

CREATORS, FARMERS, & NESTERS

To see where we need to go, sometimes it is essential to realize where we've come from. Take a moment with me, and rewind back ten thousand years. We'll traverse space as well as time—we'll find ourselves in Catalhoyuk, Turkey.

This is the birthplace of human settlements, as far as we know. The people settled here for good reason—to farm. But farming wasn't necessarily a better way of life; the skeletons of these forefathers speak of malnourished and difficult lives. Hunters and gatherers may have been more nomadic, but their bones speak of a more leisurely, albeit more uncertain, lifestyle.

Why then the appeal of a farmer's life?

I'll throw a few terms your way. Solidity. Stability. Sustenance. Surety. Not absolute, of course—weather and insects and accidents and a whole host of other catalysts could determine the outcome of a crop or of a farming family's wellbeing. Yet there is solidness in the farming way of life. There's a pattern, a cycle, a routine, a rhyme and reason, a comfort. Comfort... a false yet desired sense of control, however small and illusory.

It's the same reason that you might pick a guaranteed promise of \$200,000 as opposed to a one-time gamble of \$1 million or nothing, were I to make you such an offer. Depending on your circumstances, having a secure sum (as opposed to a far greater but far more uncertain amount of money) may be worth more to you. Whether you're a farmer, a stockbroker, or a president... you might have this "farmer's" mindset.

“Creation pulls something from an abyss of nothing. Startups take the something and give it to those in the dark, at first, perhaps, for nothing.” – Ryan Lilly

In order to understand the context of a Founder's actions in creating a new venture (be it a company, association, or movement), one must be fully aware of the role of the Founder as a prime mover within society.

As I see it, there are fundamentally three main classes in our society.

1. **Creators**
2. **Farmers**
3. **Nesters**

Let me clarify. These classifications aren't meant to differentiate between income levels, "blue collar" vs. "white collar" jobs, or the industry or departments in which we operate. They're also not about social capital, levels of formal education, or our understanding of technology. They don't pertain to geography, land ownership, or capital ownership either.

On the contrary, let's define them as follows:

- **Creators** directly create new ideas, offer new information, and seek to pave new avenues of happiness for society; these are the original sources of society's wealth.
- **Farmers** appropriate the wealth of others, whether through political influence, or through forceful coercion or fraud.
- **Nesters** participate in neither of the above activities to a significant degree; they instead contentedly seek the path of least resistance to having their basic needs met.

By defining and understanding this system, we have the ability to unlearn everything that we believe about our places in society and let go of the presumptions that more money or more leisurely tastes or pursuits equate to having more or better "class". No matter the resources currently at our disposal, we can shift "class" with relative ease. What is, then, the main factor that classifies us?

It is our wills.

Each of us is driven by the will to survive, obviously. Our life depends, to a major extent, on our *will* to continue breathing and functioning. Once our basic human needs have been met, however, our preferences and desires begin to differentiate. We are each dominated by a specific drive or desire, a certain passion. And while this can change year by year, or even moment by moment, we generally align ourselves with a particular belief and mission. Our will becomes and upholds our selected purpose in life. For us, it's the "point of our existence".

I wouldn't exactly call this a revolutionary concept. Back in the 1980s, political activist and writer Samuel Edward Konkin III created a system that he called **agorism** in order to describe a similar political/economic class theory. His system essentially boils down to three classes within society: Entrepreneurs, Employees, and the Government.

entrepreneur	non-statist capitalist	statist capitalist
(good)	(neutral)	(bad)
innovator, risk-taker, producer the strength of a free market	holders of capital not necessarily ideologically aware "relatively drone-like non-innovators"	the primary beneficiaries of government controls "the main Evil in the political realm"

I'm not reinventing the wheel with this notion; rather presenting it at different angle that one can make sense of on a personal level. I outline the three key Wills of this world as follows:

- **The Will to Create (creators)**
- **The Will to Control (farmers)**
- **The Will to Comfort (nesters)**

Konkin's Class Theory is very different from other socio-economic lenses, and here's what I like about it: it seems that what matters is not so much the resources that one possesses, but rather the *origin* of those resources. We could say, for instance, that it is not necessarily the sector within which one operates that matters; rather, it's the core internal *drive* that is being followed by that person.

Quite simply, it's a matter of what drives the person to operate within that sector.

For example, the majority of government employees are driven more by a Will to Comfort than by a Will to Control, given the stereotype that government jobs are "cushy" as compared to work in the private sector, and that a minimal investment of effort is required to avoid getting fired. These employees benefit by proxy from state activities yet are relegated to a role without agency within the bowels of the leviathan. This is a very different situation as opposed to the higher echelons of the State-Capital complex, where people work—in a manner that is often cited as "ruthless", "cutthroat", "fiercely competitive", and "single-minded"—to achieve their ends through political influence.

In the same way, a businessperson may exert the monopoly of state power over others through patents, subsidies, or lobbying. Those with a Will to Comfort may start businesses (legal or illegal) not to specifically add value to the world, but because they have no other means of getting their needs for security met (finding employment difficult they may resolve to find a client instead. On the other hand, one with a Will to Comfort may create a business based on the desire to take care of others, and (regardless of whether the business flourishes or not) will ultimately create an environment that resembles more a philanthropic institution rather than a profit-reaping company.

Up to here, however, one can only make gross generalizations. It is very difficult to isolate the core drive of an individual without personally knowing and understanding that particular person. Everyone is different; everyone has a backstory, a reason, and a belief system that is the result of his or her individual life's worth of compounded values and experiences. However, by analyzing a person's actions over time, you could make an educated guess.

Certainly it is possible to gain enough self-knowledge to stratify yourself based on the strongest Will that lies within you, as it lies within each of us.