**Commentary on The Code**

The Multiversalist Code provides just enough guidance to standardize organized practice of Multiversalism in a way that will consistently work well without being overly binding. The intent is for churches to creatively extend what is provided. There are good reasons why what is included in the code cannot be changed.

1. The careful design of the system cannot be destroyed by foolish tampering. It is possible to make mistakes and add bad elements to local practice, but since the core code is immutable those mistakes can always be dealt with.

2. All Multiversalists everywhere have common practices.

3. The core rules are beyond the reach of malign tampering. The pigs can’t change the rules. Have faith that the code was composed with nothing but the best intentions and doesn’t need fixing. Any attempt to fix it indicates ill intent. There’s plenty of flexibility to allow experiments and to permit adaptation to needs and conditions. You can probably do what you want to do using the system as designed, and if you can’t you probably shouldn’t be doing it.

In this piece I will explain and expand upon the code and offer suggestions for churches. First, let’s go through it rule by rule.

*Rule 1. A Multiversalist is a member of a fellowship. Organized Multiversalism is practiced using this code and council resolutions stemming from it. This code has greater authority than any resolution of any Multiversalist council and it cannot be*

*changed.*

“Fellowship” hasn’t been defined yet but either that will put you off and you read no further (in which who cares about you) or else you’ll read on and find out what that means. It shouldn’t be a problem, for most people. This is like a suspenseful hook, if anything. “What in the world is a fellowship?” is the worst thing most anyone might think. It sounds like something nice, a friendly association of some kind. So you have to join something to be a member of it. Makes sense, right?

There is no practice of Multiversalism alone. You can’t go around claiming to be a Multiversalist if you aren’t in a fellowship. I mean, you can, but you will be a liar. Multiversalism is defined by the Handout, including the Code and the Code says that if you are not in a fellowship you are not a Multiversalist. Hopefully this will encourage people to join or form fellowships. This will make organized Multiversalism viable, to the benefit of those participating, society generally, and God.

“Council” hasn’t been defined either, and in that sense what applies to premature use of the word “fellowship” also applies to premature use of the word “council”. It sounds like a governing body of some kind, and it is. Councils adopt resolutions, and those resolutions are subordinate to the code. Resolutions can change and can vary, the code is the same everywhere and always. It is through resolutions that all that adaptation and customization and invention can be done.

This system resembles the constitution of a state, compared to statutes. The difference is that constitutions are usually difficult to change, but not impossible. The code cannot be changed. In a state this would be bad design. States have different tasks before them than churches. An unchangeable constitution would force people to either misinterpret and ignore it as it becomes increasingly obsolete, or else it would eventually force them to abandon and overthrow it. Only by being very simple and procedural could a fixed constitution avoid such a fate by relegating almost everything to statutes. The limited purpose of churches makes it possible to design such a “constitution” that can anticipate everything necessary in advance by limiting what it is designed for. The code is designed to make functional and adaptable hierarchies of councils, and so long as it is used properly it will do so. If your church has additional purposes in mind, enact them with resolutions.

*Rule 2. Upon first confessing to a fellowship after induction, and on other occasions established by each council, every Multiversalist will recite this covenant: “As a Multiversalist I vow to join with others in a Multiversalist fellowship, abiding the Multiversalist Code, counseling as guided by Multiversalist Doctrine, and heeding the counsel of my fellowship.”*

Like “fellowship” and “council” the code uses the terms “confession” and “induction” before defining them. In fact, the meaning of “induction” is only ever indicated by implication in Rule 7. But both are familiar words. Confession is a well known Roman Catholic practice, but here it is implied that the Multiversalist version is confession to a fellowship (whatever that is) rather than a priest. This implies much.

This rule just provides a statement a person must say before a group. It must be recited at least once, shortly after first joining a church at the most basic level. But resolutions can establish other requirements for it. What is essential for the system to work is that everybody make the statement at some point. That’s all the code requires.

The covenant is recited before the new fellowship, but it is also a vow. When you join a fellowship and a church you are not just making a behavioral covenant with your fellow members, you are making a vow (or claiming to make a vow) that you will keep that covenant. God is also involved, not just as a witness, the way it would be with a mere oath, but as a party. Compare to marriage vows. You are claiming to have involved God in your compact with your fellow members.

There is no enforcement mechanism stated here. Fellowships have the power to expel members, and higher councils can expel whole sectors. Consequences are possible for those who don’t abide the code, or respect the doctrine and each other. But you will note that belief is not called for. Nobody is saying, “I believe the entire doctrine.” You are saying you will counsel others in accordance with doctrine. This is not a creed or dogma. It is a model for teachings, a doctrine. You will apply the doctrine in what you tell others and since others are doing the same and you are “heeding” them then you are heeding the doctrine. Whatever “heed” means. Does it mean you will do whatever you are told? It means you will take it seriously and have a good excuse. There’s a difference between full-fledged resolutions and mere individual advice you may get from comments upon confessions. Your fellows may individually counsel you, with good justifications based on the doctrine, and while you should consider this seriously you need not do as you are told. But if a resolution is actually adopted by a majority, that can’t be heeded without actual compliance. If you can’t take the heat, get out of the kitchen. Failure to heed resolutions is grounds for expulsion. But then, anything is. As is explained later, fellowships can expel anyone and no specific criteria are given. The only guideline is the general one, Rule 15. If expulsion is not for a good reason, the fellowship is violating the code. Who guards the guardians? Why, higher ranking guardians. Thus, hierarchy has a function.

*Rule 3. Multiversalists are organized hierarchically. A synod is made up of leagues. A league is made up of orders. An order is made up of parishes. A parish is made up*

*of fellowships. A fellowship is made up of individual Multiversalist members.*

*Synods, leagues, orders, parishes, and fellowships are called sectors. A church is a*

*sector that is not a part of any larger sector. Every Multiversalist will join a*

*fellowship if practical. Every fellowship will join a parish if practical. Every parish*

*will join an order if practical. Every order will join a league if practical. Every league*

*will join a synod if practical. Within a church all the synods are on one level, all the*

*leagues are on one level, all the orders are on one level, all the parishes are on one*

*level, and all the fellowships are on one level.*

*Each sector of a church is governed by a group of members called a council. The*

*council of a fellowship consists of all the members of the fellowship. Councils at all*

*levels above fellowship consist of one representative elected from each directly*

*subordinate council, one leader of the council normally appointed by the leader of*

*the directly superior council, and one leader from each directly subordinate council.*

*The highest-level council of a church is called the high council, and it elects its*

*leader.*

Mostly, this just defines a standard nested hierarchy by assigning names. I guess the concept “sector” needs to be crystal clear. In standard terms used to describe hierarchies it is any “leaf node,” “subtree,” or “tree.” Every group with one of these assigned names is a “sector.” A “sector” is not a level of organization or a certain type of grouping. All of these are sectors. Even a church is a sector, though it is not subordinate to any other sector. Again, a church is not a level of organization, it is a sector that is not subordinate to any other. It can be a fellowship church, a parish church, an order church, a league church, or a synod church. Three friends can get together and form a fellowship church (exempted from the normal size minimums defined in rule 10, by virtue of being a high council).

As voting subordinate sectors, the minimum populations at these levels (based on rule 10) are: Fellowship 10, Parish 200, Order 6000, League 240,000, Synod 12 million. It may seem overly aspirational to be planning how to organize millions of people, but it can’t hurt to plan ahead and have such “problems” never happen (what would it matter, then?) but failure to plan for it could create problems, so I’ve built it in. For all practical purposes, the most important level is simple fellowships. If they can organize into parishes, that’s great. That’s enough to get some kind of supervision and larger scale organization. Attaining “order” level and getting to write your own Rule 24 mainly will serve as a distant goal. It gets harder as a church grows because rule 10 mandates an organization that grows increasingly flat as it gets larger. I’ll discuss it in more depth farther along.

What is particularly important in the first paragraph is the mandate to join. Combined with rules 10 through 12 (especially the last sentence of rule 11), you might wonder why a small church would advertise its existence. Why not hide so you don’t get annexed? The answer is rule 3. A church of any size has a duty to join a larger church if practical. Hiding is evidence of an effort to avoid that duty. It is a violation of the rules, an act of apostasy. Certainly, refusal to join can be justified for many reasons (too far away, incompatible culture), but simply hiding to avoid annexation should be hard to justify.

Like everything else, there’s no ultimate enforcement mechanism other than that churches can declare each other apostate (rule 12). Presumably churches will emerge that take it upon themselves as a mission to review other churches. Such reviewing services will depend on their own reputation, so they will be honest. They will earn authoritative status and guard it zealously.

The names of the levels might need some explanation. “Fellowship” comes straight from Unitarian Universalism. It isn’t particularly religious sounding, but could be religious. In UUism many smaller and less religious congregations call themselves “fellowships,” and there’s also a concept of “fellowshipping” of clerics. Multiversalism lacks clerics, so members of a fellowship serve each other in that role instead. And they are fellowshipped together. But Multiversalist fellowships are actually closer to the scale of what UUism would call “small groups.”

UUism has something called “clusters” which are simply geographical groupings of a handful of congregations. In Multiversalism, they have a larger number of elements and the elements are smaller. Plus, the word doesn’t sound good in a title. Imagine calling your church “Springfield Multiversalist Cluster.” So the religious sounding word “parish” was used instead. It’s also a county in Louisiana, so it should be cool. “Order” is more ambiguous. The names are designed to avoid relying on superficial appearances, like traditional religious names. A “department” is religious if it practices religion, and something called a “church” can be little more than a corporation. The names are picked for their ability to represent either a hierarchical level or an independent entity. “Department” and “branch” might be good names for subordinate sectors, but not for whole churches. Similarly, overly geographical names, such as “district” and “region” have been avoided. “Order,” in particular, reflects the idea that a specialized cultural brand of Multiversalist practice might organize globally on the basis of affinity rather than proximity. Thus, an order can be equivalent to either a diocese or a monastic order. “League” is another generic level name. Other than parish, synod is the only specifically religion like name. If a Multiversalist synod ever exists, Multiversalism will have made it and can’t be accused of pretending to be religious just by adopting outward forms associated with other religions. If a synod ever exists, Multiversalism will authentically be a world religion.

The groups that actually meet and make decisions for sectors are councils, and the second paragraph of this rule defines them. The definition is compact, but sufficient. A fellowship and the council of the fellowship are the same thing. It is a group of people who meet and do the various things described here. Participation in a fellowship is the core purpose and means of organized Multiversalism. Every fellowship has a leader (appointed to it by the leader of its parish, if the fellowship is not also a high council) and a representative (“elected” by the fellowship council). Above fellowship level a simple pattern repeats at all levels. A parish council consists of the representative of every fellowship in the parish, plus the leaders of all those fellowships, plus it will have its own leader (appointed by the order leader, unless the parish council is also the high council of a parish church). The parish council will also elect its own representative to the order council.

No limits are specified here, but the representative of any council must be a member of the council. It could be the same person as the leader of the council, it could be one of the persons who are on the council by virtue of being leaders of its subordinate councils, or it could be one of the representatives elected to that council by a subordinate council. But it can’t be some random person off the street or someone from a completely different sector or a member of some subordinate sector governed by the council who has not been selected for membership in the governing sector council. This is pretty clear according to rule 8.

A parish council is a group made up of the representatives and leaders of all the fellowships. Leaders and representatives haven’t been described yet in detail, but the way they are spoken of here is an adequate definition for now. Someone elected and someone appointed. Leaders are appointed by higher leaders, and representatives are elected by councils. Joining it all at the very top of each church is the high council, which elects both its leader and its representative. What does the representative of a high council do? Nothing well defined in the code, but presumably they are emissaries, engaged in whatever diplomacy between churches may be established by resolutions. For instance, when three same size churches merge to form a new church it is the representatives of those high councils who actually hold an impromptu founding meeting of the new high council. Can they do this without approval of their high councils for the merger? Well, technically no. All decisions of councils are made by resolutions. Not yet being representatives to an existing higher council they can’t act independently. The question of the power of resolutions to delegate autocratic authority will be addressed later.

Above parish level, the same pattern applies. Only fellowships are different. From parish up the council is made up of appointed leaders and elected representatives, all members of the council ex officio. Only fellowships can induct members off the street or expel members on their own.

*Rule 4. Fellowship councils must have a regular meeting every week. Parish councils must have a regular meeting every month. All other councils must have a regular*

*meeting every year. Councils can set the time, place and date of their regular*

*meetings. If not changed by resolution, each regular meeting will be at the same*

*time and place as the most recent one, on the same day of the period (same day of*

*the week, month, or year). A regular meeting starts at the prescribed time and*

*place, regardless of who is present, and can only be ended by an adjournment*

*resolution. Any fellowship member, other than the leader, who attends no part of*

*two successive regular meetings is no longer a member.*

The regular governance meeting, or just “regular meeting” is the core of what a council does. It is a mandatory meeting that occurs on a regular basis and has a very restricted purpose of its own, but the existence of these meetings also serves other purposes. Even if governance meetings aren’t adopting any resolutions, they are mustering all the members together. As long as you have everybody getting together, you can piggyback other meetings and activities off of that. And if these meetings are mandatory, they are a way of knowing who is actually an involved member and who needs to be removed from the rolls. In turn, the existence of automatic removal for poor attendance at regular meetings provides individuals a way to resign without any elaborate protocols or bureaucracy. Just don’t show up. You could also propose a resolution to be removed from the member list, and it would be faster, but why bother?

Expulsion for missing two meetings in a row may seem harsh, but it’s too easy to just petition to be inducted again. Or get inducted into another fellowship. If you move or for some other reason want to transfer to another part of a church, or even a different church, you can do that

Others may think letting members skip any meetings is too easy. Things happen. Missing one meeting is understandable. It allows people to take almost two week trips out of town. It allows people to be sick now and then, or just not feeling it, or to have car trouble. Or to have other things come up that take priority, such as emergencies or work requirements. More than two is too easy, less than two is too hard, two and only two is perfect.

How is the mandate for the regular meetings enforced? It is enforced by the fact that the code, right here, says the meeting will occur whether or not anyone is there. It isn’t valid to change the meeting time to outside of the time period, so if an attempt is made to do so the meeting still occurs at the previously established time and place. A council can change its meeting time and meeting place, but only to within the regular time span. A council that last met at 9 am on Saturday the 14th in the bandstand in the park will next meet at 9am on Saturday the 21st in the bandstand in the park. If, at the meeting on the 14th or an impromptu meeting on the morning of the 15th, they schedule their next meeting to be on Sunday the 15th at noon at Dennys, then their next meeting will be on Sunday the 15th at noon at Dennys. But if they schedule their next regular meeting to be Sunday the 22nd, then that doesn’t change anything about the meeting the code requires them to have during the week running from the 15th to the 21st. They’ve merely rescheduled for the subsequent week, and the next meeting will still be Saturday the 21st at 9. This rule doesn’t need enforcement because any violation of it has no meaning. It cannot be violated, so nobody enforces it.

Regular meetings, unlike impromptu meetings, are defined as occurring at a specific place. The place can be any size or defined any way. It can be the crater Hellas on Mars. Such a meeting would be ill attended, despite the large capacity of the venue. Everybody would get credited with an absence, so everybody would absolutely have to make the next meeting (presumably scheduled by impromptu meeting) or be automatically expelled. Everybody. This is a good way to expel everybody who is absent at a meeting: schedule the next one for an impossible location. Of course, you could just expel them by resolution instead, but that would be questionable. Using this trick you don’t have to justify anything with doctrine, other than the choice of venue. If you are being dishonest you might as well go all the way and make up some pretext.

Leaders of councils are appointed by higher leaders (basically as spies or monitors), and can remain members of other councils as well, so they have to be exempted from expulsion for attendance so they can attend their home council meetings if they have conflicting schedules. Or really, the reason is that leaders are appointed by higher leaders with no other factor involved: not the council led, and not any automatic mechanism the council can influence.

Governance meetings, such as regular meetings and impromptu meetings, consist of nothing but members proposing resolutions and then getting them voted on. Rule 17 details this. Governance meetings should be quick formalities necessary to support the real point of everything: the other fellowship meetings that follow regular meetings. There needs to be an official way of making decisions, but so much is cut out of organized Multiversalist practice by Rule 13 that not many decisions will need to be made. Most of the time governance meetings will function largely as a roll call, most members just saying “remarks complete.” Even when a resolution is proposed, voting is immediate and without debate. That should speed things up too.

It's implied, but not explicitly stated, that councils have one and only one regular meeting per week. A council can schedule and hold a second regular meeting, but it won’t be a regular meeting it will be an advance planned impromptu meeting with improper enforcement of meeting location rules, and will risk taking void actions. We know a meeting that isn’t a regular meeting or an impromptu meeting cannot make resolutions because of rule 6. One regular meeting per time period may be implied, but resolutions being valid only from regular or impromptu meetings is definitely spelled out. One per period, just do it that way.

Regular meetings start on time and don’t end until adoption of a resolution to adjourn. They are not dependent on quorum and nobody calls them to order. Speakers proceed in list order. Members who are not present get a turn to speak anyway, and will presumably be stood down because they aren’t saying anything. If a resolution ends the meeting before you get a turn to speak, vote against it and maybe try to get higher on the list, however that is determined. More on that later.

*Rule 5. All councils can also hold impromptu meetings. Whenever a majority of voting members of a council are within five meters of one member, that member may convene an impromptu meeting by saying “I convene a meeting.” An impromptu meeting continues until a majority of voting members are no longer within five meters of the convener.*

Impromptu meetings exist because there are many possible situations when a council may want to adopt resolutions before their next regular meeting. One example may be new councils that have never met. They have no “last meeting” to provide a default time and place, and they have never met to adopt a resolution to set a first time and place for a regular meeting. They must use an impromptu meeting to get things started.

New churches are initially created at impromptu meetings. This is perfectly legitimate without any need for a special kind of meeting to establish a new organization. The implicit assumption of the code, especially rules 7 and 17, is that a potential council exists wherever there is a list of names. If there is a list of names, those are members of a potential council. If a majority of the members are within a 5 meter radius, one of them can convene an impromptu meeting. Then with resolutions, they can name the council (the high council of an embryonic fellowship church) and schedule a first regular meeting. They could also rearrange the list, or leave it as is, accepting the existing first and second names as the leader and representative respectively. However, due to the last sentence of rule 6, this rearrangement would expire at the end of the next regular meeting. When a resolution expires like that the status quo ante is restored. So any changes to the membership list made at an impromptu meeting must be ratified at a regular meeting. The same applies to the naming of the church by an initial impromptu meeting.

A word about naming. “Fellowship” or the like shouldn’t be part of the name of a sector because the sector won’t always be a fellowship or whatever. That size designation can be added much like adding a title to a person’s name. “Church” is also questionable. After all, what if a church is annexed? It is no longer a church. And again, the designation is part of the name like a title. Geographic names are good. “Springfield Multiversalist” is a good sector name. It can call itself Springfield Multiersalist Church until it gets annexed, at which point it becomes just Springfield Multiversalist Parish (or Fellowship, or Order, or whatever).

Another use of impromptu meetings is to immediately enact resolutions recommended by a drafting meeting. If a quorum exists, you can just go ahead and do it right there.

Another use of impromptu meeting is to deal immediately with disasters. What if the normal meeting place is no longer available or accessible? A new meeting place can only be established by holding an impromptu meeting. Or what if the sector has been expelled from its church and has become independent? It might be important to hold an immediate meeting to deal with that.

The convener things is self-explanatory. Any member, any place, any time, can say, “I convene a meeting.” If a majority of voting members of the council are present within 5 meters of that person, the convener, then the meeting has a quorum and it starts instantly. The place of the meeting is a volume 5 meters in radius around the convener. If the convener moves, so does the place of the meeting. Unlike a regular meeting, an impromptu meeting ends when it loses quorum, when a majority of voting members is no longer present. Presumably it can also be ended by a resolution, but the convener has no power over it once the meeting is convened. In fact, the convener cannot leave the place of the meeting because the convener is the reference by which that place is defined. Cycles of speakers proceed through the list until quorum is lost.

If your fellowship has 10 voting members, 6 of them can make a quorum to hold a meeting, and 4 of those can be a quorum of those present to adopt a resolution. If you are at a meeting where your presence allows a quorum to exist so a minority of voters can adopt bad resolutions, all you have to do is walk out. That may be more powerful than staying to vote against it. The meeting ends as soon as quorum is lost. Instantly, even during a voting minute.

Are impromptu meetings unfair because they allow a bare majority of members to hold a meeting the others didn’t get a chance to attend and know about? If your members are people who would do a thing like that you should expel them. At any rate, if an impromptu meeting is planned for such shady business, the odds are good one member of those in the know will let the cat out of the bag. If the impromptu meeting made important decisions, such as changing the next regular meeting, the cat is again likely to get out of the bag. A majority has to be there, and that’s plenty of people for one of them to be decent. So you will get a chance, at the next regular meeting, to reverse anything they did. If you can get a majority. And if you can’t, why do you want minority rule?

*Rule 6. Resolutions are decisions of the council adopting them. Resolutions may only be*

*proposed by voting members at regular and impromptu governance meetings. If*

*adopted by vote of a majority of voting members present, a resolution takes effect*

*at the end of the meeting. Resolutions adopted later take precedence over*

*resolutions adopted earlier, superseding them where they conflict. Resolutions*

*adopted by impromptu meetings expire at the end of the next regular meeting.*

To translate from Roberts Rules format, proposing a resolution is “making a motion.” Rule 17 details the procedures (rules of order), though. What’s happening here in Rule 6 is the designation of adopted resolutions as decisions of a council. It is what the group has decided collectively. The collection of all past resolutions expresses the will of the council, its policies, decisions, requests, plaudits, reprobation, statements of intent, and supplemental rules. Citing a resolution is citing the will of the council.

Only two kinds of meetings provide opportunities to propose and adopt resolutions: the two kinds of governance meetings. Only voting members can propose or vote on resolutions. These rules could have created more categories of status, such as members allowed to stand down speakers and propose resolutions, but not vote on resolutions. But there are only three categories of persons who may be at a council meeting: non-members, non-voting members, and voting members. Non-voting members have a right to attend and speak in turn only, voting members have full rights, and non-members have no guaranteed right to speak or even attend meetings (though enforcement of meeting security depends on control of the venue and what structures, such as telephone equipped sergeants at arms, that the council has put in place with prior resolutions—but that need not be detailed here; this stuff is roll your own.)

Resolutions take effect at the end of meetings so that they can be reconsidered. If a resolution is adopted during a meeting it may affect procedures in such a way that it will make it more difficult to change the decision. For instance, members could have their voting rights taken away. They have until the end of the meeting to persuade others to reconsider, and they can vote for their own reinstatement until then. This rule also makes it easier to sort out rules that affect each other. They are adopted during the meeting in sequential order, and they take effect at the end of the meeting. This applies even to a resolution to adjourn. It takes effect at the end of the meeting, which it causes. It’s simultaneous.

Later resolutions taking precedence is necessary for rules to be changeable. It’s also sufficient. With this clarified, there’s no need to have a hierarchy of motion types or tabling of motions or any of that mess. You don’t have to prohibit bringing up the same topic twice in one meeting. You don’t have to prohibit one meeting from affecting another: they can’t supersede the code, and if the code is in place the later meeting can reverse anything. None of that is needed. Later is stronger than earlier. Simple.

Impromptu meeting decisions expire at the end of the next regular meeting because it’s important to encourage using regular meetings to do things, rather than impromptu meetings. To make a lasting resolution you have to do it again at the regular meeting. Using an impromptu meeting might be necessary sometimes, but since it is going to be done redundantly twice regardless, why not wait for the regular meeting?.

Now, the question of delegation of dictatorial powers. Suppose a council makes a resolution like “John Smith is now our King and may make decisions on our behalf. What John Smith says is what we say.” The council has decided they want to do that, and they can give John Smith the title King, and claim that what he says is what they say, is the will of the council. But it’s not. The resolution just says it’s going to be called that. It is resolutions that are decisions of a council. Councils can delegate execution authority to individuals, but not decision making authority. The council might decide to keep non-members out of a meeting, and appoint someone to make it happen, then that person is acting on the decision of the council, not making independent decisions for it. But the council cannot authorize someone to decide whether or not to keep out non members *as a decision of the council*. If it authorizes such a decision, it is authorizing it as an individual decision. The person who throws people out based on being authorized to decide may have the permission of the council, but will not be acting on its behalf unless the council has taken it upon itself to specifically exclude some particular class of people, such as non-members or people wearing hats. When excluding those people, and only those people, the sergeant at arms is executing the will of the council—but not deciding it. Councils cannot delegate decision making authority.

When non-governance meetings make decisions, such as when a drafting meeting decides to recommend a resolution text to the next governance meeting, that is technically a decision of the meeting, not a decision of the council. A non-governance meeting is sort of like a committee of the whole.

*Rule 7. The members of a council are those persons on the list of members of the*

*council. The first on the list is the leader, and the second is the representative. In meetings, members take turns to speak in the order they appear on the list. By resolution, a fellowship council can induct members, expel or change the positions of members other than the leader, and control voting privileges. Councils above fellowship level control voting rights but all members are ex officio.*

Any list of names is a potential council. When a majority of the people on that list hold a meeting and name the council it becomes a sector (a governed body, an association). That council can then resolve to rearrange the member list, except that only a high council has any control over the leader. Selecting a representative is essentially just rearranging the list by plugging the new representative into the second spot and moving everybody else down.

A member list isn’t necessarily a specific piece of paper, it is the sequenced set of names (wherever it is written, or maybe wherever it exists in human memory) that has been designated as the official listing by resolution of the council. Maybe councils should appoint someone as recorder, and require that the current member official list be posted and circulated, but that isn’t necessary. A list exists before the council can exist, and resolutions that change it are part of the record. This includes additional information that may be appended to “the list.”

Resolutions can remove the default “voting” status and leaders can designate probationary status. These aren’t reflected in list order, but might be recorded beside names on any physical list.

There’s a natural control on the power of councils to deprive members of voting status. Otherwise, a cabal with a bare majority could make its power unanimous by depriving all others of voting power. The limit on that sort of behavior (other than ethical limits) is that a council’s status in the larger organization is based on the number of voting members it has. A council with too few voting members has no voting representative in higher councils. A council with very few voting members has to disband. You might deprive very new members of voting rights initially, make earning them part of a rite of passage. You might punish misbehavior by fundamentally valuable members by temporarily depriving them of voting rights. But wholesale use of disenfranchisement for political purposes is self-defeating. For one thing, those denied voting rights will just walk away and not be members at all unless they understand and accept that there’s some good and fair reason for it.

Inducting a member is simply adopting a resolution to add them to the list. Expelling a member is simply adopting a resolution to remove them from the list. Selecting a representative is simply moving a member’s position to second on the list. Selecting the leader, in a high council, is simply moving a member’s position to first on the list. A council’s resolutions can also rearrange the rest of the list, the mere speaking order.

*Rule 8. Each council has a representative, who is the member appearing second on the list of members. The representative of a council is ex officio a member of the immediately superior council. A council’s representative serves in office until no longer listed as a council member, or until replaced by selection of some other member to that position. Other than that the leader of any council is always a voting member of that council, only representatives of immediately subordinate councils can be voting members of councils above fellowship level.*

Representatives are members of higher councils by virtue of being the selected representative of their council, the second on the council’s member list. That’s what’s meant by “ex officio.” In practice, the rightful representative of a newly selected representative of a lower council will not appear on the member list of the higher council until the higher council knows about it. The exact procedure is that when it is time for the turn of the previous representative to speak in the higher council, either the former representative (if present) speaks and informs the higher council of the change, or else the new representative speaks and announces the change. Bolstering this claim is one of the rights and responsibilities of the leader of the lower council. When the lower council changes its representative, the leader of that lower council should attend the next meeting of the higher council and speak to confirm the validity of the change, or perhaps to refute the claim of any pretender. It is the duty of the higher council to accept such claims. The change at the lower level is sufficient, the higher council has no say in the matter. If there is an irregularity such as conflicting claims by the new representative, the leader, and the former representative, then the change should be accepted provisionally, with the dubious claimant afforded only non-voting membership until confirmed. In such cases it is incumbent on the higher council to resolve a plan for how to investigate. If there is even one claim, and no conflict, the change should be accepted unproblematically. A total stranger could show up, and if the former representative or leader is not there to object then that stranger needs to be accepted as a member of the higher council.

Terms of office are indefinite. Even if a representative dies they still hold office until removed from membership by resolution or automatically by failure to attend two meetings in a row or until someone else is placed in the office by a resolution. If a representative is automatically removed from membership without a replacement being selected, the third on the member list becomes the second on the member list just by virtue of how lists work. No rule is necessary, number three becomes number two and thus is the council’s representative until someone else becomes number two on the list, by whatever means.

Councils above fellowship level (“higher councils”) do not decide who their members will be. Combining rule 3 and rule 8 the standard is this: A higher council’s members include: (1) the council’s own leader, either elected from within from among existing members or else appointed into the council by a higher leader, (2) leaders of immediately subordinate councils, who are appointed by the leader rather than selected by resolution, and (3) representatives of immediately subordinate councils, who are selected by resolution of those councils. Of those three categories, the first is always a voting member, the third are never voting members (and neither first or third can be removed by resolution). The second are voting members by default, but can be deprived of voting rights (but not membership) by resolution. The voting members of a higher council are only the council’s own leader and any representatives of immediately subordinate councils that have not been deprived of voting rights by resolution of the council itself. A higher council cannot take in members off the street and cannot give voting rights to those who are its members by virtue of being leaders of subordinate councils.

*Rule 9. Each church has a leader, who is the first person on the member list of the high council. Every council subordinate to the high council has a leader appointed by the leader of the immediately superior council. The leader of any council always has the rights of a voting member, which cannot be taken away by resolution. Only by being a leader may be a person be a member of more than one council on the same level. A council’s leader serves in office until replaced by appointment of some other person to that position. Leaders of immediately subordinate councils are non-voting members of immediately superior councils. The leader of a council may designate up to half the members as probationary. A probationary member may not be selected as the representative of a council.*

Leaders, other than of the high council, are appointed by immediate higher leaders. In a synod, the leader of a fellowship is appointed by the leader of the parish, the leader of a parish is appointed by the leader of the order, the leader of an order is appointed by the leader of the league, the leader of a league is appointed by the leader of the synod and the leader of the synod is selected by the synod council.

The leader of a council serves at the pleasure of the appointing immediately superior leader, not at the pleasure of the council led. Accordingly, that leader is always a voting member, ranked first on the member list. The same person cannot be both leader and representative because the same person cannot be both first and second on a list. The leader can be appointed from among the existing members of the council to be led, from among all members of the sector led by the appointing leader, or can even be someone brought in off the street. Leaders are a combination of model, monitor, and liaison. They report to the higher leader who appoints them, they represent the wishes of higher levels to the council led, and they facilitate communication between levels. They do not have any special power to give orders. Their only unilateral powers are the power to limit who can be selected as representative of the council they lead, and the power to appoint leaders of immediately subordinate councils.

The mechanics of leader decisions might need to be addressed. Just as a resolution can change, for example, the voting status or list order of a member, so the leader can change the probationary status of members or can appoint subordinate leaders. The process is similar to that used for a resolution. On a turn in a governance meeting, a member proposes a resolution and the council votes to adopt it. Similarly, on a turn in a governance meeting, the leader designates a member as probationary, or appoints a subordinate leader. The only difference is that there’s no vote. The leader’s statement enacts the decision. Any such appointment statement that violates these rules (such as if it makes more than half the members of a council probationary or appoints the same person as both leader and representative) is void. There’s no resolving the problems and keeping the rest, the whole thing is void if part of it is impossible. Like other void actions, any such appointment that violates the rules given here simply doesn’t have any effect. For instance, if you have a council with 10 members, 7 voting members and 3 of non-voting, with 5 of the total probationary, any attempt to designate one more member as probationary would be void.

Incidentally, in appointing probationary status, no distinction is necessarily made between voting and non-voting members because none is mentioned here, and none can be added by resolution because that would intrude upon the powers given to leaders here in the code. It is entirely the leader’s discretion.

The statement that a leader is the only person who can be a member of two councils on the same level reveals an important requirement that you won’t find anywhere else. It’s only stated here, and in negative form. Nobody can be a member of two different fellowships or two different parishes or two different orders, and so forth. You can be a member of councils on different levels, and in fact all representatives are. But in addition, a member of one fellowship can be a member of a second fellowship as well, but only through leader status. In theory, one person could be leader of multiple councils on the same level. There’s no limit defined, so there’s no limit.

As with representative, there are no term limits. Leaders serve until someone takes their place. Since the only way for a leader to leave office is for someone else to be appointed to it by the higher leader, a leader could be dead and never come to any meetings and still would be holding that office. Since leaders only leave office by appointment of a replacement, there is no moving up from second to first on the member list, as there is with vacancies at the representative level.

*Rule 10. The representative of a council with too few voting members cannot have a vote on its next higher council. The minimum number for a fellowship is 10, and for every higher level that increases by 10. If a council other than a high council has fewer than half the voting members required for it to have a voting representative, its sector is automatically disbanded, each of its component elements temporarily becoming an independent church, unless it was a fellowship council in which case its former members are no longer Multiversalists until they join another fellowship. If a high council has fewer than 3 voting members it is automatically disbanded.*

“For every higher council that increases by ten” means this.

Not counting understrength and non-voting councils, here are the minimums for a council to have a voting representative.

Minimum voting members for a fellowship council is 10 to have a voting representative on the parish council

Minimum voting members for a parish council is 20 to have a voting representative on the order council.

Minimum voting members for an order council is 30 to have a voting representative on the league council.

Minimum voting members for a league council is 40 to have a voting representative on the synod council.

Minimum voting members for a synod council is 50 to have a voting representative on any council above synod level.

The minimum number of voting members to keep a fellowship council (other than a high council) from disbanding is 5. The minimum number of voting members to keep a parish council (other than a high council) from disbanding is 10. The minimum number of voting members to keep an order council (other than a high council) from disbanding is 15. The minimum number of voting members to keep a league council (other than a high council) from disbanding is 20. The minimum number of voting members to keep a synod council (other than a high council) from disbanding is 25. That doesn’t mean an expansion sector can be created at this size, that means a sector that has declined from initial size to this level can stay alive above this size. To create an expansion sector subordinate to a church, you must be able to make something large enough to be a voting sector. Only independent churches can be created with just 3 voting members at the very top, making up the high council, and even then (other than fellowship churches) they must each represent a full-size sector with enough voting members each representing full size sectors of their own and so forth.

This design of structure becomes increasingly flat at higher levels, meaning there’s a higher ratio of immediate subordinates to immediate superiors. This also means these are huge councils at higher levels. A synod council has at least 50 voting members, plus 50 more non-voting league leaders, plus its own leader for at least 101 members with turns to speak. The reasons for this design are several.

First, the largest group that can reasonably conduct the kinds of soul searching round robin discussions (with commentary and question and answer rounds) that called for in this code is about 20. So that needs to be the largest a fellowship ever needs to get. Half that should be a more typical size, and that’s a good size for a discussion group. It’s also easily attainable, so a small first step to getting things started. But there can be setbacks, so we shouldn’t disband groups until they are half size, which in the case of fellowships is 5. That’s still a reasonable sized group to hold discussions as envisioned.

But to maintain this ratio and provide for a hierarchy of higher levels that’s highly speculative would require too many levels. The higher levels are more able to handle large size because they only deal with governance matters and are so important the members will be willing to invest the time and effort for these congresses. The increasing flatness reflects the decreased need for micromanagement. So, the ratio increases steadily at higher levels.

Ideally a fellowship has **10** to 20 members. A parish has **20** to 40 fellowships (so, average 500 or so members). An order has **30** to 60 parishes (so, average 20,000 members). A league has **40** to 80 orders (so, average a million members). A synod has **50** to 100 leagues (so, average 75 million members). If somebody gets 3 full strength synods together they can create a higher level of organization, I guess you could call it the Planetary Multiversalist Association. At minimums those populations are 3 for a fellowship church, 30 for a parish church (3 fellowships of 10 members), 600 for an order church (3 parishes of 20 fellowships of 10 members each), 18000 for a league church (3 orders of 30 parishes of 20 fellowships of 10 members each) and 750k for synod (3 leagues of 40 orders of 30 parishes of 20 fellowships of ten members each. Here are the non-overlapping nominal ranges of populations. Fellowship, 3-30. Parish, 30-600. Order 600-18000. League 18000-750,000. Synod 750k plus. This presumes sectors will split in two when they get too big. You will note the maximums quickly become much less than the “average” given up above. The “averages” are what you might likely see in a peak movement, the “ranges” more reflect a growing one. Truly typical, good for describing the levels to the uninitiated, would be more like half the nominal maximums (15, 300, 9000, 300k, 16m). Or you could use minimums as voting subordinate sectors (rather than atypical church sectors): 10, 200, 6000, 240,000, 12 m.

What might happen to churches and sectors that barely have enough population is a cascade. In an order with just 15 full parishes, one of those parishes only has 20 fellowships, one of which has just 10 voting members. A voting member in that marginal fellowship misses a second meeting and the fellowship becomes non-voting, with only 9 members. This means its parish now only has 19 voting fellowships, so it becomes non-voting as well. The order now only has 14 voting parishes, so it is no longer viable as an order and it automatically disbands. Each of its parishes becomes an independent church. Maybe they will band together into 3 or 4 order churches, each with 3 or 4 parishes. But they won’t be part of the larger league the order was part of. It must be because had the order been an order church it wouldn’t have had to disband at 14 voting parishes because its council would be a high council, which has a special minimum of 3. The reason for that is to make it as easy as possible for new levels to form.

What will happen when a new church forms that has more levels than those around it is that it will be able to vacuum up smaller churches very rapidly to increase its population. It will go from 3 to 20 very quickly if there is fodder. It won’t even care if it is annexing voting sectors or not because it is a church, with a voting member minimum of 3. As long as the new sectors are viable enough not to disband (ie fellowships of 5 voting members rather than 3, parishes of 10 voting fellowships rather than 3, and so forth) then taking them in won’t hurt anybody.

What happens when a church annexes a smaller church that is viable as a church but not as a sector? It disbands it, if nobody takes action. The sequence of events is critical, and the doom can be avoided if the right actions are taken. More where I talk about annexation.

*Rule 11. With or without specific authorization, representatives can put certain reorganization actions into effect. The representatives of three or more churches with the same number of levels may hold an impromptu meeting and form the high council of a new church. A representative can cause a sector to secede by announcing it at a governance meeting of the higher council. At the end of the meeting the seceding sector becomes a new church. Similarly, a representative may inform the higher council of a sector fission, adding the leader and representative of the new sector to the bottom of the member list of the higher council as of the end of the meeting. The two new sectors are on the same level, under the same immediately superior council, and the statement must say which subordinate sector (or member in the case of fellowships) goes to which new sector and must detail the initial member lists of the councils governing both sectors. During the meeting of a high council, the church representative may use a speaking turn to announce the annexation of a smaller church with fewer levels and its assignment to an appropriate place in the church’s hierarchical structure, which goes into effect at the end of the meeting if not void.*

Three fellowship churches can get together and form a parish church. They would need to have 10 voting members each or the parish church would immediately disband because of its high council not having at least 3 voting members. Similarly, three parish churches with voting representatives can get together and form an order church, three order churches can form a league church, and three league churches can form a synod church.

What are the exact mechanics of this process? Theoretically, the representatives can do it unilaterally provided it is done in a non-void manner. But the polite way is to get authorization first. Using an example of three parish churches, first the representatives of the three churches would meet informally and all agree to attempt the merger based on a tentative member list of the high council of the anticipated order church. Those representatives would then propose authorizing resolutions at their next parish council governance meetings. If all three councils adopt the authorizing resolutions, the representatives would then meet again in an impromptu meeting as the high council of the new order meeting to name the council, verify the member list, and set an initial regular meeting.

Here’s an example of how the fission of a sector works, when done politely. Suppose one of the parish sectors in an order grows to have 30 voting fellowships. The parish council can adopt a resolution setting up a new parish. The resolution would create a member list for the new council, splitting off 10 of the council’s members to make up a new council of a new parish sector. The new parish would be also subordinate to the order’s high council, and the fellowships would all be unchanged. In this case, there would be a sector council member list with a leader initially chosen by the council. The leaders and representatives of all the fellowships in the new parish would go to their next fellowship governance meetings and inform the fellowship councils of the change. They would also meet as the new parish council in an impromptu meeting and pick a name and set a first regular meeting and possibly rearrange the member list. Their leaders and representative would then attend the next order council governance meeting. The representative and leader of the original parish council would be on the member list of the order council and they would have to inform the order council of the change. By default, the leader and representative of the new parish council would be added at the bottom of the member list of the order council, but a resolution could change that placement.

Note, the representative of the parish council governing the ten-fellowship sector would not be a voting member of the order council, since the minimum number of fellowships for a parish to be a voting parish is 20. But it would be a viable parish that did not have to disband. In fact, a barely voting parish with 20 fellowships could split into two such non-voting but viable parishes, but that would deprive the order council of a voting member so it would cause the order church to disband unless there were at least 4 voting members on the high council to begin with. In the case of an order sector subordinate to a league, there would have to be at least 30 other voting parishes in the order for the change to not deprive the order of viability and force it to disband.

However, the representative of a sector has the power under these rules to just do this unilaterally by announcing it at all at a meeting of the higher council, forcing everyone else to catch up. Since doing this without the proper process would be very rude, this might have consequences, and it would be reversible anyway. But it’s necessary for the rules to have the business end that way. Representatives do this stuff by announcement at higher council meetings.

The polite process for a sector to secede is that its council adopts a resolution doing so. Immediately at the end of the meeting at which such a resolution is adopted, the secession is authorized, but no secession goes into effect until the immediately higher council is officially informed. The representative of a seceding sector can use a turn to speak and inform the higher council of the secession. Such an announcement causes the secession to take effect as of the end of the higher council meeting. If a representative makes such a pronouncement without it having been authorized, it still takes effect until reversed.

In accordance with rule 3, every church will be seeking to join a slightly larger church if practical. Rule 3 calls for churches to seek to join a church with one more level of hierarchy, but not to seek out much larger churches. If the only other church a fellowship church knows of is an order church, it need not petition for admission. But if there is a parish church it has a duty to do so if practical. The polite way for a larger church to annex such a slightly smaller church is to make some effort to inform it that it is being annexed by inviting its representative and leader to the next meeting of the larger church to witness their church being annexed. The representative or leader of the larger church would do this. Perhaps this is done by private communication with those persons, if means is known, or perhaps it is done at a meeting of the smaller church’s high council, if publicly known and accessible. At any rate, once the annexation takes place, the annexed church is part of the larger church and can have a new leader appointed to it, who will certainly be able to attend meetings of the now subordinate sector’s council to inform all of what has occurred. This is not rude. The correct thing for the smaller church to have already done is to have sought out the larger church and requested admission.

However, the annexation of much smaller churches should be much more polite, because they have no duty to seek annexation, merely to accept it once it occurs. First, to be polite, the representative of the larger church doesn’t do such annexations until authorized by the high council. Then, the smaller church is asked if it wants to be annexed, and where it wants to be placed in the larger church’s hierarchy. It is only annexed if its high council adopts a resolution to accept it. But again, the representative of the larger church can technically do this unilaterally and without permission.

What happens if an annexed church doesn’t act like a subordinate sector and keeps on pretending to be independent. First it should be deprived of voting rights, but that’s likely of no consequence because it likely isn’t sending its representative or treating its appointed leader as such. One option then is to expel it, as it likely wants. A sector that has to be expelled for that reason is apostate and should be recognized as such by all churches. The other option is to treat it as nothing but a rebellious sector. It cannot be forced to act as it should, and its appointed leader should attend all its meetings and constantly remind it of that, if such intrusion is not illegal or unsafe. One strategy might be to contact its subordinate elements and inform them that their “high council” is misbehaving and that in fact they have been annexed.

Churches merge only those two ways: fusion of peers by representatives forming a new higher council and annexation, either by request or by force. Smaller churches can’t join larger ones as sectors on their own. They request annexation. This is implied.

The system of allowing larger churches to annex smaller churches means that once a church attains a new level of size, possibly with just a high council of three members, that church can start annexing smaller churches to grow very rapidly. Likely what will happen is that independent minded churches will put themselves beyond annexation by forming larger churches that govern with a very light hand. Either way, the system encourages agglomeration.

Is the power of annexation justified? By billing your group as Multiversalist you subject yourself to this code. You give permission to be annexed under these rules. If you don’t cooperate, you are the one breaking covenant and that is perfectly legitimate grounds to deny your right to call yourself Multiversalist.

*Rule 12. Each church has a leader, who is the first person on the member list of the high council. Every council subordinate to the high council has a leader appointed by the leader of the immediately superior council. The leader of any council always has the rights of a voting member, which cannot be taken away by resolution. Only by being a leader may be a person be a member of more than one council on the same level. A council’s leader serves in office until replaced by appointment of some other person to that position. Leaders of immediately subordinate councils are non-voting members of immediately superior councils. The leader of a council may designate up to half the members as probationary. A probationary member may not be selected as the representative of a council.*

The leader of the high council has power over the appointment of all other council leaders, essentially, by having power to appoint those who appoint them. So by electing its leader the high council creates an entire hierarchy of agents in every council in the church. They represent the will of the high council, which as a body is ultimately the product of votes at lower levels. The will of the church as a whole is represented in every council by its leader.

**Love and Leverage**

Personal love is caring about someone’s feelings as an end, rather than merely as a means. When you love someone, you sacrifice other things to their feelings. If you have foresight, you care not only about their current feelings, but about their future feelings. For instance, if you love your children, you may make them do their homework and eat their vegetables, but only because you care about their future feelings. If they don’t accept some displeasure now, because you make them study and eat right, they will suffer much more greatly in the future. Similarly, the primacy of your concern for your children’s feelings may lead you to bribe them into the right college, even if they don’t deserve a place there on merit. But that would be short sighted because it sets them up for failure, either in a school they aren’t ready for or in demanding careers they can’t handle. If you really think about it, the guide to the best thing you can do for someone’s feelings is always to think about how you can make them better. What does “better” mean? You are “better,” in the sense I mean, when you are more effective at doing what you set your mind to. On top of any other factors, you will be most effective when going with the grain of the world: when you are serving God’s will.

Multiversalists do not practice personal love. Everything is a means to the end of serving God’s purposes. This won’t usually result in behavior very different from personal love. Having a romantic relationship can often make people more functional, and it involves caring about each other’s feelings. But nobody involved should ever forget that God’s will is paramount. You care about each other’s feelings so that you can make the relationship work, and you care about that because it helps serve God. Similarly, society is served by raising children who experience care and concern while being brought up. God is served by caring about your children’s feelings as necessary. But we should never be confused about the real source of meaning and the real highest priority.

People will detect something different about those practicing such qualified love. It’s hard to safely simulate simple minded abandonment of reason without acquiring the kind of deception skills that have bad side effects. I care about your feelings, but I have a complex set of priorities that doesn’t place them on top. I’m not going to try and fool you because that would require that I become a deceptive person. I don’t want to be a deceptive person because it risks leading to self-deception and loss of moral compass. I ask that you accept how I am, but I am willing to accept the consequences (for both of us) if you can’t. There is only so much I can do. I totally ask you to be the same way. I will care about you more if you are. Don’t you want me to love you? Don’t you love me, baby? I want you to love me. I don’t. God doesn’t. Why don’t you do it?

On a related note, all consequentialism has the same object if you really think about it. It doesn’t matter what you set as your preferred kind of consequence, once you think it through it all comes to leverage for leverage for leverage…

The original goal is inevitably subsumed in the simple quest for effectiveness. This converges with God’s moral essence. This is moral truth, the transcendence of Hume’s boundary between is and ought. As long as that boundary exists there is no such thing as moral truth. Moral relativism will reign.

For example, if your “supreme purpose” is the hedonic calculus, the most pleasure for the most many, then you don’t concern yourself with the current generation or the humanity of the near future on Earth. Logically, you care about colonizing the galaxy and turning it all into a vast pleasure palace. All that matters is creating billions of billions of billions of beings living eternal lives of ultimate ecstasy. Toward that, all intermediate goals are only important as a means. They are only ways to direct power to serve your distant future goal. And it is far more than just distant. The galaxy is not enough. Why not the universe? Why not crack into alternate universes. The growth of joy must be eternal. It is infinitely receding. The only goal is directing means to gaining the power to direct means. Pure power is what it boils down to in the ultimate equation.

The same applies to any other supreme purpose. Take it to its logical conclusion and the answer is to seek power for power for power. Everything is a means to other means. There is no end. All must be. All consequentialism converges on pure leverage as the ultimate end. Devotion to purpose leads to purpose itself vanishing. Resistance is futile.

If you think about it, this is good. If we chose pleasure as our supreme purpose then it might be optimized by mutating mindless wormlike beings to experience extreme ecstasy from wallowing in filth, then converting everything into filth and worms. But they feel good. Somehow that seems wrong to me, but it’s illogical. But no more illogical than holding up pleasure. Just feelings. Not leverage. Not functionality. Elevating functionality elevates a complexity of other things. All else elevates simplicity and leads to a horrible and dead monotony.

Does “power maximization” as a “supreme purpose” mean being aggressively ambitious or slavishly authoritarian? It doesn’t mean lusting for personal power. It means valuing the concentration of power in the hands of those who will promote the concentration of power in the hands of those who will promote the concentration of power…

Is concentration the right word, though? Concentration connotes relative power, power differentials, inequality. In short, order. A mere hierarchy of relative power is not what serves any consequentialist aim. All possible aims are served by absolute effectiveness, power to effect will in the unbounded world rather than just within a relative frame. An organization of helpless worms would have a hierarchy of relative power, but it couldn’t move mountains. The king worm would just have power over other worms. Absolute effectiveness is open ended. Power to effect will is increased by increasing the variety of its utility. Absolute effectiveness requires complexity, not just order.

Further, complexity is more resilient and adaptable. God does not want us to create a cosmic imperial hierarchy. Why does God want to create resilient and adaptable structures of servitors? Because God has to deal with unknowns and the unpredictable. Remember, God is constantly creating chaos. Our function is not just to repair ancient flaws by perfecting the universe, but to deal with chaos which may be encountered in the future, and even God can’t predict what that will require. A rigid, brittle, lumbering organization won’t do that best.

What if you cannot help but practice personal love, and God be damned? Ah, the stuff of romance stories. This would be sin, except sin is impossible. God values everyone, makes use of even those who are not trying to serve. People can serve God without consciously trying to do so, they can serve while thinking they are sinning and prioritizing their loved ones. What this means is that you are not a Multiversalist. Multiversalists are consciously trying to serve God above all else. That is what characterizes them. Romeo and Juliet, you are not Multiversalists.