

**MANIFESTO:
AFRICAN CORPORATIST SOCIETY**

A FIVE-VOLUME LITERARY BOOK

**VOLUME 3: ETHNOSCIENCE OF COMMICRACY:
MORAL AND NORMATIVE BASES OF
COMMISSIONING-RULE IN SOCIETAL VALUES**

OMOLAJA MAKINEE

Volume-3: African Corporatist Society
Copyright © 2022 by Omolaja Makinee

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means without written permission from the author.

ISBN: 979-8-88862-631-3 Paperback

04-November-2022

Table of Contents

PREFACE	4
INTRODUCTION	11
 Chapter 1:	
The Veil of Bureaucracy in African Society	17
Chapter 2:	
Commicratic Revolution of Ethnopolitanism	51
Chapter 3:	
Equalitarian Bases of Commicracy	106
Chapter 4:	
Social and Economic Character of Commicracy	171
Chapter 5:	
Relational Architecture of Commicracy	223
Chapter 6:	
Institutional Development of Commicracy	360

PREFACE

Bureaucracy, as a vertical structure and impersonal organisation procedure promote irrationality and inequality in its own right. This verticality entrenches distance rather than duty. And so—in every chamber of our social existence—the interpersonal organisation of commicracy rises like a moral rebuke to a withering order.

Commicracy looks upon bureaucracy and sees not efficiency but the seedbed of absenteeism, the breeding ground of administrative burdens, the architect of declining performance, wounded productivity, and—worst of all—the silent corrosion of human health in the workplace.

Bureaucracy is not a system worthy of human appropriation—it is an organisational deception. A deception that undermines public function. A deception adopted not only by governments, but creeping silently into private organisations, into families, into the very microstructures of society.

For when a human being bends their personality to a vocation, their labour becomes living fire! Their ethics resonate through the work itself. This is why every employer hunts for “passion”—because passion is the living voltage that awakens

expertise. We have all seen it: brilliant minds called “over-qualified” simply because they did not radiate the required passion—the emotional fuel bureaucracies feed upon for their very survival. Without passion, bureaucracy cannot walk; without passion, bureaucracy cannot breathe. And where passion dies, discontent festers. There—within those grey corridors—begins the psychosocial dysfunction that plagues the modern worker.

And consider: if doctors, nurses, and carers lose passion for their patients, the sacred alignment between their personal values and the essence of their vocation shatters. Their hands may still work, but the heart has departed. If teachers do not burn with a passion for teaching and the subjects they bring to life, how can they ignite curiosity in the minds of students—those sparks of the future? If the police do not wield passion for the security of the community, then respect, integrity, commitment, and excellence—all pillars of public service—collapse into empty mottos without a vision or a goal.

This is the tragedy of bureaucratic daily life: A system that urges its servants to treat people as objects. A system that strips decision-making power from those most affected by its decisions. A system that erects class divisions as structural necessities rather than moral failures. Thus it becomes a forge

for discontent, a breeding ground for frustration, a mechanism of quiet emotional injury.

For bureaucracy is a theatre of confusion: Rigid rules strangling efficiency. Delays collapsing into contradictory directives. Promotion shaped by class, not competence. Officials stumbling blindly, building departmental empires instead of serving human purpose. Routines repeated without heart or thought, crushing the dignity of individual cases and human needs. Misallocated tasks, duplications, over-staffing; paperwork swelling like a disease; time mismanaged; resources squandered. And above all—decision-making power concentrated in the hands of a select few, suffocating initiative, smothering creativity, and treating risk not as opportunity, but as a path to loss.

And the consequences reach far beyond the office walls. Observe the world: the human-made global warming of the planet, the crisis of climate change—these are not natural accidents. They are the direct consequence of capitalist economic practices rooted in bureaucratic thinking. Since the 1800s, corporations have belched greenhouse gases into the sky in pursuit of limitless profit, guided by economic programmes that honoured monetary gain over planetary survival. Capitalism—once praised for energising human ambition—has, in the 21st century, revealed its devastating truth: its organisational logic is

incompatible with the survival of the Earth itself. A doctrine that cannot safeguard the world forfeits its right to continue.

Yet from this global crisis arises a new paradigm—the corporatist learning system, thriving on the web-based economy. Corporatism, unlike capitalism, evolves. It adapts. It experiments. It learns. It embraces renewable electrical energy as the new engine of industry. It uses digital infrastructure not to exploit labour, but to amplify innovation. It institutionalises commicracies within its programmes to stimulate creativity, encourage policy experimentation, and elevate customer satisfaction—not merely profit—into the core of economic value. Corporatism is becoming the first economic philosophy in modern history to align production with planetary responsibility.

Thus I define Commicracy as a *learning system approach*: A framework that produces diverse experimental programmes; A method that enables effective management to meet human-centred goals; A system where managerial leadership works symbiotically with participant members; And where work-ethics evolve fluidly to nurture expertise and optimise outcomes—all with human happiness as the central objective.

Commicracy is a system of governance in which authority is exercised by function, not rank: the State is commissioned to inform and implement, the people are commissioned to authorise

and decide, and legitimacy arises only where both act within their assigned scope.

But through the lens of indigenous African pantheistic spirituality, a truth emerges—one hidden from the non-native gaze: The natural world does not operate bureaucratically. The rivers do not wait for stamps. The wind does not seek approval from a directorate of breezes. The ant colony does not submit memos for permission to forage. Nature is commicratic. Life is commicratic. Human engagement—fluid, dynamic, adaptive—is commicratic, because survival itself is cooperative. Each person works with another so that all may achieve their goals, desires, needs, and wants. The entire natural world, visible and invisible, pulses with a single principle: commicracy is the architecture of reality.

And science confirms this spiritual truth. In my forthcoming research in Psychextrics, the neuroplasticity of the brain reveals the same pattern: When one region of the brain is injured, the living neural network does not appeal to a bureaucratic superior. It re-routes, regenerates, reorganises itself around the injury—because biological life is wired for cooperative commicratic compensation. The explanation stands firm: nerves do not operate in isolated hierarchies. They function as unified, interdependent agencies of survival—Commicracy!

Commicracy is not merely an organisational concept; it is the lifeblood of populocracy. The web-internetisation platform—the new civic nervous system of the 21st century—depends wholly on the dual engines of commicracy and populocracy functioning in cooperative harmony. If one collapses, the other stumbles. And if both falter, the great digital architecture that binds the modern State—its communication, its participation, its collective intelligence—falls into dysfunction. That is why this Manifesto turns its gaze unflinchingly toward State building. For the future of Africa will not be crafted in silence; it will be engineered through commicratic order.

Thus, the commicratic State proposed for a federated African future is not an invention—It is a return to the law of Nature. A return aligned with the global culture of web-internetisation, with populocracies rooted in interdependent leadership between State and citizen. Commicracy, populocracy, and digital platforms all share the same ancestral grammar: Humanitarian law. Interpersonal procedure. Consensus enforced by equality. Leadership built on interdependence rather than domination.

These interpersonal legal relations, grounded in cooperative decision-making, forge a society of equalitarian engagement—a place where communication itself becomes the infrastructure of justice, and cooperation becomes the engine of civilisation.

Commicracy extends into all arenas of social life, just as bureaucracy infiltrated every corner of modern governance. But unlike bureaucracy, commicracy is not an instrument of rigidity—it is an instrument of harmony. It is an organisational structure perfectly aligned with the global culture of internetisation and the universal pursuit of equalitarian relations.

Where bureaucracy divides people into hierarchical layers, commicracy divides responsibility equally between people. Where bureaucracy centralises power in the hands of the government, commicracy distributes power in both the hands of the government and the governed. Where bureaucracy isolates human needs into procedural compartments, commicracy binds people through interpersonal cooperation and adaptive commissioning-rule.

For commicracy is not merely a theory of organisational behaviour. It is a method for governing diversity. A protocol for harmonising the unique needs and wants that shape societal values across the world. A new architecture of civic morality. A new grammar of human cooperation. A new foundation upon which Africa—and the world—may build the next era of civilisation.

INTRODUCTION

In the preceding Volume-2 of this Manifesto, I introduced the term Commicracy—a word forged from the linguistic iron of history itself. Born from the old French *commission*, rooted in the Latin *commissio*, meaning “*sending together*”, and welded to *cracy*, from the old French *cratie*, meaning “*rule*”, the term becomes a profound declaration: Commicracy — “sending together to rule,” or in a clearer govoxical truth: to rule together, interdependently. This name is not poetic embellishment; it is revelation. It announces the operational soul of commicracy.

In its purest essence, I defined Commicracy as a system in which the most consequential decisions are made by those who bear their consequences. It is governance built not on hierarchy but on horizontal responsibility—where the organised body of the affected becomes the architect of their own destiny.

Within the domain of State administration, commicracy transforms into a commissioning-rule of the citizenry themselves. It is a structure where citizen-electrates issue directives to State officials and elected representatives—binding instructions that direct the machinery of public office. This is not

a mere alternative to bureaucracy; it is a straightforward, necessary, and unchallengeable administrative procedure that returns ownership of governance to those whom governance exists to serve.

Under the ethnopolitan administration of govox-populi, commicracy acquires even greater depth. Here, elected officials are not rulers over the populace—they are commissioned partners, co-governing with the people. Legislation, policy, and State-centred decisions rise not from secluded chambers but from the deliberating voice of the citizenry. Governance becomes a shared enterprise—a disciplined practice of collective authority.

Thus emerges the ethnoscience of commicracy: the moral and normative foundation of commissioning-rule, the science of how two or more parties govern their independent values while standing in interdependent relation.

It is the codified expression of shared values—articulated explicitly—by which a community agrees to govern its immediate affairs. It is a discipline anchored in the universal laws of human nature: Human beings are united by shared psychological adaptations, yet remain profoundly unique as individuals. It is precisely this duality—unity in adaptation, diversity in expression—that necessitates commissioning-rule. It

is what allows conventions to form, norms to stabilise, and behaviour to harmonise across differing personal identities.

But in Africa, the ethnoscience of commicracy takes on an even deeper meaning. It becomes the study of cooperative customs, collectivist traditions, and interdependent cultural practices that shaped indigenous African civilisation long before the arrival of external cultures—Arabian or Western—each of which, in different historical waves, imposed their own systems upon our lands, moulding our religions, traditions, and ways of perceiving the world.

Commicracy, in its African interpretation, is therefore not an invention of modern philosophy. It is a remembrance, a return to the ancient organisational wisdom that governed our societies from the earliest eras of humanity. It is the rediscovery of Africa's communal genius—now re-forged into a govoxical science for the contemporary age.

This is the path that Volume-3 of this manifesto now opens before us: the ethnoscience of commicracy—the moral structure, the normative logic, the ancestral rhythm—through which a people may govern themselves by commissioning-rule, interdependently, intentionally, and in accordance with the truth of their own values.

In this Manifesto, my focus turns to the interdependent organisational management of commicracy—a system born not from abstraction, but from the lived realities of a world undergoing rapid structural transformation. My aim is to construct a comprehensive, integral understanding of interpersonal organisational procedures as they evolve under populocracy, now expressed vibrantly across the global web-internetisation platform.

Through the open architecture of this digital commons—its transparent policies, its collaborative protocols, its populocratic administrative logic—we are witnessing the accelerating demise of bureaucratic responses between government and governed. Bureaucracy, once the iron cage of social organisation, is crumbling under the weight of a world that has learned to speak, decide, and act together.

Before us rises a new order of engagement:

- Collective rules reshaping the relationship between employer and employee;
- A steady departure from rigid bureaucratic interactions at the State level;
- An emerging equalitarian ethos redefining the relationship between husband and wife.

Across social-media platforms—the agora of the 21st century—we watch humanity peel back the layers of inherited bureaucratic behaviours. We witness the interrogation of past racial and tribal antagonisms; we observe the transformation of the discourse around biological social roles, femininity, masculinity, and human identity itself. And something profound becomes clear: As bureaucratic ethics dissolve, social divisions soften. The communal voice grows sharper. The collective consciousness becomes more courageous.

This Manifesto stands as a declaration of an inevitable victory—the victory of commicratic institutions, the victory of de-bureaucratisation, the victory of human society over the impersonal machinery that sought to govern it from above. Commicracy emerges not merely as a desirable alternative, but as an organisational philosophy functionally and normatively superior to bureaucracy in every domain where human beings interact.

For the web-internetisation platform is more than a tool; it is a dominant social model of human engagement—open, free, expressive, consonant with human nature’s desire for individuality and authenticity. Its very structure rejects the cold hierarchy of bureaucracy and gravitates instead toward interpersonal justice, equalitarian cooperation, and human-centred decision-making.

My position here aligns with a broader truth now visible in global human behaviour: As social cohesion strengthens, humanity naturally evolves toward shared administrative practices, collective intelligence, and unified moral reasoning. An advanced human society will not cling to territorial borders; it will transcend them. It will cultivate advanced automated institutions, interdependent governments, shared histories, and diverse cultural identities coexisting under the logic of govities —governed communities in commicratic harmony.

This Manifesto therefore serves as witness and blueprint to an unfolding epoch. A world beyond bureaucracy. A civilisation shaped by commicratic organisation. A future where human beings rule together, by commissioning-rule, in alignment with the universal laws of Nature and the ancestral wisdom of Africa. The age of commicracy is not approaching. It has already begun.

CHAPTER ONE

THE VEIL OF BUREAUCRACY IN AFRICAN SOCIETY

A monstrous garb is spotted on the fabric of Africa—making us appear out of shape and out of place. It called itself ‘Bureaucracy’ and is conditioning how far we have fallen outside of who we truly are as a people. This veil—this imported garment stitched from foreign fibres—strangles the cultural breath of our people.

The culture of bureaucracy, alien to the ancestral rhythms of African cooperativism, has risen as an ideological assault on the very dispositions that once defined our harmony. It drags us into the regiment of a class-system, the very machine that manufactures inequality and distributes it like a poison through the veins of human society.

It indoctrinates us into the emotional impoverishment of a pathological lie—implanting delusions of superiority in some, inferiority in others, and spiritual confusion in many. It forces us to camouflage ourselves in public spaces, to adopt unreal cultural postures, and to believe that our human essence has been corrupted by some mythical “god-bug syndrome”. Bureaucracy

rewrites our self-image until we no longer recognise our own reflection.

When the colonial era was established across African soil, the Western institutions of bureaucracy entered like an occupying spirit. Africa became the testing ground—the experimental laboratory—where the Western world measured the extension of bureaucratic influence over social, political, economic, and cultural consciousness. Under capitalist bureaucracy, Africans from every walk of life were conditioned to perceive their human worth as a commodity, indebted to the State and beholden to corporate institutions.

And in that process, we abandoned the truth that we are cooperatively entitled to our own natural resources. We began to treat access to government contracts and civil service work as privileges granted by an overlord, rather than rights inherent in our citizenship.

Bureaucracy seeped not only into our public institutions, but into our homes. It entrenched the notion of men as absolute heads over women and children, distorted our family structures, and sanctified the capitalist delusion that money alone grants access to basic needs and to the beauty of life. We became defenders of the very democratic-bureaucratic machine that confined us.

I must confess a difficult truth: I do not accept that colonialism was designed with the intention to destroy African lives. Its negative outcomes were consequences—consequences born of multiple overlapping factors, so complex and heavily entangled that no consensus can easily arise among those who shaped or suffered its history. My reasoning is this:

The ambition of Western colonial powers was to replace the indigenous African collectivist structures—those moral, social, and organisational systems that governed our cooperative customs and ethnoist traditions—with Western individualistic systems of bureaucracy, capitalist economics, and State-centred democracy. The friction between these imported economic-values and our natural social-values is visible across Africa today. It is a friction that still bleeds into every institution, every community, every moment of political and economic turbulence.

The consequences of our continued obstinacy—our refusal to abandon the mimicry of Western socio-economic structures that conflict with our indigenous identity—have deprived Africans of fulfilment in both worlds. We stand neither comfortably within Western economic-order nor fully within our ancestral social-order. This confusion fuels the persistence of underdevelopment across the continent, both socially and economically.

Colonialism claimed its mission was to align African ethno-governed communities with Western States socially, politically, economically, and culturally. And later, it claimed that its work was cut short by the advent of African independence—cut short before the “grand design” could be completed.

From this vantage point, it is fair to say that colonialism carried a dual intention: To preserve Western economic power, and to position Africa as a global economic actor—not for Africa own ascendancy, but as the world’s chief producer of raw materials feeding Western prosperity. In essence, it sought to place Africa not in the ascendancy that China occupies in the global economy today—a manufacturing engine altruistically serving the world population, but rather as the economic mule for the western States pumping out its own natural resources without equal benefits to its own people.

This is the veil of bureaucracy. A veil woven by colonial hands, worn by African institutions, and carried into the present by unexamined loyalty to alien philosophies. And in this chapter, we begin the work of tearing it away.

Western Republic and African Ethnpublic: The Unholy Alliance

The reasoning of the western key players in their economic relations with African actors was simple: The Western approach

to Africa—both during and after colonialism—was shaped by a fundamental calculation: the African continent is the most resource-abundant environment on Earth, endowed with vast deposits of natural minerals and an equally vast reservoir of human potential.

This reasoning is not unique to Europe. The United States demonstrated a similar logic through decades of its expansive visa-lottery programmes, drawing millions from every nationality into its labour system to sustain its own economic ascendancy.

Yet despite these grand strategies, both America and Africa find themselves caught in the same paralysing pendulum: the persistent swing between governmental bureaucracy, organisational dependency, and the social fractures that arise from them. In America, this manifests as deep social polarisation; in Africa, as profound economic polarisation.

To understand this shared predicament, consider a values–benefit formula that illustrates the logic at play in the historical relationship between African leaders and Western colonial powers:

$$n = h^+ + x + r$$

Where:

- n represents what a society *needs*,

- h^+ represents the *help* required to meet that need,
- x represents the *process* or *system* in place,
- r represents the *natural resources* already possessed by that society, with the aim that these resources should multiply to produce large-scale economic benefits.

If we accept the Western colonial claim that their ambition was to integrate African societies into the Western socio-economic framework, then Africa's need (n) was presumed to be the formation of a harmonious system blending:

- Western capitalism and bureaucratic individualism, with
- African cooperativism and collectivist social structures.

Under this narrative, Western States supplied the help (h^+) through industrial projects and infrastructural expansion. Meanwhile, Africans were justified in expecting that their resource-base (r) would remain fundamentally in their possession, producing $+r$ —a positive multiplication of their economic value. However, under capitalist extraction models, this did not materialise. Instead, the formula for Africans shifted to:

$$n = h^+ + x - r$$

The promised benefits of industrialisation were overshadowed by the systemic loss of natural resources. In

response, African thinkers proposed returning to African-Socialism—our indigenous cooperativist economy—believing that this would restore the original formula $n = h^+ + x + r$, creating a risk-free mutual benefit for both Africans and Western partners.

But Western economic actors interpreted this restoration as an intrusion into their imposed capitalist order. Their counter-formula was:

$$n = -h \times + r$$

Meaning: Their *help* (h), if Africa reverted to cooperativist socialism, would yield a negative effect ($-h$) for Western interests while granting Africans full resource benefit ($+r$). In this view, African-socialism produced a zero-sum outcome for the West.

When both formulaic arguments are placed side by side, the relationship collapses into a values-conflict:

- plus (+) versus minus (–),
- Western *needs* (n) vs African *needs* (n),
- capitalist preservation versus cooperative sovereignty.

The result—following African Independence—was an economic relationship defined by a single conflicted equation:

$$n = h^+ / - r$$

Here:

- h^+ symbolises the continuous aid given to Africa for industrial development,
- $-r$ represents Africa's ongoing loss of natural resources through imbalanced trade and extraction.

Thus, the final value n —the realised outcome of this relationship—produces:

- an enriched Western economy, and
- an impoverished African economy.

This equation has shaped the last half-century of Africa's structural underdevelopment, embedding a persistent imbalance into the global economic system: Western gain is structurally tied to African loss.

The Environmental Roots of Afro-Western Economic Conflict

A closer examination of Afro-Western historical dynamics reveals a fundamental truth: Africa's cooperative economic-order and collectivist social-order did not emerge accidentally. They were shaped by an environment of abundant natural resources, fertile soils, favourable climates, and organically grown food distributed across the western, eastern, and southern regions of ancient Africa. These environmental blessings

nurtured African-socialism—a system grounded in communal ownership, shared labour, and interdependent prosperity.

By contrast, the environmental conditions of ancient Western societies were markedly different. Long winters, harsh snow seasons, and insufficient summer heat limited agricultural productivity and natural resource abundance. These adverse conditions produced the opposite social effect: scarcity, which encouraged competitive individualism, resource hoarding, and the eventual development of capitalist and bureaucratic structures.

If Western colonial actors had not attempted to overwrite the African economic-order with capitalism, cooperation between Africa and the West might have stabilised into a mutually beneficial system. Africa would have retained its +r (positive resource multiplication), while Western societies would still have achieved a favourable n (need outcome), benefiting from interdependence rather than domination. This possibility was lost when African-socialism was rejected, rather than integrated, into the global economic system.

The Failure to Achieve African-Socialism and the Consequences

Africa's inability to unify its fragmented colonial States into a single national body—a prerequisite for building a cooperative

economic system extending from micro-cooperativism to large-scale macro-corporatism—proved catastrophic. Without unity, African-socialism could not materialise, and the continent became trapped within externally imposed capitalist structures.

As a result, Africa was forced into trade negotiations operating under the Western capitalist formula:
 $n = h^+ / -r$

Here:

- Western aid (h^+) came with *conditions*,
- The multiplication factor x was substituted with divisive mechanisms $/$,
- And African resources (r) continued to subtract from Africa's economic potential ($-r$).

Under this arrangement, the damage became structural. African societies were left economically poor, with low monetary purchasing power in the global capitalist market, while Western societies accumulated wealth.

The challenge facing this generation is clear: to unify the divided African States and rebuild our cooperative economy by converting $-r$ back into $+r$. Kwame Nkrumah (1909–1972) captured this with prophetic clarity:

“It is clear that we must find an African solution to our problems, and this can only be found in African unity. Divided, we are weak; united, Africa could become one of the greatest forces for good in the world.”

To solve the problem, we must first understand its true origin.

The Birth of the Conflict: The Independence Movement

The conflict between Western colonial actors and African leaders began when African intelligentsias—many from the diaspora—started advocating for African independence. A major catalyst for this movement was the Western media’s persistent portrayal of Africans as “lower-class,” both racially and intellectually. These insults struck a deep and sensitive nerve, particularly given Africa’s proximity to the era of slavery, abolished barely decades earlier by the same colonial powers.

African thinkers viewed these demeaning narratives as intolerable affronts to dignity—insults that demanded rectification. Western governments, however, saw the push for independence as premature. They urged African leaders to delay the independence movement, insisting that their civilising and developmental project was incomplete. But African leaders were

unpersuaded. Their dignity as a people, and the memory of historical injustices, compelled them to press forward.

Through further research and political awakening, African intellectuals came to understand the deeper cause behind the derogatory Western narratives: the economic contradictions embedded in Africa's colonial experience.

While Africans expected the $n = h^+ x + r$ formula—industrial help plus resource benefit—Western economic actors were operating through $n = h^+ x - r$, extracting resources rather than multiplying them. This revealed exploitation, and with it, the independence struggle became inevitable.

A Paradoxical Appreciation:

In a paradox of history, the Western media institutions of the colonial era—though derogatory and unrestrained—played a pivotal role in awakening African consciousness. Their inflammatory depictions stirred African anger, pride, and political resolve. In doing so, they exercised the populist force inherent in their platform, projecting public opinion in ways that unexpectedly catalysed African liberation movements.

Thus, ironically, Africans may owe them a peculiar form of appreciation: their prejudiced commentary inadvertently accelerated Africa's fight for social and economic self-determination.

The Structural Bindings of Post-Colonial Economic Control

The structural policies designed by Western colonial actors to intertwine the Western economy with the African economy—policies that laid the industrial foundations across vast regions of Africa—were sharply criticised by African intelligentsias.

They denounced these arrangements as mechanisms of extraction, systems that industrialised Africa only insofar as it benefited the colonial project. This critique ultimately catalysed the push for independence across the continent and throughout the diaspora.

Yet the underlying question remains: Why did the African economy remain trapped within the Western-dominated values-conflict formula, $n = h^+ / -r$, even after independence? The answer lies in a political struggle internal to Africa itself. African leaders were divided between two visions for post-colonial governance:

- The Casablanca Group, which advocated for a *unitary* form of all African States—a single national body capable of controlling its economic destiny.
- The Monrovia and Brazzaville Group, which preferred cooperation among *divided* African States through loose intergovernmental arrangements.

History records that the latter prevailed. And this decision shaped the continent's economic fate.

Had the Casablanca vision triumphed, Africa would likely have solidified a unified economic front capable of maintaining $n = h^+ \times +r$, the formula of mutual benefit and shared prosperity. A united African State would have safeguarded its resource sovereignty, commanded its industrial destiny, and sustained symmetrical interdependence with Western economies post-independence.

Instead, the victory of the Monrovia–Brazzaville bloc ensured that Africa emerged into independence as diversified, fragmented States, each negotiating separately with a coordinated Western economic bloc. Under these unequal conditions, political relations became strained, economic relations became skewed, and cultural relations became disoriented.

Fragmented Negotiations and Predictable Losses:

After independence, Africa's attempts to negotiate favourable interdependence with Western States faltered repeatedly. The reasons were structural. Negotiations occurred on *the* same matters, with:

- Collaborating Western actors, unified in strategy,
- Facing divided African actors, fragmented in position.

The outcome became predictable: they won most of the time, and we lost most of the time.

The absence of a unitary African economic front meant that every African State negotiated from a position of weakness. Even when African leaders sought the same goals, their divided platforms nullified their collective leverage. This allowed the Western-favoured formula $n = h^+ / -r$ to continue governing post-independence relations.

Casablanca versus Monrovia–Brazzaville: A Critical Divergence

The Casablanca Group envisioned something bold—something historically transformative. Their ambition was nothing less than the reconstitution of Africa as one sovereign economic civilisation, able to protect its resources, mobilise its collective labour, and engage the world on equal footing. Their proposal reflected wisdom, foresight, and a profound understanding of structural power.

By contrast, the Monrovia and Brazzaville advocates chose a path dependent on political party-based governance, capitalist economic frameworks, and bureaucratic State structures—none of which originated from African civilisation or compatible with African indigenous social-order. Their position relied heavily on the borrowed scaffolding of Western systems, presuming that

independence could be sustained by maintaining the very structures colonialism had erected. This was not merely misguided; it was reckless and audacious.

The Western claim that colonialism was “cut short” before fulfilling its intended process should itself have been a warning. It revealed that the political and economic instruments African States adopted at independence were incomplete, externally designed, and incompatible with indigenous African values.

Thus, the lesson is clear: Post-independence Africa should never have attempted to go it alone under fragmented inter-governmental cooperation. And we should have abandoned Western bureaucratic structures immediately after independence, recognising them as unsuitable for African social-order and economic-order.

When examined closely, colonialism operated by extracting African natural resources to fuel Western industrial expansion—feeding manufacturing systems that required new global markets for Western-made goods. Some of these goods circulated not only for Western consumption but also for African consumption, binding both societies into a single economic loop.

Yet in the post-Independence era, the industrial structures inherited by African States remained structurally disenfranchised from the global market economy. Our natural

resources continue to flow outward to Western States, while the financial returns dissipate through mismanagement embedded in bureaucratic procedures where the exercise of power remains *personalised*—in direct contrast to the *impersonal* administrative ethos that defines classical bureaucracy.

This distorted, “im-personal” mode of governance—neither truly personal nor genuinely impersonal—is the very veil of bureaucracy under which African nation-states now struggle. Economically, we remain misplaced within the capitalist system; politically, we remain fragmented as diversified nation-states adopting a foreign governmental logic; and culturally, we are structurally reshaped under the weight of this bureaucratic veil that mutates our social coherence.

Thus, it is insufficient—and indeed historically biased—to claim that colonialism sought merely to destroy African traditional life or dismantle our collectivist cooperative systems. Rather, colonialism was designed to displace and overwrite them: to implant Western systematic culture such that Africans would gradually absorb Western institutional habits, enabling long-term integration between Western and African societies.

This integration was not intended as dependency, but as a form of economic interdependence—a shared progression toward mutual self-preservation through the exchange of inventions, systems, and industries. The evidence is visible

everywhere today: our vernaculars are Afro-Western hybrids, our dress codes Afro-Western, our family structures and social values reformatted into hybrid expressions. We have adopted Western models as our default blueprint for progress.

The deeper interest of colonialism was, therefore, the division and coordinated utilisation of African resources among Western powers, creating a shared economic ecosystem in which Africans and Westerners would remain interdependent. Achieving this would have required Western corporations and manufacturing industries to transplant themselves into Africa—establishing permanent economic roots on the continent as co-inhabitants of its industrial future.

But at Independence, as African States emerged in fragmented political arrangements, the systemic continuity required for such interdependence collapsed. Western State actors ensured that no African polity could fully extend the economic logic of colonialism to its own advantage—neither politically nor structurally.

With Western industrial enterprises withdrawn from Africa's internal systems, the very Western structural model Africans attempted to adopt became deprived of its nourishing source. What remained was an institutional skeleton—an inherited system without its sustaining economic engine.

The Colonial Bureaucratic Displacement of African Economic-Order

During the colonial era, Western powers appropriated vast territories in Africa for their own commercial and personal use. They established manufacturing centres, mining complexes, and commercial plantations, and settled permanently on African soil.

These industries employed Africans, but under an ethic rooted in capitalist work-discipline—an ethic which, when contrasted with the African indigenous cooperative work-ethics, reveals its core dependence on cheap labour, harsh taxation, low wages, unsafe working environments, and the systematic extraction of labour-power for far less than the true value of what workers produced.

The Western structural system was entirely new to African societies, yet African leaders encouraged their people to embrace Western bureaucratic norms and the culture of individualism as markers of modernity and progress. Around these industries, Africans built new towns and cities; they migrated from their villages and gradually wove Western cultural norms into their traditional social lives, creating hybridised identities shaped by industrial urbanism.

In this transition, the traditional collectivist socio-economic structure—rooted in cooperative interdependence—was steadily displaced. What had sustained ethno-governed communities for generations was now deemed outdated, irrelevant, or a relic of a distant past. The collectivist architecture of African society became dismantled.

Men were separated from their families as they moved into industrial centres, dedicating their lives to earning money to purchase Western-made goods and aesthetic items for their families back home. Women, in turn, were removed from the communal labour ethics of village life; farming shifted into industrial operations, reorganising gender roles and economic participation across the continent.

Capitalism, in its very logic, thrives on surplus-value: it requires the production of goods beyond subsistence in order to sell them cheaply while maximising profit. This demands an accelerated pace of labour, mass production, and an abundant supply of workers. African men filled these roles in vast numbers.

Women, encouraged to abandon the village economy, became economically dependent housewives in urban settings and emerged as principal consumers of capitalist commodities and services, while their husbands exhausted themselves to maintain the monetary flow. As villages declined and the

working-age population relocated, capitalist expansion across Africa accelerated—and when labour shortages emerged, migrants from parts of Asia were invited to fill specific industrial roles in Africa.

Thus the socio-economic ambitions of Western colonialism displaced Africa's collectivist foundations. Competition became the governing logic. Western industries concentrated on large-scale mining and agricultural production—cotton, cocoa, coffee, tea, and other cash crops—primarily for export to sustain Western economies.

But in the post-Independence era, lacking the machinery, technological subsidies, and power sources required to sustain these large-scale industrial systems, African industries faltered. The organisational logic that had animated colonial industrial settings could not be reproduced under fragmented national administrations. The collapse of machinery and the inability to maintain capitalist productivity standards led to agricultural disruptions and, in many regions, famine.

Had Africa emerged from Independence as a unitary continental structure, rather than a collection of disparate nation-states cooperating loosely at intergovernmental levels, the industrial trend inherited from the colonial era could have continued in a form beneficial to Africans.

Production would have met both the basic needs of African populations and the aesthetic aspirations embodied in new manufactured goods, while cash-crop production could have sustained equitable trade with Western partners in exchange for machinery and technological support. Under such a unified structure, no African State would have descended into the poverty witnessed after Independence, nor would any have resorted to reliance on imported second-hand goods from the West.

For in truth, second-hand goods—cars, clothing, appliances, electronics—are meant for recycling into new materials, not for reuse by entire populations. Their circulation across Africa today is the clearest material expression of a manufactured poverty imposed through structural fragmentation, the erosion of collectivist economies, and the breakdown of industrial continuity after Independence.

The ambition of colonialism was straightforward and precise: to secure direct access to African natural resources and labour power to feed their own industrial machinery, ensuring the economic self-sufficiency of Western States, while simultaneously aiding Africans in adopting a Western-style structural system across their social and economic institutions.

Cash-crops, uranium, petroleum, and other minerals were only the most visible targets of this agenda; the broader objective

was to subsume African societies into a system where Western bureaucratic control and capitalist principles dictated economic and social behaviour.

African collectivist culture, rooted in cooperative work-ethics and shared responsibility, found itself in direct conflict with Western capitalism—a system driven by individualistic self-interest, profit maximisation, and greed. Western actors monopolised the production and trade of cash-crops, while Africans were prohibited from cultivating or trading these goods commercially within their own lands or on the global stage. Inevitably, resentment and a sense of injustice grew among African communities.

Yet, this manifesto argues that Africans fundamentally misunderstood the colonial-era capitalist system, or more accurately, misread its intentions and structural logic. Western colonial powers were acutely aware that Africans were collectivist by the organised nature of their tribes and ethnicity—socially interdependent in their governance model between rulers and ruled, and economically cooperative and non-monetary.

As this manifesto demonstrates, large-scale collectivist culture corresponds to ethnopublicanism that unifies multiple ethnic groups under one nationalism structure, while large-scale cooperative economic custom constitutes the self-sufficient subsistence economy of ethno-corporatism. The transformation

from small-scale collectivist structures to continent-wide ethnopolitan governance and corporatist economic systems is the very purpose of this multi-volume manifesto.

The Colonial Bureaucratic Displacement of African Social-Order

When some Africans attempted to engage in trade and compete with Western actors in the capitalist spirit, their efforts were immediately suppressed. It seemed inexplicable to Africans that cash-crops they cultivated by hand had to be exported raw to Western societies, processed into finished products there, and then imported back into Africa for sale—requiring Africans to purchase the goods they had originally produced, with money earned from the very labour that had been exploited.

From an African cooperative mores, this defied all principles of sense and fairness. Traditional African economies thrive on collective ownership, cooperative labour, and self-reliance—from cultivation to production to consumption. It was natural, therefore, for African expectations to align with the formula $n = h^+ \times +r$, whereas Western economic activity imposed $n = h^+ \times -r$, systematically denying Africans the fruits of their own labour.

The collectivist cooperative structures that governed smaller-scale African economies are, in essence, microcosms of large-

scale corporatism. Within the moral and normative frameworks that guide African cooperative economies, it is inconceivable—and ethically absurd—to pay for what one has cultivated through one’s own hands and labour. Such a system is incompatible with African cosmology and cultural praxis. In the African pantheistic worldview, crops, resources, and sustenance are gifts from the gods, earned through the virtues of ancestors and maintained through ritual reverence to Nature. To monetise these basic necessities—essentially to sell back what was divinely provided and nurtured—conflicted profoundly with the ethical and spiritual fabric of African life.

Western colonial actors soon discovered a profound conflict between their ambitions and the African sense of self-subsistence and self-reliance, grounded in reverence for gods and Nature. Africans clearly perceived that the industrialisation of cash-crop economies was intended to serve Western industrial needs, to feed the factories, markets, and people of Europe, rather than to modernise Africa for the benefit of Africans themselves. To African societies, this was exploitation in its purest form—a systematic extraction of resources and labour with little to no regard for the prosperity of the local population.

African expectations were fundamentally different. They envisaged the colonial powers industrialising Africa without taxation, without labour exploitation, and without restrictions on

trade. In essence, Africans sought to merge the capitalist system with their indigenous cooperative economy, just as they had already successfully integrated Western cultural and aesthetic forms into their traditional social lives.

The veil of bureaucracy, imposed and reinforced by the colonial system, began to show cracks under the commissioning-rule of African indigenous culture. Africans found themselves caught in a duality: yearning for the restoration of their traditional collectivist values and cooperative work-ethics on one hand, while desiring the organised, large-scale industrial production of capitalism on the other.

From the African perspective, industrialising the cash-crops economy for the benefit of Western States could have been resolved through complete localisation of the manufacturing process, supporting African-owned industries while exporting finished products to Western markets.

Africans sought to address the lack of industrialisation by creating a larger, self-sustaining market economy, where surplus labour could translate into wealth retained within Africa. They also sought to expand agricultural techniques using Western machinery, reducing manual labour and alleviating exploitation. Yet conflicts arose from what colonial powers perceived as either unrealistically high expectations of Africans or simply as part of the ongoing process of colonial integration.

Bureaucracy and Commicracy:
The Inevitable Conflict

Upon arriving in Africa, colonial powers outlined three primary objectives:

1. Economic expansion of the capitalist industrial revolution across Africa;
2. Organised political structures through bureaucracy and State governance;
3. Social advancement via large-scale development programs.

These objectives crystallised the African expectation formula: $n = h^+ \times +r$. But the lived reality diverged sharply. Economic expansion favoured the cash-crops economy above all else. Political structures were dominated by African officials and civil servants serving the interests of the colonial population rather than the indigenous communities, many of whom had abandoned their villages for overpopulated cities.

Social advances disrupted traditional family dynamics, eroding values and practices that had sustained African society for generations. Africans found themselves pursuing money to meet basic needs, rather than experiencing the promised surplus of wealth and opportunity.

This outcome validated the African critique of colonial economic practices, reducing their expectations to the formula: $n = h^+ \times -r$ —a systematic deprivation under the guise of industrial modernisation.

At the call of Africans for Independence, the colonial actors raised their familiar argument: that Africa could not have advanced as it had without colonialism. They pointed to improved infrastructure—roads, railroads, telecommunication systems, electricity, water, and government buildings—as evidence of progress.

They highlighted the provision of housing in urban areas, the introduction of Western-style formal education in western curriculums, the construction of schools and general hospitals, the provision of medicine, and the work of Christian religious missions promoting literacy, healthcare, and church-building.

They also emphasised the formation of republican State boundaries as a marker of order and civilisation. Colonial powers submitted, in principle, to meeting African desires for further development, framing colonialism as an ongoing process—one they argued had not yet reached its full course.

But Africans saw a very different reality. They believed colonialism had been short-handed, that the promises of political,

economic, and social transformation had been deliberately inhibited. Development in Africa lagged far behind Western standards, despite the continent's abundant natural resources and extraordinary human labour potential. Africans believed that, as independent sovereign States, they could finally engage in inter-governmental cooperation with Western powers on more equal and mutually beneficial terms.

The colonial powers, however, were unwilling to relinquish control. They regarded colonialism as an ongoing and successful enterprise—beneficial both to Western societies and to Africans, at least in their view. Yet the African perspective told another story: the negatives far outweighed any positives.

In the end, the Western-imposed veil of bureaucracy—its hierarchical structures, capitalist economic system, and governmental social-control mechanisms—lost the race in its mission to entrench itself across Africa. Colonial Africa bore witness not to a flourishing of bureaucracy, capitalism, or formal political control, but rather to the resilience of African collectivist structures, the enduring spirit of self-determination, and the eventual assertion of Independence across the continent.

Alas! Here we stand in the 21st century, and what do we see? Africans bewildered and divided, unsure of how to navigate the remnants of failed political and capitalist structures,

permeated with bureaucratic procedures inherited from the post-Independence generation.

The colonial-socialist imprint conditioned us to curtail our indigenous economic upward mobility, replacing our collectivist economic customs with Western individualist economic practices. From this collision arose an internal struggle: the desperate effort to revive our African cooperative customs and transform them into a corporatist economic system suited for self-determination in the post-Independence era.

Yet bureaucracy stands as the gatekeeper of capitalist individualism—its creed of private ownership, competition, and self-interest exalted as progress—while African economic corporatism, rooted in collective involvement and joint control of the economy in interdependence between the government and its citizens, is relegated to the margins.

Our indigenous path of social upward mobility became disrupted and discombobulated. Language in government offices and media mutated into vernacular accents alien to the one imposed by colonial powers. The capitalist method of data collection and tax extraction clashed violently with the African sense of moral responsibility. Governance took on monarchical and dictatorial forms disguised as bureaucracy. Our indigenous pantheistic worship of Nature in the recognition of many gods became a hybrid of an imported personal-God devotion layered

upon our impersonal-gods framework, producing a contradictory religious practice where African happy-clappy singing and dancing exists in tension with the Western Christian traditions.

I say this boldly: the veil of bureaucracy has robbed Africans of the knowledge of who we truly are. The moral and normative foundations of bureaucracy are Western constructs, alien to African culture. While the adoption of foreign systems to enhance our own practices can be progressive, the colonial powers failed to fully displace our indigenous systems. This failure, paradoxically, created a persistent post-Independence dilemma.

Before colonial intervention, Africans thrived under collectivist structural systems, content with shared responsibility, cooperative economic management, and communal values. Today, we live in a hybrid Afro-Westernised world, a fractured reflection of our true selves. We see it in our vernacular languages, in family dynamics where men are excluded from child-rearing and forced into economic labour while women enjoy new “options”; in our governmental and private institutions, where personal, dictatorial power replaces the impersonal hierarchy of classical bureaucracy.

All of this has fostered discombobulation and fragmentation in our collective sense of self. Across Africa, we experience these distortions in every facet of life: socially, politically,

economically, and culturally. We are left divided, hybridised, and alienated, and yet, the true African spirit, rooted in cooperative customs, patiently endures, waiting for rediscovery, reclamation, and revival.

The moral and normative culture we practise across African bureaucracy has lost all sense of accountability, all notion of structural clarity. Rules and regulations, which ought to guide and restrain, are ignored or bent at the whim of the individual power-holder. Authority is no longer a principle to be respected; it is a tool for personal indulgence. That is why African businesses struggle to compete in the global market, why governments fester with corruption, and why every new entrant into public office soon succumbs to the same cycles of self-interest and abuse.

This is not merely a flaw—it is a fundamental mismatch. Our bureaucratic systems, designed for authoritarian compliance, clash violently with our inherited collectivist culture. Africans are not temperamentally suited to this rigid hierarchy. As a result, bureaucracy in Africa has degenerated into autocracy, leaving our continent mired in poverty and disenfranchisement.

To paraphrase the words of Martin Luther King, Jr.: *“As long as there is poverty in Africa in any form, Africans anywhere in the world can never be rich. As long as preventable diseases ravage our people and life-spans are cut short, we can never*

claim full health—even if some Africans enjoy the best doctors abroad. You cannot be what you ought to be until your people are what they ought to be. Our African moral world and normative culture is interdependent. No individual African can stand truly independent; we need each other.”

And so, the 21st century African generation stands at a critical crossroads. We have inherited from our ancestors abundant natural resources and powerful biological potential, the very black-power genes capable of achieving greatness in any pursuit.

The baton has fallen upon our hands. It is our responsibility to lay the foundation for the next generation, to secure an Africa that is not merely surviving but thriving—a continent rich in resources, in knowledge, and in the joy of life. We must refuse to perpetuate poverty, poor governance, and division.

As Barack Obama reminds us: *“Change will not come if we wait for some other person or some other time. We are the ones we’ve been waiting for. We are the change that we seek.”* And so I say: let us tear away the veil of bureaucracy once and for all! Let us replace it with commicracy, a system that restores our African-socialist heritage of cooperative governance and aligns with the 21st century global web-internetisation, where interdependence, equality, and innovation thrive.

I dare proclaim: bureaucracy belongs to the past, uncertainty defines our present, and commicracy is the future of a united Africa.

CHAPTER TWO

COMMICRATIC REVOLUTION OF ETHNOPUBLICANISM

The 21st century African stands at a remarkable intersection in human history—an age where social interaction and economic exchange now thrive upon the invisible architecture of web-internetisation, where entire worlds of business, governance, community, and creativity unfold from screens and signals rather than soil and stone. Yet within this new global arena, we Africans face a profound duality of truth:

First, we recognise—rightly—that Africa is unimaginably rich, endowed with abundant natural resources and a vast reservoir of human labour power unmatched anywhere on Earth. Second, we recognise—painfully—that Africans themselves are not rich, that the indigenous children of this resource-overflowing continent live in economic material scarcity, stripped of the conveniences, aesthetics, and accessible opportunities enjoyed elsewhere across the globe.

This contradiction forms a psychological storm inside the African spirit. On one side, the first recognition inflates our pride. It makes us feel, even if only for a moment, that we ought

to walk the world without the humiliation of visas, welcome everywhere with applause and red carpets, honoured for the nobility of being African.

On the other side, the second recognition humiliates us. It forces us to confront how deeply life has disadvantaged us, how often we have been pushed into misery, or compelled to carry ourselves with hat-in-hand begging for charity. How tragic—how profoundly destabilising—to wage such internal warfare over our own self-concept in the 21st century!

These two opposing recognitions tear at the African psyche. They make us feel like fashionable paupers—descendants of a wealthy land, possessing strong bodies and admirable genetic attributes, yet denied the economic advancement that should naturally flow from such gifts. Even with academic brilliance, craftsmanship, vocational talent, cultural flair, and world-class potential, the global gaze insists that the indigenous African is poor—and somehow, that poverty defines us.

And why? Because Africans, like all humans, often define their worth by comparing their access to material goods and aesthetics with others. Humans everywhere fall into the deceptive habit of comparison. We measure bravery by past conquests. We measure wealth by assets and bank accounts. We measure beauty by imitating someone else's image. We feel a false sense of validation only when we believe we possess what

others possess. Thus Africans, too, measure their sense of wealth through a comparative lens of material attainment—one that the current global order does not grant us equally.

This is a delusional trap of perception, a psychological reflex fuelled by instincts seeking approval, conformity, and social acceptance. It is human nature—universal, deeply ingrained, brutally influential. And yet, despite these distortions, one fact remains constant across all nationalities: Humanity agrees on what wealth looks like, and the wealthiest nations are those with the greatest control of material resources and the highest productive economic output in monetary terms.

The Resource Paradox:
Moving Beyond the Psychology of Poverty

In October of 2012, Mariko Sanchanta of the WSJ Digital Network announced to the world that Asia had become the wealthiest region on Earth—its household wealth surpassing all others, its surge of millionaires in China outstripping every other region. The World Atlas later confirmed that Europe is the richest continent in terms of development, with a landscape dominated by fully developed States. And in March 2017, James Pethokoukis of AEIdeas reminded us that America stands as the single richest nation, wielding a purchasing power unmatched by any other country on Earth.

Against this global backdrop of judgment—where wealth is quantified by what a nation can buy, build, or boast—Africa stands stripped of economic recognition. Our industrial corporations cannot assert meaningful monetary power on the global market. Our states cannot claim developed-world infrastructure. Our purchasing power is ranked among the lowest in the world economy.

And yet, with all this, Africa remains one of the richest continents in the world in natural and mineral resources. So the question becomes unavoidable: What must Africans finally do right? And what deep strengths must we nurture, harness, and perfect?

First, we must confront a psychological reality: The world's perceptual judgement has established a simple formula—Africa is rich in resources, but Africans are poor in access to material goods. This is not merely an economic truth; it is a cognitive one. A global psychological adaptation has occurred that views the continent as resource-abundant but people-poor.

But let us be clear: Africa does not need to match Asia's tally of millionaires to be considered wealthy. Africa does not need to chase America's purchasing power to be respected. The African economy does not need to mirror the competitive monetary model to lift its people into dignity. What Africa needs is not ideological imitation, donor prescriptions, aggressive push

for tax extraction on its people, or perpetual administrative reform.

What Africa needs is material intelligence—the kind that transforms potential into power. In its most distilled form, Africa’s requirement is far simpler—and far more strategic—than the labyrinth of policies imposed upon it: European-level infrastructure and Chinese-level industrial manufacturing capacity. If Africa secures these two pillars, it will not merely improve its global standing; it will redefine the terms on which the world relates to it.

This necessity is best understood through the analogy of Africa as a grand mansion—majestic in structure, rich in land, expansive in space, yet dimly lit within and chaotically arranged. The mansion is admired from the outside for its size and natural beauty, but inside, movement is slow, coordination is difficult, and productivity is fractured. No matter how rich the household, a mansion without electricity and internal passageways remains functionally underdeveloped.

In development terms, electricity is the bloodstream of modern civilisation, and transportation is its nervous system. Without power, nothing moves; without movement, nothing integrates. Africa’s underdevelopment is therefore not a mystery of talent, culture, or intelligence—it is the predictable outcome of energy scarcity and infrastructural fragmentation.

Electricity as Civilisational Power:

Uninterrupted, continental-scale electricity—specifically through a unified nuclear grid—is the first non-negotiable foundation of African development. Electricity is not merely about lighting homes; it is about powering factories, cooling medicines, digitising governance, mechanising agriculture, enabling research, host more data centres to power web-infrastructures, and sustaining industrial production without interruption. Every developed civilisation is, at its core, an energy civilisation.

Africa cannot industrialise on solar fragments, diesel dependency, or externally rationed grids. It requires sovereign, base-load energy capable of powering the continent continuously, reliably, and independently. A continental nuclear grid does not simply generate electricity—it generates time, efficiency, and economic predictability. It allows factories to operate 24 hours round the clock uninterrupted, logistics to run seamlessly, and innovation ecosystems to emerge organically.

Once electricity flows uninterrupted across the continent, African labour instantly becomes more productive, African resources become more valuable in-house, and African manufacturing becomes competitive on product quality by default.

Roads as Economic Integration:

If electricity powers Africa's mansion, then borderless, state-of-the-art road and rail networks organise it internally. Roads are not just physical infrastructure; they are economic connectors. They collapse distance, dissolve artificial borders, and convert isolated markets into unified production zones.

Africa's greatest economic weakness is not lack of resources—it is internal disconnection. A mineral extracted in one country cannot easily feed a factory in another. A farmer in one region cannot efficiently supply an urban market in another. Colonial borders function as bureaucratic chokepoints rather than logistical gateways.

A continent-wide road and rail network—high-speed, electric, and borderless—would transform Africa into a single, integrated industrial space. Goods would move freely. Labour would circulate efficiently. Specialised production zones would emerge naturally. Internal trade would eclipse external dependency.

This is precisely how Europe stabilised itself and how China accelerated its rise: infrastructure first, governance second.

Why Unification Is the Multiplier:

No single African State can achieve these two pillars alone. But a unified African ethno-corporatist body can achieve both

simultaneously. Government unification eliminates redundant borders, fragmented energy policies, and competing infrastructure standards. It allows for continent-scale planning, pooled capital, and coordinated industrial strategy.

Unity transforms electricity from a national asset into a continental utility. It transforms roads from local projects into economic arteries. And most importantly, it transforms Africans from isolated populations into a single productive civilisation.

Once electricity and transportation are secured, everything else follows naturally. Manufacturing scales. Education modernises. Healthcare stabilises. Technology localises. The resourcefulness of African people—long suppressed by infrastructural absence—fills in the rest with ease. Africa does not need to be told what development should look like. It needs the conditions under which its people can define development for themselves.

The case, therefore, is not speculative—it is structural. No civilisation has ever developed without energy and internal connectivity. Africa's delay is not moral, cultural, or intellectual; it is infrastructural. Fix the infrastructure, and the civilisation activates itself.

Uninterrupted continental nuclear electricity and borderless road networks are not just development projects—they are the

ignition keys to Africa's future. With them, Africa's mansion lights up, its rooms interconnect, and its inhabitants finally move freely within their own home. Everything else—wealth, dignity, power, and global respect—will follow.

This is the foundational logic of the African ethno-corporatist economy—a non-monetary, self-sufficient subsistence model built on interconnected resource platforms. It functions through three primary modules:

1. Material Identification: What resources, goods, or services are needed?
2. Material Production: What skills, personnel, and capacities are required to produce them?
3. Material Valuation: How do these outputs align with the global price index, not in money, but in comparative productive value?

These modules serve not individuals alone, but the collective judgment of a continent. To achieve this, several key elements must be incorporated into ethno-corporatist economic planning:

- Age and health metrics of the population.
- Workmanship skills across all working-age groups.
- Multi-role employment capacities.

- Periodic shortage assessment of post-working-age labour.
- Forecasting and training for the pre-working-age generation.

These are the essential variables of a non-monetary resource economy—its heartbeat, its logic, its stabilising force.

But human societies are dynamic. People acquire new skills, lose others, heal, age, adapt, and change. Thus, the system must continually retrain and redeploy its labour power, ensuring that every individual retains multiple productive capacities. Even the post-working-age population may be recalled in times of specific need or emergency—affirming their ongoing value through commissioned roles that uplift collective morale and reinforce social identity.

This is the essence of the commicratic revolution in an African context: A system that maintains perpetual equilibrium between productive fitness and self-sufficient subsistence within a non-monetary economy. A system where every person matters. A system where the wealth of the continent finally becomes the wealth of its people.

To understand Africa's challenge, the analogy of a grand mansion is revisited: its façade glistening in the sunlight, impressive to the passerby, yet its interiors lie dark, disordered,

and unconnected—furniture misplaced, passageways rough, rooms inaccessible. This is Africa today: immense natural wealth, boundless potential, but internal dysfunction and infrastructural gaps obscuring its greatness.

Now imagine that mansion powered by a state-of-the-art nuclear reactor, illuminating every room, energising every corner, while its interiors are thoughtfully arranged—fast roads, electric railways, bridges, and communication networks seamlessly connecting all spaces. Suddenly, the mansion transforms from a mere spectacle into a fully functional, thriving home. Africa, too, requires such structural empowerment.

Electricity must flow uninterrupted across borders, fuelling homes, factories, and cities. Transport networks—roads, rail, and ports—must bind regions together in a continental web of mobility. Telecommunications, digital infrastructure, and energy must operate at world-class standards. Only then can the resourcefulness, ingenuity, and entrepreneurial spirit of African people fully flourish, filling in the gaps, defining development on Africa's own terms, and converting latent wealth into tangible progress.

The lesson is clear: development is not just about wealth extraction or natural resources; it is about creating the internal architecture—the infrastructure, the connectivity, the energy, and the institutional functionality—that allows human potential to

operate at full capacity. Africa's future does not lie in external validation or borrowed models; it lies in empowering its people with the tools, networks, and power systems that transform latent abundance into lived prosperity.

In this vision, Africa's transformation is not a distant dream—it is a design challenge, a blueprint waiting to be executed. With electricity, transportation, and connectivity as the skeleton, the flesh of development—the creativity, labour, and innovation of its people—will naturally follow. Wealth will no longer be a measure of what is extracted from the ground, but of what Africans can produce, share, and sustain, continent-wide, under their own governance and vision of development.

Therefore, the commicratic revolution of ethnopublicanism therefore takes its stand upon this new architecture of economic planning—an architecture built on *exactitude*, *competence*, and *multi-skilled human capacity*. Under commicracy, every individual is shaped into a multi-potential economic force, armed with several workmanship skills, capable of performing multiple professional roles, and confident in the mastery of each. No longer do they walk as mere employees; they walk as co-governors of the economic establishments in which they serve.

For the first time in African governance imagination, the worker is not merely a tool of production but a chief decision-maker in the administration of their own labour. This is the life-

energy of commicracy: a system where the worker shapes their own methods, governs their own workplace procedures, and exercises authority in the very institution that employs them.

This alone is revolutionary. In commicratic society, individuals may cycle through multiple jobs—not out of economic desperation, but out of economic liberty. The incentives of commicracy restore to the worker the ideal work/life balance: time for personal goals, time for family life, time for creativity, time for hobbies, and time for self-development. A human being finally becomes whole—not enslaved to labour, but partnered with it.

At the heart of this revolution is a radical organisational model: a horizontal governance structure where every employee holds equal managerial authority. No superior. No subordinate. No pyramid of command. Instead, a consensual, ordered level of management, where every member is answerable to every other member, guided not by hierarchy but by commissioning-rules that reflect collective intelligence, collective purpose, and collective dignity.

This is the organisational soul of commicracy, enshrined in the proposed *Corporatist Organisation Memorandum of Service (COMOS)*—a foundational legal document for all service establishments in the Ethnopolitan State.

COMOS:

The Constitutional Charter of African Corporatism

COMOS regulates every external affair of an organisation. It defines the parameters, purpose, and public service orientation of a company. Its “object clause” informs all stakeholders—service-users, employees, possessors, suppliers, and partner institutions—of the permitted range of the organisation’s operation. In essence, no company may operate outside the boundaries set by its COMOS. It becomes the charter of service, the constitutional document of every corporatist establishment.

There is, however, a specific distinction within commicratic organisation—but not one of superiority. The Possessor is simply the initiator—the person who sets up the business, introduces a service concept, or enters the national service-trade with a new value or product. The Workers—including supervisors, technicians, artisans, innovators—are the ones who transform the conceptual idea into a living reality.

Both are equal in authority. Neither rules over the other. Both participate in governance. Both are bound by COMOS. Yet, if the company collapses into administration, the legal responsibility returns to the Possessor, for it was they who inaugurated the service-enterprise. This is not superiority—it is accountability.

COMOS in the Ethnopolitan State:

Within an Ethnopolitan Africa, COMOS becomes indispensable. It is a mandatory document required at the birth of every service establishment. To incorporate a company, the founders must file application for a Memorandum of Service—the COMOS—at the Secretariat-Ministry of Labour & Industry, specifically with the Registrar of Service.

This document, signed by the Possessor(s), is a legal statement affirming the formation of a corporatist service company under the principles of commicracy. It is the final seal that transforms an idea into a recognised organisational entity within the Ethnopolitan State.

In the post-protégé reconstruction of administrative and economic life, an additional foundational document—termed the Articles of Service—must also be issued. This document functions as the constitutional charter of each service company, setting out the commissioning-rules, operational principles, and structural expectations that govern the organisation. It defines, with precision, the primary duties of every employee division and outlines the parameters within which each role is authorised to function.

Within every company, the Articles of Service expressly recognise the equal managerial authority of all departments

belonging to the employee-division, while also delineating the ordinary responsibilities assigned to the supervisory-division. These Articles establish the boundaries of each job role, ensuring that every worker possesses a defined sphere of autonomy. This autonomy includes the right to decide their own working methods and to craft a work-life balance aligned with personal purpose, individual desire, and the overarching mission of the company.

This structural recognition of equal managerial authority within the employee-division is justified by the educational foundation of commicracy itself, which does not train individuals to be governed, instructed, or perpetually corrected, but to be independent operators of defined functions.

Unlike bureaucratic education—where learning is fragmented, authority-dependent, and designed to habituate the learner to external control—commicratic education is task-centric, mastery-oriented, and autonomy-preserving. It equips individuals to internalise their role, understand its operational boundaries, and execute its functions without the psychological need for managerial command. In this sense, every worker enters service not as a subordinate employee, but as a freelance specialist commissioned for a function, whose competence renders continuous supervision unnecessary.

The supervisory-division therefore exists not to control labour, but to safeguard coherence, legality, and interdepartmental alignment. This is why commicracy dissolves the employer–employee hierarchy and replaces it with a contractor–freelancer relation: authority arises from competence and scope, not from rank. Education, in this system, does not produce obedience; it produces self-governing professionals capable of aligning personal purpose with collective mission without coercion.

The central purpose of the Comos system is therefore to equalise the scope of powers and activities across all members of a service company. Each member is authorised to act only within the powers provided to their designated role and division by the Comos. Any act committed outside those authorised powers—whether by an employee or by a supervisor—is deemed *ultra-vires* and unlawful.

To maintain this framework, the supervisory Personnel-division of each company must prepare and submit an *Annual Statement of Service (ASS)* report for every employee to the Secretariat-Ministry of Labour & Industry. This regulatory body is responsible for issuing both rewards and penalties on the basis of these reports.

The ASS framework illustrates a defining transformation: it ensures that supervisors possess no inherent superiority of

authority over employees beyond what is granted by the Articles of Service themselves. Instead, all workers—supervisory and non-supervisory—remain directly bound to the commissioning-rules enforced by the government at all times.



The ASS-report is revolutionary precisely because it places the internal affairs of each company under the direct regulatory jurisdiction of the Secretariat-Ministry of Labour & Industry. Operating alongside the Articles of Service, it serves as an internal constitution of service, setting out the fundamental

conditions under which each member of a company is legally empowered to act.

Central to the ASS-report is an explicit object clause, which defines the permissible range of actions, duties, and decision-making authority associated with every job role. Through this, both employees and supervisors gain a clear understanding of the lawful parameters of their positions, ensuring that all service activity remains aligned with the company's constitutional mandate and the wider civic order.

The Philosophical Basis of Power-Reciprocity in Commicracy

The commicratic model necessarily advances a deeper philosophical principle: that interdependent-leadership and equalitarian-authority together produce what may be termed power-reciprocity—a structural condition in which authority circulates rather than accumulates.

Power-reciprocity is not an incidental feature of commicracy; it is the ethical grammar of its organisational life. It arises from the premise that when leadership is interdependent, and authority is equalitarian, the moral legitimacy of each member's decisions must be continuously open to reciprocal questioning and refinement.

In this arrangement, the right to question is not an act of defiance; it is an act of preservation. For equalitarian-authority to remain functional, it must avoid decay into either passive conformity or hierarchical drift. Power-reciprocity ensures this by establishing the philosophical expectation that each individual guards the authority of all others by being permitted to interrogate it.

When authority can be questioned across all directions—supervisor to employee, employee to supervisor, possessor to worker, and worker to possessor—the organisational field becomes a space of mutual stewardship rather than unilateral domination.

From the standpoint of collectivist doctrine, interdependent-leadership treats leadership not as a static attribute possessed by a few, but as a rotational energy distributed across a cooperative body. It embodies the principle that no individual leads alone; each leads through the presence, contributions, and scrutiny of others.

Thus leadership becomes a relational virtue, not a structural privilege. Because every member depends on the others for the preservation of the organisational whole, they are philosophically obliged to guard against any concentration of power that would fracture that interdependence.

Cooperativist theory completes this framework through equalitarian-authority, which rests on the moral premise that authority is valid only insofar as it is shared. Shared authority is not weaker authority; rather, it is authority fortified by collective ratification.

In such a system, authority derives not from positional supremacy but from the consensual trust built into the commissioning-rules of the organisation. This is why power-reciprocity becomes the safeguard of equalitarian-authority: it allows each party to recall the other back to the equal order when any deviation is detected. The right to question is, therefore, the right to equalise.

Within an commicratic society, this philosophical understanding is operationalised through the Articles of Service, whose legal and ethical mandates define the orbit within which each party may exercise their authority. Because both the possessor and the worker are bound to the same commissioning-rules issued by the labour ministry, their authority is not privately possessed but publicly regulated. No party is permitted to extend beyond their COMOS-mandate without becoming *ultra-vires*.

Thus power-reciprocity becomes not simply a company policy but an institutional culture grounded in State-defined ethical architecture.

Ultimately, power-reciprocity serves as the structural logic that eliminates the historical imbalance between supervisor and employee, or between possessor and worker. Each role is differentiated only by functional designation, not by hierarchical superiority. Authority is contextual, not absolute; reciprocal, not unilateral.

In this way, commicracy transforms organisational life into a philosophical ecosystem in which the equality of decision-making power is preserved through mutual vigilance, continuous alignment, and the collective guardianship of the organisation's moral geometry.

The Theory of Commicracy: Morality, Accountability, and Organisational Commissioning

In examining the foundations of commicracy, I analysed its moral and accountability architecture through the lens of its interpersonal procedural necessities. To articulate the governance dynamics embedded within its commissioning-rules, I adopted phrases such as interdependent-leadership, drawn from collectivist doctrine, and equalitarian-authority, derived from cooperativist theory. Together, these concepts describe the ethical and structural essence of commicratic organisation.

Within the framework of commicratic management theory, commicracy is conceived as a model of progressive

organisational development rooted in shared leadership and equalitarian-authority. Equalitarian-authority rests on the conviction that organisational life should operate through classless association and equality in reciprocal decision-making power.

Authority arises not from hierarchical position but from interpersonal devotion among members of the organisation. In commicracy, most large, complex, and interdependent institutions—along with individual service establishments—would naturally accommodate and benefit from a commicratic structural design. The central characteristics of a commicratic organisational structure can be summarised as follows:

- First, Horizontal Structure: Commicracy mandates equal-ordered levels of management, where each unit or department is sufficiently resourced to function interdependently with other establishments, whether internally or across external partner establishment. Members within each department operate on a completely level footing—there are no inherent superior or subordinate roles. Every individual stands at par with others within the organisational system.
- Second, Equality of Legal Authority: The organisation is governed by a unified set of ethical codes, commissioning-rules, and procedural duties. These form

the constitutional basis of the shared authority exercised by members in the self-governance of their workflows. Decision-making power is held collectively, ensuring equality in reciprocal authority across the organisational body.

- Third, Efficiency: The horizontal form enhances organisational efficiency through interdependent departmental divisions capable of self-regulation. Cooperation is maximised and focused directly on the execution of productive work with accuracy and speed. Unlike bureaucratic systems—where paperwork, excessive planning, and prolonged meetings often overshadow actual output—commicratic management prioritises simplicity, experimentation, and rapid delivery. Commicracy embodies the principle of achieving more with less time, eliminating structural drag and enabling adaptability.
- Fourth, Strength: Strength emerges from the clear distribution of responsibility and accountability within and across departments. Interdepartmental cooperation replaces competition, as each division specialises in a defined area of work. This specialisation creates continual opportunities for collective improvement, experimentation, and internal upskilling. Since each

division relies upon others, organisational resources and functional capacities are evenly distributed and mutually shared.

In practice, a commicratic arrangement might involve one department specialising in marketing and human resources, while another focuses on manufacturing and design. The supervisory Planning-division would coordinate task delegation and set strategic timelines.

This distributed structure enables departments to operate from separate geographic locations without loss of cohesion. It also empowers smaller companies to accept large-scale contracts by outsourcing specialised elements—ranging from manufacturing to sales—across partner organisations.

Operational Morality and Supervisory Exactitude in Commicratic Organisations

Within the commicratic organisational order, the most critical element for the harmonious functioning of differentiated departmental structures is the integrity and precision of the supervisory-division.

Unlike hierarchical models where supervisors exert superiority over subordinates, commicratic supervisors possess expertise—not authority—over the interlocking functions of the employee-divisions. Their role is to uphold the interdependent

architecture of the organisation by coordinating work patterns, facilitating departmental synergies, and guiding employees toward strategic re-alignments that improve efficiency and accelerate productive outputs. They ensure that departments remain functionally interconnected without ever acquiring a vertical dominance over them.

Commicracy, therefore, rejects the notion of affiliating workers to a company as loyal subjects or company-bound personalities. Its focus is the exclusive dedication of each employee to their functional purpose, to their craftsmanship, and to the technical distinction of their departmental role. What binds individuals to an organisation is not sentimental allegiance but the precision of their expertise and the clarity of their contribution to a shared economic function.

Consider, for example, a commicratic mobile-phone manufacturing establishment. Its structure would contain autonomous yet interlocking departments—hardware engineering, microcircuitry, software design, assembly, testing, and quality assurance.

Technical employees naturally gravitate to the division where their specific craftsmanship is most needed. A software engineer contributes at the level of firmware integration, while a hardware technician specialises in the structural apparatus of the device. Employees feel a deeper professional identity, not

because they “belong” to the company, but because they understand exactly how their unique skillset integrates into a broader technological whole. Commicracy thus cultivates not loyalty, but functional pride.

At the heart of such an establishment stands the commicratic moral system, grounded in accountability and the shared recognition of each worker as an independent craftsman—an entrepreneur of their own expertise—freelancer thriving within a web of interdependent relationships. The moral understanding that “our ability matters, therefore our authority matters” infuses organisational culture. Each worker realises that their craftsmanship bears consequences for the entire system, and thus they participate in the company’s equalitarian-authority with an intrinsic sense of responsibility.

This is the first principle of commicratic moral order: The responsibility of one department is inherently accountable to the responsibility of another, and all responsibilities converge into a collective accountability for the organisation’s output. Every member must be prepared to justify their decisions, methods, and actions through their *Annual Statement of Service (ASS)* as submitted by the supervision-division to the secretariat-ministry of Labour & Industry.

In an Ethnopolitan State, the regulatory government authority does not merely review performance—it actively

enforces accountability. In extreme instances, penalties may include a term of Redeem-Service, as fully detailed in the later chapters of this Manifesto. Thus every worker, from possessor to technical artisan, carries a lived awareness of the commissioning-rule embedded in their job role.

Where bureaucracy relies on fear—fear of losing bonuses, facing dismissals, or receiving punitive managerial treatment—commicracy substitutes moral exactitude. Bureaucratic employment systems have historically produced a landscape rife with power abuses, unfair dismissal claims, and managerial coercion.

Commicracy replaces these structural imbalances with an accountability system fused with moral purpose. In the commicratic philosophy, wherever a moral code is found, an accountable procedure accompanies it; and wherever an accountable procedure is examined closely, a moral code is discovered guiding its operation.

Thus commicracy is composed of two inseparable commissioning-pillars: morality that drives accountability, and accountability that drives morality. Industries in a commicratic State may choose the emphasis that best reflects their operational identity—whether guided predominantly by moral codes or by procedures of accountability—but both remain deeply intertwined under the ‘Articles of Service’.

In this dynamic, the commicratic organisation does not merely function; it behaves, in a moral and systematic sense, reflecting an ethical architecture where responsibility flows horizontally, cooperation becomes instinctive, and the equalitarian-authority of every member is continuously renewed through reciprocal accountability.

Moral-Code, Accountability,
and the Legal Mandate of Equalitarian Authority

In an Ethnpublican State, moral-code and accountability are not mere organisational conveniences—they are privileges of citizenship, rights of participation, and instruments of civic justification. They exist not to gratify individual authority but to safeguard the integrity of collective work. Thus, every employee is expected to render their service in a cross-managerial entrepreneurial capacity, exercising authority either through their designated office or in collegial assemblies. Yet such authority is never arbitrary: it is drawn exclusively from the commissioning-rules contained within the organisation's internal constitution, the *Articles of Service*.

The scope of each employee's authority ends precisely where the Articles of Service end. No person, regardless of experience, title, or seniority, may overreach the boundaries of their designated function. For example, a supervisor possesses no legitimate power to impose directives upon an employee

concerning personal life, dress style, or preferred work method, so long as that method remains within the authorised operational parameters.

A supervisor may advise, coordinate, and guide tasks between interdependent departments, but cannot impose dominance over another's autonomy. This limitation is not a curtailment of authority—it is the very definition of equality-legal authority, which sits at the heart of commicratic ethics.

Equalitarian-legal authority flows downward from State policy into organisational practice. It is codified by government procedures, formalised into every organisation's Articles of Service, and incorporated into each individual's service contract with the secretariat-ministry of Labour & Industry. In such a system, authority is not "held"; it is delegated by law, and its legitimacy is continuously renewed through compliance with the commissioning-rule.

This is why the horizontal structure remains the defining feature of commicracy. Its purpose is not merely to flatten hierarchy, but to articulate a clear chain of interdependent relationships between skilled workers. Each skilled entity is answerable only to the entity whose function is entwined with their own, and together they form a systemic mesh that aligns workers toward the company's operational goals.

This prevents the conflicting authorities so characteristic of bureaucratic institutions—where committees multiply paperwork, meetings proliferate without consequence, and problems are admired in conference rooms instead of being solved at the coalface of production.

Commicracy rejects the structural anxiety of bureaucracy. Instead, it restores productive simplicity. Every worker's position is transparent; every role is legible. Whether an organisation employs five people or five thousand, both supervisory and employee duties are unambiguous. In smaller enterprises, a single individual may embody both supervisor and employee roles, yet their duties remain distinct within their *Contract-Service Agreement* filed at the secretariat-ministry.

Their self-written ASS-report will reflect not only their internal conduct but also customer complaints, cross-referenced automatically with the Trade-Standard regulatory department within the secretariat-ministry of Labour & Industry. In this way, even small-scale commicracies are woven into the national grid of accountability and consumer protection.

This design reflects the natural life-cycle of enterprises: beginning as small units, evolving into departmentalised structures, and expanding into large-scale organisations while retaining the same moral and administrative architecture. The aim is not size but clarity, for the commicratic structure depends

on the clear division of labour between supervisory and employee functions. This clarity ensures that authority remains horizontal, duties remain lawful, and the organisation remains aligned with national regulations governing their industry.

Such clarity also empowers emerging entrepreneurs. Understanding the precise relationship between supervisory function and employee function enables anyone aspiring to form a company under commicracy to envision their aims, objectives, goals, and mission with structural discipline. It removes ambiguity, stabilises expectations, and integrates every new enterprise into the moral and legal current of the commicratic order.

Thus, commicracy does not merely organise labour; it cultivates an ethical economy, where moral-code and accountability operate as twin pillars supporting the horizontal edifice of equalitarian-authority. Below are the roles and duties under equality-legal authority between the supervisory-division and the employee-division in a commicratic organisation:

COMMICRATIC ORGANISATION: EQUALITY-LEGAL AUTHORITY TABLE		
Category	Supervisory Division	Employee Division
	Directs the organisation	Works as freelancers within

Function	through unique vision, manages daily operations, acts as public spokesperson.	the organisation, usually in collaborative groups, delivering tasks with efficient human-resource utilisation.
Primary Task	Oversees basic departmental functions (Coordinator, HR Inspector, Project Manager, Contract Administrator, Client Representative, Foreman), commissioning work to align departmental and organisational goals.	Covers fundamental departmental functions (Accounting, Customer Service, Engineering, Marketing & Sales, IT, R&D, Production, Purchasing, Transport, etc.), collaborating to align departmental output with company goals.
Focus	Manages people and ensures	Manages tasks and strengthens

	organisational smooth-running.	departmental expertise.
Market Player	Expands organisational concepts, improves products/services, ensures competitive operation.	Executes operational work and improves skill-sets to enhance product/service quality.
Continuity	Engagement is discontinuous—initiates work orders and reappears upon next project requirement.	Engagement is continuous—employees work synergistically, focusing on improvement and upskilling.
Resource Mobiliser	Mobilises resources and provides input resources to employees; communication is direct due to non-hierarchical departmental structure.	Utilises resources efficiently, enabling each worker to identify their role clearly and focus on high-quality delivery.

Primary Motives	Motive is project completion and client satisfaction within established corporate timetables.	Motive is resource availability, expertise development, and achieving departmental goals.
Time Orientation	Plans weekly, monthly, quarterly cycles, organises annual quotas and submissions to government offices; maintains proper ASS-reports.	Ensures deadlines are met and departmental records remain compliant with organisational timetables.
Strategic Orientation	Driven by organisational opportunity and client satisfaction.	Driven by upskilling opportunities and access to resources.
Activity Orientation	Commissions tasks and provides supervision without deep involvement in work patterns.	Executes commissioned tasks without requiring supervisor involvement in

		work processes.
Risk Orientation	Risk-averse; avoids direct risk-taking yet manages employees' outputs.	Risk-taking; evaluates benefits, costs, and outcomes before committing.
Failure & Mistakes	Seeks to avoid surprises and minimise mistakes.	Handles, manages, and learns from mistakes and failures.
Decisions	Intuitive decision-making; supportive of employee decisions to aligned with organisational aims.	Calculative decision-making; actively secures cooperation to meet targets and objectives.
Relationship	Maintains internal and external relationships (transactions, deals, negotiations).	Maintains internal, inter-departmental relationships essential for workflow.
Expertise	Requires competency in business operations	Requires technical/professional competency and

	and capacity to manage workforce under pressure.	intrapreneurial skill within designated roles.
Creativity Advantage	Strength in visioning, empowering, influencing, and idea generation.	Strength in mastery, focus, expertise, teamwork, execution drive.
Objective Approach	Systematic management to align processes with outcomes; prevents deadline drift and organisational disarray.	Workplace discipline, adherence to organisational policies, and responsible teamwork ensuring goal completion.
Reward Philosophy	Value-driven, performance-based, outcome-oriented.	Security-driven, resource-based, team-reward oriented.

Equalitarian-Legal Authority
in Commicratic Organisation

The supervisory-division and the employee-division exist not as hierarchical strata but as equalitarian-legal authorities within a commicratic organisation. Their functions differ, yet their legitimacy is symmetrical: each embodies a specialised domain of expertise that the organisation depends upon.

In an average supervisory-division, this expertise appears through roles such as the Coordinator, Human-Resources Inspector, Project Manager, Contract Administrator, Client Representative, and Foreman. These roles embody strategic oversight, external interfacing, and the mobilisation of organisational resources.

Conversely, the employee-division expresses its expertise within its own fields. A Finance department may include Resource Accountants, Auditors, Book-keepers, Budget Analysts, and Resource Administrators. A Marketing department may include Brand Managers, Content-Marketing Managers, Product-Marketing Managers, Data Analysts, Copywriters, and Social-Media Promoters. Such roles reveal the non-monetary internal economy of the organisation—an economy based not on hierarchical power but on the circulation of capability, creativity, and contributory responsibility.

In this configuration, neither division functions as a status-symbol or territorial hierarchy. Both are interdependent authorities whose decisions, duties, and responsibilities reflect

equalised power-reciprocity, not dominance. Employees work in teams and retain autonomous decision-making capacity; supervisors coordinate strategic direction but are equally accountable to the employee-division for operational feasibility. Each division serves the other, serves itself, and serves the organisation's users and consumers. Their communication is structured through formalised, horizontal commicracy—equalitarian protocols of engagement that prevent the emergence of imbalanced power structures.

Both divisions contribute their distinct temperaments and cognitive-emotional abilities to the organisation's success: creativity, formulation, problem-solving, courage, focus, opportunity-spotting, team-working, perceptual judgement, expertise-orientation, networking capacity, and advantage-orientation. Likewise, both divisions share temperamental drivers such as competitive spirit, desire, urgency, opportunity-taking, dedication, responsibility, mission-focus, ego-strength, and disciplined performance orientation. Their involvement is multistage—they set milestones, measure progress, validate results, and make commitments visible at every exposure point in the production cycle.

The moral objective behind the supervisory-division in a commicratic structure is not control but coordination for clarity: ensuring that customers' needs are met, that every incoming job

is immediately decipherable, and that each participant understands what they must do, why they must do it, and within which timeframe. When roles are transparent, responsibility becomes distributed; and when responsibility is distributed, authority becomes reciprocal and non-decaying.

Smaller organisations may have supervisors carrying multiple supervisory functions—particularly in product-manufacturing sectors, where a single individual may act simultaneously as Foreman, Contract Administrator, and Client Representative, while others combine the roles of HR-Inspector, Coordinator, or Project Manager. This strengthens commicracy and reflects the adaptive flexibility of equalitarian authority within smaller operational ecosystems.

Ultimately, the type of economic service a company delivers—and its organisational size—determines the extent of supervisory specialisation required. What remains constant is the commicratic principle: simplify work processes, clarify responsibilities, and orient all labour—supervisory and employee alike—toward rapid, high-quality fulfilment of customer needs. In this way, commicracy ensures that interdependent-leadership, equalitarian-authority, and power-reciprocity manifest not as policy but as institutional culture.

Hybrid Departments and the Dynamics of Commicratic Coordination

Another essential dimension of commicratic organisation is the expectation that departmental employees align their individual goals and objectives with the operational goals of the entire organisation. Because commicracy is an interdependent model of labour, increased collaboration is not an optional accessory but a primary task of every employee. Departments must work synergistically, not in isolation, to ensure that quality-improvement efforts radiate across the whole organisation rather than remaining confined within internal silos.

To achieve this broader coherence, commicracies frequently employ hybrid departments—temporary combinations of employees drawn from multiple departments to satisfy the specific resource needs of a given project. The responsibility for forming and structuring such hybrid departments belongs to the Coordinator within the Planning Division, whose supervisory mandate includes the integration of skills, resources, and labour-temperaments from across the organisation.

For example, a Coordinator-Supervisor may assemble a hybrid team composed of a Budget Analyst from Finance, a Brand Manager and Social-Media Promoter from Marketing, and a contracted Software Developer from an external agency.

This team exists only for the duration of a particular contract or project, yet hybridisation is entirely normal and expected

within commicratic practice. Projects do not always conform to the conventional departmental model; therefore, it is the duty of the Supervisor-Coordinator to determine *what combination of labour-ability is needed, who embodies the relevant skills, and how these skills must interrelate* for the project to succeed.

Hybrid departments are formally classified as part of the Employee-Division, although they sit under a general “Hybrid Fields” category due to their temporary and cross-functional nature. In the example above, the contracted Software Developer and the in-house Social-Media Promoter may work closely together on the technical and promotional elements of the project, while the Brand Manager shadows their work to ensure strategic coherence. Meanwhile, the Budget Analyst maintains oversight of resource allocation to ensure that expenditures remain within the authorised threshold.

In conventional projects, employees report the completion of their tasks to the Coordinator responsible for the work, who then approves and aligns all outputs with customer needs and project deadlines. In hybrid departments, however, all employees report directly to the Project Manager for task validation, given the multi-functional and often bespoke nature of hybridised work. This ensures a coherent point of accountability while maintaining the horizontal commicratic structure.

Hybrid departments often arise in organisations that produce niche, bespoke, or experimental products or offer customised services outside the standard operational catalogue. In such cases, the selection of a project-supervisor with the appropriate skill-set becomes critical, as the success of the operation depends on specialised insight rather than routine managerial oversight.

A foundational principle of commicracy is that workers are experts in specific parts of a whole, not universal technicians expected to know every dimension of a product or service. Employees contribute precise expertise; coordinators bring these parts together into a functioning whole. Thus, hybridisation reflects a structurally intelligent design rather than organisational improvisation. In many cases, Coordinators from the Planning Division may outsource tasks requiring unavailable skills to external companies. Such outsourcing is a collaborative effort with the Foreman from the Personnel Division, and in rare instances involving disciplinary sanctions or regulatory obligations, the HR-Inspector may also participate.

Within an Ethnpublican State, the secretariat-ministry of Labour & Industry protects the organisational ecosystem and ensures that the commicratic model functions according to its philosophical principles. Employees are regarded as experts—not trainees—and are therefore free to employ innovative or unconventional methods to execute their tasks. Because

commicracy is founded on equalitarian-legal authority and professional autonomy, employees bear the natural consequences—whether success or failure—of their claimed expertise and their chosen methods.

The Social Values of Commicracy

The social values of commicracy are implicit guidelines that furnish institutional orientation for individuals and corporations to conduct themselves according to a collectivistic order. They constitute the standardised behavioural approach through which individuals pursue personal ambition while simultaneously advancing collective goals. In this way, social values determine the nature of equality-legal authority within society and reflect the traditions, cultural beliefs, and moral principles that regulate its dynamics.

Informed by the 21st century global culture of internetisation—and the universal human inclination toward equal treatment between persons and between corporations—the ethnoist social relations, govovoxical governmental structure, and ethno-corporatist economic transformations envisioned in the Ethnopublican State represent Africa's generational turning point. This is the African revolution of our century: a re-centring of collective participation in public affairs as a defining value of the good life. It is through this collective participation that we

pursue the economic self-sufficiency and subsistence security that Africans aspire to reclaim for Africa and for Africans.

The pursuit of uninterrupted continental electricity and borderless roads infrastructural systems is the foundational investment for an ethno-corporatist self-sufficiency economy. It will generate the well-being and standard of living that Africans have long desired. With these foundational investments, Africa will stop being judged solely by its natural resources and start being measured by its human capital, industrial output, and integrated infrastructure. Development will no longer be an imported concept but a continent-defined reality, shaped and sustained by Africans themselves.

Earlier volumes of this Manifesto articulate the mechanisms through which such development can be realised. Here, the collectivist principles of commicracy become indispensable: they form the moral and operational lens through which Africans can understand both the means and the goals of the human nature that leads toward societal happiness. This collective happiness remains the deepest object of African desire.

The social importance of commicratic values in African society is inseparable from the process of their attainment, preservation, and ongoing maintenance. Before colonial intrusion, Africans understood themselves primarily through their collective values, implicitly expressed in daily life.

These values guided cultural self-conception and determined the standards by which Africans engaged with foreigners. This Manifesto calls for Africa to realign its ancient collectivist ethos with modern ethno-corporatist development, promoting cooperative work ethics, elevated quality of life, and the shared knowledge foundations of an Ethnopolitan society.

To achieve this, this Manifesto maps the value-patterns of Africa's key occupational groups: the economic-specific education and training of the pre-working-age population, and the service-oriented or technical skills of the working-age population. Both constitute the living core of Africa's traditional value system. Additionally, the selective recall of specialised skills from the post-working-age population, on a temporary and advisory basis, characterises the prescriptive value system needed to stabilise intergenerational continuity.

Drawing from pre-colonial African traditions, cultural beliefs, ethics, and value systems—including family dynamics, recreational life, and occupational structures—this framework demonstrates the context-specificity of African social values within modern economic and organisational design.

In commicratic workplaces, collectivism manifests as a system in which workers themselves prescribe the value processes that structure their commitments and outputs. They define, both individually and collectively, what constitutes

meaningful creative endeavour and what qualifies as a social life-incentive. These prescriptions shape their desired work-life balance and align with broader societal, economic, govovical, and organisational contexts.

A central expression of commicratic social value is the privilege to work remotely rather than being confined to a rigid 9-to-5 daily routine. This flexibility enables each individual to cultivate a creative focus that aligns with personal rhythms and psychological temperaments. It becomes a social incentive through which individuals generate their own value-meanings, enact those values across multiple roles, and manage their time to pursue personal goals, interests, or hobbies. Such freedoms empower the working-age population to make meaningful sense of their existence within society and remain present and resilient in confronting adversities within their private and family lives.

Commicracy, Familial Sovereignty, and the Transformation of Social-Economic Life

In the same way that interdependent-leadership and equalitarian-authority institutionalise power-reciprocity within economic life, the logic of commicracy extends this structural philosophy into the intimate spheres of family and social reproduction. For commicracy holds that freedom of work-pattern is inseparable from freedom of relational-presence.

A society that decentralises authority in the workplace but preserves capitalist dependency within the family merely relocates subjection; it does not transcend it. Commicracy therefore dismantles the old bureaucratic paradigm in which the economic survival of family members depended upon internal hierarchies, emotional absenteeism, and the latent coercion of financial interdependence.

Where bureaucracy sanctified the economic necessity of the family and thereby restricted the emotional availability of its members, commicracy sanctifies the emotional sovereignty of the family by removing its economic dependencies. It does so by embedding households within the ethno-corporatist non-monetary economy, where economic support is not a function of familial obligation but a function of individual sole right with the State. In such a system, family membership ceases to be a contract of economic assistance; it becomes a space for emotional reciprocity, physical co-presence, and moral cultivation.

Thus, the rhythms of family life—meeting, caring, bonding, supporting—are liberated from the distortions of wage-labour schedules and become reorganised as collectivised social activities, not contingent upon income or monetary exchange. The presence of the individual with their family is no longer an

after-thought to labour; it is built into the architecture of work itself.

In this way, commicracy accomplishes what capitalism could not: it re-anchors the meaning of family in the stability of emotional and physical support, detached from economic obligation.

The State as Custodian of Individual Sole Right

The collectivism of commicracy attaches self-efficacy, self-worth, and existential security to the individual's direct relation with the State. From birth to death, each person is constituted as a sovereign economic unit whose welfare is assured by the State through the principle of individual sole right. This does not reduce individuality; it stabilises it. For only when individuals are economically secured outside the fluctuations of family, market, or trade can they formulate their personal conception of the good life without fear of deprivation.

The State therefore assumes full economic responsibility at each stage of life:

- Pre-working age: provision is collective, shared between the State and guardians, preparing the child for independent integration into the labour system.

- Working age: economic provision is collectivised strictly through the individual's sole right, not mediated by employer dependency nor familial expectation.
- Pension age: the State resumes full provision until death, completing the life-cycle of economic sovereignty.

Under this model, collectivism is not an ideological ornament; it is the operational grammar that coordinates economic security and human development across the entire lifespan.

Collectivism, State-Provision,
and the Limits of Individual Desire

Yet collectivism of commicracy does not mean unbounded fulfillment of individual desire. The State's provision functions inevitably place limits on aspirations that contradict social or economic-order. Individual sole rights are expressions of personalised conceptions of the good life, but such rights are always interpreted through the lens of collective stability. The State must therefore modulate desires that threaten imbalance, resource distortion, or social incoherence.

Thus, collectivism is not a monolith but a contextual value—its meaning shifts depending on the economic-order the State must secure and the social-order it must maintain. The

relationship between the two becomes a philosophical question of regulatory sequence:

- Under ethno-corporatism, economic-order naturally regulates social-order.
- Under commicracy, this relationship becomes more dynamic: social-order may sometimes be re-regulated to preserve or generate economic-order for the sake of collective equilibrium.

The critical inquiry is no longer whether the State should regulate, but which order—social or economic—must be prioritised in a given context to uphold the collectivist architecture of commicracy. Ultimately, the State-centred decision lies solely in the hands of the citizenry-electrates or their working-group.

Commicracy as a Total Framework of Human Flourishing:

The philosophical unity across interdependent-leadership, equalitarian-authority, and the collectivism of commicracy lies in their shared commitment to reciprocal power, sovereign individuality, and relational security. Power-reciprocity stabilises authority within institutions; collectivism stabilises life-paths within society; and ethno-corporatist commicracy stabilises relationships within the family and community.

Together, they form a coherent model of social organisation in which the individual is neither subordinated to the collective nor abandoned to the trade-economy, but is upheld by a reciprocal architecture of rights, presence, and emotional belonging.

Re-Regulating Social-Order
to Sustain Economic-Order in Commicracy

To anchor the principles developed throughout this chapter, consider the case of nursing mothers within the working-age population. Under commicracy, such individuals may rightly assert their full individual sole right to State-provision for their economic needs.

The claim is legitimate, for childbearing is a Nature-given right, and no woman should find herself economically disadvantaged for fulfilling a biological and social function essential to the continuity of society. Yet circumstances may arise in which the State, the Executive function of the secretariats in particular, cannot fully yield this right without simultaneously compromising its wider economic-order.

Where labour shortages exist—particularly in occupations designated under the Shortage Occupation List—the State must reconcile its obligation to uphold individual rights with its responsibility to sustain the labour ecosystem. In such instances,

re-regulation of the social-order becomes necessary to preserve the stability of the economic-order. This re-regulation does not nullify the individual's sole right; instead, it restructures the conditions under which that right can be meaningfully exercised.

One such measure is the establishment of State-funded nanny-centres across localities. These centres would operate continuously—day-care and night-care alike—allowing children to reside for extended periods, regardless of whether the mother works remotely or on-site.

Organised visitation programmes would permit children to visit their parents at home or at the workplace, ensuring routine emotional contact. Professional nannies would carry the principal burdens of child nursing and developmental care, relieving mothers of the most strenuous practical responsibilities.

To reinforce trust and transparency, all nanny-centres would be equipped with remote CCTV systems accessible to mothers through secure applications on their mobile devices. Real-time visual access to the entirety of a centre's environment would allow nursing mothers to maintain peace of mind, regardless of location.

Here we see clearly how the collectivism of commicracy functions as the guiding principle for the re-regulation of the social-order. The State becomes the protector of individual sole

rights by ensuring that personal circumstances—such as child nursing—do not render a citizen economically vulnerable.

At the same time, the State safeguards its own economic-order by providing compensatory social structures that allow individuals to meet their responsibilities within the labour system. Commicratic collectivism therefore binds moral accountability to State governance: the State must justify its actions not only in functional terms but in accordance with the societal values it exists to uphold.

In the commicratic society, citizens increasingly ground their arguments in a conceptualisation of Nature-given rights. Human needs and biological processes become moral premises from which individuals derive claims upon the State.

Conversely, the State, in fulfilling its provision functions, must devise mechanisms that both respect these claims and preserve the conditions of collective flourishing. How individuals frame their expectations and how the State responds to them will reveal the practical texture of the commicratic order.

Thus, collectivism within commicracy is projected through the continual balancing of social-order and economic-order, the preservation of the authority system of State governance, and the judicial vigilance of the StateLords, who interpret citizenry

proposals and policies against the constitutional framework of Ethnpublicanism.

This dual structure is necessitated by the inherent dialectical tension between citizens and their government, between service-users and service-providers, between employees and their employing organisations. These oppositions are neither artificial nor reducible to simple formulas; they express the real relational dynamics of social life.

For this reason, those entrusted with the authority to provide provision must remain morally accountable. Their governing patterns shape the articulation of societal values and the integrity of collectivism as defined by commicracy. In this equilibrium of rights, duties, and re-regulations, commicracy reveals its essential character: a system in which the State protects individual sovereignty while harmonising it with the collective needs of the society it serves.

CHAPTER THREE

EQUALITARIAN BASES OF COMMICRACY

Organisational behaviour operates far beyond the visible surface of workplace interactions; it is rooted in the deep substratum of a society's cultural values. These values extend across the entire cultural spectrum, shaping both formal institutions and the informal institutions whose implicit commissioning-rules quietly govern social expectations.

It is within these informal rules that we find the true dependencies linking the benchmark values of a society to the performance, conduct, and legitimacy of its formal structures.

Understanding this relationship requires examining the interplay among four critical variables that together constitute the behavioural architecture of any society:

1. Its traditional social culture,
2. Its assumed economic structure,
3. Its moral orientation toward values, and
4. Its ethical constructs for problem-solving.

These four variables do not stand in isolation. They operate as an interdependent system in which each variable draws meaning, stability, and direction from the other three. Although societies naturally evolve over time—adapting their values and behaviours to technological change and new social realities—when these shifts are abrupt, the dependent system is strained. Sudden transitions disrupt the balance between cultural expectations and institutional responses, leading to complications, conflicts, and contradictions in organisational behaviour.

This interdependence provides a more accurate picture of societal organisation than any simplified attempt to regulate economic-order alone or to govern social-order in isolation. Neither sphere can be pulled in one direction without affecting the other. The moral culture and ethical behaviour of a society emerge only when these variables move in complementarity.

Thus, to understand the equalitarian bases of commicracy, one must first grasp the dynamic equilibrium connecting culture, economy, morality, and ethics. Commicracy seeks not to isolate these forces but to harmonise them—creating a system in which organisational behaviour reflects the collective values of society and where equalitarian relations form the moral backbone of institutional life.

The Colonial Misreading of African Collectivism

The above discussion is broadly concerned with the conflicts that have plagued indigenous Africans since the colonial era. Its central premise recognises that every economic transformation produces its own distinct organisational structure. Yet, when colonial administrators imposed Western bureaucratic frameworks upon African societies—whose traditional orientation was deeply rooted in cooperative and collectivist customs—the result was conflict, confusion, and systemic disarray.

This arose from a profound misinformation: the mistaken belief that Western bureaucracy was merely a refined strand of Africa's pre-existing cooperative culture. In truth, this was a misunderstanding—one borne not simply from ignorance, but from a structured historical disinformation.

Colonial powers observed the pre-colonial organisational patterns of African ethno-governed communities and called them kingdoms—divine rulers as kings, royal wives as queens, chiefs and councils maintains their original understandings—and misinterpreted them as embryonic versions of bureaucratic hierarchy. But the internal logic of these indigenous systems was entirely different.

African systems of authority were embedded in social reciprocity, kinship-based obligation, moral duty, and collectivist norms—not in the rigid proceduralism and impersonality of Western administrative models. The social and economic values that Africans established for themselves were fundamentally anti-bureaucratic: communal, cooperative, and relational rather than individualistic and profit-driven.

The clash between Western bureaucracy and indigenous African collectivism should have made it immediately clear to colonial observers that what they perceived as an “underdeveloped bureaucracy” was, in fact, something else entirely—a non-bureaucratic social system with different ethical foundations, organisational rhythms, and cultural principles.

A major source of this misunderstanding was the colonial conflation of the Arabised regions of North Africa with the indigenous peoples of the continent. For centuries prior to colonialism, Western societies shared a long-standing bureaucratic and commercial interface with Arabian, North African, and Indo-Persian civilisations—all of which were already heavily bureaucratised after the fall of ancient Kemet civilisation that instituted pharaonic governance with interdependent leadership with the priests.

When colonial rulers encountered the structured administrative and arabised cultures of North Africa, they

erroneously projected those characteristics onto West, East, Central, and Southern African societies, failing to distinguish between historically distinct civilisational lineages.

Thus, when Western colonial powers superimposed their bureaucratic and capitalist frameworks upon indigenous African societies, they believed they were accelerating an already familiar organisational trajectory. They claimed that the limited penetration of their system was due to cultural resistance and that deeper cultural change would require time—much as centuries of Arab influence had gradually reshaped northern regions such as ancient Nubia. But this diagnosis was incorrect. The conflict did not arise because Africa was slow to adapt; it arose because the imposed model was structurally incompatible with indigenous social logic.

The result was a pattern of organisational behaviour that appeared inconsistent, irrational, or dysfunctional when judged by bureaucratic standards—but these distortions were symptoms of a deeper systemic mismatch. Bureaucracy, designed for individualist economic cultures, was forced to operate inside collectivist moral frameworks that it neither understood nor respected. This incompatibility generated decades of institutional instability and moral dissonance across African societies—conditions that only a return to collectivist organisational principles, such as commicracy, can begin to resolve.

Reclaiming the Indigenous Foundations of Commicracy

Within the proposed commicratic society, the institutional architecture mirrors—both philosophically and structurally—the indigenous African organisational system that existed prior to colonial disruption. The StateLords exercise an authoritative role analogous to the pre-colonial rulers whose legitimacy was rooted not in bureaucratic hierarchy but in moral custodianship, communal trust, and reciprocal authority.

Likewise, the secretariat and the prime-ministers inherit responsibilities similar to the councils of elders and chiefs who collectively deliberated on matters of governance, culture, and social-order. The commicrats who operate across government offices function in a manner akin to the trusted erranders of the noble houses—those who executed specific tasks essential to sustaining social cohesion and public welfare.

Before the fall of Kemet to successive eastern incursions and the later processes of Arabisation that fractured its indigenous civilisational continuity, Pharaonic Kemet functioned as the fountainhead of ethno-governed order across Africa, radiating its moral, administrative, and organisational logic southward and westward into Nubia, Kush, Axum, the Sahelian, Ife, Akan, and others. What colonial anthropology and imperial historiography later mislabelled as primitive sub-bureaucracy was, in truth, a

sub-commicratic derivative of Pharaonic governance—a decentralised yet morally coherent system anchored in Ma’at rather than command.

The Pharaoh, as the divine head and living custodian of Ma’at, corresponds directly to both the pre-colonial rulers and the proposed Statelords of ethnopublicanism, the three occupying the judicial-supervisory apex tasked with maintaining cosmic and social equilibrium rather than micro-managing labour.

The Vizier’s role as chief executive finds its parallel with pre-colonial chiefs, and modern parallel in the Secretary-of-State, coordinating administration without severing accountability from moral law. The Royal Council and scribal institutions—repositories of law, memory, and public deliberation—prefigure the Citizenry Prime Minister and legislative arm, while the temple-treasury economy, which regulated labour, redistribution, and trade as sacred duties, maps cleanly onto the Economy-Prime Minister.

Most crucially, the people of Kemet themselves were not subjects of domination but participants in a shared moral economy, just as the Citizenry constitutes the living legitimacy of ethnopublic governance and parallel with village citizens in pre-colonial Africa.

Below is a side-by-side comparative table placing the three systems in direct alignment, showing clearly that Pharaonic governance, pre-colonial African systems, and Ethnpublican commicracy are not separate inventions but evolutionary expressions of the same African governing logic, unified by moral supervision, reciprocal authority, and horizontal social-order.

Unified African Governance Continuum:
Pharaonic, Pre-Colonial, and Ethnpublican

Pharaonic Pillar (Kemet)	Pre-Colonial African Governance	Ethnpublican Arm of Government	Unified Core Function
Pharaoh (Divine Head / Custodian of Ma’at)	Supreme Ruler, Oba, Mwami, Asantehene, Negus, Mansa (Moral Sovereign)	Statelords (Judicial Arm)	Moral supervision, constitutional balance, guardianship of ethical order and social harmony
Vizier (Chief Administrator)	Chief Minister, Prime Elder, Grand Vizier-equivalent,	Secretary of State (Executive Arm)	Administrative coordination, policy execution,

	Council Head		operational coherence
Royal Council & Scribes	Council of Elders, Lineage Councils, Griot-Scribes, Clan Assemblies	Citizenry Prime Minister (Legislative Arm)	Lawmaking, deliberation, memory-keeping, civic representation
Temple Economy & Treasury	Communal Granaries, Guild Elders, Trade Stewards, Labour Councils	Economy-Prime Minister (Economic Arm)	Resource distribution, labour organisation, trade regulation, economic equilibrium
Priesthood of Ma'at	Spiritual Custodians, Ethical Elders, Ancestor Councils, Priests	Judicial Oversight Institutions	Ethical arbitration, moral instruction, dispute resolution
Nomarchs (Provincial Governors)	Regional or Tribal Chiefs, Clan Heads, Provincial Heads	Regional Statelords & Commissions	Decentralised governance under unified moral law

Scribes (Record-Keepers)	Griots, Oral Historians, Court Recorders	Civic Registrars & Govox Systems	Knowledge preservation, accountability, institutional memory
People of Kemet	Clans, Lineages, Age-Grades, Guild Members	Citizenry	Social participation, legitimacy, collective identity
Ma'at (Cosmic Law)	Customary Law, Ancestral Codes, Communal Ethics	Ethnopolitan Constitution	Universal ethical order governing all relations
Public Works (Temples, Roads, Irrigation)	Communal Labour Systems, Cooperative economy, Rotational Service	National Infrastructure Corps	Collective development, shared prosperity, social cohesion

This table demonstrates that colonial interpretations were fundamentally flawed. What European administrators mistook

for “undeveloped bureaucracy” of pre-colonial Africa was, in reality, a distributed commicratic system—one where:

- Authority was moral, not coercive,
- Power flowed horizontally through reciprocity,
- Leadership existed to balance society, not dominate it,
- Governance was embedded in culture, not imposed by paperwork.

Ethnopublicanism does not invent a new African State—it restores Africa’s original governing intelligence, updated for modern scale, technology, and continental unity. In this light, pre-colonial African rulership was not a failed imitation of European bureaucracy, but a continent-wide echo of Pharaonic commicracy—horizontal in social relations, vertical only in moral supervision under judicial oversights by the priests, and unified by reciprocal obligation rather than coercive control.

This same relational dynamic extends into the economic organisation of commicratic society. Company supervisors do not function as bureaucratic overseers in the Western sense; instead, they mirror the role of chiefs acting as village council members—responsible for guidance, coordination, and the safeguarding of communal interest.

Company employees then act in the participatory spirit of the erranders, performing specialised duties that support both the organisation and the broader community. Authority is exercised horizontally, not through hierarchical subjection, but through interdependent responsibilities where each role complements the other.

In contrast, Western society developed its own hierarchical architecture in which kings and queens presided at the apex, followed by their offspring as princes and princesses, and beneath them a stratified nobility—dukes and duchesses, earls and countesses, viscounts and viscountesses, barons and baronesses—each occupying fixed, rank-based tiers of authority. This structure codified hierarchy, formalised power-distance, and institutionalised bureaucratic ordering as the cultural logic of social control.

For this reason, it is a misconception to assume that indigenous African societies were already bureaucratised prior to the Slave Trade or colonial eras. Such an interpretation wrongly imposes Western hierarchical taxonomies onto African traditions whose internal logic was fundamentally collectivist, cooperative, and relational rather than bureaucratic.

Thus, what the colonial powers misread as an “underdeveloped bureaucracy” was, in fact, a sophisticated form of commicracy—a system grounded in shared responsibility,

reciprocal authority, and communal self-regulation. Bureaucracy, therefore, is of Western origin, not an indigenous African invention.

Recognising the persistence of human nature everywhere to seek equality in both formal and informal institutions, it becomes essential to not divorce this principle from the design of the commicratic model. Commicracy is structured precisely to satisfy this universal human tendency—to ensure that authority is not hoarded but shared, not imposed but reciprocally enacted.

Consequently, the equalitarian social values underpinning a commicratic organisation require that the common instrument of social and economic administration be designed to facilitate shared-control of authority among workers and between service-providers and service-users.

Thus, any proposed organisational framework in Africa must conform to the ethical essence of indigenous African collectivism. It must institutionalise horizontal structures and polycentric processes where authority is distributed rather than centralised, where cooperation replaces coercion, and where organisational behaviour aligns with traditional African social values that historically prioritised reciprocity, harmony, and communal participation.

This manifesto establishes the framework through which the horizontal structure of a commicratic organisation produces equality. The framework complements Volume II of this manifesto, which explains how the govox-populi system achieves equality through shared control of State administration between the government and the governed within an Ethnopublican State.

Commicracy emerges naturally from the theory of the ethno-corporatist economic system, which promotes equality-legal authority across all areas of socio-economic life. Its non-monetary economy abolishes the traditional money-capital requirement for business formation and daily operations; it removes from employers the burden of exercising impersonal authority over employees; and it dissolves the class distinction between “skilled” and “unskilled.”

Instead, all workers operate within an equalitarian system that recognises the ordinary human capacity to perform productive tasks as freelancers, rather than as trainees to be shaped by managerial command. This forms the foundational equalitarian basis of a commicratic organisation.

In illustrating how the transition from bureaucracy to commicracy transforms a hierarchical structure into a horizontal one, it is essential to emphasise that this transition does not alter the functional roles workers perform for the productive output of

the organisation. What changes is not the work itself, but the authority-relations that define the ethical fabric of the organisation. Bureaucracy concentrates moral and decision-making authority at the top of a vertical chain, creating an imbalance of power in which workers below have limited clarity about their own status as skilled contributors rather than subordinate trainees.

Commicracy corrects this imbalance by generating a horizontal structure in which ethical constructs of problem-solving arise from shared and balanced authority. Workers understand themselves as freelancers with equal authority to their supervisors, operating in an open, regulatory system in which they report directly to government oversight as independent skilled agents. They understand their place in the organisational ecosystem: the worker creates the product that enters trade; the supervisor creates the trading idea and coordinates organisational direction. This functional clarity is the foundational purpose of commicratic horizontality.

Commicracy contains no vertical hierarchical layers in theory and no formal chain of command. In practice, it recognises a supervisory division—composed of inventors, managers, and coordinators—situated not above but within the homologue of the organisation. These individuals carry distinct roles, not superior authority, existing as diverse skill-bearers

whose functions sit in equilibrium with the wider organisational community.

Unlike large-scale bureaucracy, where each employee is positioned within a layered pyramid of dependent managerial strata, commicracy redefines the organisational landscape. Each worker is their own management layer—an autonomous entity participating in a network of interdependent management layers occupied by other autonomous entities. This structure grants each employee full control over their own work-outputs while ensuring coordination through interdependence rather than hierarchy.

Commicratic Workers Service System

In a commicratic society, workers enter into agreed services with the Secretariat Government Authority of Labour & Industry to establish a corporation under a unified Contract of Service. This Contract of Service provides all capital resources necessary to found, operate, and maintain the corporation throughout its service life.

It also establishes the framework through which employees are loaned to the organisation to produce goods and services for trade, governed through the proposed Corporation Employee-

Contract between the Secretariat of Labour & Industry and each worker across their working life.

Unlike bureaucratic systems that refer to their clients as “customers,” a commicratic government refers to them as service-users: individuals who, by entering the society-prescribed working-age group, engage in an agreed service relationship with the State. When a person accepts a role in an organisation, they simultaneously become a worker of that corporation and a service-user of the State, providing economic service under their Contract of Service.

This dual identity allows workers to undertake tasks on behalf of the corporation which the corporation, as a possessed entity, is responsible for fulfilling under its service agreement with the State. The State, having provided all required capital, retains regulatory oversight while enabling economic autonomy for workers.

Volume I of this manifesto introduced the *Corporatist Service Provision (CSP)* entitlement card, a national mechanism under ethno-corporatism for integrating all working-age individuals into the State’s service-card system. Workers maintain ownership of their skill-sets, while start-up founders rely on government-assigned CSP workers to operate their establishments.

This operates under the State's Master-Franchise Corporatist Agreement, which governs trades and industries on the platform of *Social Interests Economic Relation (SIER)*. The SIER defines the socio-economic relationship between the government, workers, and their industries, ensuring that all organisational performance contributes to the objectives of the State. This aligns with the governmental regulatory control that accompanies State ownership of the means of production in an ethno-corporatist State.

In this system, a worker may operate as a company possessor, a company worker, or both. An individual may supervise a small organisation as its possessor while simultaneously holding a second role as an employee in a larger corporation.

This dual function is common: people often take employee roles to acquire skills necessary to become possessors of similar enterprises in the future. Every worker—regardless of skill set, training, or educational background—holds a Contract of Service authorising them to engage in economic activity as possessor, worker, or both. This creates an open contract of economic service that maintains universal access to productive engagement.

Workers may exercise their Contract of Service by establishing corporations as possessors or by accepting

employment for other possessors—or both. As freelancers, employees may work through task-based contracts, open-ended service arrangements, or fixed-term engagements.

Under the Contract of Service, the government authorises workers to undertake employment in any establishment within the State's jurisdiction. It also regulates working hours and role arrangements through each worker's *Annual Statement of Service (ASS)* report, which records and certifies their economic participation annually.

The Economic-Provision Cycle for Possessors in a Commicratic Society

When a person successfully establishes a start-up in a commicratic society, the State's economic-provision remains active for as long as the business continues to operate. The continuity of operation sustains the possessor's entitlement to the State's full economic support — meaning that as long as the enterprise remains functional, the possessor's service-card provision does not expire.

However, once the business ceases operation or is formally shut down, the period of economic provision enters a fixed-duration phase: the individual retains one full year of provision for the first year of the business shut-down. This ensures a regulated transition period after business cessation, giving the

possessor time to either start another enterprise or take up employment within an approved establishment.

If a new start-up is successfully launched during this transition, a fresh cycle of provision begins according to the same rules — continuous provision while the business operates, followed by the fixed one-year upon cessation. In this way, economic provision does not abruptly terminate with the end of business activity; rather, it is tapered to protect economic stability, incentivise ongoing productivity, and maintain the fluid interdependence between the State, possessors, and the wider commicratic economic system.

In circumstances where a possessor successfully registers and establishes a start-up but does not take up employment within the enterprise, the rule of economic provision follows the fixed-duration model. In such cases, the State's service-card economic provision extends for one full year for the first start-up, regardless of whether the business continues operations without the possessor's direct labour contribution.

These periods function as mandatory windows within which the individual must either launch another successful start-up or take employment within any recognised establishment — whether inside their own company or in another organisation — in order to sustain their ongoing economic provision. This requirement ensures that individuals do not disengage from the

productive economy after merely registering a company, and it preserves the principle that economic provision is tied to demonstrable participation in the commicratic labour system, either as a possessor or as an active employee.

For example, an individual who successfully launches five companies in a single year receives one year of State provision for the first start-up and six months each for the remaining four. This produces a combined three-year provision period. At the conclusion of that period, the possessor must either complete a new start-up to add an additional six months to their provision or take up employment in any approved establishment to maintain their service-card eligibility.

Start-ups operate under specific rules and guidelines, including the awarding of benefits and the issuing of sanctions. These standards fall under the constitutional regulatory authority of the Economy-Arm of the Ethnopolitan State, which oversees regulatory control of start-up integrity.

While the role of possessor can be rewarding, it demands a strong skill-set, as only individuals with demonstrated competence tend to become successful serial founders. Joint-possessor of a single company are entitled to the split of the one-year economic provision entitlement, and the State requires all submitted information to be accurate.

Should it emerge that a possessor or joint-possessor has provided false or misleading information after the State has invested resources in the company, the government may impose sanctions and immediately recall the individual's economic provision.

In cases where a possessor also works as an employee in another company, any accrued start-up credit is deducted directly from the individual's mandatory working-age. For example, if an individual has accumulated one year of credit and the standard pension age is sixty, that person may be pensioned at fifty-nine.

Pensioned individuals may be recalled for temporary service, though the system requires that a minimum of one full year of pension be completed before recall eligibility. Individuals may choose to extend this year or divide it into segments of work and rest as they desire. In rare cases, some individuals—particularly those who have founded numerous start-ups—may accumulate enough credit to qualify for pension far earlier.

Despite their pensioned status, individuals with valued skill-sets may still be recalled for temporary duties in patriotic service to the State. Most commonly, these recalls involve providing work-skills training at educational institutions, apprenticeship centres, or upskilling programs within company organisations. Such engagements are generally short-term and focus on

transmitting specialised knowledge essential for sustaining the commicratic ecosystem.

Annual Statement of Service
(ASS-report)

In general, the worker's *Annual Statement of Service (ASS)* report affirms that every worker in a commicracy is a skilled worker in their own right. This denotes that workers possess an equal capacity to perform real physical work, though they hold differing levels of expertise to carry out specific tasks in defined areas or to occupy specialised roles within an organisation. The definition rests on the recognition that the ability to perform work—whether manual, technical, or intellectual—depends fundamentally on the mental resources of the individual.

Thus, a cleaner possesses the mental ability to perform real productive work in the same essential capacity as a computer programmer possesses the mental skill-set to conduct technically complex work. The same principle applies to the engineer and the gardener, the footballer and the school teacher, and to any other form of labour.

The demonstrable capacity to perform a task, with or without formal training, defines a worker in a commicracy. It is this capacity that recognises workers as independent freelancers in their own right within any organisation. Such capacity not only

gives workers the freedom to occupy defined areas of work, but also empowers them to explore different sides of their mental ability — to take calculated risks, to pursue new roles, and to weigh the potential benefits or costs of such decisions.

Because here, employees are regulated directly by the State government rather than by the company management, workers bear both the risks and the rewards of the capacities they choose to exercise. A trained medical surgeon, for instance, may acquire the desirable ability to work as a biomedical engineer without formal retraining and may even contribute to software development for improving human health. Likewise, a gardener may naturally develop proficiency in tool servicing and mechanical repairs, thereby extending their functional repertoire beyond the confines of their initial occupation.

In a commicratic organisation, the horizontal structure makes it necessary for employees to explore multiple dimensions of their mental capacity, to undertake specified areas of work, and to demonstrate competence across a range of roles in order to maintain their job-security status in society.

Put differently, the ability to perform multiple work types becomes essential for workers in a commicracy, especially where such work types fall within related or adjacent areas that may traditionally be categorised under the same department in a bureaucratic organisation. This polyvalent capacity directly

reduces the number of formal management layers, departmental divisions, or supervisory heads required within an organisation. By default, it also minimises the level of resource usage required in production, as labour becomes more fluid, more adaptive, and more collectively efficient.

The Operational Logic of Commicracy In a Post-Bureaucratic Economy

In volume-1 of this manifesto, it was proposed that with Africa's growing population—now exceeding 1.3 billion—it becomes both feasible and desirable to define the primary working-age group as those between ages 21 and 50.

Under the ethno-corporatist economic-system, the strategic deployment of artificial-intelligence technologies and robotic machinery would allow societies to harness the biological strength, natural vigour, and high-initiative behavioural traits most pronounced in individuals aged 16 to 50. Such integration of technological systems makes it possible to channel the working-age population into multiple roles that can be rapidly reconfigured to meet the fluctuating operational demands of any corporation at any time.

With the drastically reduced number of management layers found in a commicracy, employees operate as freelancers who bear the responsibility to identify, pursue, and accomplish their

own objectives in alignment with the targets projected for their division by the coordinator-supervisor.

The horizontal structure and efficient use of communal resources make each worker an independent operational entity, situated within an interdependent network of co-workers functioning as one coordinated team. In larger commicratic organisations, each management layer or department has direct and immediate access to the full set of resources necessary to complete its tasks, with video conferencing in most cases, removing the barriers of physical distance.

Indeed, the contemporary social culture of internetisation, which already defines much of 21st century life, provides the ideal economic platform for remote collaboration across all sectors of an organisation. Workers can obtain resources and perform joint tasks from different locations with the same efficiency as if they were physically present in the same building.

This demonstrates that commicracy does not require large bodies of workers to commute daily to centralised office spaces. Entire industries would shift toward remote production, with employees maintaining open video communication channels from their homes during working hours. Physical office buildings would thus become rare and context-specific rather than universal.

Because ethno-corporatism operates as a non-monetary economy—neither money-driven nor profit-oriented—the competitive capacity of organisations depends primarily on product quality. Individual *corposense* becomes openly appropriated as the animating force of production: intellectual-property insights, resources of functional-value, material accessibility, and the collective energy of labour power.

It would become normal for companies to employ large teams and establish home-office setups for their workers, equipping them with the necessary tools and systems connected to the organisation's private Central LAN Server.

Whereas bureaucratic organisations waste vast amounts of time sourcing resources—often unaware that the same tools already exist in other departments—commicracy centralises this process. The company's Foreman-supervisor manages the Central Server, allowing employees from any department to request and immediately access the resources already available elsewhere within the organisation. Real-time reporting eliminates the unnecessary duplication of purchases or licence renewals that typically occur in bureaucracies due to information silos and hierarchical bottlenecks.

By placing all workers on the same management level, the horizontal structure of commicracy enables a high degree of coordination and synchronous execution of tasks, regardless of

organisational size. Work can be rapidly reorganised into short phases with continuous reassessment and adaptation. Each employee remains a freelancer in their own right, holding personal goals and objectives that must align with the broader aims of the organisation.

Workers thus become independent operational units with full control over their work processes, able to manipulate resources, alter strategies, and recalibrate their workflow patterns to optimise performance.

This stands in sharp contrast to bureaucracy, where employees are frequently slowed down by procedural delays, excessive paperwork, and the burden of seeking permission from multiple superiors in a dual-reporting hierarchy merely to access a resource. In commicracy, authority is equalised, access is immediate, and productive capacity is unconstrained by hierarchical obstruction.

Ethno-Corporatist Labour Dynamics and the Horizontal Structure of Commicracy

The commicratic structure is engineered to concentrate worker attention on outcomes rather than processes, ensuring that every individual's cognitive and creative energy is directed toward the completion of a definable end-result. Bureaucratic systems, by contrast, misallocate human focus toward procedural

rituals—forms, permissions, meetings, and layered approvals—where the process eclipses the product. In such environments, the natural susceptibility of human attention to distraction becomes a structural liability. Commicracy resolves this by removing excess procedural noise and designing the workflow around the clarity of purpose.

Because of this systemic clarity, commicracy can scale upward or downward without degrading quality, speed, or delivery. The structure is inherently elastic: it expands to absorb large projects and contracts, and it contracts efficiently without paralysing the organisation. This adaptability emerges from the absence of traditional departmental heads.

Without the restrictive reporting chains of bureaucracy, employees act with greater autonomy and creativity, engaging in interdependent collaborations with colleagues while receiving strategic direction only from the coordinator-supervisor. Completed work then follows a simple pathway: approval by the coordinator-supervisor before delivery to the Contract-administrator supervisor or the Client-representative supervisor, depending on the nature of the task.

A commicratic organisation is built upon two permanent worker divisions:

1. The Supervisory Division, and

2. The Employee Division,

with the capacity to spawn temporary hybrid departments whenever project-specific demands arise. Supervisors serve as the interface between employees and customers, reinforcing workplace clarity by ensuring that workers understand their task priorities without being pulled into administrative burdens.

Where bureaucracies disperse a worker's attention through endless meetings, paperwork, and dual-reporting lines, commicracies strategically allocate administrative functions to the supervisory division. This enables employees to direct their full skill-set toward specialised duties without administrative burdens. The supervisory-division, therefore, shoulders the responsibility for organisational goals, maximising alignment between strategic direction and operational execution.

Within a typical commicratic organisation, the Contract-administrator supervisor and Client-representative supervisor constitute the core of the Administrative-Department. Their roles are carefully differentiated to suit the nature of production. The Contract-administrator supervisor is ideal for manufacturing and product-based organisations, managing contractual obligations, scheduling, and the formal conditions under which labour and resources are mobilised. Conversely, the Client-representative supervisor is better suited to service-based organisations where

client interaction, expectations management, and service continuity are paramount.

Both supervisors maintain the critical function of meeting with potential clients and executing the contractual framework that governs each project. They liaise with the Personnel-Department through the Foreman, ensuring that each contract is assigned to the appropriate Project-manager or coordinator, who then oversees its execution from inception to completion within the timeframe specified.

SUPERVISORY DIVISION			EMPLOYEE-DIVISION
Administrative Department	Personnel Department	Planning Department	Employee Department(s)
Contract-Administrator and/or, Client-Representative	HR-Inspector and, Foreman	Coordinator and/or, Project Manager	Freelancer(s)

Within the Personnel-Department, the Foreman and the HR-Inspector operate as distinct supervisory authorities with clearly differentiated responsibilities. Each manages a different dimension of organisational resources, ensuring that both human

and material assets function efficiently and without disruption. The Foreman oversees the organisation's resource architecture from an accounts-receivable and employee-allocation perspective, making the Personnel-Department the central hub through which all resource management flows.

By contrast, the HR-Inspector serves as the institutional conduit to the Secretariat Ministry of Labour & Industry. Their role encompasses recruitment, the regulation of each employee's lifecycle within the organisation, and the administration of individual worker's State-entitlement through the worker's CSP government-issued service card.

The HR-Inspector also has the mandate to recommend sanctions to the State based on each worker's *Annual Statement of Service (ASS)* report, making their office both regulatory and corrective. However, the final decision whether to award sanction in specific case rests with the State regulatory department, and not the HR-Inspector.

Both supervisory offices—the Foreman and the HR-Inspector—thus engage in the combined internal and external management of organisational resources, each sustaining the structural integrity of commicratic operations.

Alongside the Personnel-Department, the Planning-Department houses the Project-manager and the Coordinator.

Their functions revolve around the complete life cycle of contracts and projects, from initial planning to final execution. These two roles anchor the intellectual and logistical core of commicratic project governance. They maintain responsibility for advising all employees, including supervisory colleagues, on company policies and organisational regulations, ensuring alignment between individual objectives, departmental affiliations, and the overarching mission of the organisation.

The Coordinator, in particular, bears responsibility for managing planning compliance, recommending training programmes, and facilitating up-skilling to enhance workers' specialised expertise. In commicracy, coordinators frequently assume the duties of a Project-manager when a project arises within their department, eliminating the bureaucratic impulse to hire additional temporary managers for tasks already within the department's intellectual capacity.

However, the designation of Project-manager holds a specific meaning within commicracy. It signifies an individual commissioned to execute a skill-set that is not ordinarily available within the organisation. Some contracts may demand specialist project-management capacities that exceed the organisation's in-house expertise.

In such cases, a Project-manager may be temporarily employed within the Planning-Department, or certain aspects of

the work may be outsourced to another organisation. When this occurs, a coordinator from the insourced organisation may operate as a Project-manager when working across multiple locations, emphasising the fluid and interchangeable nature of both roles. Thus, both Coordinator and Project-manager are interlinked positions belonging to the Planning -Department within the supervisory-division.

As demonstrated, each role within the supervisory division carries a specialised skill-set distinct from others within the same division. For example, the Contract-administrator supervises contractual integrity and possesses the authority to amend or restructure existing contractual terms. Such modifications may arise from customer requirements or from internal departmental recommendations—whether to accommodate resource availability, skill-set limitations, or new project conditions emerging from the Planning or Personnel-departments.

This internal specialisation does not operate in isolation. Just as the employee-division functions through extensive collaboration, so too does the supervisory-division. Each role and duty within commicracy is shaped by the commissioning-rules binding organisations to their clients, and these rules vary across projects. This ensures that commicratic structures remain adaptive, agreement-driven, and aligned with the pragmatic requirements of each contractual undertaking.

Within the employee-division, each department operates with the freedom to concentrate exclusively on the delivery of tangible work-output according to its specialised skill-set. Employees are liberated from the bureaucratic burdens of paperwork, mandatory meetings, and the hierarchical expectation to prioritise loyalty to the company above loyalty to their operational department.

This structural liberation allows the IT department to focus purely on writing code, the Research & Development department to concentrate on data collection and field research, the Marketing & Sales division to allocate its Social-Media promoters to writing analytical or promotional articles, the Customer Service department to commit fully to receiving calls and attending to client needs, the Engineering department to design and prototype technical solutions, and the Resource & Accounting department to concentrate on calculations, estimations, and analytical assessments. In commicracy, the employee-division embodies the productive engine of the organisation, committed solely to the work that generates real value.

Commicracy grows organically from the cultural shift toward web-internetisation and relies deeply on simple computer programs to execute tasks, with digital forms replacing all physical paperwork. The supervisory-division retains

responsibility for documentation when required, yet even this occurs entirely through digital means. There is no need for paper stacks, filing cabinets, or physical archives occupying office space.

Communication and coordination between internal departments use organisations government-provided Private Network LAN Server, removing the necessity for internet access except when connecting deliberately to external World Wide Web portals. Information circulates digitally across offices using portable storage devices or shared digital environments, making the storage and reuse of essential data seamless and efficient.

In commicracy, the deliberate commitment to eliminating paper is aligned with a broader objective: to automate as many tasks as possible through computer programming. Over time, the reliance on paperwork naturally diminishes as digital workflows and automated systems take precedence.

However, due to the commissioning-rules governing the workers' service system, the supervisory-division maintains the discretion to choose between taking immediate action to complete tasks or devoting time to digital paperwork when documentation is necessary.

For example, in a small commicratic establishment where a single individual occupies the entire supervisory-division, the

personal choice to complete digital paperwork may serve as a means of alleviating boredom or acquiring hands-on experience that contributes to up-skilling. However, as the organisation expands, paperwork and meetings quickly become unnecessary burdens that slow productivity.

In such contexts, committing to the real work—action-based, productive, and outcome-driven—becomes the authentic necessity of commicracy. There is no cultural or structural compulsion to conform to bureaucratic performances of status or authority. Instead, the ethos of commicracy encourages workers to prioritise productive action over administrative ritual, ensuring that the organisational focus remains on doing the work rather than maintaining symbolic hierarchies.

Operational Fluidity Under Commicratic Organisation

The commicratic approach to organising work horizontally—granting workers equal decision-making authority with no superiors or subordinates—is a deliberate commitment to preserving the populocratic foundations of commicracy. By removing hierarchical gradients and concentrating organisational focus on cooperative productivity, commicracy acknowledges every worker as an independent, skilled office-holder whose contributions regulate and refine the work of others.

This horizontal equilibrium is a structural affirmation that shared authority and mutual regulation are essential to the health, efficiency, and ethical integrity of commicratic organisations.

Within this structure, the various specialised employee-departments collectively form the Employee-division of the organisation. Their operational direction flows from the supervisory Planning-department, which functions as the central coordination hub. The same applies to the supervisory Administrative-department and Personnel-department, as well as to any temporary hybrid departments established for project-based needs; all take coordinating direction from the Planning-department.

In a commicracy, departments hold mutual authority to regulate one another's functional conduct. At the micro-level, employees exercise their office's discretion to manage workflows involving colleagues—both within their own department and across others—whenever those workflows impact their own individual productivity. This reciprocal regulation serves as the operational backbone of the system, ensuring fluidity, accountability, and interdepartmental harmony.

To illustrate: when a company receives a new work project from a client, the process typically begins in the Administrative-department, where the Contract-administrator receives and

interprets project requirements. The Contract-administrator then passes the project to the Foreman within the Personnel-department, who approves the allocation of material and labour resources. The availability or shortages of resources or specialist skill-sets within the organisation—especially any divergence from what the Contract-administrator anticipated—provide essential guidance for the coordinator when the project arrives at the Planning-department.

Once the Foreman has approved the project's resource allocation, the coordinator evaluates the workflow, identifies task sequences, and allocates employees across the employee-division. The coordinator then supervises, schedules, and manages the human and material resources available, ensuring the project is delivered safely, efficiently, on time, and within budget.

When a project does not proceed as planned—whether due to internal errors or customer dissatisfaction—the HR-Inspector is called upon to investigate and implement resolutions. As the supervisory officer responsible for recruitment, employee life-cycle management, and regulatory compliance through the Ministry of Labour & Industry, the HR-Inspector ensures that workers possess the competence required for their assigned roles and that their workplace environments support productivity and well-being.

The HR-Inspector also oversees health and safety standards, delivering government policies to all workers and ensuring compliance across both public and private operational environments. Their role is central to maintaining quality control and safeguarding the organisational ecology of commicracy.

This demonstrates how commicracy's horizontal structure functions with no superior-subordinate hierarchy. Every worker has equal responsibility to direct their office in a way that regulates and supports the operations of other workers across interdependent collaborations. This relational balance extends across all departments, ensuring that coordination emerges naturally from reciprocal duties rather than hierarchical command.

In practice, this becomes fully visible within everyday project workflows. For example, consider a company contracted to design and develop a website with additional digital marketing and on-page Search Engine Optimisation (SEO) services. After the web-designer in the IT-department completes their initial work, input from the Marketing-department may trigger a sequence of amendments or design adjustments to optimise the site for customer engagement or brand alignment.

The Marketing-department's direction may then require the software-developer to code new scripts or programs to meet updated customer requirements. With resources readily available

through the central server and with departments functioning synchronously, these iterative tasks can be executed within 24 to 48 hours—a speed made possible only through the horizontal, interdependent, and resource-fluid structure of commicracy.

Unlike traditional bureaucratic structures—where employees must navigate layers of administrative procedure, complete forms, secure signatures from departmental heads, schedule meetings, plan multi-stage actions, and wait through extended risk-assessment cycles—the commicratic process removes these time-consuming obstacles. Bureaucracy introduces delays measured not only in hours but in days and even weeks, stretching the time between problem identification and actual productive work. The commicratic system rejects this inefficiency entirely.

In a commicratic organisation, departmental heads are removed from the operational chain altogether. Direction, redirection, and project coherence flow exclusively through the coordinator-supervisor, whose role is not managerial in the bureaucratic sense but relational and integrative. Any procedural routine that can be eliminated, automated, or programmatically handled is excluded from commicratic daily operations. Employees receive assignments directly from the coordinator-supervisor, who ensures that all tasks—regardless of their

diversity—align with the unified completion of the project to which those tasks contribute.

Large organisations may operate with a Planning-Department composed of approximately ten coordinators, each functioning as a supervisory nexus for varying workflows. An employee may therefore work on multiple tasks under multiple coordinators, reflecting the freelance-like mobility and task-fluidity that characterise commicratic labour patterns. Coordinators may assign work based on rota systems, skill-sets, or through observed individual employee's operational abilities, depending on what the project requires.

However, in operations where departments must be grouped by function—particularly in factory-based or high-synchronisation environments—coordination does not depend on micro-managed assignment. Instead, entire departments engage collectively in the same type of work, ensuring that all incoming tasks are handled as a collective unit.

In such environments, every employee performs identical duties, removing the need for coordinators to assign individual tasks. Here, commicracy adapts seamlessly: maintaining efficiency without imposing unnecessary coordination or hierarchical fragmentation.

Employee Empowerment and Adaptive Functionality in Commicratic Systems

The various domains of commicratic processes are specifically designed to expand the empowerment of individuals within the workplace. Unlike bureaucratic systems—where managers exercise overpowering authority, signatures are required for even trivial matters, and recommendations or rejections circulate endlessly—commicracy removes such procedural congestion.

Instead, it grants employees the freedom to make real-time decisions, while the supervisory team ensures that those decisions remain aligned with organisational objectives and the regulatory standards established by the State. This balanced structure creates wide operational boundaries within which employees may act autonomously, define their expectations, and set personal performance goals.

Because employees are regarded as experts within their respective fields, the burden of micromanagement is lifted entirely from the coordinator. Employees retain full freedom to apply their own professional initiative to fulfill customer requirements and meet task-specific demands. Coordinators hold no authority to impose discretionary methods or personal preferences upon employees; their function is limited to ensuring compliance with the directives issued by the Contract-

Administrator or Client-Representative from the Administrative-Department.

These supervisory instructions—which reflect customer specifications—establish the guiding framework within which all employee initiatives must operate. The Coordinator’s monitoring responsibilities therefore exist only to verify that employees are following the customer-aligned instructions accurately, not to dictate how a task must be executed.

This structure demonstrates the inherent adaptability of commicratic organisations. Such institutions can rapidly adjust to shifting market conditions through flexible recruitment of additional personnel and the efficient allocation of material resources. Over time, this produces an economic environment in which industries become robust, cross-functional, and mutually convergent. It becomes common, in a mature commicratic society, to find organisations undertaking functions that overlap with entirely different sectors, reflecting a national landscape of operational fluidity and resource interchangeability.

For example, consider a company specialising in the production and sale of plastic kitchenware and home containers manufactured through 3D printing at customer-specified shapes and dimensions. Although formally registered as a producer of plastic wares, its technical infrastructure—particularly its use of advanced 3D printing—naturally positions it to receive

commissions for 3D-printed plastic components used in unrelated domains, such as children's toys, industrial prototypes, or bespoke plastic parts.

Similarly, the company may be called upon to produce 3D drawings for external clients. Thus, the organisation's functional identity expands beyond its registered category, merging the fields of plastic manufacturing, 3D printing, and 3D design into a single adaptable enterprise.

Cross-Sector Fluidity and Project-Managerial Mobility in Commicratic Organisations

Similarly, an organisation specialising in recruitment services for the hospitality industry may be contracted to provide recruitment solutions in entirely different sectors such as engineering, telemarketing, or logistics. While such diversification may require a Project-Manager with specialised expertise to oversee the recruitment process, it naturally merges the organisation's operational domain with other recruitment agencies functioning across these sectors.

Within a commicratic society, this type of functional expansion is not exceptional but expected. The frequent demand for Project-Managers encourages companies to grow horizontally by adding new employee-departments capable of delivering additional products and services.

Regardless of organisational size, high-level performance within a commicracy depends on the effectiveness of the coordinator-supervisor. When new departments are added, the organisation's horizontal structure broadens, often requiring the supervisory Planning-Department to expand with additional coordinators to maintain operational harmony across the extended landscape of tasks.

Coordinators, by design, may also serve as Project-Managers for external organisations on a contractual or temporary basis. In such arrangements, the coordinator's responsibility is to ensure that all employees involved in the project align with the customer's goals and comply with the directives issued by the supervisory Administrative Department.

This responsibility is simplified by the commicratic principle that employees are task-specific experts. When a required skill-set is absent within the host organisation, the coordinator simply sources the necessary expertise from within the organisation or elsewhere.

This framework further reinforces a key characteristic of commicratic labour: employees may be commissioned to work in external organisations on defined tasks, but always under the strategic coordination of a Project-Manager. For instance, if a company receives a project requiring its Coordinator to act as a Project-Manager in a host organisation, the Coordinator may

identify specific skill-sets that exist within their home-company but are lacking in the host-company.

Because employees in a commicracy function as practical freelancers—experts in their fields and action-oriented task executors—it is entirely appropriate for the Coordinator to select and assign a specialised team from various departments within their home-company to complete the project tasks externally. Thus, employees may operate under the direction of their own Coordinator acting in a Project-Managerial capacity within the host organisation, ensuring coherence, expertise, and commicratic efficiency across organisational boundaries.

Commissioning, Outsourcing, and Relational Coordination in Commicratic Workplaces

In situations where severe government sanctions or penalties threaten the viability of an organisation—potentially leading to forced liquidation—the supervisory Personnel-Department and the Administrative-Department from other organisation may be recruited to also be placed on the commissioning list to support a struggling company.

This flexible transfer of supervisory roles makes organisational takeovers significantly more seamless in commicratic societies. Expertise from various departments can be reallocated swiftly, ensuring that operational continuity and

institutional knowledge are preserved even during structural transitions.

Outsourcing similarly follows this logic. When an organisation does not wish to create a new department to accommodate a specialised function, it may adopt a coordinated commissioning strategy. A Project-Manager with the required expertise can be brought in from another organisation, accompanied by a team of employees possessing the necessary skill-set to complete the task.

In a commicracy, this arrangement imposes no additional burden on workers. Commissioned employees simply perform the same tasks they normally carry out in their home-company, with the same coordinator supervising their work in the host environment. This preserves workflow familiarity while maintaining high standards of productivity.

By contrast, in bureaucratic systems, temporary or contracted workers often endure significant burdens as they are forced to regulate their work practices according to each host-company's shifting rules, changing expectations, and variable operational conditions. Such constant adaptation drains time, reduces efficiency, and places unnecessary stress on workers. My personal experience across multiple recruitment agencies highlights how inconsistent bureaucratic structures hinder

productive capacity and impose avoidable obstacles on the workforce.

Commicracy, with its interpersonal organisational character, replaces such inefficiencies with a system grounded in continuous relational communication. It is built on the principle that the exchange of information between workers is central to achieving both personal and collective goals.

Coordinated activities are intentionally designed to strengthen relational ties—between employees, between employees and coordinators, and across supervisory teams. Workers from different departments are expected to meet regularly, engage in open dialogue about their tasks, and build communication pathways that support effective coordination in an organic and affinity-driven manner.

To support this, commicratic procedures intentionally create opportunities for relational interaction throughout the working day. Shared self-prepared lunches in office kitchens, designated group walks to reduce stress, collective breaks away from screens, and casual cross-departmental discussions are all structured into the organisational culture.

These practices foster relational coordination, improve communication flow, deepen interpersonal understanding, and enhance overall work performance. More importantly, they

encourage continual upskilling through shared knowledge and mutual support—solidifying the commicratic belief that coordination thrives through human connection rather than hierarchical enforcement.

Populocratic Foundations of Commicratic Governance
in an Ethnopolitan State

The activity of commicracy within any organisational setting is intrinsically populocratic. Within an Ethnopolitan State, the operational nature of commicratic practice in workplaces reflects, in real terms, the regulatory functions of State governance.

An analysis of the equalitarian foundations within a commicratic organisation reveals the government not as an external overseer, but as an authoritative participant embedded within the corporate architecture of institutions and values. Through the regulatory duty of the secretariat-ministry of Labour & Industry, governmental commicracy actively enforces equalitarian relations in the workplace.

In this sense, populocratising commicracy becomes an examination of how equality is actualised and how populocratic culture is lived in its purest existential form. The secretariat-ministry's efforts to embed equal-decision-making models within corporate organisations empower workers' unions to

articulate and defend occupational rights. These unions participate in citizenry decision-making processes that affect their trades, especially in areas where governmental conduct plays a regulatory role.

Most disputes in which workers-unions seek to express their values or challenge regulatory interpretations are settled through the Palaver-courts. In more complex or contentious cases—where either the union or the Labour & Industry ministerial office objects to the rulings on grounds of inequality or perceived bias—the matter is escalated to the House of StateLords.

As ultimate arbiters, the StateLords deliver final judicial rulings through constitutional interpretation, ensuring that all concerns and interests are represented on an equalitarian basis within the Ethnpublican State.

In circumstances where a workers' union remains dissatisfied even after adjudication by the StateLords' Assembly, the commicratic framework preserves a higher and more populocratic recourse: the matter may be taken directly to the entire working-group population for deliberation and decision on whether the relevant economic law should be amended, repealed, or reaffirmed in that specific area of concern.

Where the implications of the dispute extend beyond the working-groups and touch the broader social-order, the policy proposal may be reframed as a citizenry-wide policy question, submitted for selection by the citizenry-electorates—with or without concessions to the initiating union's position. In such instances, the authority of the secretariat-ministry of Labour & Industry is expressly subordinate to the collective will of the citizenry or their organised working-groups.

The outcome of this process is not guaranteed to favour the union that initiated the challenge; rather, it affirms a foundational principle of commicratic society: citizenry rule governs by populocratic governance. Decisions flow from the people as a whole, not from unions, ministries, or offices of administration, ensuring that law and policy remain expressions of collective consent rather than institutional preference.

The populocratic activity of commicracy illustrates how equality shapes the broader social system of control and influences how commicratic decision-making must respond to individual circumstances. Commicracy is inherently open and inclusive, ensuring that all who are affected by a given decision participate in the equalitarian-legal authority that governs it.

Populocratic principles thus flow directly from the architecture of equalitarian authority, influencing how individuals construct ethical frameworks and how they address

problems across social life. Ethnopolitanism rests on the premise that citizenry-electoralates retain full control over the governance of their society.

In contrast to democratic systems—where citizenry-electoralates elect representatives who make decisions on their behalf and enforce those decisions upon society—a populocratic government elects individuals who execute the decisions made by the people. Public officials govern their offices according to directives prescribed by the citizenry-electoralates, and the authority they exercise is strictly bound to this public mandate.

Because governmental bodies hold no superior, overriding authority in a populocratic order, there is no structural requirement for society to “hold government to account” in a democratic sense. Instead, those elected to public office are accountable to the people directly if they are alleged to have implemented their prescribed duties incorrectly or beyond the scope of their authorised mandate.

If the population becomes dissatisfied with the conduct of an elected officeholder, the people wield the power of Demotion & Substitution, exercised through the electoral process. This mechanism allows citizenry-electoralates to remove and replace any individual who occupies public office, ensuring that no official governs beyond the consent of the governed.

The decision-making power of the governed over the government is therefore the defining feature that gives a commicratic society its populocratic character, positioning the populace as the primary architects of both organisational and governmental authority.

Organisational Populocracy and the Supervisory Mandate in Commicratic Structures

Organisational populocracy has not yet been realised in any existing society, largely because contemporary institutions continue to operate through the frameworks of organisational democracy. When commicratic populocracy eventually emerges in practice, it will become synonymous with the modest conduct expected of individuals elected to public office—requiring them to behave with propriety, avoid corruption, and demonstrate respectful and considerate behaviour toward all who are affected by their administrative discretions.

Public officials will remain accountable for the actions taken within their administrative duties, fully expected to justify their decisions according to the equalitarian-legal authority that governs a populocratic State. Within organisational settings, commicracy will become associated with fast-paced procedures and prescriptive administration, characterised by a horizontal system devoid of class distinctions.

The equality-legal authority underpins populocratic activity within a commicratic organisation. It influences how the working-age may transform their skill-set into a vocation; it defines the tone of supervisory relationships; and it clarifies the employee's role within occupational complexity and diverse working environments.

In contrast to bureaucratic systems—where rational-legal authority becomes increasingly rigid as the organisation grows—commicracy is defined by equality-legal authority from its inception. The size of the organisation does not alter this principle.

Large-scale commicratic organisations may contain multiple layers of interdependent management, yet each layer remains aligned within a horizontally structured framework. Employees enter through a single reporting channel directed toward one supervisor's office, and all workers—regardless of their functional status—maintain equal authority.

As the organisation grows and requires additional workers, the structure expands horizontally by adding parallel supervisory layers, not hierarchical ones. Consequently, larger organisations will require a greater number of supervisors across their supervisory-division to oversee and maintain the daily operational flow.

The primary function of the supervisory-division is the collective monitoring of all departmental management levels within the organisation. Supervisors are responsible for setting timelines, approving task quality, and ensuring that productive work meets organisational standards. They occupy the supervisory-department with defined duties that include advising employees, motivating performance, interpreting and explaining task instructions, improving organisational order, and guiding freelance workers in their productive output.

The supervisory-department has the authority to approve tasks once they meet the quality standards set by the organisation. However, supervisors do not dictate how an employee should complete their work; commicracy protects the autonomy of employees as freelancers to carry out tasks according to their own methods, provided these methods align with organisational ethos and the job specifications originating from the Administrative-department.

The supervisor's central responsibility is to establish timelines for task completion. Employees, in turn, must deliver the final output within the prescribed timeframe. Supervisors must also build allowances for revisions and re-delivery, as it is common for work to be returned for correction. Supervisors function as evaluators, overseeing the quality of services and products produced on behalf of the organisation for the public.

Given that a commicratic economy is non-monetary, customer dissatisfaction cannot simply be dismissed or redirected. One of the primary responsibilities of the supervisory HR-Inspector is to document all disputed service outputs annually and submit them to the government regulatory office for their industry within the secretariat-ministry of Labour & Industry. These documented disputes form part of the formal record of customer dissatisfaction and inform the State's regulatory oversight of organisational performance.

In practice, a *National Customer Dissatisfaction Portal (NCDP)* will operate under the regulatory office within the secretariat-ministry of Labour & Industry. This online platform will allow customers of any organisation—whether a corporation, cooperative, or sole-trader—to report their dissatisfaction directly to the local Products & Services Standards regulatory agencies within their region.

Every submitted complaint will generate an automated unique reference number, with identical copies sent simultaneously to the complainant and to the organisation concerned. Each complaint reference number issued against an organisation must appear in the *Annual Statement of Service (ASS)* report submitted by the relevant HR-supervisor responsible for the employee implicated in the disputed service or output.

A public complaint submitted through the government database must only occur after the organisation's internal complaint procedures have been fully exhausted. Accordingly, any report lodged on the national portal must be accurately reflected in the corresponding supervisor's Annual Statement of Service for the employee involved.

Should a customer's report appear on the government database yet fail to appear in the supervisor's ASS-report submitted to the secretariat-ministry of Labour & Industry, such an omission will require a valid and substantiated explanation. Absent such justification, additional penalties will be imposed upon the supervisor, while the employee whose performance resulted in the complaint may if adjudicated incur penalties for substandard work output.

This structural arrangement highlights a critical distinction between bureaucratic and commicratic organisational governance. In bureaucratic systems, complaints are directed impersonally at the organisation as a collective entity; the company's name absorbs both acclaim and blame, masking individual accountability. Commicracy rejects this impersonality.

Instead, it institutes an interpersonal organisational procedure in which accountability is accurately attributed to the specific employees whose actions shaped the customer's

experience. The company's name functions solely as an identifier of the products and services provided; it does not represent the successes or failures of the workers who temporarily operate within its organisational framework.

For instance, in cases of food poisoning within a restaurant or the discovery of foreign objects—such as insects—in packaged meals, the individuals responsible for the lapse in standards will face direct disciplinary action from the regulatory authority. These actions may include compulsory retraining, mandatory upskilling, or assignment to a period of redemption service without reward. The company itself will remain active: in severe cases, the regulatory office may commission new management to replace those deemed incompetent or negligent.

However, even in such circumstances, the organisation retains its original identity. The company's name is not altered, punished, or rebranded, as its role in a commicratic society is simply to denote the goods and services it provides—not to absorb operational blame for failures that are, by design, attributable to individual workers.

Enforcement of Penalties

Through the Corporatist Service Provision (CSP) Card

The process by which penalties are enforced in a commicratic society operates primarily through the individual's

Corporatist Service Provision (CSP) service card, an instrument central to both economic provision and social privilege management. The CSP card functions as a comprehensive civic identity within an Ethnpublican State, governing the allocation of economic benefits, the granting of social privileges, and—where necessary—the administration of penalties.

These penalties may include temporary restrictions on privileges or the downgrading of an individual's economic provision from the standard tier to the basic tier for a set duration.

In bureaucratic societies, individuals often lose substantial funds in legal fees when defending themselves against various forms of legal action—whether work-related, civil, or familial. Commicratic societies preserve the need for legal regulation but streamline its enforcement through the national CSP system. Any penalties, restrictions, or adjustments to a person's socio-economic standing are executed directly through their CSP card rather than through financially burdensome private legal channels.

Privilege restrictions may range from the suspension of access to premium economic provisions to more serious sanctions, such as temporary loss of access to privately assigned vehicles. Even recently acquired materials may be recalled and replaced with lower-tier alternatives when penalties necessitate

it. The technical process by which all acquired economic products are digitally tagged to specific individuals—preventing transfer or unauthorised post-ownership as a means of enforcing distributive justice—will be elaborated in the subsequent volume of this manifesto.

Crucially, If a customer initiates a complaint, supervisors must ensure the matter is resolved satisfactorily. Should resolution fail and the customer remain dissatisfied, the customer must be informed that the case will be recorded in the employee's ASS-report for further review by regulatory authorities and for potential penalties where appropriate.

Where capitalist societies focus their government economic offices on tax reports and tax enforcement, a govovoxical society orientates its economic oversight toward ASS-reports, consumer satisfaction, and the integrity of service outcomes. The Ministry of Labour & Industry—responsible for regulating workers, products, and services—determines whether a company handled a complaint correctly and whether supervisors complied with the equality-legal authority directives mandated by the citizenry-electorate and binding upon all administrative governance.

Each year, and especially in complex or unresolved matters, the regulatory office must issue formal responses to complainants, delivered either by email or postal mail, detailing how their submitted complaint on the *National Customer*

Dissatisfaction Portal was addressed. If an individual remains dissatisfied with the government office's interpretation or perceives that equality-legal authority directives were misapplied or neglected, they are entitled to escalate the matter to the Palaver Court, where the case will be adjudicated and resolved according to commicratic jurisprudence.

Horizontal Structure, Innovation, and the Flexibility of Commicratic Operations

In a commicratic organisation, management layers exist in parallel horizontal structures, each defined by the specific functional responsibilities of their departments. One division may specialise in sales, while another focuses on repairs, maintenance, or technical refinement of returned products. Coordinator-supervisors oversee these divisions, monitoring employee output across multiple departments according to the organisation's scale.

In larger corporations, several supervisors may collectively manage the activities of a vast workforce; smaller organisations, as they expand, naturally subdivide their departments into more specialised units to enhance efficiency and maintain the high standard expected in commicracy.

Major corporations adopting commicratic structures often diversify into multiple product lines. Each product line may

require departments to be reorganised into smaller or larger units depending on operational needs and employee volume. This structural adaptability is a deliberate feature of commicratic design—ensuring responsiveness, cohesion, and efficient monitoring while preventing operational stagnation.

The flexibility afforded to both employees and supervisors is central to the success of commicratic organisations. The environment is intentionally shaped to promote continuous innovation, especially in contrast to bureaucratic systems where employees' ideas must ascend long chains of command before being acknowledged, approved, rejected, or ignored.

In commicracy, decision-making occurs at the closest functional level: between the supervisor and the individual employee. An employee with a novel idea for improving a product or service may submit it directly to the supervisor, bypassing unnecessary administrative barriers.

Often, customers themselves introduce new concepts or specifications, inspiring employees to refine or innovate product designs. The supervisory-division alone determines whether such innovations can be realised. If declined—whether due to resource limitations, unavailable materials, or insufficient skill capacity—customers have no grounds for complaint in such scenario. The organisation cannot be held accountable for conditions beyond its operational reach.

However, if a proposal is rejected because the idea does not align with the company's stated mission or advertised function, commicracy introduces an additional layer of innovation-friendly flexibility. Customers may appeal directly to employees by submitting requests through the organisation's supervisory Personnel-department, enabling individual employees to volunteer to undertake the work without exposing themselves to complaint risks.

In such cases, the work is carried out entirely at the customer's own risk, and dissatisfaction cannot result in a formal complaint. This exception is not a loophole but a structurally integrated motivational mechanism. It encourages creativity, and empowers employees to expand their craft.

Moreover, successful completion of these type of discretionary tasks contributes positively to an employee's *Annual Statement of Service (ASS)* report, strengthening their professional standing. This improvement reflects directly on their *Corporatist Service Provision (CSP)* service-card, resulting in enhanced privileges within the ethno-corporatist economy.

Thus, the concluding framework of commicracy affirms a system that is at once equalitarian, innovative, horizontally structured, and deeply committed to balancing consumer satisfaction with worker autonomy. It rejects the inefficiencies of bureaucracy and replaces them with a model where flexibility,

initiative, accountability, and communal fairness converge, forming a corporate culture aligned with the broader principles of Ethnopolitan governance.

CHAPTER FOUR

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHARACTER OF COMMICRACY

The morale and attitudes that give shape to a society's socio-economic character are never fixed; they shift according to human intention, collective effort, and the values a people choose to uphold. When these attitudes fail to evolve, the socio-economic character of a society can become static—a rigid condition from which its social performers struggle to extricate themselves. Stagnation, in this sense, becomes both a predicament and an inherited burden.

Avoiding such stagnation requires deliberate and sustained engagement. Societies must continuously invest in developing skills, cultivating awareness, and dedicating time to reshape the moral foundations on which their values rest. Only through persistent examination of these foundations—particularly the moral logic that underpins the dominant modal personality type of a society—can a community prevent the entrenchment of regressive or restrictive socio-economic patterns.

Commicracy therefore begins with an evaluative posture: a willingness to question and oppose any condition in which the

social-order becomes subservient to an economic-order that progresses blindly without ethical grounding. Instead, the economic-order must be aligned with the society's ethical constructs—its inherited and evolving methods of problem-solving, its communal perception of fairness, and its deeper cultural commitments. It is these peculiar ethical constructs, unique to every society, that ultimately determine how commicracy shapes its social and economic reality.

The Crisis of Conflicted Values in Africa's Socio-Economic-Order

Across the African continent today, public attitudes toward government are marked by deep frustration. Citizens speak of bad governance, institutional distrust, the inability of government bodies to prevent conflict, and the persistent failure to provide basic security and essential services—failures that often carry life-or-death consequences.

Generations remain trapped in poverty due to limited opportunity, while national economies struggle to grow because the majority of citizens do not earn enough to contribute through taxation. As a result, many African States remain locked in cycles of foreign aid-dependency simply to maintain the most basic functions of society.

Yet at the root of these crises lies a core issue seldom addressed: the structure and philosophy of organisational governance itself. Without understanding organisational structure, it becomes impossible to generate sustainable development or reconcile the conflicting values operating within African governance.

Colonialism imposed a socio-economic model designed to invert the natural order of African societies. The colonial approach enforced a bureaucratic, individualist structure aligned with Western capitalist traditions—one in which class cohort dictates the conditions of both economic-order and social-order. This violently contradicted the African normative worldview, which is rooted in collectivist cooperation, indigenous ethnoist traditions, and community-based social organisation.

The clash of these two civilisational value-systems created a profound rupture: African societies attempted to use an imported Western class cohort structure as the driver of both their economic-order and social-order, contrary to their indigenous logic. The aftermath of this forced inversion is visible across Africa today.

Following European imperialism and the rise of industrial capitalism, Western societies embraced laissez-faire economic culture—an ideology that promotes minimal government involvement in economic affairs. This worldview was exported

to African colonies, shaping their new economic systems around the supposed “free market.”

Yet this model also came embedded with social consequences: when social-order is left to drive economic-order in the absence of strong, structured government intervention, societies inevitably begin to rank people according to an economic hierarchy of worth. Social status becomes monetised, and a competitive motivation culture emerges—one that drives individuals to pursue status as the primary pathway to meeting their economic needs.

However, this process generates a regressive socio-economic structure. Social-order, operating without a stabilising ethno-corporatist economic framework, produces extreme inequality. Social status becomes tied to market-driven economic worth, leading to distortions such as:

- average footballers earning more money than politicians,
- media celebrities earning more than doctors, nurses, and police officers,
- construction workers often earning more than computer programmers.

These disparities reveal the fragmented and inconsistent logic of the imported system. The classical principles of ethno-corporatism, as advanced in this manifesto, demonstrate that

such inequalities are incompatible with the natural communal balance required for social cohesion.

Under laissez-faire capitalism, attempts to interpret or justify pay-gaps become entangled in conflicting theories. Economists struggle because:

- social bias distorts the valuation of diverse occupations,
- fluctuating social conditions lead to inconsistent interpretations of earnings data,
- qualitative value is mismatched with quantitative measurement,
- projected growth rates become unreliable,
- entire nations remain trapped in aid-dependency due to insufficient internal revenue,
- inflation becomes weaponised as a tool of economic manipulation.

These systemic distortions hinder Africa's ability to grow economically and create stability for its people. They are symptoms of a deeper structural flaw: a society cannot prosper when its social-order and economic-order are governed by contradictory civilisational values.

Commicracy responds to this crisis by restoring harmony between social-order and economic-order under an equalitarian,

organisationally coherent system—one aligned with Africa’s indigenous moral logic rather than the inherited contradictions of colonial capitalism.

Reassessing Human Inequality
and the Revaluation of Social-Order

The disorganisation within the economic-order becomes destructive when it is governed by the impulses of social-order rather than by structured economic logic. To understand how to remedy the entrenched patterns of inequality—and to ensure that the disillusionment surrounding work aligns with the social and economic character of commicracy—we must begin by recognising the biological realities of the human condition.

Humans are not identical in intellectual capacity, nor in physical ability, regardless of gender. In any workplace, two people performing substantially equal roles will not always produce equal work-output. The variability in physical stamina, cognitive endurance, or practical proficiency affects productivity in ways that are often invisible in abstract economic theory.

Similarly, the biological realities of pregnancy and menstrual symptoms frequently result in presenteeism, contributing to lost productivity that is unfairly interpreted as diminished economic value when the social-order is left to define economic worth.

Thus, creating a balanced system requires revaluing the function of social-order—not as a driver of economic-order, but as a compensatory tool to remedy perceived inequalities. Biological diversity—differences in body shape, strength, neurocognitive profile, hormonal profile, or psychological disposition—does not diminish humanity.

Individuals, through shared cultural habits, acquired knowledge, and distributed labour, function as a unified social organism capable of collective productivity. When social-status is allowed to determine economic value, as is typical in hierarchical capitalist cultures, it transforms organic differences into artificial economic inequalities. This regressive culture of social and economic disparity arises from bureaucratic systems that structure people into hierarchical levels of worth.

Commicracy rejects this model. Its foundational principle is the horizontal level of worth, an inherent social characteristic that equalises human relations by ensuring that whilst economic-order drives social-order, not the reverse, worth is equalised. In a commicratic society, economic-order becomes the rational engine of societal organisation, while social-order becomes the reflective outcome of a well-structured economic arrangement.

In Nature, biological species—including humans—exhibit natural diversity of gender, mental capability, and physical ability. These differences inevitably generate a degree of social

classification. Yet when monetary systems distort these natural distinctions by elevating or diminishing social-status according to wealth, income, or occupation, social-classification evolves into economic hierarchy. The spending power of money, when placed at the centre of determining human worth, converts social categories into rigid class systems.

The economic-order, when improperly aligned, can transform these natural differences into instruments of domination. The imposition of monetary value on human labour has been exploited to such a degree that it entrenches hierarchical class relations, amplifying social and economic inequalities far beyond the scope of natural diversity.

A commicratic system, by contrast, restores equilibrium by restructuring economic-order as the primary force that shapes social-order whilst equalising their interlink with worth, allowing society to transcend artificial hierarchies and move towards equality that respects human diversity without weaponising it.

Status-Consistency, Biological Diversity,
and the Class-Altruist Foundation of Commicracy

When we apply the sociological concept of *status-consistency* to the social-order of animals, we observe a naturally organised economic-order governed almost entirely by biological factors. Animals exhibit greater flexibility in maintaining status-

consistency because their social organisation is not distorted by artificial mechanisms such as monetary imposition, academic credentialism, or bureaucratic hierarchies. Their economic-order remains a direct expression of biological capability, instinctual cooperation, and distributed labour.

When we contrast this with humans, however, we immediately identify the origins of structural inequality. First, education—although fundamentally a tool for increasing economic efficiency in any species—has been transformed by humans into a mechanism for social-consistency. By placing economic value upon education, human societies stratify labour into hierarchical tiers. This creates the first layer of economic-hierarchy—an essential characteristic of bureaucracy—where educational achievement artificially determines economic opportunity.

Second, labour itself provides the foundation for the material well-being of every biological species. Yet humans extend this by placing value on *economic security*, manufacturing the dichotomy of rich and poor. This move introduces status-consistency into economic-hierarchy and ultimately solidifies the class-system. Once economic security becomes the marker of social-worth, labour ceases to be an equalising force and instead becomes the tool by which hierarchical social-order is reproduced.

Third, the economic value assigned to human labour gradually becomes the primary determinant of both economic efficiency and social-consistency. The imposition of money as the regulator of human resources elevates economic value above biological reality, creating a permanent inequality embedded within status-consistency. This is the machinery that generates the contemporary inequality crisis: economic-order distorted by hierarchical valuation, rather than shaped by the natural distribution of capability to do anytime of work.

To illustrate this dynamic, we may consider the example of Richard Branson, founder of the Virgin Group. With no college education and having dropped out of high school, he entered adulthood as a member of what society would identify as the lower-class. Manual labour and low income reinforced that categorisation.

However, through mental ingenuity and physical capability alone—traits available across the human population—he established enterprises, employed others, and accumulated vast wealth. He rose into the upper-class, gaining social-consistency and economic security. Yet this ascent exposes a deep contradiction: society claims to value education as the pathway to higher status, yet Branson surpassed this valuation entirely through non-academic capability. His example reveals that human-imposed hierarchies of educational worth are

fundamentally inconsistent with actual human potential and capability to do any type of work.

In a commicratic society, such artificial contradictions dissolve. Economic resources, labour roles, and employment opportunities would be simplified equally across industries, regardless of formal education. Workers under commicracy share equal human capacity to perform real physical work, though they differ in expertise suited to specialised tasks or organisational roles.

Biological diversity creates natural economic classification, but does not dictate economic hierarchy. Instead, it forms the basis for the class-altruist system within an ethno-corporatist economic structure, where economic security derives from one's capacity to contribute labour or any type of work, rather than from credentials or Corposense advantage.

Education, in such a system, retains its rightful purpose: not as a gatekeeper of hierarchical privilege, but as a mechanism for increasing skill, improving economic efficiency, and supporting collective understanding of economic security. Its role shifts from manufacturing hierarchy to enhancing shared prosperity. Under commicracy, economic-order drives social-order and mediated by equal worth; and under a class-altruist society, education strengthens the collective capability rather than stratifying it.

Class-Altruism and the Reversal of Hierarchical Value

The class-altruist system recognises that individuals with the capability to perform real work—regardless of the extent of their formal education—can legitimately become supervisors in large-scale organisations, possessors of enterprises, or founders of multiple companies. Under this model, capability is not predetermined by academic credentials but by the individual's real capacity for labour, responsibility, and contribution to economic-order.

In contrast, within the class-system of bureaucratic societies, Richard Branson stands as a rare exception: an outlier who succeeded in spite of a system that imposes social-order to control economic-order. His rise is often described as “luck” precisely because, for the average person, such upward mobility is nearly impossible in a world ruled by monetary hierarchy and economic inequality. In a system where monetary value tyrannises over all other values, exceptional cases do not refute the structure—they highlight its failure.

In bureaucratic societies, countless individuals labour twice as hard, accumulating degrees, masters' qualifications, and even multiple PhDs, yet remain trapped within the middle-class in Western states or the lower-class across Africa. Their credentials do not translate into economic-security because value is not

determined by capability for work but by the hierarchical control mechanisms of the money economy.

Under a class-altruist system, however, a person's ability to engage meaningfully in multiple forms of work opens pathways to continuous opportunity and lifelong economic-security. All individuals—including women whose economic productivity may fluctuate due to biological cycles, the elderly, and persons with disabilities—retain equal status-consistency, because economic worth is decoupled from hierarchy and grounded in participation rather than exclusion.

Commicracy rests on the belief that status-consistency, which defines an individual's capacity for work, should emerge from personal effort and inherent ability—not from biased meritocratic filters, credential barriers, or imposed hierarchical value. It is a system that restores economic-order as the natural driver of social-order and mediated by shared worth—class-altruism.

Yet, it must be acknowledged that pure commicracy is an ideal. No society that relies on hierarchical monetary regulation can fully realise equality. Status-consistency is today shaped by an entanglement of educational privilege, economic stratification, and institutionalised merit. These forces, reinforced by bureaucratic norms, distort human potential and disrupt the possibility of a naturally balanced social-order.

Although commicracy has not yet been implemented in any nation, this manifesto proposes its structured application across Africa. It offers a framework in which academic performance, job performance, and institutional assessment are integrated not to reproduce hierarchy but to cultivate a shared worth in value-consistency that produces a class-altruist system—one where economic-security is grounded in collective welfare and individual capability rather than monetary accumulation.

A class-altruist society comprises individuals who share a common status based on capability for meaningful work, learning, and contribution rather than on wealth or credentialism. Unlike the class-system—where individuals chase higher education merely to secure income, seek employment that pays more rather than work aligned with their natural capacities, and where social boundaries restrict friendship, association, or marriage—the class-altruist model dissolves these artificial limitations.

In the class-system, the wealthy often isolate themselves socially from the poor, while the poor aspire to marry or associate upward in an attempt to escape their imposed economic fate. In a class-altruist system, neither money nor the monetary definition of “value” determines the economic destiny of individuals.

Under commicracy, the State assumes a transformative role, guiding individuals from birth to death, ensuring that every person is equipped with the skill-set and opportunities necessary for a fulfilling career that matches their natural capacity. Education becomes an instrument of empowerment rather than a barrier; career pathways are aligned with personal inclination and not necessarily of imposed economic necessity; and the pursuit of money ceases to distort human aspiration.

Thus, in a class-altruist society, people are liberated to marry for love, form genuine friendships, and build human relationships grounded in affection, respect, and shared humanity. No person gains unfair advantage on the basis of wealth or hierarchical status, and none is pressured into unequal relationships for economic survival. Social-standing ceases to be an economic weapon. The human body—the natural biological vessel of our varied abilities—loses its exploitability as a tool for climbing imposed class hierarchies. A commicratic society, therefore, restores the dignity of equality to all human interactions and dissolves the artificial divisions sustained by the monetised class-system.

The Moral Architecture of Commicracy and the Commissioning-Rule

Commicratic morality is embodied in the term commicrats—the public officials appointed or elected to administer public

office through the principle of commissioning-rule. These individuals, whether elected govoxiers or govoxical appointees within an Ethnopolitan State, hold authority not as autonomous rulers but as co-governors. Their mandate is to execute public duties in shared-rule with the electorate, forming a cooperative administrative union between the governed and those chosen to serve.

The morale and attitude underpinning commicrats' work-ethics are shaped entirely by the commissioning-rule. This rule constitutes the guiding covenant of public service: a set of mutually agreed values and responsibilities that define how public office is to be held, exercised, and preserved.

Commicratic work-ethics extend beyond procedural duties; they are the moral qualities and mental attitudes of public performers. Competence, fairness, and accountability become the baseline virtues through which commicrats engage in the shared governance of society.

At the centre of commicratic morality is the mental attitude necessary for public service: the interpersonal ability to cooperate, communicate, and build relationships across the layers of governance. Commissioning-rule binds self and others in a shared civic experience. It asks each public official to internalise the experiences of citizens, to relate to others'

circumstances with a sense of empathetic identification—as if their struggles, expectations, and aspirations were their own.

In effect, commissioning-rule functions as the moral spine of commicratic administration. It provides the ethical convenience and clarity required for stable public policy: transparent decision-making, unambiguous moral directives, consensual procedures, and harmonised expectations.

Under commicracy, decisions taken by public officials are legitimate only when they reflect a shared understanding between State actors and citizenry. The moral claims guiding administrative actions derive not from unilateral authority but from consensus—both among those who govern and among those affected by governance.

Consequently, commicratic standards articulate what public officials are expected to do, rather than focusing on prohibitions. This positive formulation reflects the nature of commissioning-rule: both the government and the governed are signatories to an ethical agreement that outlines expectations, responsibilities, and moral consequences of public action. Commicrats and citizens alike share accountability in preserving this moral equilibrium.

Importantly, a distinction must be recognised between two domains of action in commicracy:

1. Legal action – actions explicitly prescribed or required under the commissioning-rule.
2. Right or wrong action – actions not expressly required but left to the discretion of public officials, guided by the moral logic of commicratic governance and interpersonal procedures.

This duality creates space for innovation. Commicratic structure does not suffocate personal initiative under bureaucratic rigidity. Instead, it encourages public officials to exercise discretion, creativity, and professional judgement. Individuals have full managerial control over work techniques, provided these techniques aim at efficiency, equity, and the moral coherence of the commissioning-rule.

In this way, commicracy merges ethical governance with functional flexibility. It replaces hierarchical bureaucratic coercion with a cooperative moral order—an administrative culture where duty, empathy, innovation, and shared-rule form the foundation of govovical life.

The Moral Foundations and Administrative Governance of Commicracy

The morale and attitudes towards the socio-economic character of society are regarded as changing and changeable by deliberate human effort; otherwise, they risk remaining static—

forming a predicament from which social performers find extrication increasingly difficult. While such an approach to change demands strategic investments in skills, time, and institutional discipline, it remains the only safeguard against nurturing a rigid socio-economic culture that no longer meets the moral aspirations of its people.

Avoiding stagnation requires continuous evaluation of the moral source from which societal values arise, especially those shaping the modal personality type of a population. It further requires persistent resistance to conditions that permit social-order to dominate or distort the economic-order. Rather, commicracy insists that the ethical constructs guiding problem-solving must shape, refine, and sometimes override habitual socio-economic practices so that society evolves progressively and morally.

In this context, how moral discretion is exercised within administrative settings becomes central to the socio-economic character of commicracy. For example, determining what constitutes a fair decision by a government official may fall within, or outside, what the public might perceive as “right” or “wrong.”

When such a decision is submitted to the Supervisory-arm of government for adjudication, the action may be legally justified either way under commicratic principles or interpersonal

procedures. The decisive factor is whether the decision-maker acted within the mandate granted by their commissioning-rule.

Society is not a static entity but a project requiring deliberate effort. Here is a summary of the key pillars of the moral foundations of administrative governance in commicracy:

- **Dynamic Evolution:** Morale and social attitudes must be consciously shaped to avoid stagnation.
- **Strategic Investment:** Progress requires a commitment to skill development, time management, and institutional discipline.
- **The Primacy of Ethics:** In a "Commicratic" system, the ethical framework (the "moral source") should govern and refine economic practices in institutionalising altruism relations, rather than allowing economic logic to free-falling to dictate social order.
- **Administrative Mandate:** Moral discretion in governance is validated not just by public opinion of "right or wrong," but by whether an official operates strictly within their codified commissioning-rule or uncoded interpersonal-procedure.

Understanding the "Commissioning-Rule":

Commissioning-rule highlights a fascinating tension in administrative settings. A decision might be controversial to the public, yet legally and ethically "justified" within the system if it aligns with the specific mandate granted to the official by the citizenry themselves. This provides that in Commicracy, procedural integrity is the primary safeguard of the socio-economic character.

It is a fundamental commicratic expectation that any authority-holder within the system possesses full managerial control to consider both sides of a situation before issuing a legally binding conclusion. Yet there are circumstances where a strictly legal determination may be insufficient, and where fairness demands the exercise of discretion not expressly outlined in the commissioning-rule.

Even in such cases, commicrats are required to remain firmly, not only within the legal boundaries that governs their office but to remain loyal to the interpersonal-procedures that governs commicracy. They must demonstrate heightened sensitivity to the moral consequences of their actions—particularly in how fairness is perceived and experienced by those they serve. In turn, the public is encouraged to maintain high expectations of commicratic morality, recognising that such

moral vigilance strengthens administrative integrity across government offices.

Consequently, in an Ethnopolitan State, all citizenry-electoralates are categorised as public officials in the same moral capacity as elected govoxiers and appointed government administrators. Public office is not a “job” but a vocation within the ethno-corporatist economic system. Duty, patriotism, and service to the collective conscience constitute the morale and attitude expected of commicratic work-ethics. This creates a harmony of expectation among all categories of public officials: each holds a vocational obligation to the State either as a right of citizenship or as contractual employment.

However, a distinction exists. While the obligations of citizenry-electoralates to the State remain morally grounded and separate from their economic security, the obligations of both elected govoxiers and appointed officials are legally tied to their economic provision. As such, they may be held legally responsible for deviations from their commicratic commissioning-rules, whereas citizenry-electoralates are subject to moral responsibility in the fulfilment of their civic duties.

These principles form essential components of commicratic morality and shape the administrative accountability structure within an Ethnopolitan State. Subsequent sections explore how these values manifest within corporate organisations, public

institutions, and the wider economy. They will illustrate the morale and attitude expected of workers in different settings, and examine the supervisory and regulatory attempts of governmental bodies tasked with sustaining economic institutions.

This addresses a central challenge inherent in horizontally structured organisations: how to maintain administrative control and accountability in a system where every individual holds full managerial authority over their own work-output.

In a commicratic society, the morale and attitude of workers are structured and guided by the moral consciousness of public service, ensuring that individuals conduct themselves with honesty, responsibility, professionalism as freelancers. Since commicracy eliminates hierarchical managerial authority within the workplace, each worker operates as an independent performer whose ethical discipline replaces the supervisory power over them traditionally exercised by employers.

Under this system, commicratic work-ethics reflects the intrinsic quality of the performer—their capacity to generate outcomes interdependently with others or through the commissioning-rules that organise collective tasks. It describes the ability or state of being able to carry out real physical work either collaboratively, under instruction, or independently with others within an organisational setting.

By contrast, bureaucratic work-ethics traditionally relies on academic merit—formal educational certificates, graded assessments, and institutional qualifications—as the primary barometer of a person’s ability to perform real physical work. Yet across all sectors, employers consistently demonstrate that academic attainment alone is insufficient. They routinely provide starter-training for new employees and maintain continuous upskilling throughout a worker’s time within an establishment.

This acknowledges that real competence emerges at the point of performance, not merely at the point of certification. Organisations universally recognise that employees require practical understanding, operational familiarity, and hands-on skill regardless of their academic history. In practice, academic merit functions merely as an entry filter, not as proof of the capability to do a specified job type.

Commicratic work-ethics departs sharply from this conventional model. In commicracy, neither academic merit nor the possession of a formal educational certificate is taken as definitive proof of a person’s ability to perform real physical work. Although academic accomplishment is respected as a significant intellectual achievement, it is the demonstrable performance on the job—the lived, active, embodied capability—that outweighs both past and present academic records.

Experience across diverse institutions confirms that academic merit does not reliably predict workplace competence.

Academic institutions themselves frequently alter grade cut-offs or “minimum qualifying marks” to accommodate fluctuating numbers of applicants, revealing the inherently subjective and contingent nature of merit lists. Since these thresholds are shaped by vacancy availability rather than objective competency evaluation, academic merit becomes a variable indicator rather than a universal measure of human capability.

Thus, academic merit primarily advances a person’s *subjective ability*—a learned skill-set that may or may not correspond to inner capability. In contrast, *capability* represents a person’s actual, objective ability to perform a task. While subjective ability is abstract and can be taught cognitively, objective ability is concrete and manifest in real performance.

Both can be supported by training, but capability is the more authoritative expression of human potential because it reveals whether a person can translate knowledge into practice. A person may possess the mental capacity to understand a concept but lack the innate capability to execute it effectively within a working environment.

For example, holding a university degree in Psychology does not necessarily mean that one possesses the innate logical or

interpretive capacity required to assess human behaviour in a professional sentient-observer role. It signifies primarily that the individual has studied the conceptual and empirical frameworks that constitute the art and science of human behaviour.

However, this knowledge does not automatically confer the capability to perform practical psychological work—such as nuanced behavioural interpretation, ethical judgement, or clinical decision-making. Knowing the theory of behaviour is not equivalent to possessing the capability to practise its essential nature. Commicracy recognises this distinction and prioritises objective ability over academic abstraction in structuring its socio-economic system.

In the same way, university graduates in engineering acquire the technical skill-sets that prepare them for the profession, yet their education cannot impart the real nature of the capability required to practise engineering as a vocation.

To function effectively as an engineer, one must possess the innate capability for persistent resilience in problem-finding and creative problem-solving—capacities rooted in emotional endurance and cognitive flexibility rather than in academic instruction. Formal education equips the engineer with methods, formulas, and procedural frameworks, but only innate resilience allows those frameworks to be mobilised under pressure, uncertainty, or rapid change.

Similarly, becoming a successful 3D designer demands an innate capability of open-mindedness—a creative elasticity that enables the designer to navigate the diverse engineering habits embedded within the structural nature of things.

The same applies to psychologists, who require the innate capability of open-mindedness in the engineering habits of thought-negotiation within particular minds, relative to the behavioural logic of biological species. Their education offers the conceptual tools, but only innate interpretive capability enables them to use those tools meaningfully.

To become a medical doctor, one must possess the capacity for visualisation and adaptive reasoning, but these are sustained by the deeper innate capability for systems-thinking. Without this, no amount of medical training can yield professional excellence.

Likewise, a person with a selfish nature who learns the skill-set of resourcefulness as a Business and Marketing graduate will inevitably fail in professional practice if they lack the innate capability to collaborate with others in contractual relationships aimed at mutual benefit.

In parallel, a police officer requires an innate capability for curiosity—the investigative impulse that guides effective law enforcement. A court judge must possess an innate capability for

reflection to administer justice with balanced discernment. Even a graduate of a precinct university trained in philosophy and ethics must have the innate capability to manipulate the conveyance of words from thoughts—the intuitive mastery of conceptual articulation—if they are to practise philosophy meaningfully.

Capability, then, can be taught only insofar as its skill-sets can be transmitted, but capability itself cannot be induced. What institutions teach are the operational components of capability or the idea of it, not the biological substrate that determines whether these skill-sets can be integrated into individuals' brain's memory architecture or capable of being accomplished in practice by the individual.

A person who lacks the innate capability for a given vocation cannot meaningfully internalise the skill-set, no matter the quality of instruction. For such individuals, learning becomes a futile endeavour—an acquisition of tools that cannot be effectively used—rendering the educational exercise of little benefit within the workplace.

The Workplace
as the True School of Capability

Experience consistently shows that real education begins when one starts a job. You've got the doctorate degree. You've

done the hard work and sleepless nights of studying. And yet you're told "you need 3–5 years of job experience" at every job interviews. It is within the workplace—not the classroom—that an individual's capability to perform real physical work is revealed, tested, and actualised.

In capitalist societies, it is common to see a university graduate with a degree in English literature working as a banker, or someone trained in biology working in business management. This widespread mismatch between academic merit and occupational role demonstrates a fundamental truth: academic ability—or simply the ability to afford formal schooling—merely provides a platform through which individuals may assess and discover where their true capability lies. Education does not impart capability; instead, it offers a menu of skill-sets within which a person may find the one connected to their innate capacity.

Thus, academic merit still plays an important structural role, not because it reflects real capability, but because it provides the scale upon which individuals can weigh their own abilities in relation to the knowledge and skills required for various jobs. What matters is not the merit score obtained at the completion of a course, but the skill-sets extracted from that educational experience.

Some individuals do not possess the theoretical capability to master the art of passing exams, yet may excel exceptionally well in workplace practice. Others possess the academic capability to achieve high grades but struggle with the applied nature of real physical work. A few individuals possess both capabilities; many possess only one.

Academic institutions tend to judge students by their ability to pass exams and attain high percentages, yet employers rarely attach meaningful value to these scores. Employers are primarily interested in a worker's capability—their ability to apply a skill-set to real tasks—rather than in the academic record that precedes them.

It is not uncommon to see first-class graduates perform poorly in workplace practice, while those with second-class or lower academic distinctions excel brilliantly. This divergence reflects the natural biological diversity of human mental capacities and physical capabilities within group settings—what has been identified as *Corposense* in Volume I of this manifesto.

Commicratic work-ethics therefore standardise capability—not academic merit—as the principal measure of an individual's suitability to perform a job, complete a task, or undertake real physical work. A person excels in the workplace through demonstrated performance rooted in innate or biological capability, not through examination scores.

What truly matters is the knowledge acquired during job-specific training at the start of employment or so-called probational period, for it is this practical training that determines the essential nature of the role within the workplace.

To be a successful worker in a commicratic society requires a skill-set shaped by self-belief, thoughtful risk-taking, and the capacity to judge when and how to employ intuition within a particular domain of work.

The State, in turn, provides the conditions that empower workers to recover from failure, to be decisive, to use their intuition confidently, and to acquire the socio-economic support necessary for success. In commicracy, money is not the tool for motivation; economic-security is. True motivation arises from the innate capability within each worker, supported by a societal infrastructure designed to ensure stability, dignity, and opportunity for all.

Horizontal Structure and Interdependent Capability in Commicratic Work-Ethics

The horizontal structure of commicracy creates a workplace environment in which every employee has the opportunity—and the responsibility—to surround themselves with individuals whose skills complement their own. This interdependent arrangement ensures the continuity of each worker's economic-

security, as they learn from one another and function as a highly efficient team capable of achieving maximum productivity with minimal wasted effort or resources.

Consider the relationship between a security consultant and an IT consultant within a commicratic organisation. Their roles require close cooperation, mutual emulation, and alignment in the performance standards of their shared environment.

Yet, in many bureaucratic institutions, tension commonly arises between these two professions. IT consultants often adopt a free-thinking and open-minded orientation, excelling in creative problem-solving and system optimisation. By contrast, security consultants are trained to be cautious thinkers—curious, analytical, and inherently focused on identifying vulnerabilities, anticipating breaches, and recommending protective measures.

These differing dispositions, while complementary in theory, often generate conflict in hierarchical organisations. IT consultants may view security professionals as obstructive, overly conservative, or resistant to innovation. Security consultants may perceive IT professionals as reckless, overly liberal, or lacking the necessary instincts for caution and safety. Both sides operate from different innate capabilities and professional instincts, which, in a hierarchical structure, evolve into tension rather than synergy.

For both roles to function harmoniously, each worker must possess a meaningful understanding of the other's domain. Awareness of the skills required in adjacent job roles enables individuals to make personal sacrifices in learning, to become action-oriented, and to quickly recognise niche markets or business opportunities. This shared intelligence elevates both roles, producing technology specialists who are capable of both creating robust systems and safeguarding them.

Commicratic work-ethics naturally cultivate this cross-functional orientation. Workers become multi-taskers not by bureaucratic demand but by personal and moral commitment to interdependent productivity. When workers actively learn the skill-sets of other roles and voluntarily acquire them, they gain the capacity to perform those roles when necessary—particularly in emergencies. This raises organisational standards, fuels continuous learning, and builds confidence in each worker's ability to complete tasks effectively.

This multi-directional learning also enhances emotional intelligence within the workplace. It fosters compassion, patience, creativity, dedication to teamwork, and a deeply rooted interdependence that encourages workers to support one another morally and professionally. Such qualities form the backbone of the commicratic work-ethic, replacing hierarchy with mutual empowerment.

The commicratic structure institutionalises flexibility by its very nature. Though workers remain experts and freelancers with full autonomy over how they conduct their work—without managerial interference or imposition—they willingly relinquish the rigid notion of being “experts.”

Instead, they embrace teamwork and shared responsibility as a collective strategy for completing tasks. This shared ethos transforms the workplace into an adaptive, cooperative, and efficient environment where capability is expanded through mutual learning rather than restricted by hierarchical control.

The Organisational Ethos of Commicracy

The distinction between commicracy and bureaucracy is not a technical rearrangement of administrative procedures, nor a simple reform of managerial control. It is a structural and philosophical divergence. Bureaucracy concentrates decision-power upwards, while commicracy dissolves the hierarchical gradient altogether.

In a commicratic structure, employees stand on level ground; they determine collectively which problems are worth solving, how they should be approached, and what tools are required to resolve them with precision and efficiency. Managerial authority is redistributed into the hands of the performers themselves.

This redistribution changes the psychological climate of work. When individuals have managerial control over their own outputs, they develop a deeper confidence in their own judgment. Thoroughness becomes an instinct rather than a requirement. Forthrightness becomes natural because responsibility is internalised, not imposed.

More importantly, empathy emerges almost effortlessly: since each performer must understand the surrounding roles of their co-workers to coordinate effectively, the silos of a bureaucracy disappear. In contrast, employees trapped in bureaucratic cultures routinely describe their worst experiences in terms of managerial arrogance—where supervisors dominate the work-output of others, creating the very frustrations that commicracy is designed to remove.

The best commicratic environments allow individuals to express the public relations of their personality—the outward, socially constructive dimension of their temperament—in their work. Unlike bureaucracy, where employees must often compress themselves to fit the dominant personality of their managers, commicracy permits professional identity to expand rather than shrink. This cultivates workplaces where humane interaction, reciprocal respect, and cooperative dignity frame the culture.

Within this structure, communication becomes a native excellence. Independence sharpens expression; performers cannot rely on managerial intermediaries, so they articulate needs, ideas, and solutions directly. They adopt a flexible managerial style rooted in autonomy, freelancers operating through mutual interdependence rather than hierarchical constraint. As they network, adapt to change, and interact dynamically with co-workers, they accumulate the habits of intrapreneurship—optimism, problem-solving confidence, and responsive innovation.

Commicracy also produces resourcefulness by default. It encourages well-organised, competent performers who safeguard accuracy because the ownership of work lies entirely with them. Since individuals choose their own work rhythm and schedule, they maintain a natural commitment to their tasks; autonomy reinforces discipline more effectively than managerial surveillance. The result is a workforce with high interpersonal skill, multitasking capacity, and genuine pride in their outcomes.

These dynamics apply equally to corporations and governmental organisations. Commicracy transforms how work is organised, chiefly through horizontal information flow and collaborative synchrony. Without hierarchical competition, collaboration becomes the default. Each performer is motivated not by fear of managerial reprimand but by the intrinsic

responsibility of managing their own innovation. As workers venture into new competencies, they experience genuine value and recognition from supervisory departments—whose role is supportive, not controlling.

In such an environment, decision-making becomes intelligent, strategic, and shared. Employees craft solutions that require less effort yet deliver greater quality, because the structure empowers them to align their skills, creativity, and moral discretion with the organisation's evolving needs. Commicracy therefore builds a socio-economic character defined by autonomy, cooperation, and the flourishing of collective intelligence—an organisational ecology in which innovation becomes a natural consequence of structural freedom.

The Horizontal Work Pattern of Commicracy

The horizontal work pattern of commicracy operates fundamentally as a project-based organisation. It removes the labyrinth of complicated authority lines common in hierarchical systems and places responsibility directly into the hands of those who perform the tasks. Accountability becomes clear, immediate, and unburdened by chains of command. Because the horizontal structure is composed of levelled departments—each defined by its role, objective, and functional expertise—workers

can organise themselves fluidly across divisions and respond to tasks with speed, precision, and autonomy.

Where capitalist society defaults to a vertical hierarchy as its organisational norm, the proposed ethno-corporatist society adopts horizontal organisation as its standard form. Their divergence is structural and philosophical. In capitalist enterprises, companies are typically tethered to the geographical location of their markets, creating rigidity for employees who must operate from centralised corporate offices.

The ethno-corporatist model, by contrast, accommodates remote siting of companies and fosters flexible online working arrangements. Employees can serve customers from remote locations with no dependency on the physical corporate office, thereby reducing structural constraints and increasing operational versatility.

Departments such as marketing, sales, human resources, security, and finance illustrate how employees group around functions and skill-sets. In a hierarchical model, these departments resemble branches: clusters of specialists arranged in vertical layers, each reporting upward to a departmental head. In a horizontal model, however, departments form subdivisions, with specialists positioned side-by-side, connected laterally rather than stacked vertically. Their proximity is functional, not hierarchical.

In commicracy, departments exist primarily to assemble workers of compatible skills so that each unit becomes a distinct, specialised cluster. It is an equalitarian arrangement: employees occupying related roles, share tasks openly under an Open-Role principle, reporting directly to the organisation's coordinator-supervisor or project manager upon task completion. There are no departmental line managers. There is no superior hierarchy. Instructions and reporting flow directly between performers and the supervisory Planning-department.

The supervisory Planning-department serves as the organisation's central point of coordination. It receives customer orders from the supervisory Administrative-department and communicates directly with employees responsible for executing the required tasks. This establishes a clean, direct channel of interaction between the supervisory division and each performer—particularly for projects whose responsibilities span multiple departments.

In effect, commicracy eliminates departmental-to-departmental chains of command. Communication between departments does not occur through hierarchical layers but through horizontal exchanges among employees engaged in shared projects. Departments themselves remain functionally insular, while employees maintain autonomy over their decision-

making, work-output, and methods of collaboration within their professional domain.

This stands in sharp contrast with bureaucracy. In hierarchical structures, employees depend upon the authority of their departmental head, and each department depends upon the authority of the organisational unit above it. Commicracy restructures this relational architecture: employees operate in siloed functional teams, yet these teams engage in interdependent cooperation with other units as required. Each department maintains its own aims and objectives with minimal functional overlap.

When overlaps do arise, they do not generate conflict or competition, as they might in bureaucratic settings. Instead, overlapping responsibilities become opportunities for coalition, shared problem-solving, and equitable division of tasks—precisely because no managerial hierarchy exists to impose territoriality.

Within this pattern, commicracy cultivates a social and economic character defined by autonomy, clarity, and cooperation. Task ownership strengthens the psychological investment of workers; horizontal connectivity aligns the organisation toward collective rather than competitive outcomes. The structure itself naturally produces cohesion and innovative

performance—an organisational logic grounded not in authority, but in competence, shared responsibility, and functional unity.

Project-Based Function and Operative Logic of Commicracy

The foundational function of commicratic structure is the efficient delivery of bespoke projects. Departments are organised according to specialist skill-sets, each tasked with executing a defined component of the wider project. The coordinator-supervisor divides the project into discrete tasks and assigns them to individual employees across departments.

Depending on the nature of the work, tasks may be shared within a department under an Open-role arrangement. Multiple projects can run simultaneously, and upon the completion of each one, employees transition freely to new assignments in accordance with the role-order. When an employee lacks proficiency in a particular task, another member of the department may volunteer to share the responsibility, enabling mutual training and skill development.

Consider, for example, a 3D designer department. Even within the same professional domain, employees hold different specialist competencies: some excel in 3D sculpting software, others in architectural modelling tools, while others specialise in animation or product-manufacturing design. Because each

modelling software serves different applications, individual designers naturally possess strengths and weaknesses across the range of tools.

Employing multiple specialist variants within the department ensures that expertise can be shared fluidly. Workers can train each other in essential software knowledge, preventing any one individual from becoming overburdened and ensuring equitable task distribution. This promotes a culture in which workers learn from one another, recognise related creative ideas, and maintain an equalitarian division of labour—all in alignment with the interpersonal, collaborative ethos that defines commicratic procedures.

A commicratic organisation is fundamentally devoid of hierarchy. Employees are grouped into departments based on their job role and required task specialisations. These roles frequently necessitate collaboration with co-workers both within and outside their own departments. Consequently, a horizontal structure becomes not only appropriate but essential. It allows employees to advance their skills, form coalitions with other departments, and reorganise dynamically according to the demands of each project.

Projects within a commicratic organisation are led by the coordinator-supervisor, who oversees task distribution, planning, and the monitoring of outputs across all departments. Yet within

each task, the employee retains substantial creative freedom. The supervisor may set priorities and define the scope of activities, but the authority over how creative expression materialises in the work-output remains with the performer. This balance increases organisational responsiveness and enhances the supervisor's capacity to adapt project workflows to evolving needs.

When a project enters the supervisory-division, the coordinator-supervisor allocates tasks to the appropriate departments under an Open-role order, ensuring each project receives the precise blend of skill and expertise required. While the coordinator-supervisor manages the distribution and delivery of tasks to employees, they are not the sole communication link between employees and the supervisory-division. Instead, all channels of communication—including cross-departmental collaboration and client-driven exchanges—flow through the supervisory-division in structured pathways tailored to the needs of each performer.

This design removes the labyrinth of line managers characteristic of bureaucracy. Commicracy lacks the hierarchical tensions and power struggles that often accompany managerial layering. Instead, it functions as a streamlined, project-based structure with concentrated focus on task fulfilment and alignment with organisational objectives.

Larger organisations may require more than one supervisor to manage project activities effectively. The coordinator-supervisor's office may operate in one of two ways. The first is the previously described Open-role order, in which tasks are allocated on an unreserved basis: the next available worker receives the next available task.

Once an employee completes a task within its deadline, their name moves to the end of the role-order queue, awaiting assignment after those at the front have received their next tasks. This ensures balanced workload distribution, fairness, and constant workflow momentum across the organisation.

Coordination Processes in Commicratic Project Management

The Open-role order can also operate within the supervisory-department itself when multiple supervisors are required. In such arrangements, the first supervisor in line receives the next incoming project and may coordinate several projects simultaneously according to organisational needs. The second coordination mode is the Closed-specialty allocation, whereby tasks are assigned to workers strictly according to their specialised skill-set.

Under this reserved method of allocation, the coordinator-supervisor's office assigns specific components of a project to

those employees whose expertise aligns precisely with the skill requirement, ensuring that every element receives the exact technical resource necessary to deliver the customer's expectations.

Accordingly, commicratic organisations utilise two working Coordination-processes for integrating project activities within the supervisory-department. The Open-role order is most suitable for organisations that prioritise the continual development and diversification of staff skill-sets over speed. This model allows employees to rotate tasks and expand their capability profile through exposure to varied project requirements.

Conversely, the Closed-specialty allocation is suited to organisations that prioritise value delivery and operational speed above the long-term improvement of employees' skill-set. Both coordination modes constitute the structural mechanisms through which commicracy unifies all functions of task management. They establish an orderly arrangement that enables Planning-departments to maintain equalitarian engagement and balanced worker effort while ensuring the collective fulfilment of organisational goals.

However, the Closed-specialty allocation carries inherent risks. Because it assigns projects to supervisors or distributes tasks to employees according to narrow specialisation rather than general capability, it can slow workflow when work accumulates

beyond the available time-resources of the specialist team. Larger corporations may successfully adopt this model, as they can maintain a substantial task-force with sufficient specialists to divide work efficiently. Small-scale organisations, with fewer available specialists, are more vulnerable to bottlenecks.

Organisations that prioritise the Closed-specialty allocation over the Open-role order may achieve short-term competitive advantage—greater speed, higher output, and more immediate value—but at a long-term cost. This model slows down the improvement of employees’ existing skill-sets, reduces labour adaptability, and limits the organisation’s capacity to cultivate efficient labour-power over time.

Ultimately, commicratic organisations must adopt whichever coordination model best meets customer demand. Whether the priority is the rapid fulfilment of tasks or the long-term upskilling and diversification of labour, the central emphasis remains on operational coherence, equalitarian worker engagement, and the continual delivery of high-standard outcomes.

Departmental Mobility and Hybrid Coordination in Commicracy

Within a commicratic structure, employees are permanently grouped into departments, but promotion does not exist, for

advancement is not defined by hierarchical ascent. Instead, progression occurs through skill-set acquisition. An employee may apply to transition into a different department if they acquire the additional capabilities required for a new job-role, set of goals, or organisational function. This aligns placement with innate capability, personal aspiration, and demonstrated competence rather than bureaucratic tenure.

Individuals naturally gravitate toward job-roles that resonate with their sense of self, and commicracy accommodates this by allowing employees to pursue the skill-sets necessary to be grouped into departments that reflect their vocational preferences. While commicracy distributes work on a project basis, its horizontal structure maintains stable departmental groupings based on ability profiles. Employees move continually from one project-task to another, yet they maintain no direct contact with clients, reporting exclusively to the coordinator-supervisor for all matters relating to task allocation and project completion.

Organisations that aim to up-skill their workforce and cultivate sustained innovative capacity within their industry are particularly well-suited to the Open-role order of task coordination. This model encourages knowledge-sharing, enabling employees within a department to support one another in learning new skill-sets. It opens the possibility for two or more

employees to collaborate on a single task—one acting as the primary task-owner and the other learning the practice through direct involvement.

Departments may even request that supervisors recruit individuals with required skill-sets or sponsor existing employees to receive specified training, strengthening the department's long-term operational performance.

Nevertheless, many organisations may adopt a hybrid coordination model, combining both the Open-role order and the Closed-specialty allocation within the supervisory-division and the Planning-department. This hybrid approach widens managerial flexibility: tasks may be assigned to employees who possess the exact specialised skill-set required for speed and value, while also creating deliberate opportunities for employees without those skills to be trained through participation in designated project components.

Under this hybrid system, distribution of tasks can prioritise speciality where necessary yet still accommodate employees who need to develop new expertise. Once a project concludes, all participating employees are returned to the Open-role order, where forthcoming tasks may be allocated either to the same individuals or randomly to different members on the list within the department. This maintains equalitarian access to work

opportunities while preserving the developmental ethos that defines commicratic labour dynamics.

Concluding Observations on Hybrid Coordination Management

Hybrid coordination management enables organisations to remain flexible while rapidly upskilling employees to attain comparable skill-sets within compressed periods of operational demand. Within this structure, an organisation may appropriate Closed-specialty allocation as its primary coordination-process and maintain Open-role order as secondary, or invert the arrangement according to its strategic and operational priorities.

When Closed-specialty allocation is established as the primary process, task-owners lead each project and direct the upskilling of those assigned under an Open-role order. The Open-role participants are temporarily integrated into the task-owner's workflow, learning through guided immersion. Conversely, when Open-role order becomes the primary method, tasks are taken up by individuals whose existing skill-sets align with the immediate needs of the project, enabling rapid assembly of task-specific groups.

The efficacy of any coordination-process is therefore contingent upon an organisation's operational character, its needs, and its evolving objectives. Open-role order as the

primary process can produce exceptionally strong hybrid coordination in some organisations, yet lead to inefficiency or imbalance in others, particularly where project inflow does not match the distribution of skill-sets among employees. A department whose project flow leans heavily toward one technical requirement may inadvertently leave others idle if the wrong coordination-process is adopted.

For instance, in an organisation housing a 3D design department composed of both 3D sculptors and 3D printers, a surge of printing tasks would cause the sculptors to remain idle. This contradicts the commicratic aim of full-capacity skill-use and equalitarian work division. Under such circumstances, Closed-specialty allocation as the primary coordination-process becomes more suitable for sustaining balanced productivity in manufacturing environments, whereas Open-role order often suits service-oriented environments where demand variability is higher.

Thus, the supervisory Planning-department bears the responsibility of conducting targeted experiments to determine which coordination-process—Closed-specialty or Open-role—best delivers efficiency in relation to the organisation's goals and the nature of its departmental work-output.

What ultimately defines a coordination management structure is not the number of departmental layers, but rather the

output rhythm of each department. In large organisations with multiple layers, it is common—and often necessary—for different departments to adopt different coordination-processes simultaneously. Each employee retains responsibility for the decision-making that governs their personal job-role, yet the allocation of tasks is determined by the coordination-process chosen by the coordinator-supervisor for that department.

Occasionally, employees themselves may shape or dictate the preferred coordination-process for their department, but such decisions are generally reached through consensus with the coordinator to preserve clarity, uniformity, and accountability under the commissioning-rules principle of commicracy and their interpersonal procedures in the workplace.

Regardless of which process is appropriated at any given time, it must produce the intended outcome: an equalitarian division of work that avoids disadvantaging any group within a department based on divergent skill specialisations. The hybrid organisational model—integrating both Open-role order and Closed-specialty order—achieves this balance by ensuring that skill-set optimisation coexists with equalitarian work distribution.

Large-scale organisations frequently adopt hybrid approaches precisely because they allow strategic blending of capability-based task matching with equalitarian structural

fairness. In essence, hybrid coordination management represents the interpersonal organisational procedure of commicracy: a dynamic, integrative framework where coordination is continually adjusted to maintain fairness, efficiency, and collective operational harmony.

CHAPTER FIVE

RELATIONAL ARCHITECTURE OF COMMICRACY

This chapter establishes the relational architecture through which commicracy operates—not as a system of offices, ranks, or procedural command, but as a lived design of human relations. Here, *architecture* does not denote buildings or bureaucratic structures; it refers to the invisible frameworks that organise intimacy, cooperation, responsibility, authority, and ethical accountability across social life.

Commicracy is therefore introduced not merely as a mode of governance, but as a relational order—one that begins within the smallest unit of society and scales outward without mutating into hierarchy.

At its core, relational commicracy is grounded in Interpeer ethics: the principle that authority emerges through shared responsibility rather than positional dominance. Whether expressed in family life, intimate partnership, community coordination, or collective problem-solving, commicratic relations are defined by commissioning rather than commanding—by participation in both process and outcome.

This chapter demonstrates that commicracy is not confined to public institutions; it is first rehearsed in how humans relate to one another before it ever appears in law, economy, or Statecraft.

The family is therefore examined not as a private exception to govovical theory, but as its primary training ground. Through concepts such as shared responsibility, supervision in offspring-rearing, and the articulation of *satriarchy* as supervision without domination, this chapter shows how commicratic logic governs relational balance long before formal authority is introduced.

Couples without offspring embody pure shared-responsibility; couples with offspring express shared-responsibility through supervision. These are not moral prescriptions, but architectural patterns—replicated instinctively across biological species and refined consciously within human societies.

Beyond the household, the chapter expands commicracy into broader social and relational domains: negotiated intimacy, ethicracy, interpeer coordination, and transparency as a stabilising force in human association. By addressing relational models such as exclusive-monogamish dynamics, this chapter demonstrates how commicracy responds to real human desire rather than suppressing it under rigid moral or bureaucratic abstractions. Stability, within this architecture, is not achieved

through denial or secrecy, but through clarity, consent, and ethical symmetry between parties.

Ultimately, this chapter argues that social order is not imposed from above but assembled from relational integrity below. Where bureaucracy standardises behaviour through impersonal rules, relational commicracy sustains cohesion through interpersonal ethical participation. It is this relational architecture—interpeer, adaptive, and ethically grounded—that enables commicracy to scale from intimacy to society without reproducing domination, class, or alienation.

What follows is therefore not a sociology of family alone, but a blueprint for how human beings organise themselves when equality of worth, rather than hierarchy of status, becomes the organising principle of civilisation.

Forms of Commicracy in the Concept of Family

The concept of family concerns the patterns of interaction, responsibility, and mutual expectation that operate among relatives within a household or kinship network. Within the ethnopublican vision for African society, the forms of commicracy in the family examine how horizontal, non-hierarchical coordination—central to commicracy—translates into the architecture of family dynamics. This chapter therefore

extends commicratic logic from institutional structures into the intimate domain of relational life.

In contrast, the bureaucratic form of family is historically rooted in hierarchical lineage systems in which authority is vertically concentrated. Under such systems—particularly institutionalised patriarchy—men occupy the dominant position in decision-making, and women are structurally subordinated within the household order. Both patriarchy and matriarchy frame the family as a hierarchy of status rather than an arena of cooperative supervision.

Commicracy dissolves this hierarchy. Within a commicratic family, no member—male, female, or relative—holds a superior rank in determining the direction of household decisions. Instead, family governance is understood as a shared supervisory practice regulated by commissioning-rules that mirror the horizontal design of the commicratic State.

Thus, where patriarchy positions men as the ruling head of the family, and matriarchy positions women in that same hierarchical role, a commicratic family is gender-equal by structure, with both men and women participating shared responsibility.

To articulate this more precisely, the concept of shared responsibility between partners and supervision in raising

offspring is introduced. The term describes the behavioural character with which biological species instinctively raise their offspring: correcting behaviour, enforcing discipline, nurturing emotional security, and preparing the young for independent life. These activities do not constitute leadership or rulership; rather, they exemplify the act of oversight.

The *Cambridge English Dictionary* defines “supervision” as “*the act of watching a person or activity and making certain that everything is done correctly, safely, etc.*” This definition aligns precisely with the instinctive functions observed in human families and across animal species. Parenting is therefore not a manifestation of hierarchical power but an expression of supervisory behaviour.

Recognising this leads naturally to the concept of Satriarchy—a term that captures the equal supervisory participation of both parents or guardians in the governance of the household. Satriarchy proposes a gender-equal society precisely because in lived reality, both mothers and fathers instinctively enact supervisory behaviours regardless of cultural claims of dominance in patriarchal or matriarchal systems.

The everyday responsibilities of correcting, guiding, disciplining, and nurturing children into independence are shared activities and therefore fall squarely within a supervisory paradigm rather than a hierarchical one.

Anthropologically, the term clarifies the linguistic evolution of family structures: *Patriarchy* derives from the Latin *pater* (father); *matriarchy* from *mater* (mother). By parallel construction, *satriarchy* is derived from the Latin *supervidere*—"to oversee"—formed from *super* ("over") and *videre* ("to see"), which collectively mean "to supervise." *Satriarchy* is thus defined as the customary practice in which two or more individuals in a parenting capacity share equal roles in overseeing the household, coordinating responsibilities, imparting life skills, and cultivating the competence of offspring for future independence.

To articulate this more precisely, commicracy within the family operates through shared responsibility as its default condition, while supervision emerges contextually rather than hierarchically. Where partners exist without offspring, the household is governed entirely by shared responsibility—each partner holds equal authority, reciprocal obligation, and autonomous competence over domestic, emotional, and economic functions. No supervisory relation exists because no dependent life is present.

The arrival of offspring does not dissolve this shared responsibility; rather, it reconfigures its outward expression. Shared responsibility between partners now manifests as *supervision* directed toward the child, not toward each other. It is

within this context that the concept of satriarchy—derived from *supervidere*, meaning “to supervise”—finds its proper application.

Satriarchy does not signify dominance or paternal hierarchy, but the behavioural character through which biological species collectively raise offspring: correcting behaviour, enforcing discipline, nurturing emotional security, and preparing the young for independent life.

Thus, supervision in the commicratic family is not a power relation between adults, but a shared, situational responsibility exercised jointly over dependents. In households without children, commicracy remains purely horizontal; in households with children, horizontality is preserved between partners while supervision is ethically and biologically projected toward the next generation.

Within the commicratic family model, satriarchy becomes the structural and ethical foundation: a system in which both mother and father share equal commissioning-rules in the household and hold equal descent rights to their offspring. Since every human being is biologically the product of two complementary sexes—no more, no less—commicracy interprets the family not as an inheritance-based hierarchy but as a supervisory network grounded in biological equality.

Satriarchy supports coherent developmental outcomes for children, and enhances the social integrity of the wider community. It represents the familial expression of commicratic order, positioning the family not as a hierarchy but as an equalitarian micro-society committed to oversight, cooperation, and balanced responsibility.

Satriarchy as the Familial Expression of Commicratic Collectivism

In the preceded Chapter 2 of this manifesto, collectivism within commicracy was defined as a relational system in which individual self-efficacy and self-worth are harmonised in partnership with the State. When this commicratic collectivism is viewed through the lens of satriarchy, its familial implications become clear.

The State's lifelong duty to each individual—from birth to death—combined with the individual's autonomous control over their own economic provision under State supervision, establishes a structure in which personal values, self-concept, and one's idea of the good life are upheld as the individual's sovereign right, exercised in coordinated partnership with the State. This relational configuration is inherently satriarchical.

Thus, when the commicratic State assumes full economic responsibility for the pre-working-age group, supporting them

from birth through childhood in collectivist cooperation with parents or guardians, this is an extension of satriarchical responsibility.

When individuals reach the working-age and are economically organised on the basis of their own sole right with the State—managing their self-provision under the commissioning-rules of commicracy—this remains satriarchical. And when citizens reach pension-age, at which point the commicratic State resumes full responsibility for economic provision until death, the State completes its satriarchical duty across the full span of human life. From birth to death, the commicratic social-order provides a continuous arc of supervision, guidance, and coordinated support analogous to the equal-parenting logic within the satriarchical household.

Within a satriarchical society, perceived parents in a household share equal authority and responsibility in raising their children. Satriarchy guarantees equal opportunities for men and women across all domains of social and economic participation, including govovical, cultural, and civic rights.

Originating from the ethical principles of commicracy, the theory of satriarchy describes a society in which individuals jointly participate in shared authority according to the designated roles shaped by biological constraints, rather than arbitrary cultural hierarchies. In contrast, both patriarchy and matriarchy

rely on gender as a cultural imposition—historically unequal and rigid—failing to acknowledge the balanced contributions of both men and women within the family household.

Satriarchy emerges as a 21st-century human-rights model that affirms women's social, economic, and cultural value in equal proportion to men. This egalitarian recognition forms the foundation of the commicratic concept of family, which evolved precisely to overcome the limitations and injustices inherent in gender-stratified household systems.

Importantly, the satriarchical model resonates profoundly with the indigenous social organisation of ancient African families, which were historically embedded in cooperative customs and strong collectivist cultures. In traditional African societies, moral education was shaped not only within the nuclear family but also through the broader community, where members regarded one another as relatives and kinsfolk. This communal ethic aligns naturally with satriarchy: child-rearing was a shared responsibility, and community members participated as co-parents in the upbringing of the young.

Moral values were learned not only through formal instruction from parents but also through constant interaction with elders, neighbours, extended kin, and community as a whole. The African communal structure was—and in many regions remains—profoundly gerontocratic, where authority was

exercised through the supervision of the older age groups over the younger ones. This form of elder-guided communal supervision reflects an indigenous precursor to the satriarchical principle: a social-order organised not by dominance or hierarchy of gender, but by a culture of cooperative oversight and collective responsibility.

Indigenous Egalitarianism and the Historical Shift Toward Bureaucratic Family Forms

Before the arrival of non-native cultures that later shaped the customs of indigenous African peoples, the distribution of decision-making responsibility between men and women—more precisely between husband and wife—produced interdependent social value. In many communities, women worked alongside their husbands in labour-intensive farm work; in others, women concentrated primarily on domestic organisation and child-rearing.

These variations did not alter the fundamental ethic of partnership. Across these diverse expressions of African social life, the family dynamic embodied an implicit commissioning-rule, whereby responsibilities were coordinated horizontally through mutual agreement rather than imposed hierarchically.

Thus, the indigenous African family system was neither patriarchal (rule of the father) nor matriarchal (rule of the

mother). It was, at its core, egalitarian, with decision-making shared between men and women, and with husband and wife regarded as co-supervisors of the household. This structure aligned closely with the principles of satriarchy: shared authority, cooperative responsibility, and non-hierarchical supervision within the family unit.

However, this equilibrium was significantly altered by the introduction of Islamic religious culture from northern Africa. Islam brought with it a patriarchal and hierarchical conception of family, where men assumed dominant decision-making authority over women in private and public life. As Islam spread across western and eastern Africa, many indigenous cultures became intertwined with its doctrinal norms, gradually absorbing patriarchal structures into previously egalitarian societies.

Unlike the early wave of Christianity that spread across northern Africa in the 1st and 2nd centuries AD—largely monogamous in its social orientation—the arrival of Islam in the 8th century introduced polygamous practice, which some African communities found compatible with certain non-exclusive sexual customs present in various parts of the continent since the primitive era. This perceived compatibility made the conversion to Islam socially and economically convenient, particularly as new trade networks with Arabian communities offered notable advantages.

Yet, this adoption weakened the indigenous pantheistic cultural structures that supported egalitarianism between men and women, equality between community leaders and the governed, and the exclusive parental right of biological parents to supervise and make decisions for their children without external interference.

As Islamic influence expanded from north to west Africa, many communities understood it as a reculturalising force—one that reshaped governance, reorganised family authority, and restructured social relations. New trade routes, new governing alliances, and new religious codes collectively undermined the cooperative, decentralised, and satriarchical nature of indigenous African family life.

Later, the influence of Christianity from Western Caucasian societies amplified this transformation. Both Islam and Christianity, though arriving in different eras and through different pathways, functioned as critical dissolving agents of African pantheistic culture. They accelerated the emergence of class systems and hierarchical social structures throughout eastern, central, western, and eventually southern regions of Africa.

Practices rooted in collectivist commicracy—such as consensual decision-making between ethno-governed community leaders and the governed, or the communal co-

parenting system where community members participated equally in the upbringing of children—were gradually eroded by the hierarchical models embedded in these foreign religious cultures.

Therefore, the interaction between indigenous Africans and non-native religious systems became a decisive factor in the continent's cultural shift from a strand-form of commicracy—egalitarian, supervisory, communal—to a bureaucratic form of family organisation. In Africa, religious culture did not simply coexist with traditional customs; it reshaped them, influencing governing structures, social expectations, and everyday family dynamics.

Today, bureaucratic culture permeates daily life across the continent, including within the family household. Meanwhile, commicratic culture—rooted in indigenous African origins—remains the cultural foundation from which our ancestors derived their behavioural norms. Over centuries, however, foreign religious cultures have become so interwoven with African customs that they appear inseparable from contemporary social life.

Yet the modern urgency for gender equality, the continental demand for dismantling corruption and abuses of power, and the necessity for building abundant economic resources in Africa for

Africans collectively mark the beginning of a new reformative era.

This era seeks to restore the original African ethos—not by rejecting religion, but by correcting the imbalances imposed by hierarchical interpretations of it. The path forward is the development of an economic model of ethno-corporatism and a State governmental model of ethnopublicanism, returning African societies to their egalitarian roots through the satriarchical and commicratic principles that once defined them.

Bureaucratic Intrusions and the Distortion of Indigenous Commicratic Values

To understand how bureaucratic cultures have gradually interfered with and eroded the commicratic values that once defined African societies, we must examine the original expressions of our indigenous cultures—both in their social logic and moral architecture—from antiquity to the present.

A simple point of reference is the dowry system in marriage and alimony in divorce. The practice of attaching material wealth as a prerequisite for marital union or separation is not an indigenous African value. Its modern ubiquity across the continent is a direct consequence of the infiltration of non-native bureaucratic cultures.

When the Kenyan constitution moved to outlaw mandatory dowry, it explicitly identified it as unjust, corrosive to marital unity, and harmful to the life, safety, liberty, and dignity of African women. This follows that the practice is an imposed legal-bureaucratic device, not a reflection of African communal ethics.

Likewise, the common belief that polygamy originates from primitive African culture is historically inaccurate. Indigenous African societies practised far more fluid and communal sexual customs which, in their original form, were neither polygamous nor monogamous as defined by later bureaucratic religious codes.

Among the Himba of northern Namibia and the Benue peoples of central Nigeria, for instance, it remains customary for a husband to extend unrestricted hospitality—including intimacy with his wife—to a guest as an expression of trust and communal affinity. This form of sexual openness was a universal feature of primitive human societies globally, not unique to Africa. It was only after the arrival of non-native religious bureaucracies that these fluid customs were reframed and codified into the rigid institution of polygamy, imposed as a sanctioned alternative to monogamy.

Polyandry—where a woman may have multiple male partners as part of a legitimate marital arrangement—likewise

predates bureaucratic suppression. Although rare today, it historically existed among the Maasai of Kenya and was well-documented among the Irigwe of northern Nigeria, where women maintained non-exclusive sexual relationships with several men.

The man with whom a woman resided at any given time held paternal responsibility for any child born during that period. This system, grounded in communal identity rather than property or lineage, was abolished in 1968 as part of State-led efforts to enforce non-native cultural norms onto indigenous communities.

It is important to note that primitive African societies did not confine sexual relationships to marriageable structures. Marriage, as forced into African life through imported religious bureaucracy, was originally foreign to our communal ontology. Indigenous Africans lived in communal societies where resources, responsibilities, child-rearing, and even intimate relations were shared widely.

Parenthood was collective; the entire community served as the moral and practical custodian of every child, while biological parentage held little relevance. This collectivistic orientation shaped every social relationship and ensured that close affinity between a man and a woman was not a private contract but part of a broader communal rhythm.

The governance of ancient African communities reflected this same ethos. Laws emerged through commissioning-rule—collective agreement and consensus among all members, not through imposed hierarchies. With the arrival of non-native bureaucratic cultures, however, this balance began to fracture.

Individual interests were elevated above communal priorities; male authority was privileged over shared decision-making with women; personal accumulation of property replaced collective ownership; and leadership positions became tools for exerting power rather than stewarding communal welfare. These distortions gradually dismantled the cooperative equilibrium that defined commicratic social life.

Over time, the bureaucratic reinterpretation of intimacy rebranded communal affinity as marriage, not as a reflection of indigenous belief, but as a requirement of non-native religious orthodoxy. By contrast, African pantheistic cultures understood relational union as an expression of collective belonging—a symbol of harmony between communities, not an institution of private ownership between two individuals.

The cultural systems of polygamy and dowry in marriage are merely two illustrations of the wider landscape through which non-native religious cultures reshaped African pantheistic values—embedding themselves deeply in some regions while displacing them entirely in others.

These imported frameworks altered not only our family dynamics but also the moral environments that once naturally arose from the cultural fabric of our birthplaces. Over time, African practices came to conform to the communal ethics of non-native ethnic cultures, veiled under the authority of foreign religious tradition. What was once distinctly ours gradually became a borrowed identity.

Yet, even as globalisation and technological advancement increasingly broaden the expression of African identity beyond the limits imposed by these adopted religious paradigms, there remains within us a persistent pantheistic longing for egalitarianism. It is this inner resonance—rooted in ancient commicratic consciousness—that continuously draws us back toward the cultural foundations that once defined our communal existence.

The adoption of non-native bureaucratic culture was remarkably successful in indigenous African societies largely because it aligned with the ethno-governed governmental structures that had emerged for economic purposes, particularly in facilitating commercial exchange with Arabian merchants during the ancient period. This compatibility enabled bureaucratic influence to seep quietly but profoundly into the indigenous fabric.

The turning point occurred with the disruption of gerontocratic interdependence—the mutual, reciprocal relationship between community leaders and the members they served. This equilibrium was first unsettled by the Arabian imperial ideology of dependent-leadership to God within Islamic governance, and later by the Western Christian doctrine of dependent-leadership mediated through an invisible divine authority.

Consequently, the gerontocratic institution, once defined by wisdom, stewardship, and communal trust, gradually transformed into a hierarchical monarchy. The roles of community leaders evolved into the elevated social status of kings and queens—figures distinguished by economic privilege and ownership of communal lands. With ownership came domination, and with domination emerged the authority to impose rules over the collective will of the people.

Thus, the pantheistic value systems inherited from our primitive ancestors were gradually fused—often forcibly—with the imposed social and economic systems introduced by foreign cultures. Indigenous Africans were conditioned to believe that adopting these systems represented an enlightened or globalised way of life.

Islam introduced new forms of literacy across vast regions, establishing a universal written culture; Christianity brought

missionary-based medical care and social institutions that repositioned African cosmologies as inferior, pagan, or dangerous.

In many eastern African regions, entire communities adopted Islamic culture as a defensive strategy to protect themselves from enslavement by northern traders. Christianity, in turn, severed indigenous Africans from their pantheistic worldview, denouncing it as evil and entrenching patriarchal inequalities that had not originally defined African social structures.

These transformations reveal that African communities did not abandon their ancient cultural expressions of their own volition—they were steered, pressured, or compelled into cultural realignments in pursuit of what they were made to believe was the most acceptable globalised form of life at the time. Whether through religious devotion, fear, survival, or aspiration, indigenous Africans were guided toward cultural change under the authority of traditions foreign to their ancestral world.

Regional Religiosity and the Persistence of African Pantheistic Identity

Everywhere we look across the continent, the religious expressions of African people—both Muslims and Christians—mirror the historical pathways through which non-native cultures

penetrated specific regions at different moments in African history.

The religious identity of each region today is a direct echo of the cultural, economic, and governing exchanges that once bound Africans to Arabian and European civilisations. Where Islam entered through northern corridors and expanded westward and eastward, Christian influence surged through coastal interactions and missionary expansions. In every case, the religious map of Africa reflects a past shaped by external forces rather than the natural evolution of indigenous spirituality.

This becomes even clearer when we consider that nowhere in Africa do we find indigenous communities practising the major Chinese-origin religions—Confucianism, Taoism, or Buddhism. Such practices never took root because China never imposed its organisational structures, nor did it enforce cultural transformation upon African societies at any point in our shared history.

Unlike the Arabian or Caucasian histories of engagement, China exerted no ancient religious or imperial pressure that could displace, merge with, or overwrite African cultural systems. Thus, Africans identify as Christians or Muslims today not because these religions emerged from within African civilisations, but because cultural change was imposed and normalised through ancient interactions—interactions presented

to our ancestors as the necessary markers of global advancement and gateways to trade, diplomacy, and survival.

Over time, both Islam and Christianity became deeply woven into the regional moral values and socio-cultural practices of Africa's diverse ethnic groups. Geography, therefore, became the silent architect of religious affiliation: one's region determined whether one's ancestors were aligned with Christian or Islamic doctrine. Yet neither religion can claim to be inherently right or native for Africans as a collective; both are foreign imports layered atop a much older spiritual foundation.

That foundation—Africa's pantheistic worldview—remains alive despite centuries of religious indoctrination. Indigenous Africans, irrespective of their adopted religion, still maintain an inseparable connection to their traditional spiritual expressions.

This is evident in the widespread fusion of pantheistic rituals with non-native religious practices: from the mixing of ancestral invocations with Islamic prayer traditions, to the incorporation of masquerading cultures into Christian celebrations. Africans continue to blend the impersonal-gods cosmology of their ancestral pantheon with the personal-God doctrines of Islam and Christianity, creating a hybrid orthodoxy that is distinctly African in essence and expression.

Therefore, to break free from the bureaucratic cultural systems that were imported into African family structures—systems characterised by gender inequality, patriarchal dominance, and social injustice—the present chapter proposes a return to the commicratic ethic rooted in ancient African egalitarianism.

Bureaucratic patriarchies introduced through foreign religions and colonial administration have long undermined women's participation in leadership, distorted family value systems, and fostered marital and societal imbalance. The alternative presented here aligns with the emergent global movement toward egalitarianism and emphasises the satriarchical ethic as a modern corrective.

In this light, the manifesto calls for the restoration of commissioning-rule—the consensus-based, non-hierarchical framework that once governed family life in indigenous African societies. To achieve this, the definition of “family” must be repositioned to reflect the cultural realities of intimacy, responsibility, and communal belonging beyond mere biological relations.

The family, in its commicratic sense, is a unit of shared interaction, mutual respect, and equal authority—anchored not in hierarchy but in cooperation, interdependence, and the ancient African spirit of collective harmony.

Expanding Family Structures Beyond Monogamy and Polygamy

The patriarchal form of polygamy, known as polygyny, allows a man to marry multiple women, whereas its matriarchal counterpart, polyandry, allows a woman to have multiple husbands. Yet both systems, in practice, often overlook a critical human dimension: the emotional capacities and vulnerabilities of those involved.

Not every individual within a polygynous or polyandrous union possesses the emotional resilience required to navigate such arrangements. As a result, these structures frequently impose avoidable psychological pressure, generating jealousy, strife, and emotional imbalance—consequences rooted not in culture but in the fundamental psychology of exclusive romantic bonds stretched beyond their natural limits.

Although polygamy entered the family systems of indigenous ancient Africans largely through non-native religious influences, monogamy had long existed as a customary mode of intimate partnership throughout Africa—just as it did in primitive human societies worldwide.

Yet alongside the practice of monogamy, the human inclination toward openness in sexual or romantic relations has always existed. The desire to explore emotional or physical

intimacy with multiple individuals is not uniquely African nor modern; it is a recurring aspect of human nature, observed across cultures and epochs. Long before formal marriage structures emerged, people commonly experienced and acted upon such desires, forming multiple intimate connections before eventually selecting a marriage partner.

This historical and psychological reality demonstrates that human relational instinct is not limited to monogamy or polygamy. These two familiar systems, though widely recognised and institutionally reinforced, represent merely the dominant social constructs used to regulate intimacy and social-order. While either system may be valid as a convention, expanding our understanding beyond this binary is a practical and utilitarian necessity.

In this context, the moral consideration of polyamory—understood not as polygamy, but as a consensual, emotionally transparent, non-exclusive relational structure—must be evaluated in terms of the greatest happiness it can produce for the greatest number of people. Critics argue that polyamory destabilises emotional equilibrium and invites jealousy.

Yet the counterargument acknowledges that, for many individuals, polyamory reflects their genuine emotional or sexual orientation. Denying this expression traps them in monogamous

institutions that fail to accommodate their actual desires, leading to secrecy, infidelity, and emotional double lives.

If the aim is to promote greater happiness while reducing the social dysfunction rooted in unmet emotional needs, then it becomes reasonable to consider a new conventional standard—one attached to monogamy but distinct from polygamy. Such a standard would serve individuals who feel marginalised by current bureaucratic norms of marriage and family, offering an ethical alternative to the hidden world of adultery that emerges when personal desires collide with restrictive social structures.

For this attached standard to function effectively, it must integrate smoothly with the central values that marriage represents for most people. Thus, consensual sexual openness within marriage must be grounded in mutual respect, shared values, and clearly defined conditions. These conditions include:

- a shared willingness to exclude sexual exclusivity from the definition of marriage,
- mutual commitment to good health and safe practices,
- informed consent free from coercion,
- the avoidance of unhealthy jealousy through emotional maturity,
- and a civil, respectful approach to relational boundaries.

In this way, contemporary society may evolve toward a relational model that honours both the emotional complexities of human nature and the moral responsibility to cultivate happiness, stability, and dignity within family structures.

Reclaiming Non-Exclusive Intimacy
as an Egalitarian Family Standard

It is widely acknowledged that no matter which social-control system a society adopts—whether monogamy or polygamy—human nature cannot be cleansed of the emotional impulse to seek sexual experiences outside marriage. This impulse exists across all cultures, eras, and belief systems, irrespective of whether such encounters are brief, casual, or deeply emotional. The persistence of this behaviour reveals that prohibitions alone cannot extinguish what is woven into the fabric of human instinct.

Historically, polygamy may have been constructed as a mechanism to reduce men's rampant infidelity. Yet it failed everywhere. Whether in polygamous or monogamous unions, people still engage in extramarital sex—only now it is labelled *adultery* and becomes grounds for divorce, shame, and moral condemnation.

In denouncing adultery, society rarely pauses to recognise the emotional forces that drive individuals toward such

encounters, nor the psychological variations that make strict exclusivity difficult for many.

Before non-native religious cultures reshaped African life, indigenous African family systems already accommodated non-exclusive sexual relations alongside stable pair-bonding. Sexual openness was not treated as a moral transgression but as a natural expression of human emotion.

To ignore this heritage in modern theoretical models of commicracy would therefore be irrational, particularly when proposing a family structure grounded in egalitarianism and emotional realism.

Polygyny, in contrast, is a failed paradigm precisely because it imposes emotional asymmetry. Not every woman has the desire or psychological capacity to share a husband. This emotional misalignment—the disregard of individual variant emotional capacities—is the reason many polygynous arrangements breed jealousy, hurt, and quiet suffering.

Meanwhile, the practice of non-exclusive sex within marriage—today branded as adultery—has existed since humanity’s beginning and continues despite social stigma. Its persistence signals that the prohibition does not align with the deeper mechanics of human desire.

To incorporate emotional truth into the evolving African family system under commicracy, it becomes necessary to recognise non-exclusive sex within marriage as a legitimate conventional standard, alongside monogamy. This recognition is not a promotion of moral laxity but an acknowledgement of what indigenous African traditions once permitted freely: consensual intimacy beyond the primary marital bond.

In examining this, I draw on both primitive human culture and pre-religious African traditions, where married individuals could engage in voluntary sexual relations with others—often other married individuals—without moral sanction. Translated into a modern ethical framework, this could apply only to interactions among consenting adults who are themselves married or divorced, and never with unmarried persons or individuals in significantly younger age brackets. The objective is to preserve dignity, emotional safety, and social coherence.

Within this framework emerges a hybrid form I term exclusive-monogamish—a culturally anchored, ethically structured model in which a married couple remains romantically bonded and sexually attracted to each other, yet both retain consensual freedom to engage sexually with other married couples. This model reflects the natural emotional reality that people in committed relationships may still find others attractive. Where monogamy suppresses this reality and polygamy

institutionalises imbalance, monogamish offers a structured solution that resolves the issue of adultery altogether.

For many, nothing is more emotionally torturous than a marriage where one partner remains sexually active while the other is neglected or dormant. In such cases, any external expression of desire becomes grounds for separation, divorce, or the collapse of the family unit. The exclusive-monogamish alternative provides an egalitarian remedy that acknowledges human emotional variance, preserves marital stability, and prevents the cycle of secrecy, betrayal, and family fragmentation that the current bureaucratic norms consistently produce.

By integrating this model into the commicratic concept of family, African society can reclaim an ancient emotional truth and transform it into a modern, ethical, and stable relational structure—one that serves happiness, transparency, and emotional equality for a greater number of people.

Everywhere we look, we observe that within a significant proportion of monogamously married couples—particularly among women—there exists a persistent emotional burden: an unspoken desire to explore romantic or sexual experiences with someone of the same gender.

For many men, the idea of pursuing a romantic or sexual connection with another woman outside their marriage carries a

natural emotional appeal. And for both men and women, the impulse to experiment—whether out of curiosity, fantasy, or momentary attraction—with brief casual sexual encounters, sometimes involving individuals of different racial backgrounds, remains a deeply internalised yearning. In many cases, such desires are carried silently throughout one's lifetime, repressed beneath the moral framework imposed by contemporary cultural norms.

Yet, despite any perceived or potential merits of monogamish relationships or the exclusive form of monogamish marriage, such models will not resonate with everyone. For some, the very idea of non-exclusive sexual intimacy within marriage would be objectionable; while for others, monogamish arrangements align seamlessly with the emotional texture of their human nature. Some will remain devoted to monogamy, whereas others will discover that monogamish structures better accommodate the breadth of their emotional, psychological, and sexual inclinations.

Though socially stigmatised, all forms of non-exclusive sexual intimacy within marriage continue to be widely practised. In Western societies, monogamish relationships often express themselves openly through swinging cultures, or partner-swapping communities. In China, however, the practice persists discreetly due to long-standing legal and cultural prohibitions;

yet even there, the arrangements frequently occur under the social justification of traditional expectations.

Historically, Chinese men have been permitted to keep mistresses, while those who pursue discreet extramarital intimacy increasingly prefer partners who are themselves married, sharing a mutual emotional rationale for non-exclusive sexual engagement. Likewise, throughout Africa and the broader world, such practices endure in secrecy, accompanied by moral condemnation and social sanction.

Importantly, while monogamish structures do not eliminate the requirement of mutual consent between spouses before engaging in sexual relations with others, they do dissolve the stigma of adultery by reframing such encounters as consensual rather than clandestine. In contemporary understanding, monogamish may refer to an open relationship, a structured form of partner-swapping, spontaneous casual intimacy, or a closed extramarital relationship between committed married individuals. The defining feature is not promiscuity, but the consensual nature of sexual relations outside the primary marital bond.

Those who exhibit patterns typically labelled as adultery—expressing a sustained emotional and sexual desire for multiple partners, yet unwilling to commit to the structural obligations of polygamy—tend to embody a relational disposition that is less

rigid than monogamy and less formalised than polygamy. In both theory and practice, their behavioural expressions align more precisely with the emotional architecture underlying monogamish relationships.

Refining the Language of Monogamish Dynamics

In developing *exclusive-monogamish* as a conventional standard, it becomes necessary to establish a refined vocabulary of descriptive terms and qualifying expressions—particularly those that define marital responsibilities and the extramarital roles delineated by the boundaries of intimacy and limitation between spouses and their consensual partners.

In practical terms, this involves recognising the parallelism between monogamish familial relationships and other forms of romantic or intimate arrangements, as reflected in longstanding cultural attributions such as “mistress” and “lover.” These terms, while historically associated with secrecy or moral transgression, acquire new, consensual meaning within a monogamish framework that abandons the logic of deceit and instead centres on emotional openness and negotiated boundaries.

Fundamentally, it is the emotional desire inherent in human nature—not any sociopolitical construct—that shapes the monogamish family dynamic. Historically, monogamy was

rationalised as a solution to jealousy between partners who were sexually exclusive to one another, while polygamy was often justified as a mechanism for providing social protection for widows and orphans in times of war.

Yet such justifications fall short when confronted with the deeper behavioural realities: the strong sexual desires some men feel for multiple partners, and the perpetual cycles of jealousy and conflict that emerge among co-wives within polygynous systems. These factors expose the limitations of both monogamy and polygamy as comprehensive models of human relational behaviour.

Within monogamish structures, emotional desire must be matched with transparent communication, reciprocal role-definition, and clearly negotiated boundaries if the family dynamic is to remain healthy.

Emotional desire—understood as the shared inclination to embrace a lifestyle that rejects unhealthy jealousy—functions as the primary foundation. Conversely, dysfunction within monogamish marriages arises from unhealthy jealousy, poor communication, ambiguous roles, or an inability to effectively manage time and emotional availability between the spouse and the consensual partner.

Given that non-exclusive sexual intimacy has always been a persistent feature of human emotional life—and is unlikely ever to diminish—the traditional definition of “family,” bounded strictly by monogamy or polygamy, has become increasingly eroded. The modern reality is unmistakable: even within relationships outwardly defined as monogamous, one partner may secretly engage in extramarital intimacy, thereby altering the family dynamic without acknowledgment or consent.

Where earlier generations were confined to choosing between monogamy and polygamy—often to the detriment of women, who were forced into structures of inequality—contemporary societies reveal a much broader spectrum of relational forms. Across Western cultures, East Asia with its covert behavioural allowances, and numerous other regions, we now observe relational models such as monogamish, polyamory, triads, vees, and structured or unstructured forms of swinging and partner-swapping. These configurations emerge both with and without consent, often within relationships that are nominally monogamous.

This expanding reality demonstrates that monogamy and polygamy cannot continue to serve as the sole conventional standards of family structure; they do not encompass the full range of instinctual impulses or emotional desires expressed across human nature. Monogamish arises in my theory as a

legitimate conventional standard precisely because it resolves the chronic issues of adultery and destructive jealousy that plague marriages worldwide and destroys family unit to the disadvantage of offspring.

Exclusive-monogamish, in particular, aligns naturally with the proposed framework of *commicracy* in the concept of family because it establishes clear, respectful boundaries between married couples and unmarried individuals who share the emotional desire for this lifestyle. It offers a coherent, emotionally honest, and socially stable alternative—one capable of meeting the diverse relational inclinations inherent in the human condition.

The Biological Basis of Monogamish

When examined biologically, monogamy emerges from the emotional disposition of individuals who cannot tolerate non-exclusive sexual intimacy within marriage and who experience profound jealousy when such boundaries are transgressed.

Conversely, monogamish arises from the emotional disposition of those who desire non-exclusive sexual intimacy within a committed relationship and who derive satisfaction, stability, and sexual fulfillment from such an arrangement. In this sense, the ageing-progression of genes—the gradual

unfolding of inherited emotional variants across the lifespan—plays a subtle but meaningful role in determining whether an individual gravitates toward monogamous or monogamish emotional patterns at any given time.

In my behavioural science research under *Psychextrics*, I found that all biological organisms undergo what I term epigenetic-progression of behaviour, a lifelong sequence from birth to death in which the inherited behavioural spectrum evolves through subtle shifts. Environment and diet remain the primary forces capable of stimulating these progressions, modulating the EIM (Epigenetic Index Marker) and thereby guiding the inherited GIM (Genetic Index Marker) into new behavioural phases.

This provides measurable evidence explaining how and why individuals transition from one behavioural phase to another throughout life. Within the context of marriage, this means that the emotional foundation of a couple's relationship can shift when the epigenetic-progression of one spouse moves in a direction that alters their emotional or sexual desires relative to the other.

This phenomenon is seen repeatedly in lived experience. A couple may be deeply bonded for many years, yet a decade or more into the marriage, one partner may enter a new behavioural phase that manifests as extramarital desire. Sometimes this

emerges as curiosity or the urge to explore romantic or sexual relations with others; in other cases, it arises as a sense of confinement or stagnation in one's life. Equally, a partner who once accepted the possibility of their spouse engaging in non-exclusive intimacy may, in a later behavioural phase, become distressed or intolerant of it. These shifts are not random—they reflect epigenetic progression in action.

Often, when couples cannot reconcile these changes in emotional boundaries, they enter what may be called a blended family dynamic. Here, the aggrieved spouse refuses divorce but nonetheless remains within the marriage despite the existence of extramarital relationships or even children born from such relationships.

Marital therapy frequently attempts to cultivate acceptance or compromise, but the outcome is generally one of two: either an individual endures ongoing emotional strain and deteriorating mental health, or they eventually choose separation in pursuit of renewed happiness. In other scenarios, refusal to divorce may instead trigger reciprocal adultery, producing a cycle of emotional retaliation—a tit-for-tat pattern driven not by desire alone but by injury and reactivity.

From a psychetric standpoint, however, one principle remains non-negotiable: it is biologically and behaviourally impossible for a person to express a behaviour that does not exist

within the spectrum of their expressive genes. Emotional susceptibility to monogamish behaviour must already exist as a variant within the individual's GIM–EIM system.

No environmental stimuli, dietary influence, medication, or illicit substance can activate a behavioural expression that does not already lie dormant within the inherited behavioural spectrum. Therefore, where monogamish emotionality does not exist in a person's expressive genes, no external factor can generate it artificially.

This understanding reinforces the rationale behind recognising *exclusive-monogamish* as a conventional standard in the concept of family: it is not an ideological invention but a reflection of naturally occurring behavioural variants within human emotional architecture—variants that emerge, recede, or evolve across the epigenetic progression of human life.

The Continuity of Indigenous African Collectivism

As becomes increasingly evident, my extensive research in behavioural science stands as the driving force behind the theoretical foundation of this manifesto. Human-science and social-science are inseparable disciplines—interdependent and mutually reinforcing. One cannot meaningfully examine the social world without understanding the behavioural architecture

that generates it, just as one cannot study human behaviour in isolation from the social environments that shape and express it.

Human-science concerns itself with the internal behavioural culture of individuals—those emotional, cognitive, and instinctual processes rooted in the neuro-biological organisation of human nature. Social-science articulates the external expression of that behavioural culture through interactions, norms, institutions, and social structures. Together they form a unified field, each illuminating the other, and both essential for understanding the behavioural culture of biological species, humans included.

Within this study, my research in Psychextrics repeatedly demonstrates the necessity of individuals living within a family structure that is emotionally compatible with their behavioural phase at a given time. This requirement is not merely social—it is psychological, neuro-behavioural, and essential to mental health across the lifespan. My philosophy is straightforward: if human beings live only one lifetime, it is irrational to endure that lifetime in misery or emotional confinement within an incompatible relationship.

It is both fascinating and deeply clarifying to recognise that indigenous ancient African societies practiced a fluid combination of monogamy and monogamish family structures,

each grounded in the customary expressions of their ethno-governed communities.

This was long before the egalitarian dynamics of indigenous family life were overridden by the rigid impositions of non-native religious cultures that enforced strict monogamy and polygamy for economic, political, and cultural assimilation. These impositions reshaped the social imagination of ancient Africans, embedding non-native marital structures into their evolving socialisation processes.

Consequently, in the proposed form of *commicracy* within family dynamics, the definition of family should now include *monogamish* alongside monogamy and polygamy as part of the conventional standards. In primitive African societies—prior to the arrival of foreign religious systems—paternal biological attachment to children born within monogamish arrangements was not regarded as the determinant of family identity.

In fact, such biological attribution appears to have held negligible significance, offering no basis for defining kinship, belonging, or communal responsibility. This absence of individualistic paternal emphasis reveals the philosophical root of African collectivism: a worldview in which the kinship network of the community stands above biological exclusivity.

This foundational worldview is likely the driving force behind the origin of African kinship-based social organisation, where communal ties, cooperative customs, and shared moral upbringing defined social existence. Here, every child belonged to the community; every adult bore responsibility for the moral education and welfare of the young. Social life was communal, deeply cooperative, and explicitly anti-individualistic.

Within primitive African culture, kinship ties formed the basis of interpersonal relations and structured the communal identity. Individuals could trace their descent to a shared ancestral community—a lineage often associated with the occupational and cooperative practices that defined inter-community relations. These identities were functional as well as cultural, linking individuals to specific trades, geographic origins, and collective histories.

With the introduction of Arabian writing systems into indigenous African cultures, a formalisation of historical identity emerged. Communities began adopting names that referenced geographic origin, occupational skill, social reputation, or communal prowess. Over time, both family names and personal naming practices evolved, marking individuals as members of specific family units within the broader communal structure.

The development of naming in Africa, originally intended to signify one's membership in a community, gradually expanded

to mark religious affiliation as well. Names drawn from foreign religious texts began to appear across diverse ethnic groups. Although these names were identical in form, their meanings were locally interpreted by each community, reshaped through indigenous cultural lenses.

Likewise, individuals who joined religious groups often adopted new names signifying their affiliation, marking the transition from ethnic identity to religious identity—an indication that they now belonged to a spiritual community distinct from their indigenous naming tradition.

Even with the long-standing interference of non-native religious cultures across the African continent, the foundational social life of indigenous Africans has remained deeply collective. Throughout indigenous regions of Africa, community members continue to perceive one another as distant descendants of a common ancestral line—an extended kinship network in which every individual is regarded as part of the same generational fabric.

Moral values, therefore, are not transmitted solely through the nuclear family; rather, they are absorbed through constant social interaction, where every adult becomes a moral instructor and every child a communal responsibility.

Historically, within gerontocratic systems of African traditional governance, interpersonal relationships were characterised by a linguistic and behavioural emphasis on shared affinity. The everyday vocabulary used to describe interpersonal relations (such as “my son,” “my daughter,” “my father,” “my mother,” “my sister,” “my brother,” “our wife,” “our husband”) reflects a worldview in which communal belonging overrides biological lineage. These expressions were—and remain—applied universally, regardless of blood relation, reinforcing the principle that identity is nested in the community rather than the individual.

This linguistic collectivism has also travelled with African diasporic populations, subtly shaping foreign languages and cultures. For instance, contemporary British slang reveals these inherited relational markers: “bruv” (from *my brother*), “fam” (from *family*), and similar expressions serve as echoes of the African communal disposition. African men across the diaspora also routinely address unrelated women as “sisters,” preserving the instinctive relational framing of kinship.

These examples illustrate the long-standing, inherited social expressions of Africa’s collectivistic heritage—established long before the arrival of non-native religious cultures. In primitive African societies, “family” was conceptualised broadly, encompassing all members of a regional community. Those

residing beyond the boundaries of that region were not excluded but were instead positioned as distant relatives or kin-folk rather than strangers.

One structural factor reinforcing collectivism was the absence of paternal biological identification in many early African communities. This made it difficult to describe a specific father–child responsibilities in the modern, individualistic sense. As a result, African societies naturally adopted and preserved collectivistic modes of child-rearing, moral instruction, and social identity. Even after the widespread acceptance of monogamous and polygamous family structures introduced through non-native religious cultures, the deep-seated collectivistic ethos remained intact.

Thus, the African social psyche—rooted in shared responsibility, shared identity, and communal belonging—has persisted from the primitive era to the present day, adapting to new religious frameworks while retaining its foundational communal logic.

The Dual Family Structures of Primitive Society: Monogamy and Monogamish

Across the world’s primitive cultures, two foundational family systems emerge: monogamy and monogamish. Although this dual structure may seem unconventional when framed within

African traditional philosophy, its absence from common narratives stems largely from the fact that much of Africa's primitive and ancient history survives through oral transmission rather than written documentation. As such, these cultural realities have not been fully integrated into the contemporary, text-dependent standards of Western historiography.

In essence, monogamy denotes exclusive sexual relations within marriage or long-term partnerships, whereas monogamish describes non-exclusive relational arrangements in which both partners retain reciprocal sexual freedom. However, the two dominant non-native religions in Africa—Christianity and Islam—endorse and institutionalise only monogamy or polygamy, leaving monogamish unrecognised, despite it being an egalitarian model that reflects the emotional spectrum of human desire across cultures.

For this reason, the proposed commicratic theory of family life advocates the social legitimacy of both monogamy and monogamish structures, aligning familial practice with the biological human emotional variability rather than externally imposed religious frameworks.

Although both systems clearly existed historically, their coexistence within ancient African societies is not well documented. Two major factors may explain this absence:

First, the spread of Islamic polygamy across Africa was frequently accompanied by large-scale tribal conflicts. These conflicts involved the enslavement of indigenous men and boys, often sold northwards, and the redistribution of women and girls as spoils of war.

Additionally, ethnocide, forced displacement, and the abduction of women followed many inter-African conflicts during the early Islamic era. These dynamics disrupted earlier family structures and contributed to the decline of pre-Islamic relational customs such as monogamish.

Second, Christian missionary interventions further erased indigenous relational diversity. Their widespread destruction of African historical materials, artefacts, and cultural institutions—undertaken to impose Christian norms—resulted in the near-complete disappearance of documented evidence for monogamish practices.

Consequently, under both Christian monogamy and Islamic polygamy, women became commodified within marriage systems, exchanged through dowries and framed as conjugal property within patriarchal ownership traditions.

When viewed within the broader historical development of Western and Arabian societies—and their reciprocal influences—these systems reflect attempts to regulate family life by

subordinating women. Both traditions normalised the domination of women through war, conquest, or cultural doctrine, reinforcing inequalities that undermined the basic principles of human dignity, autonomy, and rights.

In contrast, the Pantheist monogamish framework provides an egalitarian alternative that rejects the use of family systems as instruments of social control. It seeks to understand human relational structures through the lens of emotional authenticity, happiness, and the biological behavioural variety that drives human nature. Within a commicratic society, this becomes the basis for establishing family systems that genuinely reflect lived human desires.

Monogamy satisfies the emotional need for exclusivity and alleviates jealousy in individuals whose nature aligns with lifelong devotion to a single partner. Monogamish, conversely, resolves the perennial issue of adultery by offering a consensual and transparent structure for individuals who experience long-term exclusivity as restrictive, monotonous, or misaligned with their natural disposition toward diversity and novelty.

Together, these two relational systems offer a comprehensive, human-centred foundation for modern family life—grounded not in historical suppression or imposed morality, but in the genuine emotional needs and natural variations of human beings.

Family Dynamics, Emotional Variability,
and Mental Health in an Egalitarian Society

Family dynamics hold profound consequences for mental health outcomes, shaping not only the emotional stability of partners but also the psychological development of their children. In any theory aspiring to an egalitarian society, these dynamics require close attention, for incompatible emotional environments within the home directly influence the behavioural formation of the next generation.

Children absorb and internalise the trauma, stress, and emotional dissonance expressed by their parents, and these early exposures often crystallise into behavioural patterns they later reproduce in their own social relationships. Thus, incompatible family dynamics do not merely affect adults—they propagate cycles of dysfunction that echo from one generation to the next.

A central factor behind such incompatibility lies in the failure of partners to articulate and negotiate their emotional feelings as they arise. This emotional opacity is strongly associated with marital breakdown, separation, infidelity, and prolonged relational dissatisfaction.

Conversely, a shared understanding that emotional feelings in human nature are never fixed, never permanently anchored, is protective. When couples recognise that emotional variability is

a natural and continuous part of human experience, they are better positioned to navigate relational transitions without collapsing into unhealthy patterns.

Although the human body is biologically fixed and universal, the emotional feelings that organise human behaviour are diverse, fluid, and perpetually shifting. There can be no fairness between two or more engaging individuals unless their emotional desires align at the particular moments of engagement. Importantly, men and women are not fundamentally different in what they desire; the differences arise through the standards of the social systems we impose—standards that often distort equality rather than enhance it.

Despite monogamy and polygamy being the conventional norms in much of the world, cultures frequently excuse male adultery while condemning women for the same behaviour. The stoning of an Arab woman who engaged in consensual adultery with her brother-in-law—while the man lived without punishment—illustrates the gendered asymmetry embedded in these systems. Yet adultery, by its nature, requires two consensual emotional beings acting in harmony, not a single moral offender.

The commicratic framework resolves these contradictions by formally recognising both monogamy and monogamish as legitimate, conventional, and egalitarian family structures. In

doing so, it establishes fixed relational rules that nonetheless respect the natural variability of human emotional life.

These rules create a structured environment in which individuals can form relationships that genuinely align with their emotional desires at any given time—minimising the likelihood of betrayal, dissatisfaction, or coercion. Because human nature itself generates relational inclinations compatible with either monogamy or monogamish in each phase of life, commicracy simply provides the social architecture to match emotional reality.

The practical application is straightforward. Individuals who desire sexual openness should marry partners who feel indifferent—or even comfortable—about their spouse engaging with others. Likewise, those who value exclusive sexual devotion must communicate clearly with their partners about the boundaries and expectations of their emotional life. Importantly, not everyone who feels indifferent to a partner’s sexual openness will necessarily desire openness for themselves; communication remains essential.

Finally, individuals may freely choose the family dynamic that best aligns with their emotional temperament, parental priorities, interaction patterns, and extended kinship relationships. Human emotional nature can only orient a person toward one of two relational inclinations—monogamy or

monogamish. The commicratic model simply acknowledges these natural dispositions and provides a coherent, egalitarian system in which they can be expressed without harm, inequality, or moral distortion.

Panteistic Foundations of Indigenous African Culture
and the Evolution of Religious Consciousness

In the indigenous African primitive world, long before the intrusion of non-native religious cultures, Nature was understood as the giver of life, and the gods as the administrators of all existence within Nature. The gods were perceived as the very forces of the Universe—expressions of cosmic order—while every element within creation possessed its own spirit, divinity, and sacred purpose.

Humans, trees, animals, stones, rivers, and even the smallest particles were recognised as equal manifestations of sacred existence. Everything was interconnected through the ONE supreme God as Nature, and this spiritual unity informed the communal structure of African life. Every being, animate or inanimate, was part of an indivisible whole and worthy of veneration.

African moral and cultural values rested on a collective understanding of the wholeness of life. Life was believed to progress through stages, extending beyond physical existence

into the afterlife, where the soul continued its journey through reincarnation into various forms within Nature.

Birth and death were the most significant rites of passage, accompanied by other transitional rites such as initiation into puberty and the responsibilities of adulthood. Through these rituals, moral values were reinforced and the individual's spiritual connection to the wider universe was reaffirmed.

Natural phenomena—day and night, rainfall and sunshine, thunder, earthquakes, and seasonal changes—were interpreted as spiritual expressions among the gods. Each occurrence demanded either appeasement, gratitude, or veneration, depending on the perceived spiritual significance of the moment. Thus, spirituality permeated every aspect of Africans' life.

Religious veneration was central to indigenous African culture. African pantheism expressed itself through polytheism, where gratitude in times of abundance and petitions in times of need were directed toward a multitude of gods and goddesses.

Polytheism formed the foundation of African spirituality, just as monotheism underpinned Christianity and Islam. Understanding the interaction between these belief systems is essential for any exploration into the cultural transformations that shaped African societies, especially in relation to their social and economic practices.

Over time, Africans developed sophisticated spiritual systems to interpret their world and assign meaning to natural events. Through gradual cultural adaptation—particularly in interaction with Arabian societies—Africans merged polytheistic principles with monotheistic beliefs structure. This integration gave rise to henotheism, the worship of one supreme God expressed through many divine forms. This theological shift was not merely religious but also social and economic, influencing governance and community organisation across regions.

As indigenous Africans embraced the imported monotheistic concept of a singular supreme deity, they continued to honour ancestral spirits and maintain the practice of animal sacrifice as a means of communicating with these spiritual intermediaries. Sacrifices served as petitions for protection, blessings, and immediate needs. The belief in the psychic and spiritual authority of traditional priests and medicine men was also transferred to leaders of newly adopted non-native religions, who were believed to possess direct lines of communication with the one supreme God.

Similarly, the authority once held by traditional priests—who could legitimise rulers, bless warriors, or sanction communal decisions—was inherited by religious leaders in the new monotheistic traditions. These leaders exercised the power to proclaim wars, reorganise governing councils of traditional

rulers, and even initiate the deposition of the imported model of kings and queens. This demonstrates that religious transformation in Africa was never limited to spiritual life alone; it profoundly shaped governance, power structures, and the socio-political evolution of entire ethno-governed communities.

The Pantheistic Legacy and the Liberal Adaptation of Non-Native Religions in Africa

The pantheistic culture of indigenous Africans is essential to understanding how ancient African societies formed diverse religious orthodoxies fundamentally different from the inherited practices of non-native religions. Whenever Christianity or Islam was adopted by African communities, these traditions were inevitably filtered through, merged with, and socialised alongside the existing pantheistic spiritual worldview.

Thus, non-native religious cultures in Africa largely functioned as mechanisms that liberalised and reinterpreted African spiritual traditions rather than replacing them. They broadened the expression of belief in the gods by situating them as extensions or manifestations of the one supreme God—a conceptual adaptation made possible through the existing African framework of henotheism.

In the spread of Islam, many indigenous Africans embraced the religion as a means of securing economic relationships with

Arabian merchants or as a protective measure against enslavement, particularly in regions near the Mediterranean. In the case of Christianity, its re-introduction to sub-Saharan Africa in the 15th century by the Portuguese, followed by the Dutch Reformed Church in 1652, eventually expanded across the continent during the 19th-century imperial era under the banner of abolishing the slave trade.

Indigenous rulers, having already accommodated Islam, also tolerated Christianity—accepting it peacefully in line with their longstanding custom of liberal welfare, which valued respect for differing traditions and the non-confrontational inclusion of outside beliefs.

Consequently, ancient African communities embraced non-native religions not out of cultural inferiority but as strategic and pragmatic instruments to enhance social and economic cohesion. This liberal cultural philosophy enabled Africans to forge alliances, expand trading networks, and cultivate urban centres. Their objective was simple: to elevate the welfare of their societies by integrating into what they perceived as a shared global ethical standard among neighbouring civilisations.

It is within this historical foundation that the concept of commicracy revived—recognising that global interconnectedness, especially within the digital era of web-

internetisation, mirrors the same adaptive openness that characterised African cultural evolution.

Across continents, all indigenous societies have borrowed, fused, and evolved through cultural contact, forming unique social worlds shaped by their interactions with others. Commicracy reflects this universal principle by acknowledging that humans everywhere are fundamentally rational beings, capable of forming societies based on equality, open participation, and individual rights.

Throughout African history, deep thought—serious, philosophical engagement with life’s questions—has consistently defined the intellectual character of indigenous peoples. Africans have long been recognised for their passion, reflective temperament, and tolerance toward foreigners.

Inclusive forms of liberalism, rooted in communal ethics and the belief that all humans share kinship regardless of ethnicity or race, are deeply embedded in their social fabric. Likewise, African traditions emphasise the supremacy of collective welfare over narrow individualism, revealing a sophisticated communal rationality rather than a primitive social-order.

These cultural qualities—open-mindedness, liberal inclusion, and the assumption that all people are inherently related—shaped outsiders’ perceptions of Africans.

Unfortunately, this very hospitality was often exploited by non-native groups, who interpreted African acceptance as weakness rather than as a profound expression of philosophical liberalism and humanistic values.

The Pantheistic Foundation
of African Open-Mindedness

However, the logical starting point for understanding the collective open-mindedness of indigenous Africans lies in our pantheistic view of the natural world and the collective duties of all who inhabit it. While non-native groups in Africa frequently expressed ethnocentric tendencies—such as the cultural fanaticism of medieval Arab societies or the racial autonomy pursued by Western societies—indigenous Africans have no recorded history of imposing ethnomania or racial dominance upon any other group of people.

In simple terms, Africans cultivated a liberal, open culture toward all of human-nature. This collective open-mindedness, combined with an ingrained willingness to admit non-native cultures into our social space, set the stage for later exploitation: Western societies read African hospitality as subordination and reacted with racial autonomy, while medieval Arab societies vacillated between economic collaboration and attitudes of superiority toward indigenous Africans.

This historical pattern reinforces the psychextric premise that human behaviour—regardless of ethnicity or race—is governed by rational interest. Some groups collaborate in goodwill; others exploit through manipulation or deceit for self-gain. The evidence is visible everywhere.

The modern term *white solidarity*, for example, describes the unspoken racial code that structures white social-capital—often enacted to the detriment of non-Caucasian groups. Black people across the world frequently find themselves subjected to the inequalities and discriminations that arise from this solidarity. Conversely, the term *black collective* reflects the open, protective expression of African social-unity: a racial code mobilised not to oppress others, but to defend African-descended peoples from the very discriminations generated by other racial frameworks.

A parallel phenomenon appears in religion: membership within a predominantly Muslim community, irrespective of gender or ethnicity, often opens doors of opportunity through an implicit religious-code. While this practice is rooted largely in Arab societies, it has also taken hold within certain African regions and is often exercised against non-Muslims.

Indigenous African collective culture, by contrast, has always been governed by rational interest in economic growth and social development. This manifesto therefore affirms that

21st century Africans must be free to choose the pathways of our own social and economic empowerment.

Yet, the culture of collectivity—responsible for our enduring open-mindedness—has its consequences. Our readiness to accept, adapt, and integrate non-native cultures has repeatedly reshaped African societies across history. Although we succeeded in preserving our diverse indigenous customs, many of the values that govern how we express these traditions today originate from outside Africa—from both Western and Arab cultural systems. The Afrocentric ethos that shapes modern African identity is therefore guided by a freely chosen openness, sharpened by deep insights into worlds beyond our own communities.

Consider, for example, the gerontocratic leadership of African clans. Elders gather beneath the shade of trees, sharing palm wine and kola nuts, seated on stones or carved stools—away from the bustle of daily life—engaging in deep contemplation and communal philosophising. Anyone who has not witnessed this cannot claim to have experienced the living continuity of Africa’s ancient collective culture: its open-mindedness, its tolerance of foreigners, its tradition of deep thinking, and above all, its ingrained system of liberal welfare that binds communities together through shared humanity and reason.

Misinterpretations of African Collectivity and the Deep-Thinking Ethos

The ways of life and collective culture of indigenous Africans have long been misunderstood by non-native observers, especially Westerners. Indigenous Africans are deep-thinkers, driven by contemplation rather than conquest, and historically content to remain exclusive—without any desire to impose their ethnic identity or racial autonomy upon others.

Our fundamental understanding of human-nature tells us that societies which gather primarily to debate, reflect, and philosophise tend to cultivate thoughtful, passionate, and profoundly humanistic individuals. Such people understand themselves and the world around them, and are consequently more trusting and tolerant toward others.

Yet even in today's accelerated, technologically saturated world, this ingrained African culture of open-mindedness and acceptance continues to be misinterpreted. Claims persist that African governments lack the capacity for independent development, but these claims arise from a profound misunderstanding of the Afrocentric worldview.

Indigenous Africans, shaped by their own cultural experiences and values, approach the world with fascination. Their expressions of curiosity lead them to explore and absorb

elements of other peoples' cultures, integrating them into their own while still preserving their ancestral traditions.

Not all Africans were the archetypal deep-thinkers seated under trees with kola nuts and palm wine, but the majority of ethnic groups maintained this philosophical rhythm of life. Gerontocratic governance ensured that traditions and customs were passed down in their purest forms. This continuity created generations that were internally oriented toward the emotional, historical, and environmental conditions that shaped their ancestors' lives—conditions that continue to inform how communities construct meaning in the present.

In simple terms, indigenous Africans spent most of their lives immersed in communal interactions. Like all human societies, Africans innovated only when necessary; invention followed need, not novelty. They felt no compulsion to venture beyond their communities or impose their values upon others because their environments already fulfilled the essential requirements of human life. Food was naturally abundant across much of the African landmass, and the rhythms of living were sustained by proximity to natural resources.

This abundance cultivated a cultural disposition grounded in *being*—a contentment with what one has rather than anxiety about what one lacks. In other words, the African ethos internalised a simple truth: *what Africans do not have, they do*

not need—though they may, at the intersection of assimilating the culture of others, desire it.

Globalisation, Materialism,
and the African Economic Condition

Times have changed. The world has become globalised, and Africans now find themselves entangled in the world's negative perceptions—portrayed as inhabitants of an underdeveloped continent that remains materially poor despite being the richest in natural resources. Yet this narrative contradicts the historical reality. Indigenous Africans were economically self-sufficient as far back as the primitive era, long before Western and Arabian cultural influences shaped the ancient African world.

The indigenous culture of Africans was never oriented toward economic materialism or toward participation in a market-driven monetary economy. Instead, our ingrained cultural fascination with all aspects of existence guided the formation of our social understanding of the world. This same cultural curiosity now shapes our evolving material sensibilities within the global capitalist landscape.

Historically, Africans were conditioned to be content with what they *had*, prioritising sufficiency rather than accumulation. But global capitalism—rooted in the pursuit of infinite material expansion—has produced generations of Africans who have

mastered foreign innovations, even when these innovations did not emerge from African environmental conditions or indigenous inspiration.

As Africans were drawn into this globalised money-economy, systemic barriers ensured that Africa remained materially poor despite its immense wealth. The continent has been denied meaningful industrial development on its own soil—development that would satisfy Africans’ expanding aesthetic needs and material ambitions in line with global economic growth.

In truth, Africa possesses all that is required to manufacture, innovate, and reinvent the material essentials of the global economy. Yet African economic development has been continuously restricted by the inequalities embedded within the inflationary mechanisms of the global market-oriented system.

Africa—rich in both human and natural resources—can in principle withdraw from the global monetary economy and instead adopt a trade-oriented framework with foreign nations to achieve material self-sufficiency. This possibility forms the conceptual seedbed of Africa’s future economic empowerment.

Since the post-colonial era, African leaders and State governments have repeatedly championed the goal of material development and economic self-sufficiency, though mostly

through fragmented intergovernmental cooperation. In contrast, the collective ambition of emerging African generations instinctively gravitates toward unity. Guided by the ingrained collectivist culture of indigenous Africans, they envision a single, unified African national body that transcends the colonial divisions of States.

It is now evident that the unification of all African States naturally aligns with the foundational collectivist structures of ancient African societies. Likewise, the collective corporatisation of Africa's natural resources stands as the only logical conclusion for Africans who prioritise the liberal welfare of all African peoples above religious divisions and the racial prejudices plaguing African descendants worldwide.

This clarity also helps explain why indigenous African cultural experiences—rooted in deep thinking, open-mindedness, and fascination—continue to define the African worldview. Consider how contemporary Africans routinely explore global cultures through social media, tracing parallels and contrasts with their own indigenous traditions.

Consider how African intelligentsia and academics absorb knowledge from foreign literatures, adapting global intellectual frameworks to African contexts. Consider the endless curiosity of Africans who seek meaning in technology, science,

philosophy, and literature—always asking how these apply to African life, African futures, and African advancement.

Africans desire to learn everything, to understand everything, and to incorporate everything into their evolving worldview. Yet we remain continually hindered by the stereotypes, exploitation, and racial prejudices imposed upon the black identity of indigenous Africans.

Ethnopolitanism and the Economic Future
of a Unified Africa

I say that, grounded in our African collective conception of human-nature; in the liberal cultural experience of our rationalist tendency to promote collective human happiness above individual gain; and in the practical Afrocentric expression of open-mindedness, acceptance, and tolerance of all peoples regardless of race, language, or ethnicity—the unitary consolidation of all divided African nations holds the full capacity to liberate its economy from the disadvantages imposed by the global market-oriented monetary system. Through unity, Africa can reclaim its traditions and customs as the structural foundation for a trade-oriented economy rooted in indigenous logic rather than foreign prescriptions.

Consistent with this worldview, this manifesto argues unequivocally for the economic happiness of all Africans —

irrespective of race, gender, or any other criteria historically weaponised to exploit, suppress, or limit African empowerment. The collective journey away from global inequality is propelled by our ingrained sense of collectivism, guiding us toward the fulfilment of our liberal welfare in the 21st century.

In contrast to the two historical strands of nationalism — monarchy and republic — the ethnopolitan nationalism proposed here arises directly from the African collectivist cultural mindset. Ethnopolitan nationalism asserts that monetary-economy and economic-protectionism are corrosive to national interest and fundamentally incompatible with the collective liberal welfare of African societies. Instead, it embraces non-monetary economy and economic-promotionism as the truest expression of African national interest.

The envisioned Ethnopolitan State of Africa would recognise the necessity of managing economic resources, sustaining cooperative coexistence with foreign conglomerates, and maintaining trading partnerships across nations. It would also assume a moral and practical obligation to support the material development of less-resourced countries — fostering international cooperation, extending African resources toward their economic uplift, and ensuring their sufficiency on the grounds of our shared humanity.

Taken together, the ethno-corporatist economy of the Ethnopolitan State becomes the foundation for a stable global economic-order in which collective equality supersedes the ambitions of individual nations. Any nation that shares common cause with Africa would do so through alignment with the African cultural collectivist mindset.

From this perspective, ethnopolitanism recognises that its nation is built on an ethno-corporatist economic framework — a system where diverse cultures of different ethnic groups merge into a single custom of socio-economic unity, free from domination by any specific racial, ethnic, or religious group.

The ethnopolitan strand of nationalism rejects both ethnorace — which elevates biological race as a political tool — and ethnocracy, which politicises a dominant ethnic group's culture and religion as a basis for nationalist power over others. Ethnopolitan theory asserts that the 21st century world is locked in a global economic struggle for survival, in which neither ethnorace nor ethnocracy can sustain any society in achieving independent economic self-sufficiency.

Ethnopolitanism therefore advances a radically different integration logic: it binds multiple ethnic groups into a single interdependent civic body governed not by dominance, assimilation, or hierarchy, but by commissioning-rules and populocratic consent. Under this model, no ethnic group

occupies a superior constitutional position; each exists as an interpeer within a shared governance architecture, contributing its social capital, labour traditions, moral codes, and territorial knowledge to the collective national project.

National authority is not ethnic but functional, arising from agreed rules of engagement rather than inherited identity. Decision-making flows horizontally through populocratic mechanisms that allow citizens and working-groups across ethnic lines to co-author policy, resolve disputes, and arbitrate interests without subordinating one group to another.

The contemporary Sahelian States (Mali, Niger, and Burkina Faso) already provide living archetypes of this logic: despite their artificial colonial borders, their societies routinely practice cross-ethnic co-governance through shared security pacts, trade networks, pastoral–agrarian compacts, and communal adjudication systems that operate commicratically in practice, if not yet in formal structure.

In purpose, if not in present constitutional form, the Sahel demonstrates how ethnopublican governance emerges organically wherever ethnic plurality is managed through reciprocity, interdependence, and collective rule-making rather than ethnic supremacy—revealing ethnopublicanism not as an abstraction, but as an indigenous African govovical logic awaiting full institutionalisation.

Nigeria, by contrast, remains ethnopublic only in demographic appearance, not in constitutional or governance reality. While the Yoruba, Hausa, and Igbo peoples coexist within a single territorial State, their political interaction is still mediated through a colonial–bureaucratic architecture that centralises power vertically and converts ethnic plurality into competitive rivalry rather than interdependent governance.

The result is a perpetual zero-sum struggle for federal control, where representation is symbolic, rotation is cosmetic, presidential election is tribal, and ethnic balance is negotiated through patronage rather than institutional reciprocity.

What Nigeria requires to become genuinely ethnopublic is neither fragmentation nor federal tinkering, but a structural re-foundation: the erection of Statelords drawn respectively from the Yoruba, Hausa, and Igbo civilisational blocs, each acting not as ethnic champions but as judicial custodians of collective balance within a unified State.

By realigning its constitution into the ethnopublican four-arm model—Statelords (Judicial), Secretariat (Executive), Economy-Arm, and Citizenry-Arm—Nigeria would instantly convert ethnic plurality from a liability into an engine of governance.

Such a transformation would dissolve ethnic suspicion by embedding equality of authority at the highest supervisory level, replacing bureaucratic dominance with commicratic interpeer rule. In doing so, Nigeria would not only reclaim its long-asserted title as the “Giant of Africa,” but would surpass it—emerging as an advanced ethnopublic power capable of rivaling, stabilising, and coordinating with the Sahelian States through shared commicratic logic rather than inherited colonial form.

Therefore, smaller nations are better served by entering ethno-corporatist alliances with larger nations to guarantee their own economic sufficiency rather than competing over limited resources. In such an arrangement, nations are driven by their collective culture and a shared equalitarian ethic, organising and distributing resources in ways that benefit the collective above any isolated national interest that might have existed outside unity.

Ethnopolitanism thrives on the scale of its economic resources: the greater the resources, the more capable the economy becomes in sustaining ethno-corporatist self-sufficiency. Because of this, ethnopolitanism naturally employs an exclusive form of nationalism in which all who share its collective interest align themselves within the govocal spectrum—embracing a populocratic and collectivist structure to replace the conventional democratic framework. Smaller nations

therefore gain greater governmental and economic stability by joining coalitions with larger ones, enabling them to secure their economic sufficiency in the 21st century.

Nevertheless, Africa stands uniquely positioned. The continent possesses vast and overflowing economic resources — more than enough to emerge as a fully independent Ethnopolitan State, capable of achieving self-sufficient subsistence without reliance on any external monetary authority. Therefore, it is in the interest of our 21st century African generation to construct our liberal welfare upon the ethno-corporatist economic foundation and the Ethnopolitan State articulated in this manifesto.

The Reorientation of African Society Away from the Commicratic Mind

The influence of non-native cultures in Africa since the post-ancient era redirected our societies away from the collective commicratic mindset that once guided our ancestral ways of life, customs, and social organisation. Where our ancestors practised a shared ethic of collective usefulness and distributed value, we now operate within bureaucratic cultures—structures fundamentally non-native to Africa's primordial civilisational identity. Our decision-making processes, family dynamics, and models of governance have become bureaucratised, shaping

social relations around hierarchy, regulation, and institutional formality.

Yet despite surviving and adapting within these bureaucratic conditions, the African psychological architecture remains rooted in an older, indigenous commicratic ethos. This manifesto seeks to realign our civilisational orientation back to that ancestral mindset—reawakening an organisational consciousness grounded in collective usefulness, non-monetary cooperation, and shared ethical responsibility.

The commicratic mindset rests on two essential requirements:

1. To achieve the collective goal set for the group, and
2. To ensure that the end-products of individual useful-values are equally distributed among the collectives—a principle best described as collective-individualism.

Unlike the bureaucratic mindset, which interprets labour primarily through financial metrics and hierarchical advancement, the commicratic mindset values individuals for the useful-values they contribute toward collective needs, desires, and social harmony. It nurtures non-monetary relations and expands the moral architecture of society through shared purpose.

Thus, the commicratic mind parallels the equalitarian mind. Both promote the liberalisation of rules—reducing restrictive regulations in favour of equitable cooperation that maximises happiness across the community. In practice, commicracy uses the same moral laws that underpin egalitarianism: laws grounded in fairness, mutual reliance, and the harmonisation of individual capability with collective wellbeing.

Africa's abundant natural resources during the primitive and ancient eras—where food grew organically across most regions without intensive cultivation—cultivated a naturally equalitarian civilisation. This ecological ease nurtured a cultural psychology centred on sharing, cooperation, and communal provisioning. It is this equalitarian cultural imprint that, within the theory of an ethnopublican society for Africa, is reframed as the commicratic mind.

Both the equalitarian and commicratic minds recognise a foundational truth: without the cooperative contributions of *Corposense*—the collective interchange of human intelligence, labour, and capability for creating useful-values—inequality becomes inevitable. When cooperation collapses, human nature defaults to competitive advantage, greed, selfishness, aggression, and divisive ethics. Commicracy therefore stands not merely as a social system but as a safeguard against the darker inclinations of

human behaviour, offering a structural path back to communal balance and moral coherence.

Adapting Commicratic Ethics
to Contemporary Mindsets

Adapting commicratic ethics to contemporary African mindsets begins with a simple but profound principle: relations, whether equal or unequal, reflect the natural state of an organised society. In this view, bureaucratic societies do not treat their citizens equally, nor do they provide equal economic, social, or civil rights.

Bureaucracy is sustained by rigid rules and a conservative impulse to legislate for every possible scenario. It does not trust the citizenry with legislative power, nor does it believe that the people should govern the government that governs their lives.

Where the bureaucratic mind holds a deep pessimism about human nature—doubting the capacity of individuals to direct themselves—the commicratic mind is defined by an equally deep optimism. It trusts the capability of collective direction, recognising that communities have always learned from their own mistakes, just as primitive societies across the world once did.

In this view, collective rules are written by the collective to promote equality relations, making life easier for the greatest

number of people and preventing the interests of a minority of elected officials from outweighing the desires of the majority.

The commicratic mind also recognises an important truth: while the general rule must apply to everyone, every rule must also contain exceptions. Exceptions are not weaknesses but mechanisms that ensure the *equality* of rules in practice. Bureaucracy, by contrast, imposes rules uniformly and rarely permits exceptions, ignoring the fact that every rule requires knowledgeable capacity—that is, an individual must possess the intellectual understanding necessary to appreciate, comply with, or meaningfully navigate the rule.

Commicratic rules are therefore crafted to deter misconduct among the majority while ensuring accountability among the minority. Culpability only exists when a rule can be understood by the intelligence of the person to whom it applies.

Exceptions protect those whose capacity to know or understand the rule is limited by circumstances, capacity, or genuine constraints. In this way, commicracy aligns justice with knowledge, and governance with human reality.

Human action itself is governed by rules:

- The rules of self-preservation embedded in biological instinct.

- The rules taught by parents, shaped by ethnic culture and parental preference.
- The rules of schools, based on systematic procedures of learning.
- The rules that transfers between the governments and the governed.
- The rules of religious practice imparted by spiritual leaders.
- And most foundational of all, the biological rules of the neurotype-genes that govern behaviour, emotional desires, cognitive capacity, and the very architecture of self-preservation.

Everything visible to the senses, everything perceived or touched, is governed by rules. Rules form the behavioural skeleton of existence.

Within this structure, the theory of Corposense—introduced in the economic theory of ethno-corporatism in Volume I of this manifesto—defines the *intellectual capability necessary for the economic survival of the individual*.

In other words, the neurotype-gene architecture of the brain determines what a person is capable of accomplishing within their environment in order to sustain themselves economically

and navigate themselves socially. Corposense is therefore the biological foundation of economic participation, linking genetic cognitive design to societal usefulness and communal contribution.

Commicratic Equity, Corposense,
and the Limits of Legal Absolutism

In advancing commicracy as a living ethic rather than a mechanical system of control, it becomes necessary to depart from one of the most rigid assumptions of bureaucratic legal culture: the maxim that “*ignorance of the law is no excuse.*” This maxim, while administratively convenient, is philosophically flawed and socially unjust when applied indiscriminately to all persons, contexts, and capacities.

Under commicratic ethics, culpability is inseparable from Corposense—the knowledgeable capacity required for self-preservation, social participation, and economic contribution. Corposense does not merely denote awareness that a rule exists; it refers to the practical ability to understand, interpret, and reasonably apply that rule within a lived context. Where either knowledge of the rule is absent, or the intellectual and social capacity to apprehend its meaning is limited, automatic punishment becomes ethically indefensible.

Accordingly, commicracy adopts a context-sensitive legal principle: *ignorance of the law may constitute a legitimate excuse where the rule is complex, technical, newly introduced, culturally foreign, or beyond the reasonable grasp of the average person.* However, this principle does not apply to foundational moral prohibitions that are universally embedded in human social consciousness—such as violence, theft, or deliberate harm. In such cases, where the rule is common knowledge and socially intuitive, ignorance cannot be pleaded.

This distinction is critical. Bureaucratic and police-State systems presume that every individual—citizen or foreigner alike—possesses full knowledge of every statute, regulation, and procedural nuance within a territory. This presumption is neither realistic nor humane. It converts law into a trap rather than a guide, and enforcement into domination rather than order. Commicracy rejects this logic outright.

Instead, first offences within commicratic society are assessed holistically, not punitively. The objective is not retribution, but correction, learning, and reintegration. Where a breach reveals a gap in knowledge, understanding, or access, the response is rehabilitative. Punishment is reserved for conscious, repeated, or malicious violations—not for cognitive or informational absence.

Socially, this approach reflects the deeper purpose of commicracy: the promotion of equity rather than the blind enforcement of equality. Legislative authority flows upward from the citizenry-electoralates, and rules governing social order are authored collectively through participatory processes. Law is therefore not an external imposition but an evolving social agreement—one that must remain intelligible to those bound by it.

Economically, this distinction becomes even more consequential. Bureaucratic systems, with their rigid divisions of labour and standardised rule-application, routinely manufacture inequality by enforcing uniformity where human capacity differs, and hierarchy where contribution is equal. They punish deviation even when deviation is productive, innovative, or socially necessary.

Commicracy, by contrast, levels economic contribution according to collective need rather than bureaucratic rank. It does not overvalue narrow expertise while demeaning general capability, nor does it reward procedural obedience over real productivity. Where bureaucracy enforces equality in ways that produce injustice, commicracy introduces equity. Where bureaucracy enforces inequality in the name of efficiency, commicracy restores equality of worth.

Finally, while bureaucratic rule-making magnifies predictability—knowing the procedural end-point in advance—it does so at the cost of creativity and adaptive problem-solving. Productivity declines as rules multiply. Commicracy accepts reduced predictability in exchange for greater human responsiveness, innovation, and collective intelligence. It solves multiple problems through flexible reasoning rather than through endless legislative accumulation.

In this way, commicracy replaces legal absolutism with ethical proportionality, social punishment with rehabilitative correction, and economic hierarchy with equitable contribution—not by abandoning order, but by grounding order in human reality rather than desk-bound authority.

Commicratic Minds and the Biological Foundations of Human Behaviour

As my forthcoming research in *Psychextrics* will demonstrate, the biological construction of genes-neurotypes governing human behavioural intellect and knowledge is, at its core, commicratic. Even the neurotype structures that regulate movement, instinct, and automatic behavioural responses function according to commicratic logic.

Thus, any systematic attempt to impose bureaucratic rules upon these inherently commicratic biological systems—with the

aim of manufacturing intellect, shaping knowledge, or dictating instinctive expression—invariably produces deficiency. It pushes the human mind toward despondency, mirroring the behavioural attributes often observed in low-functioning individuals. Similarly, attempts to bureaucratised the natural idiomatic expressions of movement and instinct render behaviour irresponsive and lifeless, working against the self-preserving rhythms essential to the human bearer.

It should also be acknowledged that certain professions—such as military service—require heightened predictability to yield precise forms of productivity. Yet most domains, particularly those reliant on human interaction such as hospitality, require elevated productivity while predictability remains either irrelevant or fluctuating. In these environments, bureaucratic over-structuring becomes counterproductive.

Thus, adopting commicratic ethics as a workplace mindset becomes essential for countering the productivity-reducing effects of bureaucratic procedures. In the rapid tempo of the web-internetisation era, the preservation of outdated bureaucratic routines stifles innovation. The commicratic orientation insists that the status quo must be continuously evaluated, re-shaped, and made open to change in accordance with collective need and environmental pace.

The commicratic mind values the *work itself* above the prestige of a title, and willingly extends its contributions beyond formal role definitions to maximise actual productivity. Successful commicrats are those who think creatively—often outside the conventional framework—to achieve the desired outcomes.

The status quo of commicracy invites and expects individuals to question imposed rules that govern the administration of their collectives. This culture of critical engagement nurtures progressive transformation and prevents the entrenchment of systems that undermine equality relations, and in some cases equity. A commicratic society relies on continuous critique so that its structures never fall short of their equity-driven ideals.

To operate within a commicratic mindset is to challenge the moral reasons behind collective actions while acknowledging fears, weaknesses, and the discomfort associated with change. The foundation of this mindset is the ethic of *working together*—a principle deeply embedded in indigenous African collectivist culture. It calls for consensus-building across variations in human moral reasoning and emphasises fairness, reciprocity, loyalty, respect, and in-group care across lines of culture, race or creed.

Commicratic minds are inherently innovative. Transformation occurs whenever new rules promise greater satisfaction and happiness for a larger number of people. They are not resistant to change; rather, they embrace it. No individual must stand at the apex of an organisation for their ideas to be valued.

In decision-making, commicracy remains fundamentally horizontal, weighing each contribution equally and judging proposals by their collective merit rather than the authority of their source. Conformity to the living status quo—one that is dynamic, not static—enables commicratic minds to recognise shortcomings quickly and respond with risk-free, context-sensitive solutions.

Commicratic mindsets draw upon rules that strengthen horizontal working relationships. They encourage alliance, shared purpose, and a non-competitive mode of existence. Commicratic minds recognise one another, collaborate without rivalry, and willingly adjust rules whenever such changes enhance collective equality and advantage.

Therefore, the adaptation of commicratic ethics into new mindsets—central to the proposed African ethnpublican society—requires a deep re-examination of African traditional cultures, many of which have been heavily reshaped by global influences.

The Emergence of Commicratic Ethics in the Age of Web-Internetisation

On the global platform of web-internetisation, a new model of commicratic ethics is emerging across African societies. Certain remnants of bureaucratic hierarchy—those embedded within the old social-control systems—now clash with the expanding citizen-driven ethical consciousness.

The bureaucratic discipline of blind instruction-following, the expectation of obedience without scrutiny, the entrenched patterns of unfairness disguised as impartiality, and the bureaucratic ethic of loyalty to authority above truth—all stand in growing contradiction to the anxieties and sensibilities brought about by the internetisation era sweeping across Africa.

The resonance of what I call “commicratic accountability” is evident across digital Africa. Africans now confront social issues, injustices, and moral failures in real time as they unfold within their communities. Social media has become a commicratic public square where citizens collectively deliberate, critique, and propose pathways to resolution.

Consequently, government officials increasingly find themselves compelled to conform to citizen-imposed commicratic discipline—not the other way around. They are now

pressured to uphold transparency, impartiality, honour, and responsiveness under the vigilant gaze of the collective.

Platforms such as YouTube, TikTok, Instagram, and Facebook have provided Africans with unprecedented avenues to voice their moral judgements against police bribery, civil-service extortion, nepotistic politics, and even regressive occultic practices. These platforms facilitate an invitation for national participation: citizens contribute opinions, expose misconduct, and co-create courses of action. This behaviour is not bureaucratic—it is distinctly commicratic, grounded in shared morality and collective responsibility.

In this sense, commicracy represents the togetherness of a people governed by shared rules of representation and engagement, anchored in a common sense of collective purpose. The content of a culture's "commicratic morals" becomes visible in what offends its citizens, what disturbs the conscience of the collective, and what they expect from those who hold authority.

These moral triggers vary across regions in Africa, yet the internetisation platform unifies them by enabling smooth societal transitions—from rigid bureaucratic ethics to modern commicratic ethics characterised by accountability, honour, openness, equality, and mutual respect.

This behavioural transformation aligns with what I identify as a horizontal expectation of equality conduct within global ethics. Individuals expect equal treatment, equal moral consideration, and equal dignity in their daily interactions with others. Each horizontal layer of association—local, national, or international—is governed by implicit terms of equality defined by “ought to” and “ought not to,” shaping civic behaviour and social expectation.

Simultaneously, the rise of monetised social-media participation has propelled Africans into an economic environment fundamentally shaped by global corporate commicracy. The ability to generate income through platforms such as YouTube, TikTok, Instagram, Facebook, Patreon, Snapchat, Pinterest, OnlyFans, Frontroom, and many more has created a new form of economic autonomy.

African citizenries now participate in a global corporatist economy, earning monetised income equivalent to individuals anywhere else in the world. Their ability to use *corposense*—the intellectual capacity and skillset applied to digital work—to generate income under their own personal corporate identity is a manifestation of corporatist work-ethics embedded within commicratic logic.

In the 21st century, the working-age demographic has become divided not between capitalist labourers and capitalist

manufacturers as in previous generations, but between those who are corporatist workers and those who employ a corporatist mindset within their work. Anyone whose economic survival depends on the internet, digital tools, computer systems, or online platforms can no longer be categorised within the old capitalist binaries. They are corporatists operating within a commicratic economic environment—whether they realise it or not.

The web-internetisation administrative policy of open-data and open-access to information—which now grants citizenries across the world the technological capability to regularise and recalibrate their own social-systems of social-controls—poses a direct threat not only to government discretionary decision-making but also to the moral architecture of traditional bureaucratic ethics. Government agencies, including those across Africa, were never structurally designed for interdependent authority between the government and the governed; nor were they horizontally configured for the demands of commicratic policy implementation.

Consequently, the global ethical interpositions of commicratic morality have become for African governments not merely matters of compliance as a safety measure, but also matters of navigating uncertainty and defending their institutions

from accusations of corruptive practices in order to save political face and avoid public humiliation.

The bureaucratic system of government is increasingly struggling to respond effectively to what it now perceives as a proliferation of complex social challenges—challenges that are, in reality, the natural emergence of citizenry commicracies disseminating information under the banner of global collectivism of association.

The reaction of the Chinese government illustrates this dilemma. By imposing predetermined plans and blocking thousands of global websites to restrict transnational association within its territorial boundaries, China created what is popularly known as “The Great Firewall”—justified as a protective measure against “harmful information” and external influence. Yet the commicratic dominance of web-internetisation has proven too formidable, too fluid, and too decentralised to be constrained.

Virtual Private Networks (VPNs) allow individuals, including those within China’s borders, to access any website anywhere in the world. Despite China’s escalating efforts to suppress VPN usage and block thousands of additional sites, global corporatists continuously innovate methods to bypass such restrictions.

This inevitably forces the Chinese bureaucracy into an uncomfortable adaptive posture—compelled to adjust itself to commicratic realities despite its structural aversion to adaptiveness. Bureaucracy, by design, is not rooted in nurturing adaptability; commicracy, by contrast, is fundamentally rooted in cultivating adaptiveness for sustainable social growth anywhere human society exists.

Recognising the inevitability of commicratic empowerment, Chinese authorities strategically avoid direct confrontation by refraining from mass prosecutions of VPN users, opting instead for ongoing technological obstruction. Yet this only reinforces a broader reality: the attempt to wield rigid bureaucratic ethics against the fluidity of global collectivism of association is a losing battle. Commicratic ethics, grounded in cooperation, openness, and horizontal empowerment, expands wherever human interconnectedness is technologically enabled.

What this demonstrate is simply that web-internetisation is not a capitalist platform disseminating vertical bureaucracy, rather a corporatist platform disseminating horizontal commicracy. Whilst the former can be captured and constrained from the top-down, the latter cannot be constrained because its rule is the bottom-up approach and individuals can bypass and surpass bureaucratic legitimacy.

The elite no longer hold power, the people do. For power now belongs to those who can wield it, not by those who merely prescribes it. And interdependent governance between the government and the governed is the only alternative pathway forward.

The Covid-19 pandemic offered Africa a vivid demonstration of the contrasting nature of citizenry commicracy and governmental bureaucracy. While governments navigated the slow procedural channels of foreign aid and vaccine procurement, citizens improvised.

Across villages, towns, and urban centres, the population mass-produced face masks, shared preventive remedies, crowdsourced safety strategies, and revived traditional herbal practices as immediate protective measures. The citizenry adapted organically and collectively, while bureaucratic machinery moved slowly and hierarchically.

This contrast reveals a crucial truth: for governmental bureaucracies to address what they perceive as complex modern challenges, they must abandon predetermined plans that stand in opposition to the natural tendencies of human behaviour. Instead, they must cultivate open-minded, adaptive policies that resonate with the will of the people, thereby generating greater collective happiness and social stability.

While it remains true that State bureaucracies possess the authority to make and enforce laws, the structural rigidity of their top-down procedures, formalised incentives, and restrictive institutional cultures stand as barriers to genuine adaptation.

The future of governance—particularly across Africa—lies not in reinforcing hierarchical rigidity but in replacing bureaucratic structures with commicratic ethics. It lies in recognising that the people, empowered by web-internetisation, constitute a dynamic moral force capable of identifying problems, proposing solutions, and shaping the social-order through collective resonance.

Governmental survival and legitimacy will increasingly depend on their ability to absorb, respond to, align with this commicratic will of the citizenry, and ultimately institutionalise interdependent governance model to reclaim their own legitimacy as government of the people.

Interpeer Structural Performance and the Foundations of Commicratic Governance

In the proposed commicratic ethics of African society, the power to make laws belongs to the governed, while the power to enforce those laws belongs to the government. This reciprocal distribution of authority is sustained through commicratic processes that enable interdependent decision-making in a

circular structural approach. Such a structure creates a formalised platform for continuously testing policies, identifying what works and why it works, and allowing governments to learn—iteratively—how their societies are changing and what factors contribute to the reversal or revision of citizenry-generated policies at any given time.

This principle forms the basis of what I call a Reciprocal Organisational Approach, or more precisely, an ‘Interpeer Organisational Structure Performance’. This refers to an arrangement in which two or more distinct peer groups mutually influence one another’s decisions in pursuit of a shared purpose.

Within this structure, each group becomes both the cause and effect of the other’s decision-making process, creating a co-governance dynamic in which society governs itself through collective reciprocity rather than unilateral authority.

The term Interpeer is a direct portmanteau combining the meanings of “inter” and “peer.” The prefix *inter*, as found in Latin loanwords, signifies “between,” “among,” “mutually,” “reciprocally,” or “together.” The word *peer* derives from the Latin *par*, meaning “equal.” Combined, *Interpeer* literally means *the interrelation of two or more peer groups with a shared sense of purpose*. It highlights the structural performance of commicratic governance through mutual engagement, shared deliberation, and collaborative influence across distinct groups.



A *peer* describes the internal relationship among individuals within a single group, while *Interpeer* denotes the relationship between two or more groups. Thus, individuals relate to each other through exclusive peer-to-peer interactions within their group, but when distinct groups collaborate, they enter an open interpeer relation.

Within commicracy, Interpeer becomes the communication network that defines its horizontal structural performance—a system of formal communication, interaction, and shared decision-making that links members of a commicratic organisation together.

The horizontal structure of commicracy consists of individuals united by an intrinsic shared-sense of purpose, possessing equal decision-making power in pursuit of a collective mission. This shared-sense may derive from passion, skill, ability, status, rank, association, or any combination thereof.

In contrast, the vertical structure of bureaucracy consists of individuals bound by a delegated shared-sense of purpose, with unequal or devolved decision-making power flowing downward from the top of the hierarchy.

Thus, the adaptation of commicratic ethics into new mindsets requires the systematic adoption of Interpeer structural performance in governance. It is through this performance that the citizenry assess publicly both the positive and negative characteristics of their various communities during elective processes, thereby directly shaping the executive duties of national government, the govoxical responsibilities of administrators, and the legislative actions needed to meet the needs of their communities as a collective.

The Foundational Philosophy
of Commicratic Governance

Interpeer and Power-Reciprocity as the Architecture of
Horizontal Rule:

The philosophical foundation of commicratic governance rests on two inseparable principles: Interpeer and power-reciprocity. Each concept captures a distinct dimension of horizontal governance, but it is their combined logic that produces the fully realised structural performance of commicracy.

Interpeer defines how groups relate; power-reciprocity defines how power flows. Together, they form a unified philosophy that replaces hierarchical rule with collective equilibrium, and transforms governance from a vertical command system into a horizontal field of shared authority.

Interpeer: The Ontology of Horizontal Relation:

Interpeer begins with the premise that social organisation must emerge from the reciprocal engagement of *equal groups* rather than the delegation of authority from superior to subordinate classes. Derived from *inter* (“between, among, mutually, reciprocally”) and *peer* (“equal”), Interpeer establishes governance as the structured interrelation of two or more equal groups acting together toward a shared purpose.

In a commicratic society, Interpeer is not a casual collaboration—it is the formal communication and interaction architecture that binds the citizenry into a collective decision-making organism. Every group, regardless of domain, rank, skill, or social function, possesses the same intrinsic moral standing and deliberative legitimacy.

Thus, Interpeer is the structural condition of commicracy: a system in which authority is not bestowed by hierarchy but emerges from the natural alignment and negotiation between horizontal groups of equal standing.

Power-Reciprocity: The Ethics of Equitable Authority:

Where Interpeer explains structure, power-reciprocity explains ethics.

Power-reciprocity is the philosophical doctrine that power must flow cyclically between the governed and the governors, and that neither side may hold power in isolation. Power is not a possession but a mutual exchange, sustained only when both sides recognise the other's role in the collective survival of the society.

In commicratic governance:

- The citizenry holds the power to make laws.
- The government holds the power to enforce laws.

- Neither power is complete without the other.
- Each power is the cause of the other's legitimacy.
- Authority is therefore reciprocal, not hierarchical.

Power-reciprocity transforms governance into an ethical loop—each action taken by government must respond to a citizenry directive, and each directive by the citizenry must be grounded in a recognisable societal need that government is obligated to fulfill.

It is this ethical loop that intensifies accountability, minimises coercion, and elevates the collective intellect over individualised authority.

The Philosophical Union of Interpeer and Power-Reciprocity:

When Interpeer (shared structural relation) is combined with power-reciprocity (shared ethical authority), a governing philosophy emerges in which:

- No group governs alone.
- No group is governed without participation.
- No power exists without reciprocal confirmation.
- No decision stands without horizontal consensus.

This union produces the defining characteristic of commicracy:

Horizontal Structural Performance:

Horizontal structural performance is the commicratic method by which multiple peer groups—citizenry, working-groups, custodial guardians, and executive organs—operate as co-equal participants in governance. Each group possesses autonomy within its domain, yet all are bound by shared moral responsibility and a collective sense of purpose.

Under this model:

- Governance is achieved through negotiation, not imposition.
- Authority emerges from consensus, not command.
- Social cohesion grows from equality, not stratification.
- Adaptation arises from shared intelligence, not bureaucratic rigidity.

Thus, the horizontal structure of commicracy is not a mere administrative design—it is a philosophical claim about the nature of human cooperation: that equality in structure enables equality in moral participation, and equality in participation enables a society to govern itself intelligently.

The Humanistic Basis: Why Commicracy Mirrors Human Nature:

The fusion of Interpeer and power-reciprocity reflects the biological, cognitive, and social construction of the human species:

- Humans are naturally collective problem-solvers.
- Human survival has always depended on shared contribution.
- Human moral reasoning is deeply rooted in fairness, reciprocity, loyalty, and in-group protection.
- Human societies weaken when hierarchical restraint suppresses the natural flow of collective intelligence.

Thus, commicracy aligns more closely with the innate architecture of human cooperation than bureaucratic hierarchy ever could. It is a governance model that mirrors the way the human social brain evolved to function.

The Foundational Doctrine:

Bringing both principles into a single philosophical statement: Commicratic governance is the moral and organisational doctrine in which the interrelation of equal peer groups (Interpeer) is sustained by the reciprocal exchange of authority (power-reciprocity), producing a horizontal structure

through which society collectively governs itself with fairness, equality, and adaptive intelligence.

This doctrine forms the bedrock of the proposed African ethnopublican society and explains why the bureaucratic model collapses under the pressures of web-internetisation, citizenry awakening, and global commicratic ethics—while commicracy thrives, expands, and harmonises with natural human behaviour.

Interpeer Safeguards and the Philosophy of Distributed Responsibility

In the interpeer logic of commicracy, the modern State gains a profound strategic advantage: it becomes structurally protected from the emotional volatility, impulsive reactions, and arbitrary accusations that arise in societies governed through traditional bureaucratic hierarchies.

In our current generation—marked by mass communication, misinformation stressors, media sensationalism, and the rapid mobilisation of public opinion—it is no longer viable for any State government to remain the singular target of blame for every contentious or imperfect decision that affects the wider population.

Under a commicratic system where the legislative authority belongs to the governed, the emotional burden of decision-making is redistributed horizontally across the citizenry. Citizens

collectively determine the rules that govern their communities, and government officials execute those rules.

As a result, the State acquires a natural defence mechanism: the locus of responsibility shifts from “government officials making decisions about us” to “we, the collective, making decisions for ourselves.”

Thus, an individual’s frustration transitions from “I hate the government” to the far more diffused “I hate the people who made this decision”—yet with no ability to identify any specific individual, the emotional hostility collapses into abstraction. No government official becomes the face of a collective decision. The system absorbs and neutralises emotional displacement.

This is not merely a matter of govoxical convenience—it is an ethical architecture of Govox-Populi. With the proposed blockchain ballots in united Africa and global societies, no person can trace any policy outcome to a specific voter. No State agent becomes a symbolic villain. No official becomes the object of paranoid projection from individuals who feel personally wounded by a policy outcome. The bureaucratic burden of “being blamed for executing the will of the people” disappears entirely.

In bureaucratic governance, predetermined policies place particular individuals at fixed points of responsibility; citizens

inevitably identify these individuals as the cause of their misfortune. The bureaucratic structure itself amplifies emotional targeting. In contrast, commicratic ethics dissolves such targeting: individuals are compelled to understand that the source of their dissatisfaction is embedded within the collective will, not within any identifiable agent.

This shift is a crucial psychological pillar of commicratic governance. It channels emotional impulses away from personalised hostility and toward shared accountability. It reinforces the principle that power is reciprocal, distributed, and indistinguishable at the individual level.

Furthermore, commicratic organisations reform the traditional problem of bureaucracy: the overburdening of a minority with the responsibility to generate positive outcomes. In a bureaucratic system, this minority is idealised when outcomes are favourable and demonised when outcomes are unfavourable. The system is structurally unjust both to the officials and to the wider citizenry.

Commicracy eliminates this ethical distortion. Every participant within a commicratic organisation is charged with responsibility for producing positive contributions. Outcomes emerge not from the decisions of leaders but from the interdependent cooperation of *all* members. Predetermined policies still exist, but they are matched with equally

predetermined commitments to collective responsibility, collective adaptation, and collective outcomes.

The complexity that bureaucratic structures multiply is made simple under commicratic organisation. Instead of rigid vertical roles, the system functions through interpeer reciprocity—each peer group contributing to a shared mission, each decision flowing from a horizontal structure of mutual influence, and each outcome reflecting the joint efforts of everyone involved.

Thus, commicracy becomes the umbrella under which organisational success is defined not by the authority of leaders but by the productive synergy of the whole. It is the system where ethical rules, shared responsibility, and reciprocal power combine to produce outcomes that no bureaucratic structure can achieve.

In this sense, commicratic governance is not only a govovical model but a psychological safeguard, a moral system, and a structural enhancer of organisational intelligence. It demonstrates that positive outcomes arise from the interpeer web of cooperation—not from the hierarchical concentration of decision-making authority.

The Ethicratic Mode of Organisation in Commicratic Systems

The ethical-rules of an organisation form the code of conduct through which the organisation expresses its core ethical values, its structural model of operation, and its underlying moral principles. These rules shape the standard or patterned form of organisational behaviour, defining how members relate to one another and how the organisation conducts itself in its engagement with those it serves. This ethical architecture is what I refer to as the *Ethicratic Mode of Organisation*.

Ethicracy—a direct portmanteau of *ethical rule* or, more expansively, *the rule of ethics*—maps the moral trajectory of an organisation. It is the framework through which those responsible for key decisions articulate the pattern of relational behaviour, setting the conditions for what is deemed morally acceptable, professionally appropriate, and organisationally representative.

In bureaucratic organisations, leaders hold the authority to define, dictate, and direct the ethical rules that shape professional behaviour and relational conduct. Staff become reflections of the leader's moral projection, for it is the leader's own preferences that sculpt the ethical tone of the organisation.

Yet, these rules of ethics in bureaucracy often remain uncoded; they exist informally—implied rather than expressly stated. Despite their informal nature, breaches of these unspoken rules can result in sanctions, penalties, or punitive measures.

This dynamic creates the restrictive environment characteristic of bureaucracy, where the misuse of positional power, partiality, favouritism, and the erosion of universal moral principles become common. Staff members, seeking to protect their position, are compelled to follow the bureaucratic leader's directives irrespective of fairness or uniformity.

Consequently, ethical-rules within bureaucracy are neither stable nor universally applied—they shift depending on the whims, relationships, and interests of those holding authority. A private romantic affair between a leader and a subordinate, for example, often results in preferential treatment, creating unequal rules of engagement and fractured professional standards.

In commicracy, however, ethical-rules gain legitimacy only when codified through collective consensus. No individual holds the power to unilaterally impose an ethical code; instead, the moral architecture emerges from collective agreement among all members. Because the rules are imposed by the collective rather than by an individual, they are applied uniformly, regardless of personal relationships, private entanglements, or interpersonal

histories. Ethical equality becomes the default—not the exception.

Within a commicratic organisation, the performance or non-performance of ethical-rules carries no punitive consequence unless the collective has explicitly formalised those rules. This stands in stark contrast to bureaucracy, where unspoken expectations become a silent weapon of control.

Thus, the central concern of ethicracy is to define the ultimate rules of engagement by which members of an organisation display their moral operational code—one that can be measured, compared, and understood across organisational boundaries.

In bureaucracy, the power to shape this ethicratic mode rests in the hands of individual leaders; in commicracy, it rests always and only in the hands of the collective. Through this distinction, commicracy offers an ethical model not only of equality, but of structural moral integrity—a moral code authored by all, applied to all, and reflective of all.

In bureaucratic organisations, the ethical-rules in place typically conform to whatever moral framework the current leadership prescribes. Professional behaviour becomes defined by what individual bureaucratic leaders deem acceptable, and

discipline becomes defined by what those same leaders deem unacceptable.

Thus, the ethical architecture of a bureaucratic organisation is inherently unstable. New leaders mean new ethical-rules, new ethical-rules mean a new ethicratic mode, and a new ethicratic mode inevitably produces a confused and inconsistent pattern of professional behaviour among staff who remain the same while the governing moral directives continue to shift above them.

In commicracy, however, because staff collectively manage the day-to-day functioning of the organisation, they also collectively hold the power to determine and maintain the ethicratic mode. New members entering the organisation cannot unilaterally change the ethical-rules, but they may gradually influence the operational culture through their perspectives and contributions.

As a result, whereas bureaucracy experiences abrupt ethical shifts with each new leadership cycle, the ethicratic mode of a commicratic organisation evolves slowly and organically—guided either by gradual generational change or by a significant reconfiguration of the organisational administrative team.

This distinction highlights a broader truth: ethical-rules, in any organisational structure, only exist when those empowered to decide project them into existence. The theory of ethicracy

therefore aims to institute a system of accountability that anchors organisational conduct in a customary and coherent moral framework—an agreed standard of right and wrong that stabilises professional behaviour irrespective of individual personalities.

The theory of ethicracy seeks to establish a universal moral foundation upon which all organisational ethos can rest—a set of conduct principles that resonate with the intrinsic ethical behaviours common across human societies. Yet its operation differs when viewed through a commicratic lens.

In bureaucratic civil service organisations, for example, ethicracy becomes formal and legalistic: codified into legislation or embedded within formal rules of conduct. Breaches of these codified standards can result either in legal punishment or in mandated improvement and learning, depending on the organisational culture and not merely the bureaucratic standard.

In some bureaucratic institutions, such as police authorities, breaches of conduct favour the route of improvement and learning over punishment and sanction. In contrast, private bureaucratic organisations often allow the personal morality of leaders to become an ethicratic law in its own right—an internal moral regime not subject to external oversight.

This dynamic has necessitated the creation of employment tribunals and independent ombudsman agencies that enforce universal ethicratic standards and curb the hidden corruption endemic to bureaucratic structures globally.

The challenge becomes even more pronounced in Africa, where bureaucracy is not regulated through State-level oversight in the way it is in many Western nations. Without this regulatory framework, bureaucratic structures can devolve into unchecked systems of moral arbitrariness and corruption. The absence of uniform ethical governance allows bureaucracy to operate in its most predatory form, exerting corrosive influence across social-systems and systems of public control.

Thus, the advancement of ethicracy—particularly through the stabilising logic of commicracy—offers a pathway toward organisational environments grounded in consistency, collective morality, and structural integrity rather than the unpredictable whims of individual authority figures.

Ethicratic Codification and Govoxical Oversight in the Commicratic State

In the proposed commicratic system for Africa, no organisation—whether State-regulated or privately owned—would operate under ethical-rules that are not compatible with State legislation. Under the govovoxical structure, where the

apparatus of the State is controlled directly by citizenry-electorates in service of their collective interests, all ethical-rules of conduct become expressions of citizenry will, formally legislated and universally enforceable.

This ensures that the collective power and shared resources of citizenry society remain governed by ethicratic principles that arise from the people themselves, rather than from bureaucratic elites or fluctuating leadership preferences.

Within the govox-populi framework, once proven operational, promotional and supervisory groups would emerge to support the implementation of commicracy across both public and private sectors. These groups would uphold a universal ethicratic prerogative—compatible with the State constitution—ensuring that commicrats in every institution remain bound to similar ethical-rules. The populocratic architecture of govox-populi is therefore intentionally designed to thrive within a commicratic organisational standard, guaranteeing that citizenry rules are met consistently across society.

At the State level, commicrats are expected to remain govoxically responsive, including those operating under the direct authority of the working-group legislative platform. This platform regulates the firm separation between private life and professional obligation, preventing personal conduct from interfering with the constitutionally codified ethicratic rules that

govern professional practice. In this way, commicracy protects both the individual's private autonomy and the collective's public expectations.

The govoxical populocratic policy instruments reflect the processes of ethicratic instrumentation necessary to examine and regulate the administrative character of commicratic organisations. Through the integration of ethnopublican legal-Directives and citizenry-prescribed legal-Guidelines, govox-populi aims to shape the organisational and national structure of an ethnopublican society. All such policy frameworks operate under the overarching principle of ethicratic codes of conduct, ensuring that governance remains aligned with the collective moral order.

With these structures in place, the proposed unitary States of Africa would no longer require independent external bodies—such as employment tribunals, ombudsman services, or trade unions—to regulate organisational ethics.

Unlike bureaucracy, which necessitates such independent watchdogs due to its inherent vulnerabilities, commicracy embeds ethical regulation directly within its State-level govoxical systems. This structural integration eliminates the need for external intervention and prevents the moral fragmentation observed in many bureaucratic environments.

Privately owned organisations would also be govoxically integrated within the ethnopublican system. Their operations, staff relations, and engagements with service users would be regulated to prevent moral degradation or unethical practices within the workplace.

This creates a substantial advantage for workers across all sectors—accountants, factory workers, waiters, cleaners, receptionists, and more—who would no longer depend on trade unions or employment tribunals for protection. Instead, any allegations of corruptive ethicratic conduct would be addressed directly by the judicial system.

In such cases, litigation concerning workplace rules of conduct would not focus on moral accusations against individuals, but rather on resolving ethical breaches through the formal processes of law. This ensures clarity, fairness, and uniformity across all sectors, fully anchoring the societal order within the moral and ethical logic of commicratic governance.

Interpersonal Virtue and Judicial Oversight in the Ethicratic Commicratic Order

Interpersonal skills become a central virtue within a commicratic organisation, and the individual worker's passion for their role is expected to align with this virtue. Workers who lack interpersonal competence inadvertently damage the

relational fabric between themselves and service-users or customers—an outcome that undermines the very essence of commicratic economic service, which is founded upon shared human engagement. For this reason, interpersonal capacity becomes a relevant factor in judicial arbitration and in the mediation of workplace disputes.

Within commicracy, ethicratic conduct is shaped collectively by those who are governed by it in their workplace. No individual can act outside the relational, reciprocal, mutual, communal, or interpeer framework, because the populocratic mechanism of commicracy is structurally interdependent. Every organisational function relies on the collective, and therefore every member's conduct must correspond to the collective ethical reality.

Thus, ethicratic codes of conduct evolve into laws within the Ethnpublican State apparatus, regulating the commissioning-rule of economic workers—specifically their competence in facilitating communication and interaction where ethicratic rules are enforceable. This, fundamentally, is the expectation placed on commicrats.

Interpersonal relations at the core of organisational activity do not only enhance service-user satisfaction; they also cultivate humanitarian work ethics within individuals. Over time, this fosters an altruistic humanitarian culture that becomes a moral

standard for the wider society and a behavioural model for younger generations.

Although workers in a commicratic organisation regulate themselves collectively through the ethicratic mechanism—exercising shared decision-making power over their organisation’s operational mode—the judiciary remains responsible for protecting the service-users and customers in cases of conflict. This judicial role is essential because not all ethicratic codes will be perfectly defined or intuitively understood by every worker affected by them.

Where an ethicratic code requires legal interpretation, the matter is directed to the palaver-courts, which interpret the law fairly and impartially. This embodies the fundamental interdependent duty shared between the judiciary-arm and the economic-arm of government in an Ethnopublican State: the commitment to uphold ethical conduct, protect the public, and ensure that the commicratic system remains truly relational, accountable, and people-centred.

Populocratic Consumer Participation and Altruist Culture in the Ethicratic Commicratic Economy

While the collective body of workers must protect the interests of the organisation to which they belong—and are responsible for maintaining its ethicratic managerial procedures

—there are occasions when the participation of consumers becomes essential to fulfilling a populocratic decision-making process within the organisation.

It is not only ethical for an organisation to grant its registered consumers decision-making power over rules governing the production and delivery of products and services they themselves receive, but it is also practically advantageous. Doing so cultivates a direct communal affinity between workers and consumers. This represents a refined form of ethical conduct, wherein both workers and consumers jointly administer and implement rules across the full chain of production, delivery, and consumption. Commicratic workers, therefore, stand as pioneers of an advanced interpersonal economic-order.

For instance, if an organisation restricts its consumers from having influence over decisions concerning the delivery of services that affect them, the organisation may not face legal penalties; however, such an action causes reputational harm and damages the relational bond necessary for healthy commicratic economic life. This underscores why the Judiciary must uphold its ethical responsibility to protect registered consumers whenever an organisation imposes unethical or exploitative ethicratic rules that directly affect the public.

Because courts in an Ethnopolitan society hold a duty of care to all economic participants, judicial intervention becomes

an essential protective measure for service-users. Consumers naturally have an overriding interest in the continued existence, wellbeing, and direction of service-delivery by the organisations that serve them. Their participation, therefore, is not merely transactional but existential to the socio-economic fabric of commicracy. As consumers engage in these processes, they manifest the altruistic humanitarian spirit of populocracy—one of the foundational elements of the commicratic worldview.

Recognising and celebrating the altruist humanitarian contributions that shape a society's culture is not only ethically justified but indispensable. Such appreciation generates a positive civic energy that reinforces the moral and normative foundations of commissioning-rules and societal values across all spheres of public and economic life. In an ethnopublican society—where every voting-age citizen shares in the power that governs the State—communities will naturally take pride in their populocratic achievements and often seek to emulate the success of others.

Thus, it becomes both ethically desirable and practically beneficial for one community to appreciate the positive ethicratic performance of another. This mutual recognition elevates the emotional and civic morale of the entire voting-age population and strengthens the patriotic performance expected within an

Ethnpublican nation grounded on the ideals of commicracy, interpeer cooperation, and collective responsibility.

The organisational procedure of ethicracy, as a fundamental element of commicracy, is revolutionary both morally and culturally. Its very design promotes an altruist humanitarian ethos by ensuring that organisational processes become populocratically ethicratic—that is, founded on the collective moral agency of those who participate in them.

For an organisation to embody commicratic principles, its internal environment must foster interpersonal relations rooted in empathy, mutual regard, and moral consideration. Collective decision-making becomes not merely a procedural necessity but a moral imperative, ensuring that organisational standards emerge from shared humanistic values rather than imposed hierarchical directives.

This collective decision-making power grants organisations and communities the ability to build, preserve, and transform their own reputations through self-prescribed ethicratic codes of conduct. Unlike bureaucratic structures, where reputational dynamics are shaped by the decisions of a narrow leadership class, commicracy ensures that the identity and moral standing of the organisation reflect the will, values, and ethical discipline of the entire collective.

Because ethicracy places significant moral responsibility on those who prescribe the rules, members are naturally compelled to adhere wholeheartedly to the ethical frameworks they themselves have created. To violate one's own collectively agreed-upon moral code would be both ethically incoherent and indicative of psychosocial dysfunction within the collective conscience.

Below is a comparative framework, expanded on the architecture of commicracy versus bureaucracy, ensuring conceptual continuity with:

- Interpeer power-reciprocity.
- Ethicratic organisational procedure.
- Horizontalism and collective managerial power.
- Populocratic accountability.
- Humanitarian, relational performance.
- The Ethnpublican–Commicratic governance paradigm.

Ethicratic Procedures of Organisation:
A Comparative Table Between Bureaucracy and Commicracy

DIMENSION	BUREAUCRATIC ETHICRACY	COMMICRATIC ETHICRACY
Human Environment	Impersonal, transactional; people function as operational objects within a task-based system.	Interpersonal, relational; people function as humanitarian partners within a communal-service environment.
Structural Arrangement	Vertical hierarchy; lower offices are supervised and controlled by higher ones.	Horizontal structure; all offices are mutually coordinated under a single Planning- Department without hierarchical superiority.
Ethicratic Governance	Controlled by individual bureaucratic leaders who impose rules.	Coordinated by collective staff cooperation; ethicratic rules

		emerge from the group's peers' deliberation.
Rule Formation	Leadership dictates rules of engagement.	Staff prescribe rules of engagement together as peers.
Structural Logic	Operates through top-down, unilateral authority.	Operates through interdependent, reciprocal, peer organisational power.
Policy Adaptation	Policies shift with new leadership and may reflect personal agendas.	Policies evolve through any staff member's input and collective refinement.
Ethical Complexity versus Simplicity	Creates complexity; accountability is centered on leaders who must prove the superiority of their managerial control.	Creates simplicity; accountability is diffused across all members who co-manage outcomes together.

Responsibility for Outcomes	Leaders alone take responsibility for operational success or failure.	Each commicrat takes responsibility for the success or failure of their own work output within the collective ethicratic frame.
Organisational Goals	Broad, multi-dimensional, difficult to verify or attribute to specific bureaucrats.	Narrow, specific, function-dimensional, and easy to attribute to specific commicrats.
Learning versus Results Orientation	Restrictive ethics emphasise results and task execution; learning is secondary.	Adaptive ethics emphasise learning, improvement, experimentation, and functional evolution.
Source of Ethical Control	Governed by the internal force of individual leaders' will.	Governed by the moral prescriptions of the collective, not personal desires.

Innovation Environment	New leaders maintain status quo, limiting creativity that challenges bureaucratic norms.	New staff protect the commicratic culture by promoting experimentation and innovation within collective norms.
Solution Logic	Prefers template solutions; rarely incorporates innovative alternatives, limiting adaptation.	Balances template and innovative solutions, encouraging adaptive mindsets.
Attribution of Positive Outcomes	Successes are credited to top-level regulatory leadership.	Successes belong to the collective administrative management of commicrats.
Paradigmatic Orientation	Thrives on complexity and heavily stratified authority.	Thrives on simplicity with minimal or no authority lines; power is horizontally

		distributed.
--	--	--------------

Thus, the distinction between bureaucracy and commicracy is not merely structural—it is behavioural and moral, revealed through the quality of performance and the nature of outcomes. Whereas bureaucracy relies on leadership elites who often impose unrealistic administrative targets to assert managerial superiority, commicracy locates accountability horizontally among all members.

Under bureaucratic logic, the pursuit of managerial validation can lead to the demoralisation of workers and the obstruction of genuine team performance. Under commicracy, by contrast, outcomes are shaped and managed populocratically by the collective. Every participant can devote their full energy to the tasks at hand, working cooperatively within a shared ethical framework rather than under competitive or coercive pressures.

In this sense, commicratic ethicracy becomes a platform for continuous learning, trust-building, and genuine improvement. It empowers individuals with relevant expertise to develop programmes and solutions that benefit the whole organisation, ensuring that knowledge and skill are populocratically accessible. Bureaucratic ethics, by contrast, tend to produce superficially impressive data while undermining long-term

organisational learning, prioritising short-term task execution over sustainable consistency.

Commicratic ethicracy thus represents a superior form of organisational life—one in which empathy, shared responsibility, and collective empowerment converge to produce a morally coherent, socially inclusive, and economically effective system of decision-making and performance.

Adaptation, Innovation, and the Ethicratic Mindset in Commicratic Organisations

The adaptive strength of commicratic ethics lies in its capacity to unlock the authentic expertise of individual participants. In commicracy, the credibility of a worker emerges from demonstrable competence, interpersonal relationality, and their contribution to the collective ethicratic process. This stands in complete contrast to bureaucracy, where leadership often derives from social class association, status inheritance, or hierarchical symbolism—conditions that undermine the natural alignment between expertise and responsibility.

Bureaucratic workers are trained to conform to impersonal procedures that treat people as objects of administration. This impersonal culture suppresses creativity, limits initiative, and obstructs the innovative capacity of workers. A contradiction thus arises: workers are selected at job interviews for their

interpersonal skills, yet bureaucracy trains them to behave impersonally once they enter the organisational procedure.

This paradox reveals a systemic conflict—bureaucracy attempts to graft interpersonal competence onto an inherently impersonal ethicratic framework. The result is superficial performance: workers are compelled to appear adaptive and innovative, but in practice are confined to rigid templates, forced to improvise expected solutions like confident tricksters rather than confident experts.

In commicracy, the ethicratic rules of engagement are inherently interpersonal. Organised collective participation is built into the structural logic of the system. Workers are required—by design—to engage in consensus-building, cooperative deliberation, and peer-to-peer relational communication.

As a result, interpersonal skills are not ornamental expectations; they are functional necessities. Individuals adapt their interpersonal capacities to generate useful, innovative solutions for the organisation's growth. Unlike bureaucracy, where adaptation is a burden imposed from above, commicracy institutionalises adaptation as a natural expression of collective intelligence and communal expertise.

Thus, commicracy establishes a paradigm rooted in simplicity, cooperation, and open design. Bureaucracy, by

contrast, is anchored in complexity, compartmentalisation, and closed proceduralism. Where bureaucracy demands navigation of convoluted structures, commicracy provides straightforward procedures that enable workers to focus on meaningful tasks, human relationships, and solution-building.

The contemporary world—shaped by web-internetisation, digital interactivity, and computerised social integration—has reorganised human needs around speed, accessibility, and simplicity. Consumers overwhelmingly choose simpler solutions, cheaper online access, and fluid digital interactions over complex local systems. This shift reflects a deeper transformation: modern life increasingly demands organisational cultures that mirror the simplicity and adaptability of digital realities.

Commicracy rises precisely to meet this transformation. Its ethicratic foundation equips organisations, institutions, and even family structures to adapt to the evolving simplicity of 21st century life.

In an age where human wellbeing depends on accessible technology, instant communication, and unhindered collaboration, commicracy's horizontal ethicratic model provides the ideal framework for a society seeking clarity over complexity, cooperation over hierarchy, and interpeer reciprocity over unilateral authority.

Three Foundational Reactions in Commicratic Adaptation

Adaptation in a commicratic organisation arises from three essential reactions that shape its ethicratic performance: the balance between passion and expertise, the impartial structuring of organisational decision-making, and the measured equilibrium between template solutions and innovation. These three reactions define the functional anatomy of commicratic organisational life and distinguish it radically from the bureaucratic ethic that privileges rigidity, impersonality, and hierarchical control.

Passion and Expertise as Dual Engines of Commicratic Competence:

In any commicratic working environment, the evaluation of workers begins with a comparative assessment between passion and expertise. Unlike bureaucratic assessments—which privilege credentials, seniority, or class-based access to opportunities—commicracy recognises that expertise can always be trained, but passion cannot be artificially manufactured.

Thus, a commicratic interview may legitimately request:

- 100% passion and 0% expertise, when the organisation intends to provide full training; or
- 30% passion and 70% expertise, depending on the complexity or immediacy of the organisational needs.

The crucial point is that passion always carries a measurable value. Even when low, it must be accounted for in the evaluation criteria, because passion anchors motivation, effort, and emotional meaning—the interpersonal energies that drive commicratic ethicracy.

The Nature of Passion: A Personal Example Made Universal:

Human passion is not static. It evolves as life experience reshapes our personal history and identity. Many individuals shift passions across decades—what once felt permanent can be displaced by new meaning.

My own life example illustrates this universal truth:

- A teenage passion for accounting;
- A later passion for legal services;
- A life-changing experience that erased both passions through memory loss;
- The emergence of a new passion for research and the creation of new intellectual meaning.

This lived experience reveals the essence of commicratic philosophy: Passion is not merely preference; it is an emotional resonance that anchors identity. Without passion, organisational activity becomes mechanical, bureaucratic, and psychologically

suffocating. It leads to demoralisation, disengagement, and emotional emptiness.

In commicracy:

- Passion is the source of interpersonal energy.
- Passion is the root of motivation.
- Passion is the gateway to innovation.
- Passion is a protective factor against bureaucratic impersonalism.

Since anyone can be trained to become an expert—especially in a world dominated by computerised technologies and intelligence automation—passion becomes the essential nutrient of organisational performance. The commicratic ethos therefore recognises passion as a measurable variable in recruitment, development, and organisational life.

Impartial Adaptation Through Independent Decision-Making Channels:

Organisational adaptation in commicracy is never identical with giving unregulated power to the collective. Although commicracy is based on horizontal interpeer power-reciprocity, its design must avoid the pitfalls of departmental empire-building, internal favouritism, and self-reinforcing group biases.

Thus, while collective workers safeguard their organisational interests and maintain the ethicratic managerial procedure, there are situations—depending on the nature of services and the organisational scale—where independent channels must be invited into the decision-making process.

Populocratic Inclusion of Consumers: For some organisations, especially those providing public-facing services, consumers and service-users may need to be incorporated into elective processes to fulfill the principle of populocratic decision-making. This ensures the organisation remains accountable not only to itself but to the wider community it serves.

Independent Employment Agencies as Guardians of Impartiality: In the same spirit, commicratic recruitment often requires entrusting the selection of candidates to independent Employment Agencies, particularly when:

- the organisation is large,
- internal relationships may bias decisions, or
- specialised understanding is needed to balance passion and expertise.

Employment Agencies possess:

- broader insights into organisational needs,
- professional understanding of labour market dynamics,

- more neutral judgement,
- less susceptibility to internal group biases.

Their impartial vantage point ensures that recruitment supports innovation, growth, and future organisational development rather than reinforcing internal preferences or collective blind spots. While staff may select candidates in smaller or highly specialised cases, independence serves as a preventive ethicratic safeguard.

The Personnel Department then supervises the employment process, not as a hierarchical authority, but as an organisational custodian ensuring that the independent selection aligns with the collective ethos. This ensures:

- fairness,
- continuity of organisational mission,
- optimisation of staff–organisation compatibility, and
- insulation from group-based partiality.

Thus, commicracy preserves horizontal power while preventing horizontal bias—a critical distinction.

Balancing Template Solutions and Innovative Solutions:

The third reaction in commicratic adaptation concerns how an organisation navigates between pre-existing template

solutions and dynamic innovative solutions. Every organisation, regardless of its mission, requires a balanced mixture:

- Template solutions ensure stability, clarity, and predictability.
- Innovative solutions ensure growth, adaptation, and continuous improvement.

In commicracy, innovation is never optional: Even if innovation is only required at 30%, it must always be present. The interpersonal ethicratic culture of commicracy naturally encourages workers to improve the existing templates through:

- collaborative problem-solving,
- shared experiential knowledge,
- empathic understanding of workplace realities,
- interpeer evaluation of what works best.

This is fundamentally different from bureaucracy, where innovation is often perceived as a threat to hierarchical order or proof of managerial inadequacy. Bureaucracy protects templates; commicracy refines them.

The Commicratic Expectation:

Commicrats are expected to:

- identify improvement points,

- experiment responsibly,
- integrate new insights,
- revise templates when necessary,
- contribute to organisational evolution.

The ethical framework of commicracy therefore embeds innovation into the relational dynamics of organisational life.

The Three Reactions as the Behavioural Foundation of Commicratic Evolution

These three reactions—passion versus expertise, independent decision channels versus collective ownership, and template versus innovative solutions—form the adaptive spine of commicratic organisational behaviour. Together they establish:

- a moral architecture for workplace motivation,
- an ethicratic system of impartial governance,
- a dynamic culture of innovation grounded in interpersonalism,
- a horizontal structure protected from both bureaucratic hierarchy and collective bias.

This triadic model ensures that commicracy remains a living, evolving, interpeer system—capable of adapting to the demands

of modern society, digital simplicity, and the humanitarian requirements of a relational workforce.

In practice, the adaptation of commicracy to new mindsets requires an adaptive-management discipline—a continuous cycle of inquiry, refinement, and renewal. This process depends on structured research and the development of initiatives grounded in the lived social experiences of members as they co-evolve new patterns for improving the products and services offered to their consumers or service-users.

Because research constitutes a specialised profession with its own methodological demands, it should not be expected of ordinary workers to possess such expertise. For this reason, commicratic organisations gain significant advantage through outsourcing research tasks to independent agents, or by employing a dedicated researcher who joins the organisation as an *interpeer*—a member holding equal decision-making authority within the commicratic structure.

Regardless of the approach taken, the workers remains the custodian of the *ethicracies* governing their organisation. Therefore, it becomes part of their formal duty to collaborate with researchers as co-participants in the essential mechanisms that enable the organisation to adapt its commicracies in practical contexts.

Because adaptive management requires ongoing research to generate innovative solutions, commicracy rejects the bureaucratic model of randomised control trials conducted without complementary empirical analysis or experimental inquiry.

Such methods—typical in hierarchical organisational management—are incompatible with the commicratic ethos, which requires that adaptation arise organically, transparently, and in full partnership with those who enact the ethicracies.

Thus, the future performance of commicracy rests on its ability to weave research, innovation, and collective decision-power into a single adaptive rhythm—ensuring that commicratic organisations remain dynamic, self-correcting, and socially intelligent without reverting to the rigidities of bureaucratic experimentation.

CHAPTER SIX

INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF COMMICRACY

This final chapter to volume-3 sets out the institutional development of commicracy as a system of government—how its public offices, decision-making bodies, and administrative functions are designed, coordinated, and restrained.

Unlike bureaucracy, which builds governance around impersonal hierarchy and procedural rigidity, commicracy develops institutions through structural simplicity, commissioning-rules, and participatory accountability. Its concern is not administrative dominance, but the alignment of institutions with the lived realities, values, and capacities of the people they serve.

Modern societies have inherited bureaucratic institutions shaped by hierarchy, desk-rule, and expert insulation. These structures prioritise procedural compliance over social outcomes and treat failure as a justification for abandonment rather than correction.

Commicracy emerges from the recognition that such institutional rigidity is incompatible with adaptive governance. Where bureaucracy discards policies when outcomes fall short, commicracy reassesses the process, isolates points of failure, and reintegrates revised strategies through collective input. Institutional success, under commicracy, is measured not by procedural purity but by developmental effectiveness.

At the governmental level, commicratic institutions are therefore designed to be iterative rather than final, responsive rather than absolute. Policies are treated as working instruments subject to revision through citizenry participation, palaver-based deliberation, and empirical feedback. This institutional flexibility does not imply disorder; rather, it reflects a deliberate rejection of over-complex rulemaking that obscures accountability and entrenches inequality. Simplicity, in this context, is a governance discipline.

Central to this institutional model is the acceptance that social conditions evolve continuously. Commicracy does not fear change, nor does it cling to inherited rules that preserve inequity under the guise of stability. Instead, it establishes institutional mechanisms that allow governments to explore emerging conditions, test provisional policies, and discontinue inherited frameworks that no longer serve the collective good. In this way,

institutional development becomes a living process rather than a frozen architecture.

Within this system, commicrats occupy a defined governmental role—not as rulers, nor as insulated experts, but as institutional stewards of social coherence. Their function is anticipatory and coordinative: to observe shifts in social behaviour, economic practice, and ethical expectation, and to translate these shifts into actionable policy pathways consistent with constitutional principles. Commicrats do not impose moral direction; they interpret collective momentum and prepare institutions to respond lawfully and equitably.

This anticipatory capacity anchors commicracy as a future-conscious mode of governance. By forecasting social pressures, preparing policy contingencies, and aligning institutional responses with evolving public values, commicratic institutions prevent governance from lagging behind society or ruling against it.

In doing so, commicracy establishes itself not as an alternative bureaucracy, but as a fundamentally different logic of state organisation—one rooted in commissioning rather than commanding, adaptation rather than rigidity, and collective authority rather than desk-rule.

For the Implementation Performance
of the Executive-Branch of Government

The Executive-Branch functions as the implementation engine of commicratic governance, translating commissioning-rules and statutory directives into coordinated administrative action. Its performance directly shapes how policies originating from both the Economy-Branch and the Citizenry-Branch are operationalised in practice, and its outputs remain subject to continuous judicial supervision by the StateLords within the Supervisory-Division.

In relation to the Economy-Branch, the Executive-Branch implements directives concerning economic production, service delivery, labour deployment, and market participation. This includes administering economic programmes, overseeing productive sectors, managing eligibility frameworks between working-groups and non-working groups, and supporting research initiatives that analyse economic behaviour, labour patterns, and service demand. Such research does not prescribe social values but provides empirical grounding for economic coordination—identifying how production systems evolve, where service gaps emerge, and how economic activity aligns with broader societal needs.

In relation to the Citizenry-Branch, the Executive-Branch implements policies that govern the *methods* of provision rather

than the ownership of production. These include standards of service quality, delivery mechanisms, timelines, accessibility criteria, material logistics, and infrastructural coordination.

The Citizenry-Branch defines how goods and services ought to reach the population, and the Executive-Branch ensures those methods are executed efficiently, transparently, and adaptively. Continuous monitoring enables the revision of work-plans, recalibration of delivery schedules, and adjustment of resource flows in response to changing social conditions.

Across both domains, the Executive-Branch does not exercise autonomous authority. Its role is neither legislative nor judicial, but coordinative and operational. All executive actions remain accountable to the commissioning-rules established by the citizenry and interpreted by the Judiciary-Branch. In this way, commicratic execution avoids bureaucratic dominance, ensuring that implementation serves collective intent rather than institutional self-preservation.

The Roles of Commicratic-Departments

Commicratic-Departments form the institutional bedrock of government. Their delivery of bespoke research studies functions solely to uphold the duties and roles of govoxiers in strict conformity with the State Constitution under the supervision of

the Judiciary. They rely on rigorous research to engage both the Citizenry-branch and the Economy-branch in proposing legislative changes where required and in recommending amendments to ethicratic rules when necessary.

Equally, their research guides interactions with the Executive and Judiciary branches, enabling them to identify flaws in implementation performance and to advise the government on whether a petition of Constitutional Incompatibility should be raised against any branch responsible for breach or contravention, leading to amendment or repeal of the offending laws, regulations, or decisions.

The operational strength of Commicratic-Departments depends on the support they receive from the public—the populous—whose lived experiences and civic participation enrich the integrity of research outcomes. These departments are staffed by professionals passionate about positive social advancement, equipped with the skill-set necessary to recognise when government programmes deviate from their intended goals. Govoxiers hold deep respect for their expertise, dedicating time to studying their findings and placing trust in their judgments and advice.

To fulfill their constitutional mandate, Commicratic-Departments require access to robust research infrastructures and must be equipped with purpose-built facilities, both nationally

and internationally, wherever their investigative focus demands. They must be able to recruit a skilled workforce of researchers and support staff, ensuring that their work provides the government with clear, flexible, and socially aligned direction in the interests of the populous.

Consistent with the ethos of commicracy, these departments thrive on simplicity: they support applications that avoid unnecessary complexity and are easily adaptable to the regulation of social norms in pursuit of desired collective goals.

Their research approaches embody high-level strategic directives, enabling them to investigate the *when*, *where*, *why*, and *how* of changes occurring within existing known-knowns, while also mapping the trajectory of experimentation within the known-unknowns—identifying where such developments are emerging, where they are projected to emerge within a given timeframe, or where they are unlikely to emerge at all.

The open-learning ethos of commicracy guides commicrats through continual cycles of reflection, encouraging ongoing data collection to refine existing programmes and to implement necessary adjustments. In this sense, Commicratic-Departments serve as the institutional underwriters of commicratic management across all government bodies, including citizenry-centred commicratic agencies within an Ethnpublican State.

Interpersonal Competence and Public Accountability of Commicrats

Commicrats are required to possess a refined interpersonal repertoire of skills and abilities that distinguish their professional role from the impersonal, procedural habits of bureaucracy. Their institutional position places them as *intermediary public-relations commissioners* operating between the government and the governed.

This requires not only technical competence in policy development and innovative experimentation, but also an ability to engage constructively with diverse communities, cultivate trust, and work collaboratively with the populous to achieve policy targets and advance collective learning.

Some Commicratic-Departments carry mandates that extend beyond traditional administrative boundaries, requiring effective bottom-up information gathering, relationship-building, and the cultivation of long-standing community trust. These departments become embedded within localities, developing a deep situational awareness of the communities they serve, enabling them to diagnose barriers to progress long before they escalate into social problem.

The commicratic system, by design, promotes a level of accountability far exceeding what is found in bureaucratic

societies. While Citizenry-centred Commicratic Agencies handle citizenry concerns and manage secretariat functions at the local level,

Commicratic-Departments are constitutionally focused on research, focus its policy recommendations to all government bodies, and the development of proposals that guide State adaptation. Their research responsibilities are essential to the work of elected govoxiers, councillors, and commissioners, who rely on their findings to fulfill their individual and collective govoxical duties. This places Commicratic-Departments in the pivotal position of identifying, regulating, and correcting inadequacies across government offices.

In a commicratic society, it should be unthinkable that a member of the populous raises a concern or suggestion with their govoxier or local councillor and receives no acknowledgement—or worse, no resolution. Such failures are endemic in bureaucratic societies, where impersonal processes permit citizen concerns to be sidelined without consequence.

Under commicracy, however, Commicrats face heightened public scrutiny and visibility. Their performance, transparency, and responsiveness become intrinsic elements of societal trust. In extreme cases, widespread institutional negligence may warrant a published league table of underperforming government officials, enabling the populous to make informed choices at

subsequent elections—or, where urgently required, to trigger elective procedures for demotion from public office.

Bureaucratic societies reveal a consistent pattern of civic frustration: *“I have informed the Council, or the Councillor, and nothing gets done—I give up.”* These situations represent precisely the areas that Commicratic-Departments must investigate, document, and publish as part of their research reports for consideration by all branches of government.

While unresolved citizen concerns may revert to formal complaints after a specified timeframe, the repeated and routine reversion of issues into complaint status as a default administrative mechanism is incompatible with commicratic governance.

Such failures are pervasive in bureaucratic systems. Issues reported by the populous—such as fly-tipping, illegal dumping, road degradation, safety hazards, or environmental neglect—often recur without meaningful intervention.

Over time, communities become disillusioned, and minor problems are allowed to grow into major social crises. These failures stem from bureaucratic organisational design: a structure that allocates its resources toward maintaining hierarchy rather than serving the base of society.

Thus, the reporting systems currently deployed in bureaucratic societies are widely regarded as “*smoke-and-mirrors machines*”. They are engineered in such a way that, out of every thousand reported concerns, more than half are routinely discontinued without explanation, justification, or remedy.

The system is excessively complicated, burdensome for staff, alienating for the populous, and structurally tilted toward disincentivising complaints at their origin. In effect, bureaucracy discourages the populous from participating in the affairs of government, eroding civic trust and weakening the social contract.

Commicracy exists to correct these failures. Through interpersonal competence, structural accountability, and transparent public engagement, Commicrats restore the moral geometry between government and the governed—ensuring that civic concerns are addressed proactively by default, not avoided procedurally by choice.

Citizenry Scrutiny, Temporal Responsiveness,
and Programming Management in Commicracy

In a commicratic society, local councillors and citizenry-committees function as essential conduits through which the concerns of the populous are transmitted to the highest edges of

government. Their constitutional responsibility is to drive issues upward into the governmental architecture—reaching, when necessary, the House-of-StateLords’ Assembly—where citizenry concerns are subjected to meaningful scrutiny and transformed into policies through the citizenry elective-process.

This participatory scrutiny is central to the commicratic ethic: the collective must have the authority to regulate, correct, and deter recurring failures through transparent civic decision-making.

In certain circumstances, regional StateLord-Governors may issue interim orders to address urgent matters pending a permanent policy solution achieved through the citizenry voting process. These provisional directives secure stability while ensuring that long-term decisions remain firmly grounded in the populocratic will of the citizenry.

Notably, local councillors and citizenry-committees, while institutionally powerful, do not possess the same executive authority as the Chief-Commissioners who oversee service delivery at the regional level. The distinction reflects the commicratic balance between participatory influence and administrative competency.

Commicratic society operate in direct ethical opposition to bureaucracy. In bureaucratic societies, once officials are elected,

the system enables and even encourages them to recede from public engagement—appearing only in the months leading up to elections to solicit support through superficial displays of visibility. Their intermittent appearances in local newspapers or social media, usually at staged events designed to bolster their public image, seldom reflect genuine involvement in community progress.

Meanwhile, the populous—who live the daily reality of the community—are engaged in relentless pursuits to improve their environment and advance social development. Much of what is achieved in bureaucratic societies results not from governmental leadership but from the collective efforts of residents themselves.

Yet bureaucratic councillors routinely claim credit for these community-driven accomplishments. When challenged, they deflect responsibility, citing “lack of government funding” or “imposition of government cuts.” Under ethnopublicanism, of which commicracy is the organisational principle, such excuses are structurally mitigated and progressively eliminated.

Within commicratic programming management, *time* becomes a decisive factor. Coordination between Commicratic-Departments and the branches of government must be efficient, responsive, and unencumbered by bureaucratic stagnation.

The greater the availability of material resources, the more effective the implementation of any program; however, commicracy does not rely on abundance alone. It relies on accurate forecasting, carried out well in advance of anticipated developments, and on adaptive management that keeps the use of resources and time to their most efficient minimum.

Among Commicratic-Departments, the core competency distinguishing effective governance from procedural delay is their ability to conduct research *before* events occur. This anticipatory research is the fulcrum of commicratic programming management. It shifts organisational behaviour from reactive problem-solving to proactive preparedness.

The evolving framework of commicracy depends on coordinated resourcing and cooperative governance processes, both of which form the essential conditions that enable innovation, adaptation, and systematic experimentation.

This raises the central question: *What role does commicracy play in institutional development?*

This manifesto of commicratic governance places profound emphasis on social and economic research grounded in a bottom-up approach. Its institutional development model relies on evidence generated from social experiments across local communities and administrative studies conducted throughout

governmental offices. It is through this empirical, participatory, and anticipatory foundation that commicracy revitalises the structural integrity, responsiveness, and moral alignment of the modern State.

The Revival of Commicracy
in the Web-Internetisation Era

The revival of commicracy as an organisational system—particularly within the contemporary era of web-internetisation—focuses on how governance is coordinated through Govox-Populi, citizenry-centred commicratic agencies, and the formal branches of government. Together, these components form an integrated institutional ecosystem rather than a hierarchical chain of command.

Citizenry-centred commicratic agencies serve as the structural interface between the population and the State. They strengthen the population's direct, participatory relationship with both the Economy-Branch, which governs production and labour, and the Citizenry-Branch, which governs methods of provision, service standards, and social access. Through these agencies, citizens do not merely receive policy outcomes; they actively participate in shaping, reviewing, and recalibrating them.

Within this framework, Commicratic-Departments occupy a pivotal coordinating role. They operate at the intersection of social learning, economic analysis, and institutional design, contributing to policy development in collaboration with the Executive-Branch, while remaining subject to constitutional interpretation and oversight by the Judiciary-Branch. Their function is not to command outcomes, but to translate citizenry intent into coherent regulatory structures capable of adapting to social and economic change.

For commicracy to function effectively, governance processes must be supported by clear regulatory architecture and proportionate systems of social-control. These systems are not punitive or authoritarian; rather, they provide the structural stability necessary for horizontal participation, institutional accountability, and collective problem-solving. In this way, commicracy derives its institutional strength from the alignment of participatory governance, adaptive regulation, and shared responsibility across society.

In an Ethnopublican State, sustainable economic development and commicratic effectiveness are inseparable; neither can flourish without the other. Establishing an efficient, function-oriented commicracy—capable of applying simple yet robust management programmes—is therefore foundational to building economic development and social security functions.

Ancient Africa stands as the earliest demonstration of a highly proficient commicracy, sustained until the decades preceding 1460—before recorded African history was disrupted. This system was destabilised by the European slave-trade era (1457–1847), which extracted African labour for Western economic expansion; further entrenched by the colonial era (1885–1980), which exploited African natural resources to fuel European capitalism; and ultimately maintained by the ongoing protégé-society systems that continue to divert African wealth into Western economic sustenance. Throughout these eras, Western actors entrenched bureaucracy as a rigid mechanism to maintain monopoly over African resources through coordinated extractor-systems and poverty-aid strategies.

Edward Blyden (1832–1912), in his study of African cultural essence and mission, captured the communal ethic at the heart of early commicracy: in Africa, “*all work for each, and each work for all*,” summarised in the maxim, “what is mine goes; what is ours abides.”

This reflects the deeply rooted commicratic principles embedded in African social life: horizontally organised interpersonal work environments, interpeer-levelled management, collective peer-to-peer decision-making, altruist socio-economic culture, ethicratic cooperation between collective individualism, populocratic foundations,

commissioning-based rules of engagement, equal interdependent leadership, a classless organisational ethos, and an egalitarian society.

Although much of this commicratic culture has declined across the continent, remnants remain embedded within many indigenous African traditions. Unlike Western States with aggressive tax regimes, no serious development framework in Africa can justify aggressive tax enforcement in environments where the State has failed to provide the basic infrastructures upon which taxation is morally and economically premised. Taxation presupposes reciprocal provision. Where this reciprocity is absent, tax policing becomes not only unjustified, but unnecessary.

In Western states, strict contingencies and exhaustive regulatory frameworks exist to prevent tax avoidance: commodities are heavily VAT-rated, services are highly taxed, and social-control systems are intensely bureaucratised. The opposite pattern emerges across indigenous African States, where bureaucratic norms have been forced into coexistence with the enduring vestiges of commicracy—creating tension but also preserving fragments of Africa’s original classless, communal, and interpeer-organised socio-economic system.

Across much of Africa, citizens are compelled to operate as self-sufficient providers of what should be public goods. They

generate their own electricity through private means. They secure their own water supply. They construct private access roads to navigate around collapsed or nonexistent public networks. They pay out-of-pocket for healthcare, self-finance education, and sustain businesses without access to public logistics, institutional credit, or meaningful State protection.

In such conditions, taxation amounts to double payment: citizens first finance the State's absence through private expenditure, and are then taxed for the State's presence in rhetoric alone.

The outcome of such arrangement is not development, but State parasitism—a condition in which government extracts revenue from an economy it has not built, maintains, or enabled. Under these circumstances, the imposition of new or intensified tax regimes constitutes a form of economic violence, as it transfers the burden of national development entirely onto the population while absolving the State of its foundational obligations.

The only viable path forward for African governance is therefore not deeper bureaucratic enforcement, but a structural transformation toward interdependent governance between the State and the governed. This requires the replacement of bureaucratic extraction with commicratic organisation, in which citizens directly participate in directing national development

priorities, and where taxation may follow in the case of a monetary economy—rather than precedes—infrastructure, productivity, and shared economic capacity. This orientation represents Africa's own form of socialism: not imported, not ideological, but structurally indigenous.

Although much of Africa's commicratic economic culture has been eroded by colonial administration and postcolonial bureaucratic imitation, its remnants remain embedded in indigenous traditions of cooperative labour, shared provision, and communal obligation.

Despite the outward adoption of Western bureaucratic frameworks, no indigenous African State operates as a fully capitalist system. Nor does Africa practise pure capitalism. Even where tax evasion is formally criminalised, governments routinely tolerate expansive blind-spot economies—informal zones of non-payment that remain largely unpoliced. This tacit accommodation reflects an unspoken recognition that extracting revenue without first delivering infrastructure is neither sustainable nor legitimate.

In this sense, Africa's fiscal reality already gestures toward commicracy. What remains is to formalise it—by aligning any proposed taxation with provision, authority with reciprocity, and governance with the lived economic realities of the people.

Ethicratic Conflict, Protégé-Socialism,
and the Path to Commicratic Reconstruction

With the ethicratic tension between bureaucracy and commicracy generating confusion, corruption, and systemic disarray across indigenous African societies, economic development has remained trapped within a protégé-socialist framework since the colonial era. The institutionalisation of protégism—a socio-economic and political system that allocates scarce material resources across African societies—has constrained African development by design, not accident.

The evidence is unmistakable throughout history: Africans were conditioned to expect the formula $n = h + x + r$, implying that the continent's natural resources and human capital should yield abundant economic resources.

In stark contrast, Western colonial economic operations followed the formula $n = h + x - r$, deliberately restricting the material resources to become available to African economies to self-develop while simultaneously extracting African natural resources to generating surplus wealth for Western States. This structural asymmetry has shaped the contemporary landscape of underdevelopment, dependency, and economic extraction.

In this context, Edward Blyden's insight—cited in Judson M. Lyon's *Edward Blyden: Liberia Independence and African*

Nationalism, 1903–1909—remains profoundly relevant. Blyden affirmed both the cooperative, egalitarian and uniqueness of indigenous African culture, urging Africans not to waste energy emulating Western norms in science or politics but instead to refine their distinctive strengths in morality and social organisation. This perspective underscores that the commicratic culture embedded in African ancestral tradition holds positive human stock-assets that can be reclaimed as the basis of a modern governance philosophy.

This manifesto contends that commicracy is not merely an alternative to bureaucracy but a superior organisational system for Africa's future. Yet certain foundational conditions must be established before fully developing governmental commicracies.

As a collective, African societies must adopt a transformative structure that consciously reconnects with the commicratic practices that shaped ancient African civilisation during the pharaonic era—most notably within Kemet, the original continental laboratory of organised governance.

Long before Arab invasions and colonial disruption, African kinship communities across the continent were already structured as ethno-governed societies, each organised around rulers and chiefs whose authority was balanced and guided by priesthood institutions responsible for moral equilibrium, social order, and economic harmony. These were not fragmented or

primitive arrangements; they were decentralised expressions of a shared civilisational logic.

Kemet functioned as the continental nucleus of this logic. From across Africa, individuals were commissioned by their communities to undertake pilgrimage to Kemet—not merely as religious travellers, but as civilisational envoys—where they studied governance, medicine, architecture, geometry, agriculture, and the sciences of balance.

Upon returning, these individuals reintegrated their acquired knowledge into their own societies, adapting Kemetic principles to local conditions. Through this process, African societies developed cooperative economic structures grounded in reciprocity, shared responsibility, and communal provision—what may accurately be described as Africa’s original form of socialism.

It was during the period when Aye served as Vizier of Kemet and witnessed the disruption caused by Pharaoh Akhenaten’s religious reform—and when Aye later ascended as Pharaoh—that this commicratic orientation became fully articulated and diffused across the continent. Under Aye’s reforms, governance increasingly shifted from rigidly centralised authority toward commissioned responsibility, collective obligation, and cooperative economic organisation.

Authority was no longer exercised merely through command, but through commissioning—delegating responsibility to individuals and groups whose legitimacy arose from service, competence, and moral alignment. This transition catalysed the movement from individualised accumulation toward cooperative economic life, embedding commicracy as the organising principle of African social economies far beyond the Nile Valley.

The contemporary project of African unification must therefore begin not with imported republican abstractions or its corrupted democracy, but with the reinstatement of this indigenous commicratic foundation.

The initial step toward a unitary African State lies in instituting the proposed commicratic governmental departments—outlined in this chapter—as modern continuations of this ancient system. Through them, African societies can rebuild national capacity to deliver social and economic services in ways that reflect their own ancestral historical governance logic: cooperative rather than extractive, commissioned rather than imposed, and balanced rather than hierarchical.

A practical example of this institutional development is the establishment of Govox-Populi as a formal academic discipline within the social sciences. This would enable structured sandwich courses specialising in commicracy, equipping learners

for specific governmental roles and departmental functions. Participants would major in Govox-Populi and undertake at least two compulsory courses in commicracies, though they may extend their studies further to enhance employability within ethno-corporatist industries or govovoxical government structures.

Through this combined educational and institutional restructuring, Africa can cultivate the skilled cadre needed to resurrect its ancestral commicratic heritage as a modern governance architecture capable of driving socio-economic advancement across the continent.

Professionalising Govox-Populi and Reinstating Commicracy as the Engine of African Institutional Development

Professionalising Govox-Populi demands that commicratic and govovoxical competencies be cultivated with the same academic rigour as any other social science discipline. This progression naturally leads to competitive civil-service examinations across Africa, creating a merit-based entry system into national governmental roles and developing specialised skill-sets for service within distinct offices and departments.

Such professionalisation is indispensable for the ethno-corporatist economic system, particularly in its development of a non-monetary economy where administrative precision,

commicratic expertise, and citizenry-centred governance become primary tools of national economic delivery.

Within this manifesto, the unitary form of all African States is presented as the model par excellence for building State-centred commicracies capable of driving sustainable economic development. As commicracy strengthens, it acquires the reputation of a highly adaptive, effective, and hard-to-pollute institutional framework—particularly because legislative power rests directly with the citizenry-electorate.

When the people themselves hold legislative authority, they become the arbiters of industrial positioning, environmental regulation, and the operational boundaries of economic activity. Governance, in such a society, is not an abstraction imposed from above but a lived ecology that directly affects each citizen.

Institutionalising Commicracy: Lessons from Indigenous Societies:

To understand how commicracy can be institutionalised in the present African context, we must study the pre-slave-trade modes of commicracy that structured indigenous societies. This requires dissecting the cooperative economic systems, collectivist social relations, and ethicratic mores that still survive in remote African communities—even after centuries of external impositions. Such analysis helps clarify how ancient

organisational logics can be translated into modern institutional forms.

A compelling example is the fourth principle of Julius Nyerere's Ujamaa ideology, which insisted on collective ownership, communal economic control, and shared labour and wealth. Ujamaa articulated, in modern language, the same commicratic doctrine that guided African societies for millennia.

Cooperative Movements as Evidence of Commicratic Residue:

A significant baseline study—"Cooperatives in Africa: The Age of Reconstruction" (ILO, 2009)—surveyed cooperative movements in Botswana, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lesotho, Rwanda, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia. The findings confirmed that:

- cooperative presence remains significant across the continent,
- approximately 7% of Africans maintain affiliation with primary cooperatives,
- the cooperative movement struggles with legitimacy, financial stability, and organisational coherence,
- cooperatives rarely provide social protection systems beyond informal mutual support, and

- most cooperatives lack the capacity to represent their constituencies or advance life-quality campaigns.

Notably, Kenya demonstrates stronger cooperative protection and citizen “voice” compared to others—a reminder that commicratic structures thrive when supported by coherent institutional frameworks.

Research across West, East, and Southern Africa similarly shows that cooperative economic customs—the living residue of commicracy—remain embedded in indigenous cultures. Yet these traditions have been overshadowed by imported bureaucratic norms rooted in Western individualism that weaponised its monetary-economic framework on resources to stifled cooperative development across the continent, diminishing collectivist economic functions, mutual support, and the unified communal voice that once governed shared resources and social development.

The Misalignment in Cooperative Renaissance Methodology:

The Coop-AFRICA programme, informed by the ILO publication *Cooperating Out of Poverty: The Renaissance of the African Cooperative Movement* (Develtere, Pollet & Wanyama, 2008), argues that cooperatives in Africa are on the verge of a renaissance—provided they are supported with:

- favourable legal and institutional environments,

- stronger governance,
- robust managerial systems,
- solid horizontal networks, and
- strong vertical structures.

While the recommendations aim to revitalise cooperative socialism, the methodological flaw lies in the theoretical assumption that *horizontal networks* (which express peer-to-peer commicratic logic) can be harmonised with *vertical structures* (which represent hierarchical bureaucratic logic) into a single unified system.

This assumption is fundamentally oxymoronic. Horizontal commicracy and vertical bureaucracy operate on opposing epistemic and ethical foundations—one cooperative and peer-levelled, the other hierarchical and command-based. Combining them into a unified framework results in structural incoherence and counterproductive implementation, ultimately undermining the cooperative ideals intended to be revived.

Reaffirming Commicracy as Africa's Organisational Future:

The solution is not to hybridise opposing logics but to reconstruct Africa's governance systems around authentic commicratic principles, supported by:

- professionalised Govox-Populi education,

- commicratic civil-service specialisation,
- evidence-based research into indigenous governance systems,
- citizenry-led legislative authority, and
- continental integration through ethno-corporatist economics.

Through these pathways, commicracy re-emerges as Africa's most historically grounded, ethically coherent, and developmentally effective organisational system.

The Structural Antithesis Between Bureaucracy and Commicracy

It is widely accepted—and beyond reasonable doubt—that any systematic vertical structure inevitably produces the culture of bureaucracy, while any horizontal network or structure generates the culture of commicracy. Each is the ethical inverse of the other. Any attempt to merge them into a single operational framework produces an antithetical system riven with irresolute contradictions. The two cannot coexist within the same organisational body without degenerating into conflict; they can only operate successfully when placed at geographically or institutionally opposite poles.

A clear analogy is found in the enduring clash between the individualistic pursuit of money and power, and the collectivist preference for shared wealth and equalised power relations.

In the ILO's intervention, the so-called *vertical/horizontal structures of cooperatives* were imagined as a unified "meso-level" functioning between the macro-level of government and the micro-level of the populous. While this theoretical mid-range is appealing at first glance—because it seems to reconcile differences between the hierarchical State and the collectivist citizenry—the model collapses when theory meets practice. The closer these opposites are brought together, the more visible their incompatibilities become: tension increases, administrative coherence declines, and contradictions multiply.

African governments, having long abandoned their indigenous social systems in favour of Western bureaucracy and capitalism, now operate through individualistic norms shaped by profit, power, and political survival. It would therefore be naïve to assume that cooperative support organisations could function with political interference or capitalist conditionalities.

For any cooperative movement to thrive, it must enjoy the freedom to operate without being subordinated to the State's bureaucratic logic—yet such freedom is rarely granted. The required legislative protections and institutional autonomy

simply do not align with the current political realities across the continent.

Thus, it is highly improbable that any cooperative system operating at the micro-level—and rooted in the daily social and economic life of the populous—could succeed under a political order controlled by a macro-level government whose authority rests on vertical command structures. As long as the State maintains a monopoly over legislation, resource allocation, and political power, no horizontal cooperative activity can flourish or bend vertical structures into parallel alignment.

The intentions of the meso-level institutions attempting to assist cooperative development are clear and well-meaning. They assume, at face value, that bureaucracy and commicracy can coexist in Africa through small mutual compromises. But the fundamental question remains: What is the end-point of these compromises?

If the government retains its vertical bureaucratic authority while the populous preserve their horizontal commicratic practices, the result is a bifurcated society in which:

- the State continues to extract, export, and centralise wealth,
- while the people remain excluded from the benefits of national income,

- forced instead to construct their own informal cooperative economies as survival mechanisms.

This is precisely the lived reality of post-independent Africa. The populous has been left to engineer its own economy, provide its own social infrastructure, and sustain its own livelihoods outside of meaningful State support. People build their own homes, fund their own education, raise their own children, and depend on mutual aid networks for survival. Mass labour disperses into street-level enterprise and informal economies, while the cooperative ethos persists only at the grassroots, outside any formal regulatory framework.

In effect, Africans have built their own parallel commicratic economy beneath the shadow of a bureaucratic State that remains institutionally shaped by Western capitalist interests and extraction patterns. This contradiction cannot be resolved by hybridising vertical and horizontal structures; it can only be resolved by replacing the vertical bureaucratic order with a systematically designed, State-centred commicracy aligned with Africa's indigenous ethical and organisational heritage.

The historical failure facing African States has not been a failure of potential, but a failure of structural fit. The economic strength of African governments has been steadily weakened through the adoption of imported bureaucratic designs that never emerged from African civilisational logic. Western State actors

—through the diffusion of vertical bureaucratic templates—have shaped African political systems into forms that prioritise capitalist extraction, not commicratic reciprocity.

As a result, no African State has been able to exert interpeer-based, horizontally-balanced economic regulation over its own citizenry. The structural instrument of bureaucracy simply does not match the cultural commicratic architecture of the society it attempts to govern.

If bureaucracy is an alien graft, then the natural homecoming is a return to commicracy—the horizontal, inter-participatory governance system native to African structural culture. Under commicracy, governments regain their cultural legitimacy and thereby the moral authority—and practical mechanisms—to exercise economic power-reciprocity with their governed peers. Regulation becomes not an imposition but a communal equilibrium: the State and citizenry co-regulate each other as interpeers in a shared economic ecosystem.

Consider the comparison. In Western states, a foreigner without a work-permit is pushed into illegality, and illegality pushes them into an economy of deprivation: poor pay, no protections, extended hours, and a life of precarity. This is a clean demonstration of vertical bureaucratic enforcement. Such structures create strong top-down constraints. They regulate every economic gesture.

But in Africa, the inverse occurs. Small businesses, vendors, and street-level traders engage daily in economic activity without taxation, licensing requirements, VAT enforcement, or any meaningful macro-level oversight. This is not failure—it is the remnant of primary cooperatives operating under micro-level commicratic conditions. The citizenry maintain a horizontal economy with no interlocking structural interface with the macro-State.

Thus, African States are neither capitalist nor corporatist. What has emerged is a protégé condition—a dormant, neutral economic posture that produces neither sustained growth nor organised social development. While African governments negotiate and trade with global capitalist actors at the macro level and trading natural resources, the citizenry must survive in an economic-deprived environment where State-centred necessities and State-level infrastructures are absent. The gap between these two systems—vertical imported bureaucracy and horizontal native commicracy—creates a structural vacuum that this manifesto seeks to resolve.

Moreover, the contradiction is doubled. Western States empower African governments to function within the vertical bureaucratic hierarchy for international economic purposes, while Western aid agencies simultaneously support African

communities to function within their horizontal commicratic modes for local survival.

The result is a governance paradox: African governments are deprived of the power to regulate the economic life of their people, while the people are deprived of the structures constrained within western imposed monetary-economy tethered to foreign currencies that would allow their native horizontal economy to interface with and benefit from national wealth.

Science may say “opposites attract,” but in governance the opposite is true. Vertical bureaucracy and horizontal commicracy do not attract—they collide and at never-ending war. When African governments are forced into vertical forms while their populations live horizontally, the moment resources and wealth from international trade must be distributed, the structural oppositions intensify. The compromises required to bridge these incompatible systems swell beyond resolution. Inequality and embezzlement of public funds becomes the inevitable result.

Since the post-Independence era, this structural dissonance has defined African political instability. The irreconcilability between the macro-vertical and micro-horizontal systems has extinguished the moral civilisation that once anchored communal governance.

Civil wars, coups d'état, assassinations, and power grabs have repeatedly emerged from this core contradiction. The deepest consequence is borne by the citizenry: the absence of a system capable of translating macro-level wealth into micro-level security and economic empowerment, resulting in widespread resource poverty. Africans are thus prevented from attaining the same material capacities enjoyed by societies with structurally aligned governance.

The intellectual project laid across the five volumes of this manifesto is a systematic reclamation of African structural consciousness. Each theory displaces an imported Western framework by restoring the indigenous African alternative that historically fulfilled the same social function, but through a logic rooted in communal reciprocity rather than adversarial hierarchy.

Thus, the theory of ethno-corporatism introduced in Volume-1 displaces capitalist consciousness with a cooperative macro-economy. The theory of ethnopublicanism offered in Volume-2 displaces republican nationalism with an egalitarian state model. The theory of commicracy elaborated in this volume-3 displaces bureaucracy with an equality-driven organisational structure. The forthcoming theory of populocracy in Volume-4 will displace democracy with a collectivist mode of governance. And Volume-5 will introduce ethnosocialism to displace all other ideological imports including the current

appropriation of protege across Africa with a humanitarian social system grounded in the African moral imagination.

The conflict now facing the African people arises directly from the wholesale appropriation of Western bureaucratic structures, Western political templates, and Western capitalist economies. This amalgam—vertical, hierarchical, and extractive—sits in direct opposition to the cooperative socialism that African societies have always pursued. The crisis is structural, not moral.

The solution, therefore, cannot be the introduction of new meso-level mediators, such as Western aid agencies' "cooperative support organisations," intended to harmonise the vertical bureaucracy with the horizontal cooperatives of the people. Nor can the solution emerge under a value system that forces governments to defend their vertical bureaucratic authority against the horizontal economic life of their citizens. Harmonisation is structurally impossible when two systems originate from incompatible civilisational logics.

Thus the only viable path is a full departure from the vertical State structures that are, in their very architecture, reproducing underdevelopment across the continent. Africa must reconstruct its macro-structures in the image of its own horizontal cooperative socialism—a system carried in the will of its people

and embedded in its indigenous customs since before recorded history.

No matter how faithfully African societies attempt to assimilate Western bureaucratic morality, political and economic conflict will persist. Western societies will always dominate bureaucratic culture, capitalist economics, and the hierarchical forms of republicanism and constitutional monarchy, because these systems originate from their own social conditioning and worldview. They do not originate from ours. They are not primordial to African civilisation.

By contrast, African cooperativism is the micro-economic foundation of the macro-economic theory of ethno-corporatism. Commicracy, ethno-collectivism, and other communal structures are primordial African inventions, surviving fragments of an indigenous organisational intelligence. Yet African State governments continue to appropriate Western social systems that are the direct opposites of these indigenous designs. This is the core structural problem confronting Africa today.

Therefore, this manifesto proposes the unitary reorganisation of the fragmented African nation-States into a single coordinated continental body—not by dissolving diversity, but by consolidating the cooperative ideologies that originate in Africa and are embedded across its indigenous cultures. This renaissance emerges within the transformative milieu of global

web-internetisation, enabling Africa to re-enter world history on its own terms.

From this foundation arises:

- an interdependent legal structure that restores normative reciprocity,
- an institutional commicratic environment that rebalances power horizontally,
- greater visibility for the people under populocracy,
- strengthened bottom-up legislative authority from the micro-level upward,
- deeper social and economic diversification through a class-altruist system,
- improved governance under govox-populi, and
- more effective national management through departmental commicracies at the macro-level.

Through these reorganisations, Africa returns to itself as a restoration of its rightful civilisational form.

The First-Order Challenge of Institutionalising Commicracy

A first-order challenge for the institutional development of commicracy lies in how performance is to be measured at the

macro-level of State governance. The transition from entrenched bureaucratic verticality to a horizontally structured commicratic order demands new evaluative principles that align with the ethos of equality, reciprocity, and interpeer accountability.

At the outset—when ethnopublicanism is still embedded within a monetary economy—the establishment of commicracy will inevitably encounter friction arising from the residual individualistic impulses toward wealth accumulation and power-seeking. Yet, once governance enters a non-monetary order of succession, many of the chronic difficulties that plague African governments and public sectors today would disappear in a single transformative stroke.

Under commicracy, organisational aims in the public sector become narrower, more precise, and easier to verify. Objectives become specific, focus-dimensional, and clearly attributable to defined commicratic collectives.

Ethicratic codes of conduct would support this by providing measurable, analytically robust tasks that no longer require multi-layered bureaucratic navigation. Instead, each departmental layer—structured horizontally—would operate as a coordinated collective of specialists with equal decision-making power. Such symmetry streamlines performance assessment by tying outcomes directly to the shared labour of interpeer units.

A principal incentive for synchronising commicratic output lies in the expansion of social-life incentives. Rather than emphasising financial compensation—no longer a primary motivator in a post-monetary order—commicracy enhances work/life balance as a central performance driver.

Supported by web-internetisation platforms, many commicrats would work remotely from their homes, attending physical workplaces only when necessary. Thus, performance evaluation must account for how such incentives enrich personal well-being and family life while simultaneously improving collective commicratic productivity.

However, incentives must remain context-specific. Remote work, for instance, may appeal strongly to individuals with family responsibilities, yet be undesirable for young singles or extroverted personality types who thrive in socially vibrant work environments.

As such, performance-based incentives will vary widely, determined collectively by staff who wield equal decision-making power in shaping conditions that affect their own work/life balance. These incentives must nevertheless conform to ethicratic codes endorsed by the judiciary to ensure alignment with commicratic work ethics.

Cultural preferences, communal customs, shared passions, and social identity categories—such as marital status, age-group affinities, personality orientation, or parental responsibilities—all influence what incentives a particular collective will value. Likewise, the nature of service delivery in specific workplaces will shape the incentive structures that attract individuals to acquire particular skills and seek employment within certain organisational environments.

Thus, in a fully realised commicratic society, it would be entirely normal to observe clusters of individuals with shared dispositions, needs, social identity markers, or life circumstances gravitating toward job roles that suit their personalities and aspirations. Commicracy therefore creates a labour environment in which individuals naturally find themselves within sectors that reflect their immediate needs and desires, while sustaining the horizontal ethos of collective reciprocity and equal power.

Passion, Performance,
and Interpeer Structuring in Commicracy

When individuals can secure an ideal work/life balance within a non-monetary economy, the conditions for life to “go well” become intrinsic to both personal and collective flourishing. Under such circumstances, multi-tasking between work responsibilities and social or family commitments becomes effortless, supported by a web-internetisation platform that forms

the backbone of both economic relations and social life. Within such an environment, possibilities expand—anything and everything becomes achievable within the realm of human capability and collective organisation.

As previously noted, passion itself is one of the most powerful performance incentives. Passion arises when a task or mission resonates deeply with an individual or group innate longing—whether through patriotism expressed in military or naval service, through scientific aspiration such as space exploration, through altruism expressed in healthcare or mental-health practice, or through the desire to teach, travel, fly, explore, or serve.

In any commicratic society, passion is inseparable from mission. A mission that aligns with personal meaning inherently motivates individuals to care about their work-output, irrespective of the specific incentives attached to the role.

In bureaucratic societies, this natural passion has long been exploited. Bureaucracy routinely depends on workers' intrinsic attachment to a mission to keep them loyal and committed despite the hierarchical inequalities, the strain on work/life balance, and the chronic deprivation of family time. In many sectors, passion—not monetary gain—is what sustains long-term dedication amid structural dissatisfaction.

Job interviews in bureaucratic systems often prioritise those who can convincingly express passion for a role over those with expertise, with the assumption that skills can always be taught later. This leads many applicants to exaggerate or fabricate passion merely to secure a job for monetary reasons. Once financial goals are satisfied, the exaggerated passion collapses, leading to dissatisfaction and the desire to leave.

This demonstrates a crucial truth: work/life balance conditions, far more than monetary incentives, shape long-term job satisfaction and commitment. Since human needs evolve continuously and nothing within human nature is static, commicracy thrives precisely because it enables fluidity. The system makes it normal—and structurally supported—for individuals to shift their passion and mission whenever their personal needs and circumstances change. In this way, commicracy enhances freedom rather than restricting it.

Like bureaucracy, commicracy possesses the capacity to support large, multi-layered institutions performing diverse functions and complex tasks. The structural difference, however, is profound. Bureaucracy stacks workers vertically, granting those at the top the power to override the will and autonomy of those at the bottom in a top-down hierarchy.

Commicracy, by contrast, layers workers horizontally as interdependent freelancers. All members of each departmental

group possess equal interpeer decision-making power, forming internal commicracies within which peers govern themselves and collectively shape their individual group outcomes.

When this horizontal structure is viewed through a vertical lens, it may resemble a reciprocal system in which those at the perceived “bottom” influence those at the perceived “top,” and vice versa. Yet this perception merely reflects the unfamiliarity of hierarchical observers with a system that distributes power laterally. In reality, commicracy abolishes the metaphysics of top and bottom entirely.

Decision-making authority is concentrated within each interpeer group, whose collective decisions condition the performance of adjacent groups, generating reciprocal influence. Departmental-by-departmental movement then becomes cyclical rather than hierarchical: group decisions rotate clockwise through the organisational architecture, conditioning one department after another, and continually dictates how the entire institution aligned its performance output.

This rotational interpeer dynamic forms the operational backbone of commicratic institutions. It establishes a sophisticated method by which multi-layered organisations can execute large-scale, multifaceted functions while maintaining the principles of equality, reciprocity, and horizontal cohesion. In this manner, commicracy not only replaces bureaucracy—it

surpasses it by aligning structural power with human nature, collective welfare, and the egalitarian values rooted in African indigenous organisational culture.

Govoxical–Commicratic Interdependence in Ethnpublican Governance

The relationship between Commicracy and Govox-Populi is central to the effective governance capacity of an Ethnpublican State. Although govoxiers do not exercise State-power decision-making over the citizenry they represent, they remain fully accountable to their regional electorates for the quality, accuracy, and integrity of the policy information they deliver.

While tensions may occasionally emerge between Commicratic-Departments and govoxiers—especially regarding the provision of research infrastructure, facilitation of resources, or the conduct of in-country and international studies—Commicratic-Departments bear an inherent duty of care toward govoxiers. They are answerable to the entirety of government agencies, including the secretariat-ministries, for the delivery of bespoke research studies on any domain relating to social-systems or social-control.

This dynamic produces what can be described as a govoxicalisation of governmental commicracy: an interdependent, inter-peer duty of care that binds govoxiers and

Commicratic-Departments together, where the latter occupy a permanent advisory mechanism of the State. This clarifies the institutional distinction between Govox-Populi and Commicracy in an ethnopublican society while preserving their structural harmony.

As explained in Volume 2 of this manifesto, Independent-advisory bodies operate locally—on the streets and from offices in every city centre—functioning as govovical-centred information channels that help individual citizenry-electorate understand government matters. Govoxiers may appoint such bodies to undertake specialised research tasks, nationally or internationally, whenever the collective interests of their constituents require deeper fact-finding. This responsibility is typically taken with utmost seriousness, as govoxiers are expected to pursue external collaborations when such partnerships advance the public interest.

These collaborations enhance the credibility of Independent-advisory organisations while simultaneously reinforcing the reputation of the participating govoxiers as reliable interdependent leaders. Their presence also creates a healthy professional pressure on governmental Commicratic-Departments, motivating them to maintain high standards of diligence, efficiency, and expertise—lest they appear to be outperformed by advisory bodies with fewer resources.

Nevertheless, both the Citizenry-branch and Economy-branch of government consistently advocate that Commicratic-Departments, as the permanent institutional advisory bodies serving elected govoxiers, remain the most suitable, stable, and authoritative source of informed knowledge for matters related to the seat of government. Their high-quality advisory capacity is regarded as essential for crafting policies that truly benefit the people.

Because Commicratic-Departments provide advisory services exclusively to government agencies—including all secretariat-ministries—and not directly to the public, the Executive-branch (the secretariat) underscores its neutrality in govoxical matters. It therefore encourages citizens to establish informal advisory-bodies, registering them with the Secretariat-Ministry of Govoxical and Constitutional Affairs.

Once recognised, these organisations may operate as professional informal expert groups offering direct public consultations across diverse domains, including: Science, Law, Govox-Populi, Central Intelligence, National Archives and Records, Medicine and Health, History and Art, Geography, Chemistry, Behavioural Science, Family Counselling and Relationship Expertise, Technology and Engineering, Computer Information Technology, Editorial Policy and Media Standards,

Agriculture and Farming, and many other specialised fields known.

This ecosystem—comprising Commicratic-Departments, govoxiers, and Independent-advisory bodies—forms a multi-layered advisory architecture designed to uphold transparency, empower citizens with knowledge, and ensure that policy development remains rooted in informed, ethically aligned, and socially beneficial expertise.

Commicratic Institutional Development And Govoxical Interdependence

Information-delivery—particularly through advisory functions and research studies—is a primary driver of social development and economic growth. For this reason, understanding the interactive patterns of commicratic organisations and the constitutional regulations that govern them is essential to the institutional evolution of commicracy within an Ethnpublican State.

In analysing the govoxical roles of the government and the governed—especially where they interpeer and co-shape public meaning—it becomes evident that successful Ethnpublican governance requires a deep alignment of shared interests between elected govoxiers and their citizenry-electrates. Such alignment fosters a high degree of consensus in govoxical

affairs, reinforcing stability, social cohesion, and the collective legitimacy of the State.

It is therefore necessary to re-emphasise the obligatory role of government-centred Commicratic-Departments and their influence on the institutional development of commicracy. As the permanent advisory bodies of government, these departments shoulder the responsibility of conducting research, producing knowledge, and providing expert guidance across all government agencies.

Although most commicratic research is commissioned by government bodies, Commicratic-Departments may independently initiate investigations into matters that directly affect their own departmental remit, provided such matters hold broad public interest and affect a significant portion of the population. They may only pursue individual cases when at least two govoxiers co-sign a commissioning pact—an arrangement theoretically fixed at two, though adaptable in practice.

While Commicratic-Departments possess no authority to refuse any matter submitted to them for investigation, their outputs significantly shape policy development, influence the Information-delivery of both the Economy-branch and Citizenry-branch of government, and contribute to the formation of govovical regulations within the secretariat. Their advisory work also aids the supervisory character of the judiciary.

Within the context of govoxical decentralisation, Commicratic-Departments may also provide services to local Independent-advisory bodies on behalf of the government. As institutional entities with stronger access to State resources, they are often positioned to support non-governmental advisory bodies in delivering impartial and accurate information to the public. Such requests from independent bodies must be directed to their regional *Citizens Advice Commission*, which then forwards them to the relevant Commicratic-Department.

This framework strengthens the principles of freedom of information, reinforces governmental transparency, and supports the open-government philosophy that defines govox-populi as governance by the people.

Understanding the interdependencies of commicracy, and examining how the interdependent leadership of govox-populi interacts with the governed, offers a rich avenue for future research. It may reveal deeper insights into the moral and normative foundations of commissioning-rules, social values, and the evolving demands of governmental organisation in the advancing complexity of 21st century life.

Institutional Commicratic-Departments
in an Ethnopolitan State

Commicracy derives from commissioning-rule and denotes a governance culture in which authority is exercised through delegated function rather than positional supremacy. Under commicracy, the State does not rule by unilateral command, nor do the governed govern by administrative execution.

Instead, the State is commissioned to inform, structure, and present policy pathways impartially, while the governed are commissioned to authorise, reject, or redirect those pathways through collective decision. Implementation authority remains vested in government, but legitimacy of action arises exclusively from public commissioning.

In this system, government and governed do not possess identical decision-making powers; they possess distinct but interdependent authorities. Government holds technical, procedural, and operational authority to design and execute policy, while the citizenry holds authorising authority to determine whether, how, or in what alternative form such policy may proceed. No authority is absolute, and neither side may act outside its commissioned scope without losing legitimacy.

Commicracy therefore replaces hierarchical command with functional reciprocity: rule emerges not from superiority of office, expertise, or force, but from mutual commissioning between policy-formulators and policy-authorisers, ensuring that governance remains horizontal in legitimacy even where responsibilities are differentiated.

A commicratic instruction, role, or mandate is issued on a contractual interpeer basis, meaning that every participating body engages one another horizontally rather than hierarchically. All actors involved in this mutual conditioning process form part of the commicratic structure.

Commicracy therefore functions as an authorising system grounded in expertise, collaborative reasoning, and shared responsibility. Institutions operating under commicracy employ individuals based on their demonstrable knowledge, skills, and domain expertise, and they may contract third-party bodies when specialised operations are required. The emphasis is on collective analytical performance, interpeer validation, and the refinement of professional capacity across all participants.

Under an Ethnpublican State, many bureaucratic-era bodies—such as independent commissions designed for vertical oversight—become obsolete. They are replaced by a new form of social-organisational management, one that is horizontally structured, interdependent, and governed by commicratic logic.

The State invests deeply in cultivating commicratic culture and practice, embedding them directly into the State-constitution, under the supervisory guardianship of the Judicial-branch of government.

To support this system, the government establishes a network of Commicratic-Departments, each responsible for developing policy guidance, conducting research, regulating commicratic processes, and ensuring constitutional conformity. Their central responsibility is not to govern the people but to support govoxiers—the elected interdependent leaders—in carrying out their duties with clarity, accuracy, and constitutional discipline.

Yet, while govoxiers hold the obligation to present policies to their respective regional citizenry-electirates on behalf of the Citizenry-branch and Economy-branch of government respectively, the acceptance of those policies is not compulsory. In the Ethnpublican order, legislative decision-making power rests entirely with the citizenry-electirates—including their working-groups—who retain full authority to accept, amend, or reject any policy proposal, regulation, or law, brought before them.

This elective process ensures the populocratic empowerment of the populace, positioning the people themselves as the ultimate arbiters of societal direction, under the structured

guidance and advisory expertise of the Commicratic-Departments.

Here is a list of some of the major Commicratic-Departments with particular reference to each of their policy focus to the govoxical government departments in the proposed African Ethnopolitan State:

**The Ideal Formation
of Government-Centred Commicratic-Departments**

No	COMMICRATIC-DEPARTMENTS	Acronym
1	Africa Civil Rights Regulatory Department	ACRRD
2	Africa Aeronautics and Space Regulatory Department	AESRD
3	Africa Humanitarian Protection Regulatory Department	AHPRD
4	Africa Central Intelligence Regulatory Department	ACIRD
5	Africa Election Commission Regulatory Department	AECD
6	Africa Foreign Business Regulatory Department	AFBRD
7	Africa Obligations to Foreign Visitors'	AOFVRD

	Regulatory Department	
8	Africa International Trade Regulatory Department	AITRD
9	Africa Maritime Commission Regulatory Department	AMCRD
10	Africa Postal Service Regulatory Department	APSRD
11	Africa Reserve System Regulatory Department	ARSRD
12	Africa Securities and Exchange Commission Regulatory Department	ASECRD
13	African Nuclear Regulatory Department	ANRD
14	Citizenry Legislative Interest Regulatory Department	CLIRD
15	Computer and Internet Development Regulatory Department	CIDRD
16	Consumer Product Safety Regulatory Department	CPSRD
17	Environmental Protection Regulatory Department	EPRD
18	Farm Infrastructure & Forestry Regulatory Department	FIFRD

19	General Amenities Services Regulatory Department	GASRD
20	Government Communications Regulatory Department	GCRD
21	Govoxiers Personnel Management Regulatory Department	GPMRD
22	Innovation and Intellectual Property Regulatory Department	IIPRD
23	Lawderly Affairs Regulatory Department	LARD
24	Leisure & Tourism Regulatory Department	LTRD
25	Media Communication Regulatory Department	MCRD
26	National and Community service Regulatory Department	NCSRD
27	National Archives and Records Regulatory Department	NARRD
28	National Courts & Arbitration Service Regulatory Department	NCASRD
29	National Energy Authority Regulatory Department	NEARD
30	National Health Services Regulatory	NHSRD

	Department	
31	National Industries Regulatory Department	NIRD
32	National Insurance & Monetary Deposit Regulatory Department	NIMDRD
33	National Labour Relations Regulatory Department	NLRRD
34	National Science Foundation Regulatory Department	NSFRD
35	National Transportation Safety Regulatory Department	NTSRD
36	National Endowment for the Arts Regulatory Department	NEARD
37	Redeem System Regulatory Department	RSRD
38	Selective System Regulatory Department	SSRD
39	Sports Development Regulatory Department	SDRD
40	Technology and Invention Regulatory Department	TIRD

1. Africa Civil Rights Regulatory Department (ACRRD)

Summary:

The ACRRD investigates civil rights complaints—including discrimination, inequality of treatment, and denial of equal

protection under State law. Operating as a commicratic advisory body, it gathers research data, evaluates the constitutional implications of citizen grievances, and provides policy recommendations to the appropriate branches of government. Its work strengthens citizen protections and ensures govoxiers' information-delivery remains grounded in factual civil rights analysis.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat-Ministries.
- Citizenry-centred Regional Commissions.

2. Africa Aeronautics and Space Regulatory Department
(AESRD)

Summary:

The AESRD develops commicratic research guidance on aeronautics, astronautics, and space exploration. It coordinates the technical expertise, materials, and intellectual capacities required for State-approved space missions. It also advises the citizenry-body on industrial strategy, educational pathways, and scientific development relating to Africa's role in global space advancement. Its recommendations shape long-term technological aspirations in alignment with African interests.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat-Ministry of Technology & Science Research.

- Secretariat-Ministry of Education & Apprenticeship.
- Regional Education & Apprenticeship Commission.

3. Africa Humanitarian Protection Regulatory Department (AHPRD)

Summary:

The AHPRD provides commicratic advisory research concerning the treatment, representation, and social integration of asylum seekers, refugees and other humanitarian protection applicants across Africa. It analyses humanitarian concerns, legal entitlements, community integration pathways, and regional responsibilities. Its policy recommendations support govoxiers and secretariat bodies in maintaining ethical engagement and constitutional fairness toward displaced persons.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat-Ministry of HomeLand Affairs.
- Secretariat-Ministry of Govoxical & Constitutional Affairs
- Regional Citizens Advice Commission.

4. Africa Central Intelligence Regulatory Department (ACIRD)

Summary:

ACIRD supplies research and advisory intelligence to guide govoxical information-delivery on matters of central

intelligence, counter-intelligence, foreign intelligence, and national security. It functions strictly as a commicratic analytical department—not an enforcement body—providing strategic insights requested by the Defence & HomeLand Security secretariat or State-Lords. Its work strengthens the interpeer relationship between the government and the populous through accurate, constitutionally aligned intelligence guidance.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat-Ministries.
- Citizenry-centred Regional Commissions.

5. Africa Election Commission Regulatory Department
(AECRD)

Summary:

The AECRD advises the State on all election-related matters, from electoral integrity to candidate eligibility. It performs identity-profiling and background assessments of individuals seeking govoxier positions or key commicratic roles. Its commicratic research supports the Regional Electoral & Boundaries Commissions and helps uphold transparent, well-informed citizenry decision-making during elections.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat-Ministry of HomeLand Affairs.
- Regional Electoral & Boundaries Commission.

6. Africa Foreign Business Regulatory Department (AFBRD)

Summary:

The AFBRD functions as the government's commicratic advisory body on international commercial related matters. It conducts feasibility research, develops regulatory guidance, and designs strategic business plans for African-owned enterprises operating abroad. Its work strengthens Africa's global economic footprint while ensuring that foreign engagements remain constitutionally aligned with national insurance and multinational finance principles. It also assists govoxiers in communicating accurate trade and investment information to their regional electorates.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat-Ministry of National Insurance & Multinational Finance.
- Regional Citizens Advice Commission.
- Secretariat-Ministry of International Affairs & Trade (due to cross-border commercial relations).

7. Africa Obligation to Foreign Visitors Regulatory Department (AOFVRD)

Summary:

The AOFVRD ensures that the State fulfills its constitutional "duty of care" toward foreign visitors, expatriates, temporary

residents, and migrant workers. It researches welfare standards, cultural integration practices, and safety provisions. It provides policy recommendations to support hospitality, tourism regulation, and ethical treatment of people categorised as foreigners within Africa. This department ensures that govoxiers can confidently deliver accurate information to their electorates on issues relating to foreign presence and cultural relations.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat-Ministry of Culture & Tourism.
- Regional Culture & Tourism Commission.
- Secretariat-Ministry of HomeLand Affairs (due to border entry, visitor permits, and migration compliance).

8. Africa International Trade Regulatory Department (AITRD)

Summary:

The AITRD is the permanent commicratic advisory board on international trade. It conducts detailed regulatory analysis on African imports, exports, tariff structures, multilateral trade agreements, and global market positioning. It formulates strategic recommendations to ensure that Africa's trade policies align with ethnopublican principles and promote continental economic growth. Its findings guide govoxiers in presenting

transparent and informed trade information to citizenry-electorates.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat-Ministry of International Affairs & Trade.
- Regional Citizens Advice Commission.
- Secretariat-Ministry of National Insurance & Multinational Finance (for macroeconomic risk analysis).

9. Africa Maritime Commission Regulatory Department (AMCRD)

Summary:

The AMCRD provides research and regulatory policy recommendations on Africa's oceanic activities, maritime commerce, and marine strategic development. It advises on shipping routes, port infrastructure, naval safety, admiralty law coherence, and the improvement of the African State Maritime Marine. While the Citizenry-Arm has legislative jurisdiction over maritime affairs, the department supports the Executive-Arm in regulatory enforcement under the constitution. It also assists regional commissions with information crucial to fishing communities, transport industries, and coastal populations.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat-Ministry of HomeLand Affairs.

- Secretariat-Ministry of Transport & Innovation.
- Regional Citizens Advice Commission.
- Secretariat-Ministry of Defence & Homeland Security (due to naval safety and maritime security intelligence).

10. Africa Postal Service Regulatory Department (APSRD)

Summary:

The APSRD conducts policy research and regulatory development for postal services across the African continent. It advises on national postal governance, digital correspondence trends, secure document handling, and adaptation to advanced communication technologies. By providing evidence-based guidelines, it enables govoxiers and executive secretariats to maintain efficient, secure, and modernised postal systems that reflect contemporary living standards.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat-Ministry of HomeLand Affairs.
- Regional Basic Utilities Commission.
- Secretariat-Ministry of Technology & Science Research (due to digital communication convergence).

11. Africa Reserve System Regulatory Department (ARSRD)

The Africa Reserve System Regulatory Department is responsible for developing policies that safeguard the operation, stability, and long-term strategic value of African resources. Its central mandate is to strengthen Africa's economic position within the global market while aligning national and continental interests with the economic activities of citizens abroad. Through its policy recommendations and information briefings to govoxiers, the ARSRD conducts the State's monetary oversight function and directs public engagement toward global regions where State-to-State currency exchange rates yield maximal benefit for Africa's economic growth.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of International Affairs & Trade.
- Secretariat–Ministry of National Insurance & Multinational Finance.
- Regional Citizen Advice Commission.

12. Africa Securities and Exchange Commission Regulatory Department (ASECRD)

The Africa Securities and Exchange Commission Regulatory Department is responsible for proposing policies that govern and

safeguard the securities and investment activities of African citizens. Its remit includes protecting citizens' interests in foreign markets, regulating interactions with international brokers and dealers, preventing fraud, and ensuring transparency in the disclosure of financial information. Its policy architecture strengthens the security of African business capital abroad and promotes fair, equitable participation in global investment environments.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of National Insurance & Multinational Finance.
- Regional International-Travel Commission.

13. Africa Nuclear Regulatory Department (ANRD)

The Africa World Nuclear Regulatory Department conducts research and develops policy recommendations concerning nuclear science, nuclear industry regulation, nuclear information management, and global nuclear energy communication. Its work provides authoritative intelligence to govoxiers on Africa's nuclear positioning in world affairs. The department promotes international understanding of nuclear energy while shaping continental perspectives on the strategic development of Africa's own nuclear capabilities and safety frameworks.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat-Ministry of HomeLand Affairs.
- Regional Citizens Advice Commission.

14. Citizenry Legislative Interest Regulatory Department
(CLIRD)

The Citizenry Legislative Interest Regulatory Department is tasked with analysing regional population-level influences that shape voting behaviour and legislative preferences. It studies belief systems—including conspiracy narratives, UFO-related beliefs, and emergent sociological patterns—to provide the government with precise datasets on how such factors influence electoral outcomes. CLIRD supports govoxiers and government agencies by mapping the sociocultural landscape that underlies legislative decision-making across communities.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministries.
- Citizenry-centred Regional Commissions.

15. Computer and Internet Development Regulatory
Department (CIDRD)

The Computer and Internet Development Regulatory Department designs policies that regulate national and

international digital communications, including mobile telephony, landlines, radio, television, satellite, wired networks, and webcam-based communications. As the government's primary advisory authority on digital infrastructure and communication law, the CIDRD promotes technological innovation, advances in software development, and continent-wide internet expansion. Its mandate includes ensuring that every household across Africa gains access to reliable internet services and modern communication facilities.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of Technology & Science Research.
- Regional Basic Utility Commissions.

16. Consumer Products Safety Regulatory Department
(CPSRD)

The Consumer Products Safety Regulatory Department conducts research on consumer product safety and provides evidence-based policy recommendations to the government. Its work ensures that all goods entering African markets meet safety, health, and performance standards. Through continuous assessment, monitoring, and scientific evaluation, the CPSRD safeguards public welfare and strengthens confidence in both domestically produced and imported consumer products.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of Environment & Public Health.
- Secretariat–Ministry of Labour & Industry.
- Regional Citizens Advice Commission.

17. Environmental Protection Regulatory Department
(EPRD)

The Environmental Protection Regulatory Department develops policy recommendations for the Citizenry-Centred Environment & Public Health Commission, with a specific emphasis on environmental health and ecological stability. Its role includes advancing African wildlife preservation, guiding national efforts in sustainable development, and regulating industrial waste, ecology, and conservation activities. The EPRD also conducts research and drafts policy guidelines concerning contaminated land, inland water systems, riverine and estuary management, flood-risk mitigation, harbour navigation, reservoir safety, fisheries management, water resource quality, and biodiversity protection—including marine environments bordering Africa.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of Environment & Public Health.
- Regional Environment & Public Health Commission.

18. Farm Infrastructure & Forestry Regulatory Department
(FIRD)

The Farm Infrastructure & Forestry Regulatory Department provides strategic advisory services and policy recommendations to ensure African farmers, growers, and foresters receive adequate infrastructural support. Its mission is to design sustainable, practical, and progressive solutions that enhance agricultural productivity, strengthen rural economies, and advance long-term food security across Africa.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of Environment & Public Health.
- Secretariat–Ministry of Labour & Industry.
- Regional Agricultural & Farming Commission.

19. General Amenities Services Regulatory Department
(GASRD)

The General Amenities Services Regulatory Department develops policies that guide the provision and regulation of essential amenities across Africa. This includes frameworks for

free housing and access to basic necessities for all individuals irrespective of social or economic status. GASRD ensures that these amenities meet standards of dignity, universal accessibility, and social equity as part of the continent's foundational welfare State architecture.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of Housing & National Work.
- Secretariat–Ministry of Homeland Affairs.
- Secretariat–Ministry of Labour & Industry.
- Regional Basic Utilities Commission.
- Regional Identity & Social-Welfare Commission.

20. Government Communication Regulatory Department
(GCRD)

The Government Communication Regulatory Department serves as the central authority for professional government communication. It supports Secretariat-Ministers, govoxiers, and State-Lords by ensuring that all governmental branches communicate with clarity, accuracy, and integrity. GCRD upholds world-class communication standards, strengthens public service messaging, and assists in implementing the communication priorities of the Secretary-of-State and all arms of government.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of Media & Communications.
- Regional Citizens Advice Commission.

21. Govoxiers Personnel Management Regulatory
Department (GPMRD)

The Govoxiers Personnel Management Regulatory Department develops legislative and administrative policies that guide govoxiers and all government workers in maintaining the highest standard of commicratic public service. Its work reinforces the ethics of horizontality, interpeer responsibility, and service-centred governance, ensuring that govoxiers understand their Information-delivery obligations and the behavioural expectations of commicracy in African society.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministries.
- Citizenry-Centred Regional Commissions.

22. Innovation and Intellectual Property Regulatory
Department (IIPRD)

This department recognises the State's responsibility to support citizen-generated inventions and technologies that can improve African welfare and the continental economy. It

formulates policies that govern the management of intellectual property, including the valuation, welfare-sharing, and rights arrangements between government and inventors. The IIPRD ensures that innovation is protected, incentivised, and integrated into Africa's economic advancement.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of National Insurance & Multinational Finance.
- Secretariat–Ministry of Labour & Industry.
- Secretariat–Ministry of Education & Apprenticeship.
- Regional Citizens Advice Commission.

23. Lawderly Affairs Regulatory Department (LARD)

LARD develops policies governing the lawderly—the commicratic alternative to bureaucratic policing. It ensures a coherent nationwide framework where lawders perform as community-centred law umpires and arbitrators rather than antagonistic enforcers. As the primary advisory body for lawderly policy, LARD ensures integration, ethical coherence, and professional harmony, supporting a justice system built on interpeer civility rather than bureaucratic dominance.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of Homeland Affairs.
- Regional Law & Human Rights Commission.
- Regional Citizens Advice Commission.

24. Leisure & Tourism Regulatory Department (LTRD)

The Leisure & Tourism Regulatory Department researches and develops policy strategies that position Africa as a global centre for tourism, culture, and heritage. It advises govoxiers on how tourism can be enhanced through intelligent Information-delivery, new attraction development, and the strategic use of Africa's landscapes, wildlife, cultural heritage, and historical sites. The LTRD ensures tourism policy strengthens the economy while maintaining cultural integrity.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of Culture & Tourism.
- Regional Culture & Tourism Commission.

25. Media Communication Regulatory Department (MCRD)

MCRD develops regulatory policies for the media industry as part of the govoxical responsibility to ensure truthful, accurate, and public-centred Information-delivery. It responds to public complaints and sociological concerns about modern

media integrity, guiding the government toward media standards that restore public trust and eliminate the culture of misinformation and “fake news.”

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of Media & Communications.
- Secretariat–Ministry of Labour & Industry.
- Regional Citizens Advice Commission.

26. National and Community Service Regulatory
Department (NCSRD)

This department develops policies and program recommendations that mobilise Africans of all ages into service, innovation, community development, education, safety, and economic advancement. It coordinates multi-agency collaboration to enhance domestic and diaspora welfare, inspiring citizen participation and cultivating a culture of invention and civic responsibility. NCSRD embodies the developmental heart of African ethnopublicanism by fostering unity, creativity, and public service.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministries.
- Regional Citizenry-Centred Commissions.

27. National Archives and Records Regulatory Department (NARRD)

The National Archives and Records Regulatory Department formulates policies to ensure high-quality record-keeping, archival standards, and the ethical preservation of national documents. This includes guidance on records collection, environmental sustainability, storage requirements, access protocols, diversity standards, and public service consistency. NARRD safeguards transparency and the historical memory of Africa's governance.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of Homeland Affairs.
- Regional Citizens Advice Commission.

28. National Courts & Arbitration Service Regulatory Department (NCASRD)

NCASRD is the primary advisory authority on policies governing the commicratic palaver-courts system. It provides the electorate with policy guidelines that uphold fairness, communal arbitration, restorative justice, and interpeer dispute resolution. These policies ensure that palaver-courts remain accessible, culturally grounded, and harmonised with national legality.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of Homeland Affairs
- Regional Law & Human Rights Commission

29. National Energy Authority Regulatory Department
(NEARD)

The National Energy Authority Regulatory Department develops policies that advance Africa’s transition toward sustainable, renewable, and secure energy systems. It guides infrastructure development, national energy planning, and modernisation of the continental energy grid, ensuring affordability, safety, and climate-responsible growth.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of Homeland Affairs.
- Secretariat–Ministry of Housing & National Work.
- Regional Basic Utilities Commission.

30. National Health Services Regulatory Department
(NHSRD)

The National Health Services Regulatory Department provides policy development for the African “HomeLand Healthcare Provision (HHP).” It ensures that the national health service is maintained, expanded, and modernised while

remaining universally accessible. NHSRD's work includes improving healthcare delivery models, supporting the training and welfare of health professionals, and safeguarding public health infrastructures across all African States.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of Health & Social Care.
- Regional Health & Social-Care Commission.

31. National Industries Regulatory Department (NIRD)

The National Industries Regulatory Department strengthens and expands Africa's industrial capacity through the philosophy of ethno-corporatism. It guides the government toward policies that institutionalise globally recognised industries within Africa as African-owned and operated. NIRD's mandate is to ensure that industrial growth is ethically grounded, economically efficient, and structurally aligned with commicratic horizontality, enabling Africa to become a manufacturing and production power for its self-sufficiency subsistence economy.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of Labour & Industry.
- Regional Work & Pension Commission.

32. National Insurance & Monetary Deposit Regulatory Department (NIMDRD)

The NIMDRD governs the regulation of monetary deposits in the context of Africa's proposed non-monetary domestic economy. With all bank-held monetary assets consolidated into Federal Reserve Banks across every African State, this department oversees deposit protection, foreign spending rights, and cross-border liquidity. It also develops policies for allocating State-funded welfare money for citizens' international activities (tourism, education, conferences, family visitation), governed by a point-based eligibility system.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of National Insurance & Multinational Finance.
- Secretariat–Ministry of Labour & Industry.
- Regional Citizens Advice Commission.

33. National Labour Relations Regulatory Department (NLRRD)

This department formulates policies that govern national labour relations, including the institutional structure of apprenticeships within the commicratic framework. It ensures labour relations are harmonised, cooperative, and horizontally

managed, strengthening fairness, training, and interpeer accountability across the African workforce.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of Labour & Industry.
- Regional Education & Apprenticeship Commission.

34. National Science Foundation Regulatory Department
(NSFRD)

The NSFRD provides policy guidance to advance science, engineering, medicine, and technological research across Africa. It identifies strategic investment areas, supports research excellence, and expands scientific literacy and training. The department ensures that African scientific advancement aligns with sustainable development and global innovation standards.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of Technology & Science Research.
- Secretariat–Ministry of Labour & Industry.
- Secretariat–Ministry of Education & Apprenticeship.
- Regional Citizens Advice Commission.

35. National Transportation Safety Regulatory Department
(NTSRD)

NTSRD investigates all civil transportation accidents across Africa—including air, road, rail, marine, and the futuristic ropodium network. It produces safety-based policy recommendations to prevent future incidents and advances research into new transportation corridors and networks, especially in remote or underdeveloped areas.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of Transport & Innovation.
- Regional Road-Transport Commission.

36. National Endowment for the Arts Regulatory
Department (NEARD)

This department supports artistic development across Africa through policy recommendations that enhance investment in museums, cultural institutions, artists, and art programs. NEARD ensures that cultural expression becomes a pillar of African education, tourism, and societal development, promoting an artistic ecosystem that reflects Africa’s heritage and creative ingenuity.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of Culture & Tourism.

- Regional Culture & Tourism Commission.
- Secretariat–Ministry of Education & Apprenticeship.
- Regional Education & Apprenticeship Commission.

37. Redeem System Regulatory Department (RSRD)

RSRD develops the policies guiding the Redeem-System—Africa’s futuristic alternative to punitive imprisonment—Rehabilitation city of consequence. Unlike bureaucratic societies where prisons cage individuals, the Redeem-System is designed to repair behavioural harm, deter reoffending, and restore community cohesion. This department shapes the philosophy, structure, and operational ethics of a model that prioritises healing, restitution, and psychological transformation in an ethnopublican society.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of Homeland Affairs.
- Regional Law & Human Rights Commission.

38. Selective System Regulatory Department (SSRD)

The SSRD designs policy strategies for selective-service programs in times of national emergency or environmental catastrophe. It outlines criteria for assessment—age, health, skills, and capacity—and governs the registration and evaluation

of eligible individuals. In alignment with commicratic consent-based governance, it ensures that selective-service policies balance national readiness with protections for conscientious objectors.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of Defence & Homeland Security.
- Regional Citizens Advice Commission.
- Secretariat–Ministry of Labour & Industry.
- Regional Work & Pension Commission.
- Secretariat–Ministry of Homeland Affairs.
- Regional Identity & Social-Welfare Commission.
- Secretariat–Ministry of Health & Social Care.
- Regional Health & Social Care Commission.

39. Sports Development Regulatory Department (SDRD)

SDRD produces policies that advance sports development as a social, economic, and cultural asset. The department promotes resources, infrastructure, and competitive opportunities across Africa, recognising sports as a unifying identity marker and a core driver of community cohesion and social pride.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry for Sports & Recreation.
- Regional Sports & Recreation Commission.
- Secretariat–Ministry of Culture & Tourism.
- Regional Culture & Tourism Commission.

40. Technology and Invention Regulatory Department
(TIRD)

The TIRD develops policies for the governance of scientific research, medical innovation, and technological invention. It strengthens Africa’s global position by supporting sustainable technological development, encouraging invention, and coordinating national and international partnerships. TIRD serves as a cornerstone of Africa’s future-proof technological identity.

Policy Focus:

- Secretariat–Ministry of Technology & Science Research.
- Secretariat–Ministry of Education & Apprenticeship.
- Regional Citizens Advice Commission.

Justification for the Commicratic-Departments:
A Structural-Philosophical Case

The extensive architecture of commicratic-departments presented above emerges from a far-reaching body of research into commicracy, interpeer governance, and the govox-populi model of State governance. Together, these studies provide a credible and empirically grounded justification for the nationhood of ethnopublicanism—a system in which leadership does not flow downward through hierarchical command-chains, but circulates horizontally as power-reciprocity among interpeers.

To advance this understanding, it is crucial to confront a fundamental claim: commicracy cannot be meaningfully understood through the traditional frameworks of political theory or bureaucratic administration. Instead, its structural performance can only be grasped by moving away from the cumbersome dependencies between politics and bureaucracy and moving toward simpler, interpersonal, and horizontally coordinated organisational principles.

The Foundational Claim: Dependency versus Interdependence:

Having demonstrated that govox-populi and commicracy exist only as *interdependent* systems—each requiring the other to produce a harmonious, high-capacity State—it follows that

politics and bureaucracy, by contrast, exist only as *dependent* systems.

The relationship between politics and bureaucracy across all existing nation-States is one of chronic dependency:

- bureaucracy depends on political leadership for authorisation;
- political office depends on bureaucracy for execution;
- neither can operate without the other, yet neither can evolve beyond the limitations imposed by the other.

This dependency produces structural stagnation. Whenever these two dependent forces collide—as they must—they generate development deficiencies. The result is observable globally but especially acute across divided African nations, where both social and economic necessities repeatedly fail to achieve sustainable development.

In every bureaucratic society, one finds either:

- excessive social polarisation, or
- excessive economic polarisation, and often both simultaneously.

Thus the call for commicratic-departments is not accidental—it is a structural necessity arising from the need to replace dependent governance with interdependent governance.

The Empirical Evidence: The Crisis of Bureaucratic Societies:

The deficiencies of bureaucratic-political dependency are visible worldwide:

- extreme gun-law polarisation,
- chronic human-rights failures and humans as commodities for the State,
- disordered freedom-of-speech ecosystems,
- the unregulated rise of fake-news institutions,
- political tyranny and police oppression,
- bureaucratic oppression masked as administrative necessity.

These crises are not leadership failures; they are structural failures produced by politics-bureaucracy dependency.

In commicratic societies, by contrast, any manifestation of govoxical tyranny or commicratic imbalance is never attributed to leadership, because leadership in commicracy is not a vertical phenomenon. Instead, responsibility falls upon the citizenry-electorates themselves—the interpeers—because power circulates horizontally through reciprocity.

This shift of responsibility from leader to interpeer collective is the core reason why the 40 commicratic-departments must

exist: they decentralise administrative oversight into horizontally aligned fields of responsibility, preventing the concentration of power and avoiding dependency traps.

The Political Consequences of Dependency: African and Global Illustrations:

Across African States divided by the inherited colonial bureaucratic model, dependency between politics and bureaucracy continues to reproduce: underdevelopment, civil wars, mass protests, poverty, famine, and repeated leadership crises.

Recent examples illustrate this structural decay:

- the 30 September 2022 coup in Burkina Faso was sparked by a political–bureaucratic governance failure;
- the 2022 mass citizenry uprising in Haiti occurred under the same structural conditions.

These crises reinforce the necessity of commicratic-departments, each designed to replace dependent command structures with horizontal interpeer regulatory relations. This is why each department maps directly onto a specific govox-populi procedural need, ensuring that administrative functions remain distributed, decentralised, and free from dependency distortions.

The Global Turning Point: The Limits of Bureaucratic Adaptation:

The structural transformations in China and East Asia reveal that even well-managed bureaucratic systems cannot indefinitely adjust to the expanding interconnectivity generated by web-internetisation—the global interpeer platform.

Politics and bureaucracy are losing their capacity to manage societies that increasingly interact horizontally through digital interpeer channels. As these institutions strain under the weight of new social dynamics, they respond by:

- empowering police forces beyond democratic norms,
- normalising military intervention against citizens,
- intensifying surveillance,
- escalating legal controls on protests,
- and widening the gap between State and society.

The very tools used to maintain control are accelerating systemic collapse.

The assassinations and attempted assassinations of politicians stands as a global warning sign: political leadership is becoming exposed, precarious, and unsustainable under dependency-based governance. No political leader, anywhere, can survive the intensifying polarity created by bureaucratic

dependency. Commicracy therefore emerges not as an optional alternative but as a historical necessity.

The Citizenry Imperative: Abolishing Polarity Through Interpeer Responsibility:

No society should accept polarisation as a normal consequence of leadership errors, bureaucratic rigidity, or political overreach. Polarity is a structural disease, not a cultural inevitability.

Under commicracy:

- power is horizontally reciprocal,
- responsibility is shared among interpeers,
- and the citizenry-electorates become custodians of their own social harmony.

Thus any social polarity must be confronted, disassembled, and abolished not by leaders, but by the interpeer collective whose reciprocal responsibility forms the moral backbone of ethnpublican society.

Why the 40 Commicratic-Departments Are Necessary:

Each commicratic-department I have created operates as a specialised horizontal node in a non-hierarchical governance network. Their function is not to administer the State vertically but to: prevent dependency loops, distribute specialised

regulatory capacity, anchor interpeer oversight, sustain ethnopublican moral equilibrium, ensure govox-populi interdependence, replace polarisation with reciprocity, and guarantee developmental balance across social and economic sectors.

Where politics and bureaucracy collapse under dependent pressures, these departments sustain governance by reorganising societal functions along interdependent, reciprocal, and horizontally harmonised structural lines.

The 40 commicratic-departments are not mere administrative units; they are the structural expression of a new civilisational philosophy. They embody interpeer logic, redistribute power horizontally, eliminate dependency, and assert a new form of governance adapted to the realities of internetised human interaction and ethnopublican social identity. They are justified not only by the failures of bureaucratic dependency, but by the emerging necessity of interdependent Statehood.

The Great Call
to Commicracy

In bringing this Volume-3 of the *Manifesto of the African Corporatist Society* to its triumphant close, let it be declared with unmistakable clarity and unshakable resolve: the age of bureaucracy has outlived its usefulness. Its dusty corridors, its

inherited hierarchies, its fossilised procedures, and its chains of class distinction have no rightful place in the destiny of a people rising, awakening, and reclaiming their power.

For too long, bureaucracy has served as the museum of our ancestors' fears—a shrine to outdated prejudices, a monument to colonial distortions, a guardian of class divisions that dissect the human spirit into ranks, layers, and social castes. Those fears did not begin with colonialism; they were first awakened in antiquity, during the reign of Akhenaten in Kemet, when a single sovereign—intoxicated by absolutism—ruptured the sacred balance of the Black Lands.

In elevating personal revelation above the collective priesthood, Akhenaten replaced interpeer guardianship with unilateral decree. What had been a civilisation governed through moral reciprocity was momentarily reduced to bureaucratic overreach. The priesthoods, who by sacred law stood in interdependent parity with the Pharaoh, were displaced; harmony was fractured; and the continent felt the tremor of division for the first time.

It was into this breach that Aye emerged—of priestly lineage, forged in knowledge, tempered by service. He bore the ancient title *It Netjer*—the God's Father—not as ornament, but as function. This title, older than kingship itself, signified one who stood at the axis of continuity: intermediary between mortal

and divine, custodian of succession, and keeper of systemic balance.

Aye alone possessed the panoramic vision—the bird-eye knowing—of how every institution, every moral thread, every social mechanism interlocked within the whole. His ascension was not conquest but correction. His reform was not rebellion but restoration. In reasserting commicratic order, he restrained the excesses of singular rule and returned governance to its rightful ethicratic geometry.

Yet history, as it often does, betrayed wisdom. Though balance was briefly restored, the doctrine of commicracy was later abandoned in Kemet. And centuries after, colonialism arrived—not as a teacher, but as a trespasser—clothing Africa once more in the same bureaucratic garment that had once torn its spiritual fabric.

What Akhenaten imposed in error, colonialism enforced by design. Bureaucracy was resurrected as an instrument of domination, class-making, and extraction. It taught Africans to fear one another, to obey desks instead of elders, to kneel before procedures instead of principles.

We refuse—yes, we *refuse*—to hand these burdens to the next generation. We refuse to let dead ideologies continue to choke the living. We refuse to let the past govern the future.

Africa stands today at the threshold of a new civilisational possibility. A possibility born not of submission to obsolete systems, but of courage to ignite a new organisational consciousness—a consciousness rooted in commicracy, the universal ethicratic order of horizontal interpeer relations.

Our mission is not political. It is civilisational. It is generational. It is continental. It is human. For the unification of Africa into a single, resonant national body is not a dream of conquest or dominion, but a strategic necessity for survival, prosperity, dignity, and global respect. We seek unity not for grandeur, but for security. Not for spectacle, but for efficiency. Not for nostalgia, but for innovation.

We seek unity so African nations may stand as one sovereign organism—capable of managing its internal affairs, mastering its external relations, and elevating the living conditions of its children with a coherence that bureaucracy could never achieve. Bureaucracy ties the future to the past. Commicracy frees the future to design itself.

Our goal is simple but formidable: to empower the younger generations of Africa to master the protocols of tomorrow, not the paperwork of yesterday; to master adaptive technologies, not administrative labyrinths; to master human development, not human separation. For Africa must not prepare its youth for a

world that no longer exists. Africa must prepare them for a world they must shape.

And hear this truth clearly—the future we envision does not belong only to Africans. It calls to every human being, in every land, of every race, every tongue, every nationality, who longs for a world without class domination and bureaucratic decay. The gates of commicracy are open; its logic is universal; its ethic is human; its promise is shared.

And so, let it be understood: The proposed unitary system of African States shall, by necessity and by conviction, enact the immediate abolition of bureaucracy. Not a gradual erosion, not a timid reform, not a decorative adjustment—abolition. We abolish bureaucracy not out of rage, but out of responsibility. Not out of defiance, but out of alignment with the universal laws that govern all meaningful interaction.

For commicracy is not a theory. It is not a policy. It is not a convenience. It is the natural operating principle of the universe—the architecture of oneness, the ethic of horizontal existence, the grammar by which all beings, all systems, all relationships interact.

To place African society within the universal laws of commicracy is therefore not merely a State governing reform—it is cosmic alignment. It is the repositioning of society into the

flow of natural order. It is the restoration of harmony between governance and human nature.

Let the world hear this declaration: Commicracy is the organisational base of a classless human society. It dissolves the artificial walls that bureaucracy protects. It dismantles the vertical distortions that democracy tolerates. It uproots the inherited fears that oligarchies cultivate. It replaces them with a horizontal civilisation—a civilisation where interpeer relations form the living tissue of society, where equality is not legislated but practised, where unity is not symbolic but structural, and where every human being stands as a sovereign contributor to the collective.

This is the future Africa deserves. This is the future humanity deserves. This is the future that awaits all who dare to transcend the relics of hierarchical governance. Volume-3 ends here—but the mission does not. The call does not fall silent. The vision does not fade.

And so today, the call before us is not new—it is ancestral. We are summoned once more to remove this monstrous garb from our garments—this imported garment stitched from foreign fibres—to cast off the inherited machinery of division, and to return to the ethicratic order that once bound society through interpeer responsibility. Bureaucracy has no place in Africa—not

because Africa rejects order, but because Africa was born with a higher one.

Let us not forget it. Let us not repeat the error of mistaking control for governance, nor procedure for justice. The Great Call to Commicracy is the call to remember who we were—so that we may finally govern as who we are meant to be.

Its flame now belongs to you, to your children, to your communities, to the African continent, and to all who recognise that a new organisational civilisation is both possible and necessary. The era of bureaucracy is ending. The era of commicracy is rising. And we—together—shall build it.

End