Twitter Thread by Travis Kimmel



Travis Kimmel
@coloradotravis

Let’s talk about money and the State (Sovereign).

Since everyone constantly gets this wrong.

1/

So look: there never was a barter-centric state of nature.

That’s a nice story but when we look at the historical record, it’s just flat out false.

In point of fact:

- Debt predates money.
- Money predates barter.

2/

The way the Sovereign first got involved with debt was something like this:

King: “If you don’t give me 3 goats during harvest season, my soldiers will come burn your fucking house down.”

And in this way, the King originated a debt.

By fiat.

3/

But moving goats around sucks (horrible creatures) and is just sort of logistically annoying, so a new plan was devised, like this:

King: “Same deal with the soldiers and the burning and the profanity, but now it’s 50 pieces of silver instead of goats.”

Presto! Money!

4/

Money is a token that settles debts - always has been. The reason it's useful is because it allows society to function like an abacus with N players.

In lieu of just the sovereign playing debt, these tokens are 'debt settlement bearer assets' which allow…well... the economy
5/

What makes a thing money is its ability to settle debts.

All money is fiat.

It's fiat because we all agree, by fiat, that it will be sufficient unto the settlement of debt. Because we want to have an economy.
6/

Some people like a certain type of token.

Hard money advocates (of all varieties) seem to believe that a supply-constrained token (gold/BTC) is "good" because it's more "natural" — if you watch closely, you can see these recurrent themes pop up in their language:
7/

This specific form of reasoning failure is called the "appeal to nature fallacy," and is most often used as a conduit to imply moral superiority without having to make a case for it.

But anyhow, tokens are just tokens - they're for debt settlement.
8/

https://t.co/SxUWU0fCLN

So now let's think about the Sovereign of today vs. the ones of yesteryear.

Kings would simply originate debts by decree ('you owe me goats/silver!') and this was just sort of the way things worked.

Until representative democracy (and other representative approaches)!
9/

Representative governments are an attempt to "hijack the Sovereign" and create a group project sovereign that we all get a say in.

That 'power domain' doesn't tend to remain empty for long (much to the chagrin of anarchists), so the Founding Fathers filled it.

With us.
10/

You may not like the job we're doing currently, and I'd agree that it's a little weird and there's a lot of underrepresentation but…it's still a hell of a lot better than previous ways (real ones from history, not fantasies).

It also means that we already control the money.
11/

So now let’s ponder: why would we, as a society, “debase” our money? Like, why would we do that to ourselves?

Well - remember that all money is is a debt settlement token.

Now consider that we, as a society, have a boatload of debt, both public and private.
12/

In a society where there’s a lot of debt, periodically juicing the amount of tokens available so that people can access them somewhat easier sort of makes sense - it provides more opportunities for people to get tokens and pay off debts with them (vs. just getting wiped out).
13/

For as long as there has been debt, there has been debt forgiveness — levered systems periodically need a reset.

Inflation targeting is, from one standpoint, simply a “perpetual light jubilee” that makes debt loads easier for everyone to carry.
14/

So next time you ranting about the state, remember:

This is a historically superior type of Sovereign (we have some say, which is rare, historically speaking).

Some amount of the tithe this Sovereign exacts goes toward the common good (a high amount, historically speaking).
15/

Those who would complain about this system would do well to first respect it.

Few have ever had it this good, from the perspective of both governance and money.

So let's stop being so ridiculous and decadent, it’s unsightly.
16/

I’m sure people will want to debate this but there’s really not much point to that, IMO, unless you’ve read the material. There is a long history here, and it's relevant.

Now, it you want to debate after reading the material, I’m totally down.

This is the material:
/17