

# Anti-Capture Protocols for the Continuity Market

## Legal and Technical Enforcement Architecture

---

### Authors

**John Ryder**

Independent Researcher

Conceptual Future Pragmatist

Slovakia

---

### License

**Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC-BY 4.0)**

---

## I. Purpose and Scope

The continuity market describes how markets begin to price reduced systemic uncertainty when social continuity is institutionally produced in PPP space. This creates a predictable and valuable signal.

However, once continuity becomes priceable, **market actors have structural incentives to extract, condition, and monetise the participation that produces it**. Historical precedent demonstrates that without explicit enforcement architecture, capture is not a risk but an inevitability.

This document specifies the **anti-capture protocols** required to ensure that:

1. Continuity remains a **public good**, not an asset class
2. Participation is **never converted into an individual credential**
3. Markets may **observe aggregate effects** but may not **access or condition on causes**
4. Democratic authority permanently controls the market interface

These protocols are not optional safeguards. They are **constitutive requirements** of any legitimate continuity market.

---

## II. Threat Model: How Capture Occurs

Capture follows a predictable progression:

1. **Observation** – Markets notice reduced risk variance
2. **Pricing** – Markets reprice instruments (insurance, credit, assets)
3. **Conditioning** – Access becomes linked to participation evidence
4. **Extraction** – Intermediaries monetise continuity signals
5. **Surveillance** – Participation becomes a comprehensive control layer

The continuity market is valid **only at Stages 1–2**.  
Stages 3–5 represent systemic failure.

Anti-capture architecture must therefore **block progression beyond pricing**.

---

## III. Core Boundary Doctrine

The following doctrine governs all implementations:

**Markets may price aggregate continuity effects.**  
**Markets may not access, infer, condition upon, or monetise individual participation.**

This doctrine is enforced through **four independent layers**:

1. Technical impossibility
2. Legal prohibition
3. Democratic control
4. Constitutional entrenchment

Failure of any one layer compromises the system.

---

## IV. Layer One: Technical Architecture

**(What Cannot Be Collected)**

The most reliable enforcement mechanism is **non-existence**.

### 1. Prohibited Data Structures

The system must not generate, store, or transmit:

- Individual continuity scores
- Behavioural profiles
- Persistent participation histories usable outside local context
- Cross-domain identifiers linking participation to identity
- Real-time or longitudinal tracking data

If such data exists, markets will demand it.

## 2. Permitted Technical Elements

Allowed elements are strictly limited to:

- **Local, peer-verified participation tokens**
- **Purpose-bound verification events** (“was participation sufficient for this local function?”)
- **Non-persistent, non-transferable confirmation signals**

Verification answers *yes/no*, not *how much*, *how often*, or *how well*.

## 3. Aggregation Rules

Any data leaving the local system must be:

- Aggregated above a minimum population threshold
- Time-lagged
- Banded (ranges, not point values)
- Audited by an independent public body

Reverse engineering individual behaviour must be mathematically infeasible.

---

# V. Layer Two: Legal Architecture

## (What Cannot Be Shared or Used)

Technical controls are necessary but insufficient. Markets will pressure for legal access.

### 1. Explicit Prohibitions

The following uses are categorically prohibited:

- Insurance underwriting or pricing based on participation
- Credit scoring, lending decisions, or collateral assessment using continuity data

- Employment screening, promotion, or dismissal based on engagement records
- Housing access, rental pricing, or tenancy decisions using participation signals
- Platform access, ranking, or monetisation based on continuity indicators
- State surveillance, policing, or benefits enforcement via participation systems

## 2. Protected Status

Participation data constitutes a **protected civic status**, analogous to protected characteristics in anti-discrimination law.

Use of such data for exclusion, pricing, or denial of essential services is unlawful *per se*.

## 3. Penalties

Penalties must exceed expected profit:

- Strict liability (intent irrelevant)
- Statutory damages without proof of harm
- Personal liability for senior officers
- Licence suspension or revocation for systemic violations

Weak penalties guarantee capture.

---

# VI. Layer Three: Democratic Control

## (Who Decides Market Access)

Markets do not have standing rights to continuity data.

### 1. Market Interface Authority (MIA)

A democratically accountable body with exclusive authority to:

- Approve any aggregate metrics released externally
- Define thresholds, lags, and aggregation standards
- Audit third-party compliance
- Suspend or revoke market access immediately

### 2. Mandatory Review

- Annual public review of all market interfaces
- Automatic sunset clauses on all data-sharing authorisations
- Public reporting of violations and enforcement actions

### 3. Community Right of Withdrawal

Communities retain the unconditional right to:

- Withdraw from market visibility
- Cease external reporting
- Revert to internal continuity operation

This right must be credible and executable without external permission.

---

## VII. Layer Four: Constitutional Entrenchment

### (What Cannot Be Changed)

Certain rules must be **non-derogable**, even by democratic vote, to prevent capture via political pressure.

These principles must be embedded in founding charters:

- Individual participation data shall not be collected in extractable form
- Participation shall never be mandatory
- Markets shall never condition access on engagement status
- Verification systems shall not operate for profit
- Exit from market visibility shall always remain possible

Why constitutional?

Because once markets depend on continuity pricing, they will seek to rewrite the rules.

---

## VIII. Exit Strategy and Failure Containment

The system must remain viable **without market recognition**.

### 1. Independence Principle

ECE and similar systems derive legitimacy from:

- Lived participation
- Peer verification
- Local stability
- Democratic governance

Not from market validation.

## 2. The Nuclear Option

If capture becomes systemic:

- External reporting ceases
- Market interfaces are severed
- Continuity production continues locally
- Reduced capital access is accepted as the cost of autonomy

This option must remain credible, or it will not deter capture.

---

## IX. Why These Protocols Can Succeed Where Others Failed

Previous systems failed because they:

- Allowed private ownership of verification
- Treated metrics as products
- Depended on market validation for legitimacy
- Lacked enforceable penalties
- Collected individual-level data

The continuity market can avoid this fate **only** by enforcing:

- No individual continuity
- No conditioning
- No extraction
- No ownership
- Permanent exit rights

This is not moral preference.

It is structural necessity.

---

## X. Summary

The continuity market is viable only if **pricing does not become control**.

Anti-capture protocols therefore require:

- Technical impossibility of extraction

- Legal prohibition of conditioning
- Democratic authority over interfaces
- Constitutional protection of boundaries
- Credible independence from markets

If these conditions hold, markets can price stability without owning society.

If they fail, continuity becomes just another asset class — and the system collapses.

There is no middle ground.