at the firm level. Conversely, the Yugoslav experiment encountered challenges, with enterprises at times engaging in competition that resulted in regional disparities, and the absence of a comprehensive plan giving rise to inefficiencies. The system was ultimately unravelled by geopolitical and debt crises in the 1980s. Nevertheless, the Yugoslav experiment in self-management remains a noteworthy historical precedent. It is evident that the institution of these elements was pivotal in the establishment of Deluism. Workers' control, social ownership of the means of production, and an attempt at democratic planning, as an alternative to both capitalist markets and statist command economies, are all intrinsic to the Deluism doctrine. Deluism derives lessons from these antecedents

– their triumphs and errors alike – to delineate the trajectory towards a contemporary guild-based commons.

The Deluist Critique of Capitalism: Inequality, Exploitation, Alienation

At its core, Deluism can be understood as a form of revolutionary humanism, and its critique of capitalism is uncompromising. The rejection of capitalism is not merely an abstract ideal; rather, it is a concrete response to the harms it inflicts on humanity and the planet. Deluists concur with the long-standing tradition of social critics who assert that profit-driven markets inherently foster inequality, exploitation, and alienation on a vast scale.

Within a capitalist system, there is a pronounced concentration of wealth and power. A select group of proprietors collectively possess the means of production, while the majority of the population is compelled to sell their labour in order to subsist. This system has been identified as "inherently exploitative" and as a major contributor to the creation of significant economic inequality, a conclusion that has been reached by mainstream analyses. The labour of many is expropriated to enrich the few – capitalists pay workers less than the value of what they produce, thereby extracting profit (Marx's surplus value) through this process of exploitation. It is important to note that inequality should not be viewed as a mere bug, but rather as an integral feature. Over time, individuals in possession of capital

accumulate greater wealth, while those lacking this asset remain dependent. The result is a society characterised by significant material abundance, alongside scarcity and poverty for those excluded from wealth. Deluism regards this as morally obscene and socially corrosive. It is evident that extreme inequality has a detrimental effect on social cohesion and the very concept of democracy. The existence of a dual economy, characterised by the presence of billionaires on one hand and beggars on the other, represents a fundamental contradiction with the principles of solidarity and justice espoused by the Deluist movement.

Capitalism is not only exploitative; it is also alienating. As Marx observed, it transforms the very conditions of human life (work, creativity, community) into sources of estrangement. In a capitalist economic system, workers are characterised by a sense of alienation from several key aspects of their professional lives. Firstly, they are separated from the direct control of their own work, which is instead overseen by an external entity. Secondly, they are disconnected from the final products of their labour, which are owned by the employer and subsequently sold to generate profit. Thirdly, workers find themselves in a state of perpetual competition with their peers, or subjected to hierarchical structures that dictate specific roles and responsibilities. Lastly, workers are often deprived of their own human potential, which is hindered by the constraints imposed by the system. The Deluist manifesto identifies this as a key issue, asserting that a profit-driven economy dehumanises individuals, deeming

them to be merely components of a mechanised system, valued exclusively for their capacity to generate profit. The aforementioned standpoint treats human lives as commodities, categorised as 'labor resources', thereby devoid of their inherent significance. The average person has minimal agency in the production process, resulting in a sense of powerlessness and social isolation. The pursuit of profit through production engenders a state of alienation, whereby the creative energies of the worker are directed towards objectives that do not align with their personal aspirations, resulting in a state of spiritual desolation in the context of material abundance. Conversely, Deluism posits that production should be oriented towards human utilisation and development, thereby facilitating the re-establishment of a symbiotic relationship between labour and its fruits.

Moreover, proponents of the Deluist school of thought posit that capitalist markets are characterised by an absence of system and are oblivious to the social ramifications engendered by economic activities. The production of goods and services is driven by the pursuit of profit, rather than the needs of society. It is evident that the pursuit of profit can hinder the provision of essential services, such as affordable housing, public health, and education, if industries such as fossil fuels, luxury goods, and military arms experience a period of growth and prosperity. This perverse logic gives rise to economic instability, characterised by periods of growth followed by decline, and crises, as well as significant levels of waste and inefficiency. As Kropotkin noted, even in the 19th

century, capitalism routinely limited production in order to maintain high prices, thereby resulting in the destruction of food and goods, whilst members of society were compelled to go without. Deluism posits that the so-called "efficiency" of the free market is a fallacy. The system is deemed inefficient as it leaves willing workers idle while real needs remain unfulfilled. Critiques of capitalism which have gained prominence have expressed a similar perspective, characterising the economic system as "unstable [and] unsustainable," and susceptible to periodic breakdown and crisis. The "grow-or-die" imperative inherent in the capitalist economic model has been demonstrated to incentivise the reckless plunder of natural and human resources.

Indeed, the environmental indictment of capitalism has become especially urgent. A system oriented towards infinite growth and short-term profit is inherently incompatible with the ecological limits of a finite planet. Capitalism has been criticised for its impact on the environment, with accusations that it is responsible for the depletion of resources, climate change, biodiversity loss, and ongoing pollution in the pursuit of profit. As one commentator succinctly summarised, the pursuit of profit and the imperative for perpetual growth are inherently incongruent with the principles of sustainable environmental practices. Deluism has been influenced by this critique, and asserts that humanity can only avert a climate catastrophe and heal the earth by transcending the capitalist mode of production. The Deluist economy, with its orientation towards social use and democratic

deliberation, would prioritise ecological balance and long-term well-being. This is in contrast to a system fixated on quarterly earnings, which is incapable of achieving such a goal.

In summary, the philosophy of Deluism criticises the consequences of capitalism, which have resulted in a global economic structure that benefits a small minority of the population whilst creating widespread economic hardship for the majority. Furthermore, Deluism highlights the fact that employment can often be a source of personal misery rather than personal fulfilment. Finally, the philosophy criticises the way in which the natural world is regarded as being of lesser importance than the pursuit of profit. The moral and material failure of capitalism is the impetus for Principle 6. A Deluist economy must eliminate exploitation (the abolition of wage slavery), overcome alienation (workers assuming control of their work) and address the significant inequalities (the distribution of wealth more equitably) – thus establishing a rational and humane economy for all, in place of the chaotic profit system.

The Guild-Based Model: Production for Use, Shared Ownership, and Economic Equality

The functionality of the Deluist alternative is therefore of particular interest. As outlined in Principal 6, the fundamental principles of a guild-based, non-exploitative economy are to be established, with governance being overseen by the principles of solidarity and free

development. The model is founded on four fundamental pillars: the establishment of workerrun guilds, the prioritisation of production for utilisation over profit, the adoption of shared or common ownership of resources, and the implementation of democratically determined goals with limitations on inequality.

Worker-Run Guilds:

The fundamental economic units of the Deluist economy are guilds, which are defined as associations of workers and producers in a specific trade, industry, or service. These guilds can be considered as the modern equivalent of both a democratic workplace cooperative and a professional association. In the context of the aforementioned economic model, it is observed that each enterprise or local workplace is collectively owned and self-governed by its workers. Furthermore, it is noted that all those engaged in a given sector form a guild with the purpose of coordinating their activities. This suggests that there is an absence of capitalist proprietors or external shareholders who exercise control over production decisions; rather, the individuals engaged in the production process hold decision-making authority. As the Guild Socialists advocated over a century ago, industries would be organised into guilds under the democratic control of their workers (often through trade unions or councils). The means of production, including factories, machines, land, and tools, are collectively owned and utilised for the benefit of all members of society, as opposed to being privately owned for profit. In

the context of Deluism, guilds function as autonomous economic entities, characterised by their capacity for self-governance. These entities are responsible for the establishment of policies pertaining to the workplace, the terms and conditions of labour, and the formulation of production plans. The decision-making processes within guilds are characterised by inclusivity, ensuring that all relevant stakeholders are engaged in the decision-making process. In instances where the presence of managers or coordinators is deemed necessary, these individuals are elected by the workers and are accountable to them, rather than being hired by the owners. This structure is designed to prevent exploitation, with workers collectively owning the enterprise and ensuring that no individual or entity is able to extract surplus value for their own benefit. The concept of the "full fruits of labour" is a fundamental principle in the economic structure of the guild and the community. This principle dictates that each individual is entitled to the full benefits of their labour, either through their own efforts or through the collective decisions of the guild and the community. The guild model is predicated on the dissolution of the societal dichotomy between employers and employees, between capitalists and workers – all becoming worker-members, on an equal footing.

Production for Use, Not for Profit:

In a Deluist economy, the fundamental question guiding production is not "what is the highest return on investment?" but rather, "what are the needs and desires

of the populace?" The socialist principle of "production for use" has been proposed as a replacement for the capitalist principle of "production for exchange/profit". This signifies that the production of goods and services is undertaken with the explicit purpose of addressing human needs and fostering well-being, as opposed to being a conduit for financial gain within a market economy. The principle of use-value is considered to be of greater importance than that of exchange-value. The fundamental purpose of factories is to produce footwear for the general population, not to maximize profits or market share for a shoe company. It is an irrefutable fact that the primary function of agricultural enterprises is to produce foodstuffs that are both nutritious and affordable for the community. The secondary function, if indeed it can be considered as such, is to influence the price of grain futures on commodity exchanges. It is important to note that the concept of "production for use" does not signify a deficiency in efficiency or progress. Rather, it underscores the notion that efficiency is evaluated from a human perspective, focusing on the fulfilment of needs with a minimum of waste, as opposed to being solely focused on profit margins. According to the principles of classical socialist theory, this criterion is indicative of a genuine socialist economy, whereby the "direct measure of utility and human need" functions as the primary guiding principle for production, superseding the abstractions of price and capital accumulation (see: en.wikipedia.org). In the context of Deluism, the economic framework is meticulously designed to ensure the provision of an adequate standard of living for all members of society.

Decisions regarding the production of goods and services, the quantity to be produced, and the methods to be employed, are made with consideration for social usefulness and sustainability. Since the production of this commodity is intended for utilisation, it can be limited or adjusted in accordance with the satisfaction of demand. There is no necessity to engage in perpetual sales of additional gadgets or to expend more oil merely to ensure the perpetuation of profits. This approach, however, does not subscribe to the compulsive pursuit of growth characteristic of capitalism. Instead, it enables a shift in focus towards qualities such as quality, durability, and sufficiency. The concept of "production for use" can be regarded as a moral-economic maxim, as it establishes a direct correlation between the act of work and the enhancement of life quality. It also curbs exploitation by virtue of the fact that no individual's labour is used for the generation of private profit, but rather for the generation of goods and services for mutual benefit.

Shared Ownership and Commons:

The objective of this approach is to eradicate exploitation and hierarchies. The Deluism model is predicated on the socialisation of ownership of the productive assets. This can be conceptualised as the establishment of a substantial "economic commons". In this theoretical framework, the ownership of assets such as factories, land, and software platforms is not retained by private capital, but rather, these assets become the common property of the populace. The administration of these assets is entrusted

to guilds and communities. In certain instances, the guild itself may possess the title to its workshop or land on behalf of society (with workers serving as trustees); in other instances, ownership may be held by the local commune or the entire federation. However, in either scenario, ownership is not individual, and individuals are not at liberty to do as they please with it. The elimination of private ownership of the means of production is a fundamental tenet of Deluism, as it effectively eradicates the primary source of class power. The notion that a class of rentiers can subsist off the labour of others is predicated on the premise that productive wealth is held in common. This perspective aligns with the foundational tenets of historical socialist movements, exemplified by the Paris Commune and the Yugoslavian model of selfmanagement, wherein the enterprise is regarded as a collective asset belonging to the workforce and the broader community that provides support. In practice, every worker has a stake and a say in the resources and capital of their guild – they are co-owners (along with the rest of society) rather than hired hands. This shared ownership is the cornerstone of economic equality, signifying that the wealth generated by the economy is redistributed to all individuals in some form, as opposed to being accumulated by a select few. Surpluses can be utilised for the provision of public goods, reinvested for the benefit of the general populace, or distributed extensively, with the caveat that they are not siphoned off for private profit. A Deluist guild-based economy can thus be defined as a cooperative commonwealth – a great common storehouse of productive wealth from which all

may draw. As posited by one contemporary formulation, "productive resources are socially owned by all under a productive commons". In such a system, concepts such as wage labour for someone else's profit become redundant; people are remunerated and recognised for their contributions, but no longer exploited.

Democratic Planning and Social Goals:

In contrast to the notion of market forces or technocratic elites determining the direction of the economy, Deluism advocates for democratic planning and the establishment of socially-set goals. The significance of this phenomenon is yet to be elucidated. This signifies that economic priorities – encompassing the identification of areas for development, the cessation of certain activities, and the apportionment of resources – are determined through democratic deliberation by the participants of the economy (the workers in the guilds and the members of communities). Each guild engages in autonomous deliberation, both internally and with other guilds, concerning its production targets, the necessity for contributions, and its capabilities. Communal assemblies engage in discourse on a range of issues of common concern, including infrastructure projects, the distribution of goods, environmental targets, health and education needs, and so forth. The coordination of guild and community decisions into a coherent overall plan is achieved through a system of bottom-up planning. It is important to note that this planning is decentralised and participatory, rather than being a rigid, top-down

command economy. One could hypothesise that this could be conceptualised as a federated network of planning councils. Indeed, proponents of participatory economics characterise it as an interconnected system of workplace councils and neighbourhood councils negotiating production and consumption in iterative planning rounds. In Deluist practice, guild federations (groupings of all guilds in a region or all guilds of a certain type) play a key role in coordination. They compile proposals from individual guilds, help mediate between supply and demand, and ensure that the use of the productive commons is decided "efficiently, democratically, fairly and sustainably" to fulfil human needs. This process replaces both the chaos of the market (which produces booms, busts, and miseries) and the authoritarianism of central planning (which can be unresponsive or bureaucratic). There is no omnipotent central ministry that administers such directives. In contrast, planning can be considered as a social and interactive process, drawing upon the expertise of workers on the shop floor and incorporating the contributions of citizens within their respective localities. By collectively deliberating on social goals, such decisions are made, for example, to transition to renewable energy sources, to increase medical production during a pandemic, or to reduce output in a sector to mitigate environmental harm. The economy, therefore, becomes a conscious endeavour to meet human needs, rather than an autopilot machine serving capital. Democracy in economic life is defined by the principle of workers' self-governance in the administration of their

workplaces and communities' self-governance in the administration of their economies. This approach provides a moral framework for the economy, orienting it towards enhancing quality of life, ensuring fundamental needs are met, and facilitating genuine, unrestricted human development.

Limits on Wealth and Equalization:

A non-exploitative economy must also ensure that even with shared ownership, large disparities of income or wealth do not re-emerge. Deluism has been demonstrated to incorporate mechanisms designed to restrict the concentration of wealth and to promote the principles of equality. The elimination of private profit as the primary catalyst of inequality is pivotal in this regard. Beyond this, the manifesto calls for the implementation of deliberate policies, including narrow income differentials, the sharing of surplus, and limits on accumulation. In the context of worker-run guilds, the determination of pay differentials would be conducted through democratic processes, with these disparities being maintained within reasonable limits that are indicative of skill or responsibility. The objective of this approach is to prevent the establishment of an additional class hierarchy. A compelling example of this phenomenon is provided by the pay ratio of 6:1 at Mondragón, which has been adopted as a model by Deluism. This finding suggests the possibility of the adoption of similar or even stricter norms across society, with the aim of ensuring that the contribution of any individual is not rewarded at a rate

that is hundreds of times greater than that of another. Moreover, access to fundamental resources such as housing, education, and healthcare is guaranteed as a right, thereby eliminating the incentive for wealth accumulation. By design, any surplus wealth (in excess of that required for a comfortable standard of living) would be reinvested into communal coffers. The financial resources obtained from this process would be allocated towards the provision of public goods, the support of less productive guilds, or the initiation of new ventures. The establishment of such a system would serve to circumvent the formation of a rentier class. The objective of such measures is to preserve an egalitarian and classless economic structure, thereby preventing the reemergence of exploitative economic practices. It is imperative that guilds and individuals alike refrain from accumulating power over others, as this principle necessitates a constant state of vigilance to ensure the preservation of economic equality. The overarching objective is to ensure that all individuals enjoy security and prosperity, while simultaneously preventing the exercise of authority over others by those who possess significant wealth. In practical terms, this could entail the implementation of progressive taxation on any individual income exceeding a specified threshold, or the establishment of social dividends on such income, or alternatively, the cultural norm of equity embedded within guild charters. The Deluist economy is predicated on the notion of a sufficiently elevated level of equality, ensuring that all individuals possess the capacity to cultivate their abilities, in accordance with the time-honoured dictum that "the

free development of each is the condition for the free development of all."

In summary, the practical model of Deluist economy is one of cooperative guilds producing what is required, collectively owned, and guided by democratic decisions and social benefit. The economy has been consciously designed to liberate workers from exploitation, to produce use-values that enrich life, and to ensure the circulation of wealth within the community. The approach is both visionary and pragmatic in nature. It transcends the prevailing competitive and greedy system, yet is pragmatic in its reliance on established models such as cooperatives, mutual aid networks, and participatory budgeting. The synthesis of these elements elucidates the overarching objective of Principle 6: namely, the establishment of an economic system characterised by the liberation of labour, the equitable distribution of its fruits, and the primary function of production being the facilitation of human flourishing.

Economic Democracy in Practice: Guild Decision-Making and Bottom-Up Planning

The following inquiry is posited: what would be the modus operandi of a Deluist guild-based economy in a day-to-day context? The solution to this issue is rooted in the concept of economic democracy, which involves the extension of democratic principles to the realm of the workplace and the marketplace. The concept of democratic participation is realised through the

establishment of smaller units within larger democratic structures. The Deluist model eschews both the autocracy of the capitalist firm and the bureaucracy of centralized planning, favouring instead a bottom-up, participatory approach.

To illustrate this point, consider a single guild (for the purpose of this example, we may take the Guild of Bakers in a city). The guild's constituents, comprising bakers, millers, drivers and so forth, engaged in regular convocation to reach resolutions concerning their professional undertakings. The subjects addressed included the formulation of a blend of baked goods, the apportionment of labour, the refinement of recipes and the optimisation of working conditions and the training of novices. Each member of the guild is entitled to cast a vote and the majority or consensus of the guild members determines the outcome of any decision. Delegates or councils may be elected for the purpose of day-to-day coordination; however, these entities are accountable to the membership and may be subject to revocation. Of particular note is the democratic process by which key decisions are made, including the setting of production goals, the adoption of new technologies, and the establishment of links with other guilds. This approach exemplifies a guild-based decision-making model, whereby individuals directly involved in production have the opportunity to exercise control over the process, leveraging their experiential knowledge and creative capabilities. Furthermore, it endows labour with a renewed sense of purpose: as workers evolve into active

decisionmakers, their labour becomes more than merely a means of subsistence, but a collective endeavour they contribute to shaping.

From a macro perspective, it can be seen that each guild is not an island. It is evident that guilds engage in collaborative endeavours with one another through the medium of federations and planning networks. In the context of local guilds, the formation of a communal economic council is a notable phenomenon. The composition of such councils is indicative of the diversity inherent within local guilds, with various trades coming together to establish a unified economic body. To illustrate this point, consider the example of a town where the Bakers Guild, Farmers Guild and Builders Guild, among others, convene in a local economic assembly. In this section, cross-guild issues are discussed, including the allocation of resources (for example, grain from farmers to bakers, bricks from builders to everyone), the balancing of labour if one guild is short-handed, and the avoidance of bottlenecks or surpluses. The decisions made at this level are once again of a democratic nature, with guild delegates acting on behalf of their respective members. Furthermore, each industry may comprise a regional or national guild federation. To illustrate, all baker guilds may constitute a Federation of Bakers that facilitates the exchange of information on best practices, establishes industry-wide standards (e.g. flour quality, oven safety), and articulates collective needs (e.g. requesting additional wheat from the farmers or improved ovens from the machine guild). These federations are coordination bodies

that possess no coercive authority, yet they are capable of considerable convening power. These entities can be said to embody what is termed by Deluism as "social planning without central bureaucracy". Rather than a single, top-down plan, planning is the emergent result of numerous democratic dialogues and agreements. It is through the process of iterative consultations, whereby guilds communicate their production proposals and needs, that a comprehensive economic plan is developed. The advent of modern computing and communication technology has the potential to significantly facilitate this process. For instance, the utilisation of online participatory planning platforms could enable guilds to input data and observe proposed allocations in real time. The crux of the matter is that planning is to be transparent and participatory: every guild and community is to have access to information and a say in decision-making, thus preventing the concentration of economic power.

The question that arises is how disagreements or mismatches are resolved in the absence of a top-down authority. Deluism is predicated upon a combination of negotiation, mutual adjustment, and democratic arbitration. In instances where guilds require additional resources, they may engage in negotiations with those possessing surpluses. In the event of a conflict arising, for example, in the context of competing demands for a new factory by two regions, the resolution process may involve larger federations or congresses representing all relevant stakeholders. The proposed economic congresses, which may be convened on an annual basis, would serve as a

deliberative body akin to a parliament of the economy. However, it is noteworthy that this parliament would comprise representatives from guilds and communities, as opposed to the conventional composition of politicians and CEOs. In such assemblies, plans and guidelines for the subsequent period can be deliberated and voted upon, thereby providing a forum for the democratic decision-making of broad strategic questions (e.g. the rapid reduction of carbon emissions, or the response to a novel technological opportunity). This is an illustration of economic democracy at the macro level.

It is imperative to acknowledge that, given the economy's foundation in social objectives, innovation and adaptation emerge from the grassroots. Individuals directly involved in the production process are granted the autonomy to engage in experimentation and innovation with the objective of enhancing their competencies. Bottom-up innovation is a hallmark of guild-based economics. The prospect of efficiency improvements resulting in job losses is no longer a concern for workers, as the community provides assurances of job security or the provision of re-training opportunities. Consequently, workers are at liberty to explore optimal methods for achieving their objectives. It is reasonable to hypothesise that the adoption of a more creative approach in the workplace will be a consequence of workers assuming greater control over their professional activities. This will manifest in the form of novel techniques, suitable technologies, and the dissemination of local innovations. The hypothesis that workers who feel a sense of

ownership are more invested in outcomes and often devise better solutions is supported by historical evidence. Mondragón, for instance, has flourished in part due to its emphasis on education and innovation – it established its own university and R&D labs, producing a high level of technical innovation within a cooperative framework. In a Deluist economy, the distribution of research and development would be democratised and distributed equally: each guild would possess R&D units, and guild federations would likely pool resources for significant research endeavours (for medicine, renewable energy, etc.), ensuring that innovation serves collective needs (e.g. cures for diseases or green technology) rather than merely private profit.

Another practical aspect of economic democracy is the manner in which work and rewards are distributed. Deluism repudiates both the coerced labour inherent in capitalist systems and the notion of a centralised labour draft. Instead, the selection of one's work becomes an integral component of democratic life. Education and vocational training would be universally accessible, with individuals being guided by their aptitude and interests in selecting guilds according to their specific needs. In instances where specific occupations are deemed to be of significant importance, the community has the capacity to determine whether to offer enhanced compensation or to invest in technological solutions to enhance safety. This approach stands in contrast to the frequent practice of requiring the poorest members of society to perform these tasks, as is commonly observed in capitalist systems.

Automation has been shown to have a beneficial effect on employment levels. Rather than representing a threat to employment opportunities, it can be argued that automation can act as a catalyst for reducing the amount of arduous and repetitive tasks, thereby creating more time for creative pursuits and shorter working hours. This is due to the fact that, within a guild society, the social plan provides a guarantee of income for all, thus eliminating the fear of unemployment.

The absence of centralisation in social planning also engenders flexibility. The principle of local autonomy is upheld, thereby affording guilds and communes a considerable degree of autonomy in the organisation of labour, experimentation, and the adaptation of production to regional cultural and preferential contexts. It is important to note that a one-size-fits-all approach is not applicable in this context. Rather, coordination exists to ensure fairness and sharing, rather than to restrict the autonomy of each locale. This approach fosters a pluralism within unity, whereby different regions may specialise in distinct sectors, such as solar power generation or manufacturing, based on their geographical location and the availability of skilled labour. However, all regions benefit from the shared outcomes of this exchange, which are facilitated by the guild federations. Decisions are made at the most local level possible, and only issues that require wider input are elevated to higher levels of federation (this echoes the anarchist principle of subsidiarity).

In practice, an individual in a Deluist economy would experience the effects of this democracy in their day-to-day existence. As a member of the workforce, they participate in guild meetings and contribute to the shaping of their professional activities. In their capacity as both consumer and community member, they engage in local assemblies, wherein they deliberate and determine the allocation of housing resources and the enhancement of public transit systems. It is recommended that society hold regular economic congresses at which major plans are explained in plain terms and feedback is solicited widely. The purpose of such congresses would be to provide a forum for discussion of key economic questions, as well as a means of soliciting feedback from the general public. The format of such congresses could be similar to that of national referenda or town-hall meetings, as opposed to the more traditional format of elections, which offer only vague political choices. Transparency would be paramount in such a scenario, with the absence of corporate secrets and monopolies resulting in the publication of data on resources and needs. This, in turn, would engender informed discussion.

The net effect of this vibrant economic democracy is a system that is highly adaptable and resilient. The system has the capacity for autonomous rectification through democratic feedback in the event of issues arising (rather than concealing them due to concerns regarding profit loss). It has the capacity to mobilize expeditiously for shared objectives – in a manner analogous to that of wartime economies, albeit without the imposition of

authoritarian controls – by virtue of the fact that individuals recognise and concur on the objectives in question. The process of economic decision-making, when inclusive of all stakeholders, has been demonstrated to engender a sense of collective responsibility and a sense of community. The guilds function not merely as production units, but as institutions of democratic education, where individuals are instructed in the art of cooperative endeavour, the practice of debate, the art of compromise, and the capacity to envision collective futures. This phenomenon, in turn, exerts a profound influence on the broader societal landscape, thereby contributing to the consolidation of democratic principles and values.

The Deluist vision of economic democracy can be summarised as follows: the economy is to be run by the people who constitute it, through a network of guilds and councils, from the workplace to the global level. It operationalises the concepts of freedom and equality in the day-to-day functioning of production and distribution. The order is initiated from the bottom up, characterised by its organised yet not oppressive nature, its planned yet not rigid character, and its efficient yet not exploitative nature. This finding serves to substantiate the notion that order and coordination can emerge from free cooperation – a fundamental tenet of Deluism. In the absence of a singular command centre, the coordination of millions of cells within a healthy body is possible, akin to the coordination of millions of free individuals within a healthy society through democratic and mutual aid systems. Principle 6

thus provides a critique of the former system and a proposed governance model for the new order. The Guild Federation is proposed as the democratic economic parliament of a liberated society.

A Global Vision: Federated Commons for Abundance and Sustainability

Deluism's economic vision is global in scope. The objective is not merely to establish isolated islands of cooperation in a sea of competition; it is to effect a worldwide transformation. As outlined in Principal 6, the establishment of a federated economic commons that transcends borders is imperative. The overarching objective of such a system is to ensure the creation of abundance for all humans, whilst concomitantly restoring harmony with nature. This standpoint is underpinned by two key principles: the ethical conviction that all peoples are entitled to solidarity, and the pragmatic realisation that challenges such as inequality and the environmental crisis are of a global nature, necessitating global solutions.

In the Deluist future, the guild federations would establish international links, forming a World Commonwealth of Guilds and Communities. In a manner analogous to the unification of workers within a nation, free associations of producers would also coalesce on an international scale. The exploitation of one nation by another, a hallmark of capitalism's imperialist phase (in which the wealthy nations enrich themselves at the expense of the poorer nations), would be brought to an end. In lieu of

multinational corporations extracting resources and labour from the Global South, Deluist guilds would establish collaborative relationships with communities across the globe. The dissemination of knowledge and technology would occur in an open manner, rather than being retained behind barriers such as patents or paywalls. This approach would facilitate the establishment of a global commons of knowledge, with the potential to benefit all regions. More developed guilds would provide assistance to less developed ones with regard to training and tools, operating on the principle that an injury to one is an injury to all, and that the progress of one is the progress of all. The proposed federated global economy would seek to address the underdevelopment of regions through cooperative development efforts driven by the needs and aspirations of local communities, as opposed to the utilisation of exploitative investment practices.

To illustrate this point, one may consider the potential for continental congresses of guilds to address issues of a continental scale, such as the management of a shared river basin or the coordination of a high-speed rail network spanning multiple nations. It is submitted that global councils may engage in deliberations on climate action, with the objective of allocating each region its fair share of renewable energy capacity. Alternatively, such councils may consider public health, with a view to coordinating the production of vaccines and medicines for universal access. The absence of profit as a motivating factor ensures that wealthy regions possess no incentive to withhold life-saving resources from others. The

prevailing ethical framework of solidarity naturally ensures the flow of surplus wealth and capacity to areas where it is most required. In this sense, the Deluist economy can be said to embody the motto "from each according to ability, to each according to need" on a planetary scale.

A federated global commons approach entails the recognition of the Earth's bounty – encompassing land, water, minerals and forests – as the common heritage of humanity, necessitating its prudent stewardship as opposed to its privatisation or squandering. In a similar manner to the way in which Deluism socialises national resources, it would also socialise global resources. For instance, the open oceans, the atmosphere, Antarctica, and even outer space are currently subject to minimal or no governance, often becoming sites of environmental degradation or the exploitation of natural resources by corporate entities. In accordance with a Deluist directive, these would be subject to democratic global governance by the Federated Commons. The establishment of regulatory frameworks for the sustainable and equitable utilisation of global commons, such as oceans and climate, is to be initiated by international guild bodies and assemblies of communities. It is evident that no corporation would be able to undertake the extraction of rare minerals from the seabed without the approval and oversight of the global community. Such approval would be necessary to ensure minimal ecological impact and fair distribution of benefits. Sustainability is a core social goal in Deluism, and at the global level this is crucial: the

economy must operate within the planet's ecological limits. The elimination of the drive for endless growth engenders a paradigm shift, allowing for the planning of long-term strategies and the prioritisation of ecosystem health.

Deluism is predicated on the notion of a world of abundance, which is to be realised through cooperation. The term 'abundance' is not synonymous with endless consumerism or wasteful luxury for a select few; rather, it signifies material sufficiency and comfort for all, the eradication of poverty, and the reduction of the working day so that individuals have sufficient free time for cultural, intellectual, and personal growth. In light of contemporary technological capabilities and productive capacity, the feasibility of this objective is well within reach. As Kropotkin observed, even with 19th-century industry, society could easily meet everyone's basic needs if production were organised for that purpose. In the 21st century, the potential for abundance is even greater, yet this is not realised due to the misallocation of resources in capitalism. This is evidenced by the fact that billions are spent on arms or luxury goods for a few, while billions of people lack necessities. The pooling of knowledge and resources on a global scale is a prerequisite for the elimination of material scarcity of essentials. It is asserted that hunger, homelessness and preventable disease can be eradicated through deliberate action, rather than as a consequence of charitable aid or technocratic development, but rather as an inherent outcome of the new economy. Regions that are abundant in a specific resource

(for example, regions with abundant sunshine for solar energy, or regions with fertile land for crop production) will produce in abundance and share with others; in return, they receive what others can provide. This cooperative interdependence engenders a world of shared plenty. Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that the process of identifying common ground and establishing a shared purpose can serve to dismantle prejudices and resolve conflicts. The act of perceiving oneself as part of a unified civilizational undertaking has been shown to result in a decline in nationalist and ethnic animosities. The Deluist economic federation would thus serve to strengthen global peace, rendering the use of force for the acquisition of resources or markets an anachronistic practice.

The global vision is founded on two complementary pillars: sustainability and innovation. In light of the prevailing environmental crises, including climate change, biodiversity loss, and pollution at crisis levels, it is imperative that any responsible economic model integrates ecological considerations at its core. Deluism proposes a strategy of meticulous planning for production and consumption, underpinned by ecological rationality. The termination of the growth mandate of capitalism is a prerequisite for the establishment of a steady-state or regenerative economy – one that meets human needs at a high standard of living while restoring environmental health. The guilds would internalise environmental costs instead of externalising them: each guild has a duty to minimise its ecological footprint and is accountable to the

community for any environmental harm. Large-scale decisions, such as the phase-out of fossil fuels, would be made collectively with an understanding that short-term sacrifices (e.g. retraining workers from oil guilds to renewable energy guilds) would be outweighed by long-term gains (a livable planet and green jobs for all). As communities are the primary decision-makers, it can be anticipated that a robust inclination towards preventive and precautionary measures will prevail. In contrast to the actions of corporations, which frequently engage in practices like contaminating their own water sources to increase exports, communities would not do so, as it contravenes their values and priorities. The incentive structure of Deluism is conducive to sustainability: when individuals collectively own their environment, they are significantly less likely to destroy it than when it is owned by distant shareholders who are primarily focused on profit maximisation.

In practice, a global federated economy might implement a carbon budget or resource quotas through democratic agreement. For example, the world community might decide upon the maximum amount of fish that can be fished from the oceans or the maximum amount of carbon that can be emitted. Guilds would then incorporate these limits into their plans, adjusting techniques and outputs accordingly. Richer, more industrialised regions are likely to experience a significant reduction in throughput (while maintaining quality of life via efficiency and altered consumption patterns), whereas poorer regions may increase resource use in order to achieve a satisfactory

living standard. A sustainable level for all is thus achieved by finding a middle ground. The fundamental principle underpinning this approach is the concept of shared sacrifice and shared benefit, which contrasts with the traditional approach of the affluent reducing their expenditure only after a period of indulgence.

From a cultural perspective, the global vision of Deluism is predicated on the celebration of unity in diversity. This concept is not one of a uniform, monochrome world; rather, it is a "world where many worlds fit," as the Zapatistas have termed it. Local cultures, traditions, and innovations are poised to flourish, with the potential to thrive in a manner that has not been observed previously, liberated from the constraints imposed by homogenising market pressures. It is acknowledged that a guild in one region may adopt a markedly divergent style or approach in comparison to its counterpart in another region. This diversity is embraced, provided that both adhere to the fundamental principles of solidarity and non-exploitation. It is evident that communities would engage in the exchange of goods, as well as culture, ideas, and people, through the mediums of travel and dialogue. This process would serve to enrich the global commons. The fundamental responsibility of the federation is to ensure the peaceful and equitable facilitation of these exchanges.

In a Deluist world economy, the principle of inclusivity is paramount, with no individuals or regions being left behind. The abolition of exploitation is a universal principle that applies across different societies and

nations. In the context of colonialism and economic inequality, the division of nations into "developed" and "underdeveloped" categories has been identified as a significant cause of division. The knowledge, resources, and productive power of humanity are mobilised to elevate all communities to a standard of living that respects their local ways of life. Reflect upon the immense human potential that is unleashed when a child in a formerly impoverished nation is now able to access education, nutrition, and the internet – what innovations and contributions might arise from this that will benefit all of humanity? Deluism hypothesises that untapped genius and creativity lie dormant beneath the inequalities of capitalism, and that by unleashing them, we can address problems that currently appear intractable.

The global federated commons can be regarded as a response to the existential crises of our time. It is evident that phenomena such as climate change, pandemics and financial meltdowns are not constrained by geographical boundaries. The most effective solution to this issue is a cooperative global approach. Capitalism, by its very nature, engenders a state of perpetual discord between nations and companies, thereby impeding the establishment of cohesive responses (as evidenced by the disorganised reactions to climate change or the pandemic caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus). Conversely, a Deluist world has the potential to function as a unified human family with a high degree of efficiency. In the event of the emergence of a new virus, the Medical Guilds worldwide are required to share data immediately. A plan is then

formulated on a rapid basis to produce and distribute treatments to all, with no patents holding things up. Workers in all necessary sectors are then required to pivot to respond. In the event of a natural disaster affecting a region, the remainder of the federation provides assistance not as an act of charity but as a matter of duty and solidarity – akin to the way in which we tend to a wounded part of our own body. The vision is of humanity finally acting as a conscious collective entity, taking its fate into its own hands, guided by the principles of free development and mutual care.

In summary, the global vision set out in Principle 6 is both bold and transformative. It is a world in which the economy is a commons managed by guilds of free workers, in which production serves all people's needs and stays within ecological bounds, and in which solidarity extends to every corner of the globe. This concept encapsulates the economic dimension of a liberated world, complementing the political dimension of no tyrannies and the personal dimension of freedom of thought and culture. In this world, the concept of abundance is realised without the exploitation of individuals, and sustainability is achieved without the compromise of human dignity. This concept has been a long-standing aspiration, dating back to antiquity, that technological advancement and collective endeavour would enable humanity to transcend the constraints of necessity and class division, thereby ushering in an era of shared prosperity and peace. This is the Deluist economic

commonwealth, the material base for the true free development of each and all.

To conclude, we distill Principle 6 into a few **doctrinal aphorisms** – concise maxims that capture the spirit of a guild-based, non-exploitative economy:

“Production for use, not for profit.”

“Those who work decide; those who decide work.”

“All wealth is a common wealth.”

“No masters, no slaves – only guilds of free equals.”

“People and planet over profit and property.”

“Solidarity in economics, as in all things, is freedom.”

7. A Pluralistic, Anti-Racist Society Rooted in Solidarity and Cultural Evolution

Deluism is predicated on the celebration of human diversity as a treasure rather than a threat. The present author and the organisation to which they belong explicitly reject all forms of racism, ethnonationalism, casteism, and any theory that one group is superior or inferior to another. It has been demonstrated by scientific evidence that the concept of "race" is a social construct devoid of any authentic biological foundation. This assertion signifies that humanity is unified as a single species, transcending racial distinctions.

However, beyond this scientific fact, our moral conviction is that the rich variety of cultures, languages and traditions in the world should flourish in an atmosphere of mutual respect. The Deluist society is distinguished by its pluralistic character, manifesting in the acknowledgement of the entitlement of all cultural and religious communities to exist and practise freely, contingent upon their commitment to uphold the equal rights of others. The movement is informed by a diverse array of voices in multiple languages, unified by a shared set of fundamental human values. The objective is to eliminate the deeply entrenched prejudices that have been employed as instruments of divide-and-rule politics.

Racism, in particular, is not merely an injustice to those it directly oppresses; it is toxic to society as a whole. The practice has been employed to provide a rational basis for

atrocities and warfare. Indeed, the 20th century demonstrated that the denial of the equality and mutual respect of individuals, and the propagation of the doctrine of the inequality of individuals and races, engendered the possibility of a cataclysmic global conflict. It can thus be concluded that racism constitutes an evil not only for its victims, but for entire nations as a whole, with the potential to lead to widespread devastation.

Deluism is therefore predicated on an anti-racist foundation as a foundational principle. The organisation's mission is to eradicate systemic racism and all forms of discrimination, including those based on factors such as skin colour, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, and creed. Instead, the focus is on fostering a profound sense of solidarity among all individuals. This solidarity is not characterised by blind uniformity; rather, it is defined by active camaraderie, which acknowledges differences while still identifying common cause.

The process of cultural exchange, characterised by free dialogue, has the potential to facilitate mutual learning, evolution, and progress. Just as individuals evolve through interaction, cultures too can enhance one another through mutual learning. It is hypothesised that a cultural evolution will take place, in which old forms of chauvinism and hatred will be superseded by a new global culture of solidarity, representing a true "unity in diversity". The cultural heritage of every community is esteemed, even as a novel collective human culture is forged on the principles of empathy, creativity, and justice.

Within the paradigm of Deluism, the notion of patriotism experiences a metamorphosis. The prevailing paradigm no longer conceptualises this as a sentiment of superiority towards one's nation in contrast to other nations. Instead, it is understood as an affection for humanity and one's local community as a component of a broader human family. There is a broad consensus that all forms of bigotry should be regarded as a type of treason against humanity. The foundational principle of this philosophy is predicated on the establishment of a universal brotherhood and sisterhood of all peoples, predicated on the notion that the sole race is that of the human race.

8. *An Internationalist Movement for Global Liberation*

Deluism is defined as a global internationalist movement that aims to dissolve the rival nation-state system into a cooperative network of local communities. The objective of Deluism is to liberate and empower, rather than to conquer. In contrast to historical empires that imposed their rule by force, Deluism seeks to establish a world in which all nations collaborate and thrive together. This vision resonates with the principles of world federalism, seeking to establish "appropriate and effective global governance with the aim of preventing war, protecting the environment, and ensuring adherence to universal human rights". However, it is envisaged that this would be constructed from the bottom up by free communities. In practice, Deluist councils would coordinate across borders on shared challenges (poverty, climate, health, etc.) using democratic assemblies rather than militarized alliances.

Liberation, Not Empire

The expansion of Deluism can be considered as a form of liberation rather than an imperial conquest. The objective of the movement is not the seizure of territory or the imposition of foreign rule; rather, it is the assistance of oppressed communities in the overthrow of tyranny and the joining of a cooperative cause. The historical expansion of empires has been characterised by the subjugation of cultures and the extraction of resources. In contrast, Deluism is a philosophy that seeks to empower

communities to govern themselves and provide mutual support. The objective of this struggle is not the establishment of a new empire, but rather the dissolution of all existing empires.

- **Empires:** Expansion by force and coercion.
- **Deluism:** Growth by voluntary solidarity and support.
- **Conquest vs. Cooperation:** Empires subjugate; Deluism unites communities against oppression.

Universal Solidarity of Workers

Deluism explicitly reinstates the slogan "Workers of the world, unite!" as a fundamental principle. As Marx and Engels proclaimed in the Communist Manifesto, "Workers of the World, Unite! The individual in question has been encouraged to consider the potential benefits of this offer, and to view the act of removing their chains as a positive step. This underscores the belief that no group or nation is truly free until all are free. The organisation rejects narrow nationalism and chauvinism, insisting that the global working class and oppressed peoples share a common struggle. In the context of Deluism, solidarity transcends national boundaries, with labour unions, farmers' cooperatives, and student movements among others establishing global networks. The fundamental assertion of this movement is that the pervasive phenomenon of poverty and injustice in any given locale invariably serves to erode the very fabric of freedom in all other regions.

Transcending Nationalism

Deluism is a philosophy that actively works to transcend both nationalism and xenophobia. It is acknowledged that economic development and global trade have already been eroding long-standing barriers. As Marx previously observed, "national differences and antagonisms between peoples are daily more and more vanishing" (Marx, 1848). Deluism accelerates this process by addressing the underlying causes of hatred, namely poverty, brutal competition, and imperial exploitation. The promotion of cultural and educational exchanges is a key strategy aimed at transforming diversity of language and history into a catalyst for enrichment, rather than fostering division. In a Deluist world, national identity is said to coexist with international friendship, underpinned by mutual respect rather than antagonism.

A World Federation of Communities

In practical terms, Deluism envisions a **world federation of local councils**. Once Deluist movements overthrow oppressive elites, liberated communities would federate across former borders into a cooperative global assembly. Think of a **worldwide network of sister cities and regions**, exchanging knowledge and aid. For example, formal sister-city partnerships already exist "to promote peace through mutual respect, understanding, and cooperation". Deluism would scale up this idea to every community on the planet. Rather than state-based blocs, liberated towns and neighborhoods would join a global

council to set shared policies. This federated council would coordinate disaster relief, public health, education, and environmental projects by consensus, truly reflecting the interests of people everywhere.

- **Local Councils:** Each liberated community governs itself democratically.
- **Global Assembly:** Communities send representatives to an international council for world issues.
- **Sister-City Networks:** Formal partnerships at city/regional level strengthen solidarity.

From Geopolitics to Global Peace

Deluism replaces state militarism with collective security. The proposal entails the dissolution of all standing armies in favour of the establishment of a global peacekeeping coalition. This strategic realignment would unlock substantial resources, as evidenced by the fact that a mere 7% of global military expenditure (approximately \$265 billion in 2019) is sufficient to address global hunger. It is evident from the findings of numerous studies that an increase in arms budgets does not contribute to an improvement in global security; rather, it serves to exacerbate existing tensions. The redistribution of financial resources under a Deluism framework would be directed towards addressing fundamental human needs, including the provision of sustenance to those experiencing food insecurity, the facilitation of healthcare and educational opportunities, and the restoration of

ecological systems. In lieu of the balance-of-terror paradigm, the resolution of disputes would be facilitated through the mechanisms of international law, the establishment of transparent councils, and the implementation of cooperative intervention. In a Deluist world, war machines are superseded by aid systems.

- **No More Armies:** National military forces are dissolved.
- **Global Peace Force:** Volunteers from all communities serve in an international peace coalition.
- **Redirect Spending:** A small fraction of military budgets ends global hunger.

Abolishing Hatred and Inequality

Deluism posits the objective of eradicating the material conditions that engender animosity. Marx noted that the exploitation of one nation by another would also be brought to an end once class exploitation was terminated. Deluism's approach to eliminating poverty and competition is indicative of an attempt to address the fundamental causes of national chauvinism. The concept of economic justice, which encompasses the provision of essential amenities such as food, housing, and education, has been demonstrated to play a pivotal role in mitigating inter-country resentment, thereby preventing the exploitation of populations by their own nations. The sharing of wealth and knowledge on a global scale serves to eliminate the incentives for racism and imperialism. It

is asserted that all individuals are to be treated with dignity and afforded the means to thrive, thereby facilitating the establishment of authentic international friendships.

- **End Exploitation:** “In proportion as exploitation of one individual by another is ended, that of one nation by another will also end”.
- **Global Welfare:** Equitable distribution of resources to all peoples.
- **Education & Culture:** Promote empathy and global citizenship to erase prejudices.

A Compassionate Global Future

It is to be posited herewith that a planet wherein empathy and cooperation are the defining characteristics of crisis response and achievement is a conceivable scenario. In the event of a disaster or epidemic in a given region, communities worldwide mobilise immediately to provide assistance. Advancements in the medical field, clean energy technologies, and scientific discoveries are disseminated freely for the benefit of all humanity. Collaborations are undertaken on grand projects, ranging from the curative to the exploratory, with a shared sense of purpose. In the Deluist horizon, the rise of an empire is not a feature of the scenario. Instead, the concept of universal empowerment of the populace as collaborators is a key element. The objective of the present revolution is not the establishment of a ruling regime, but rather the unification of the global community in a shared objective.

The primary objective of Deluism is the conquest of human suffering and ignorance, with the ultimate aim of ensuring universal freedom and prosperity.

***Denounce Injustice, Proclaim Hope, and Resist
Oppression***

Deluism is predicated on the principle of unadorned veracity with regard to contemporary malevolence. As Fidel Castro once asserted, "Telling the truth is the first duty of all revolutionaries". It is imperative to acknowledge the inherent intolerability of racism, capitalism and authoritarianism, which manifest as injustices that are both unacceptable and in direct contravention of fundamental ethical principles. The use of public protest imagery, such as banners displaying slogans such as "Justice for Mario Suhr" and "Asian Lives Matter", serves to illustrate how activists seek to expose acts of cruelty and mobilise public outrage. Deluists seek to denounce systemic evil in moral terms with the aim of awakening consciences and unifying resistance. As Castro emphasises, deceiving people or raising false hopes "always brings the worst consequences", and as such, the pledge is made to an uncompromising truth-telling.

We specifically condemn:

- **Racism** – the oppression of people by race or ethnicity.
- **Capitalism** – an economic system that concentrates wealth and power.

- **Authoritarianism** – political rule by force or decree.

By exposing these systems, Deluism's rhetoric has been argued to "stare reality in the face" and to channel the righteous anger required for change.

Radical Hope and Optimism of the Will

Deluism is characterised by a combination of critique and visionary hope. The following assertion is made in accordance with Antonio Gramsci's maxim: "pessimism of the intellect, optimism of the will". In practice, this entails the acknowledgement of unfavourable outcomes (pessimism) whilst maintaining an optimistic outlook. As the columnist Arwa Mahdawi notes, it is imperative to avoid complacency and to recognise the gravity of the present crises. However, it is equally crucial to maintain a sense of optimism and to believe that the world is not yet destined for disaster. Optimism is defined as a conscious act of defiance; it is not merely naïve cheer, but rather a "cry against resignation". Deluists have been known to posit a positive outlook, with the aim of inspiring others. The following concrete objectives are hereby articulated:

- **Equitable prosperity** for all communities, ending poverty and extreme inequality.
- A **cultural renaissance** where arts, education and science flourish inclusively.
- **Peaceful global cooperation** on issues like climate change and human rights.

The organisation's slogans and music are instrumental in maintaining hope during periods of adversity. The ideology of Deluism is predicated on the combination of a clear-eyed critique of contemporary society with a promise of a better future. The objective of this ideology is to inspire people to believe that collective struggle can result in the creation of a new world.

Resistance as a Moral Imperative

Deluism can be defined as a call to action. It is insufficient merely to dream or speak; it is incumbent upon us to combat oppression wherever we encounter it. The present paper endorses the strategy of militant nonviolence as the primary tactic, utilising mass strikes, boycotts, protests and civil disobedience as instruments for the oppressed. However, Deluism also affirms the right of people to self-defense if necessary. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. himself was famously armed and believed that nonviolent public action did not require personal pacifism. As Malcolm X articulated in 1964, "I do not oppose the utilisation of violence for self-defence purposes. It is challenging for any individual of sound intellect to adopt a non-violent stance when confronted with circumstances of oppression. In summary, the nonviolent movement under discussion does not constitute an abandonment of the right of individuals to protect themselves. The concept of self-defense is understood within a political framework, signifying a collective right and a form of resistance. As one political theorist writes, "Self-defense is not merely an individual right; it is collective political resistance."

In circumstances where authoritarian control is being consolidated – whether by the actions of a dictator, the implementation of unjust legislation, the exploitation of corporate entities, or the perpetration of racist attacks – Deluists will adopt a counterproductive stance. We concur with the sentiments expressed by Marx and Engels on this matter: It is imperative that the ruling classes are made to quake in their boots at the prospect of a Communist revolution. This renowned expression serves as a poignant reminder that when individuals unite, "having forfeited nothing but their chains," they possess the capacity to unsettle even the most formidable tyrants. We do not advocate senseless violence; however, we assert that the resolute courage of the people will not be subdued.

Aesthetics of Revolution: Art, Music, and Media

Deluism posits that the manner in which we articulate our ideas holds significance. The capacity of revolutionary art and culture to ignite movements is well-documented, as is their ability to offer symbols of hope and solidarity. For instance, the renowned Che Guevara portrait – captured by photographer Alberto Korda – has come to symbolise anti-capitalism and has been embraced as an emblem by peaceful social activists worldwide. As with Che's iconic image in 1968 Paris, the visual communication materials employed by this organisation – namely banners, posters and murals – utilise bold, uplifting imagery to symbolise a future worth fighting for.

Music and literature are equally vital. Throughout history, it has been observed that oppressed peoples have transformed their struggles into songs. During the American civilrights era, spirituals and blues music became anthems: Sam Cooke's "A Change Is Gonna Come" and the gospel hymn "We Shall Overcome" became rallying cries of defiance. Deluists are responsible for the creation of a new "propaganda of hope", in the form of songs, poems and theatre, which speak truth to power about injustice and celebrate the power of collective action. The inundation of culture with messages of resistance and possibility serves as a counteragent to despair. The practice of art, music and storytelling has been demonstrated to facilitate a sense of connection among individuals, whilst simultaneously providing examples of courage. This serves to reinforce the notion that individuals possess the capacity to achieve extraordinary feats.

Honoring Martyrs and Inspiring Action

Deluism is predicated on the notion that the manner in which we articulate our ideas holds significance. The capacity of revolutionary art and culture to ignite movements is welldocumented, as is their ability to offer symbols of hope and solidarity. For instance, the renowned Che Guevara portrait, captured by photographer Alberto Korda, has come to symbolise anti-capitalism and has been embraced as an emblem by peaceful social activists worldwide. As with Che's iconic image in 1968 Paris, the visual communication materials

employed by this organisation – namely banners, posters and murals – utilise bold, uplifting imagery to symbolise a future worth fighting for.

Music and literature are equally vital. It has been observed that throughout history, those who have been subject to oppression have often transformed their struggles into songs. During the American civil-rights era, spirituals and blues music became anthems: Sam Cooke's "A Change Is Gonna Come" and the gospel hymn "We Shall Overcome" became rallying cries of defiance. Deluists are responsible for the creation of a new "propaganda of hope", in the form of songs, poems and theatre, which speak truth to power about injustice and celebrate the power of collective action. The inundation of culture with messages of resistance and possibility functions as a counteragent to despair. The practice of artistic, musical and storytelling activities has been demonstrated to facilitate a sense of connection among individuals, whilst simultaneously providing examples of courage. This finding serves to reinforce the notion that individuals possess the capacity to achieve extraordinary feats.

**Rise now, for the old order has
stolen our dignity long enough, let
us tear down the tyranny of greed
and build, together, a world of
freedom and equality.**