



INTELLIGENTISM

Foundational Framework

An open framework for optimizing civilization through better incentives, scientific governance, voluntary institutions, engineering, entrepreneurship, investment, and continuous improvement.

Stewarded by the Institute for Scientific Integrity and Legal Policy

Working Edition • 2026

1. The Foundational Proposition

Intelligentism begins with a simple proposition: many of civilization’s most persistent failures are not failures of human intelligence, technology, or moral aspiration. They are failures of incentive design. Systems reproduce the conduct they reward. When extraction, hoarding, political capture, artificial scarcity, violence, or administrative growth are profitable, those behaviors spread. When investment, invention, engineering, partnership, trade, and problem solving are rewarded, productive capacity expands.

Civilization is a system. Systems can be measured, redesigned, tested, and improved.

Intelligentism therefore treats economics, governance, institutional structure, and public-purpose investment as design problems. It preserves private ownership, markets, entrepreneurship, voluntary exchange, and risk-taking, while proposing new institutional mechanisms that recycle capital and align private success with system-wide prosperity.

2. Core Principles

Principle	Meaning
Open Framework	No final doctrine. Models, terms, institutions, and assumptions remain open to testing and criticism.
Voluntary Participation	Institutional agreements apply only when participants knowingly choose to accept resources and terms.
Productive Freedom	Private enterprise, ownership, investment, trade, and entrepreneurship remain protected.
Scientific Governance	Policies and institutions should publish assumptions, outcomes, failures, audits, and revisions.
Capital Recycling	Returns from institution-supported projects replenish the system and finance future projects.

Mission-Specific Institutions

Institutions should be narrow, transparent, replaceable, and accountable to measurable outcomes.

Continuous Improvement

Rules and organizations must remain revisable rather than becoming permanent through inertia.

Prosperity Across the System

The framework prefers arrangements that expand productive capacity for multiple participants and future generations.

3. What Intelligentism Preserves—and What It Changes

Intelligentism is not organized around a binary contest between capitalism and socialism. It begins from the observation that existing systems contain useful mechanisms and recurring failures. The purpose is not to erase markets or private enterprise, but to create a new design space between uncontrolled extraction and centralized control.

It preserves: Private property, entrepreneurship, markets, investment, trade, personal initiative, contractual freedom, price discovery, and meaningful reward for risk and contribution.

It adds: Voluntary mission institutions, public-purpose capital, transparent performance metrics, shared technology, scientific audit, capital recycling, and replaceable governance.

It discourages: Greed that weakens the system, idle hoarding, monopoly capture, artificial scarcity, rent-seeking, coercion, violence, and destructive competition.

It refuses: The assumption that institutions must be permanent, that administrative growth equals public value, or that economic success must depend on another participant's permanent loss.

4. Win-Win Capitalism

Win-Win Capitalism is the market philosophy operating within the broader Intelligentism framework. It asks whether transactions can be designed so that the inventor, entrepreneur, investor, institution, customer, worker, community, and future system all gain from the same productive event.

This does not require equal benefits or eliminate bargaining. It means that the framework should prefer arrangements in which value creation expands the productive capacity of the system rather than merely transferring control, creating dependence, or manufacturing scarcity.

5. The Voluntary 90/10 Institutional Model

A mission institution may provide grants, contracts, laboratories, technology, patents, data, equipment, compute, manufacturing capacity, regulatory assistance, distribution, market access, or early-stage capital. A participating company uses those resources to create a product, service, or technology.

The participant may retain up to 10% of the project profit. At least 90% returns to the sponsoring institution for reinvestment in future projects.

The structure applies only to projects voluntarily entered into under an Intelligentism institutional agreement. It is not a universal claim on independently created wealth. A person or business that does not accept institutional resources remains outside the arrangement.

Worked Example: Capital Recycling

Stage	Illustrative Amount
Institutional support	\$1,000,000
Project profit	\$5,000,000
Entrepreneur retention at 10%	\$500,000
Return to institution at 90%	\$4,500,000
Potential next-cycle projects at \$1M each	4 full projects, with \$500,000 remaining

One successful project can therefore finance multiple additional experiments. The economic objective is circulation: capital repeatedly funds invention rather than disappearing into a permanent administrative budget or becoming idle financial control.

6. Why Entrepreneurs Participate

The framework only works if participation creates an unusually compelling opportunity. A founder should not exchange most project profit for a small grant and bureaucracy. The institution must provide a commercialization platform that would otherwise be difficult or impossible to assemble.

- Non-dilutive capital and long-duration support
- Laboratories, compute, equipment, data, and patents
- Engineering, scientific, legal, and regulatory expertise

- Manufacturing capacity and procurement contracts
- Distribution, customer introductions, and market access
- Shared services and protection from predatory financing structures
- Reputation, validation, and participation in future projects

Intelligentism is not asking entrepreneurs to work for less. It is seeking to give them access to more.

7. Voluntary, Semi-Autonomous Institutions

Intelligentism proposes a network of specialized institutions focused on measurable areas of prosperity. Participation is optional. Institutions attract founders, researchers, investors, and communities by producing useful outcomes rather than through compulsory affiliation.

Institute for Scientific Integrity	Institute for Legal Policy	Institute for Artificial Intelligence
Institute for Medicine	Institute for Energy	Institute for Water
Institute for Agriculture	Institute for Housing	Institute for Infrastructure
Institute for Transportation	Institute for Education	Institute for Manufacturing
Institute for Robotics	Institute for Space	Institute for Biotechnology
Institute for Materials Science	Institute for Environmental Systems	Institute for Entrepreneurship
Institute for Economic Measurement	Institute for Constitutional Systems	

Each institution should have a limited charter, transparent budget, published objectives, open metrics, external audit, defined appeal process, replaceable leadership, and sunset conditions. No institution should be permitted to convert a narrow mission into permanent general authority.

8. Scientific Governance

Scientific governance begins with the possibility of error. Every policy may be wrong. Every model may be incomplete. Every metric may generate unintended behavior. Every institution may need redesign.

- Mission and governing charter
- Leadership and conflicts of interest
- Funding sources and active projects
- Grant recipients and material contract terms
- Performance metrics and project failures
- Audit results and model assumptions
- Method changes and public reports
- Appeal procedures and sunset conditions

The purpose is not government by scientists. It is governance that behaves scientifically: transparent about assumptions, open to falsification, able to publish failure, and willing to change when evidence changes.

9. Government Reduction as a Long-Term Design Objective

Intelligentism explores whether many functions currently performed by permanent bureaucracies could migrate gradually to specialized, transparent, semi-autonomous institutions. The long-term theoretical objective is to reduce conventional government activity by as much as 99 percent—but only after replacement systems have proved that they can perform those functions more effectively, lawfully, and safely.

A narrow constitutional structure would remain responsible for fundamental rights, due process, courts, contract enforcement, public safety, national sovereignty, legal continuity, and protection against coercion and fraud.

The framework favors pilots, transition plans, constitutional safeguards, public consent, and demonstrated replacement—not abrupt dismantling.

10. Productive and Destructive Competition

Productive Competition

Destructive Competition

Improves quality

Promotes sabotage

Reduces cost

Rewards misinformation

Reveals better methods

Creates monopoly capture

Expands choice

Destroys useful capacity

Accelerates innovation

Converts rivalry into coercion

Challenges institutional failure

Uses political power to exclude

11. Rights and Safeguards

- Private ownership remains lawful
- Participation is voluntary and prospective
- Independent enterprise remains permitted
- Institutions cannot impose retroactive claims
- Contract terms must be understandable
- Conflicts of interest must be disclosed
- Participants require appeal and dispute rights
- Data and civil liberties must be protected
- Institutional support cannot require political obedience
- No central authority should control all institutions
- Institutions must be auditable, replaceable, and subject to sunset

Intelligentism must never become a justification for central control disguised as scientific management.

12. Practical Applications

Clean Water

A water institution provides laboratories, filtration patents, testing, and regulatory support. A private engineering team develops a modular purification system. The team earns a meaningful return; the institutional share finances rural systems and further research.

Medical Diagnostics

A medical institution provides clinical datasets, hospital partnerships, compute, and validation. A startup creates a low-cost diagnostic platform. Recycled returns fund preventive tools, rare-disease research, and additional trials.

Energy Storage

An energy institution supplies materials research, patent access, pilot manufacturing, and grid testing. A company commercializes a battery system. Institutional returns finance new energy companies and shared laboratories.

Housing

A housing institution provides open designs, automated construction technology, procurement contracts, and manufacturing support. Builders lower costs while recycled profit finances more production and infrastructure.

Artificial Intelligence

An AI institution provides compute, foundation models, evaluation systems, and distribution. A team builds manufacturing software. Returns support the next generation of AI entrepreneurs.

Agricultural Automation

An agriculture institution supports robotics that reduce water use, fertilizer waste, and crop loss. The company gains access to major infrastructure while the institution funds more agricultural tools.

13. Implementation Roadmap

- 1. Publish** — Definitions, foundational papers, legal structures, governance principles, criticism, and responses.
- 2. Model** — Capital simulations, incentive testing, failure scenarios, institutional comparisons, and stress tests.
- 3. Pilot** — Small grant programs, technology licensing, research challenges, transparent 90/10 contracts, and open engineering projects.
- 4. Measure** — Financial returns, capital recycled, innovation generated, entrepreneur satisfaction, social outcomes, failures, and unintended effects.
- 5. Expand** — University partnerships, additional institutions, international research, shared infrastructure, and larger contracts.

6. Standardize — Open institutional standards, audits, participation agreements, data schemas, certification, and public APIs.

14. Research Questions

- Would a 90/10 structure attract exceptional entrepreneurs?
- What resources make participation compelling enough?
- How should project profit, loss, and attribution be defined?
- How should intellectual property be allocated?
- How do institutions avoid monopoly, political capture, or expert capture?
- How are leaders selected and removed?
- How are disputes resolved?
- Which metrics best represent prosperity?
- Can recycled capital outperform annual taxation in selected functions?
- Which public functions can migrate safely, and which must remain constitutional?
- How should the framework respond to war, disaster, or systemic crisis?
- How can experimentation preserve dissent, privacy, and minority rights?

15. The Role of ISILP

The Institute for Scientific Integrity and Legal Policy is a private foundation dedicated to researching, developing, testing, publishing, and responsibly stewarding Intelligentism. ISILP is not intended to become the permanent ruler of the system. Its role is to maintain an open framework, sponsor research and pilots, coordinate expert review, publish transparent findings, develop standards, encourage competing implementations, and protect the framework from misrepresentation.

16. Invitation

The systems inherited from the past were not designed for artificial intelligence, autonomous machines, global digital networks, advanced biotechnology, or abundance at technological scale. They solved important problems and created new ones. Intelligentism asks whether civilization can examine its incentives with the same seriousness used to examine a bridge, a medical treatment, a spacecraft, or a computer system.

We can preserve freedom without preserving every failure. We can reward entrepreneurship without rewarding extraction. We can build institutions without making them permanent.

Intelligentism is an invitation to economists, entrepreneurs, investors, engineers, scientists, lawyers, mathematicians, developers, universities, foundations, students, independent thinkers, journalists, and critics. The framework should grow through evidence, implementation, dissent, and continuous improvement—not through demands for ideological belief.