On the Truth of Happiness

Absence of Insecurities through Personal Value Exchange

A Vision for Participant-Constitutive Networks

Anantha Krishnan

January 2018

"Happiness is about absence —
absence of insecurities."

1 The Foundational Need of Humanity

An individual is the fundamental unit of human society, yet humanity gives marginal importance to individuality. Social structures classify individuals into groups, and those groups determine how individuals are treated and allowed to treat one another. These groups can be families, societies, or citizens aggregated at various units of community, city, state, or country. Societal constructs such as social groups, organizations, or political parties often overlap, exacerbating the individual's helplessness to control their belonging and affiliation.

Within this framework, how do we understand what drives human behavior? What is our motivation? If you drill down to the core psychology of what an individual aspires for, at all stages and situations, an individual aspires for a state of equilibrium and safety which allows for self-actualization.

In simpler terms, he or she wants to be happy.

1.1 What Is Happiness?

Happiness is a state which can be clearly recognized at an individual level, but how does one define a commonly accepted state of happiness? It is a state defined not by what is present, but by what is absent. We postulate that happiness is present when there is an absence of insecurities, specifically, insecurity about the value of one's interactions.

When I trade, do I control what I give and what I receive? When I interact, does the outcome reflect my meaning or someone else's definition? Insecurity arises when the value of my interactions is determined by structures I do not control. Happiness arises when the value is mine — personal, contextual, constituted by my participation.

Insecurities, fear of a lack of control over an outcome, may be transitory or continuous. The more an individual recognizes this absence of insecurity, the more their sense of control increases. If asked, they are likely to say that they are happy. However, given the many interactions we all have each day, such a sense of happiness is often fleeting. In the next interaction, it may be quickly replaced with insecurity.

In summation, individuals aspire for an absence of insecurities and a sense of control over their interactions with the rest of the world. Yet, as humanity and technological advancement creates more intermediated structures, individuals are removed from the outcome of their interactions. The individual aspiration for control, a precondition of happiness, is at loggerheads with current societal structures.

2 Understanding Interactions

Interactions are almost always intermediated - by people, institutions, platforms, courts, and so on. Interactions are done with a lot of anxiety for the participants and, in their culmination, may provide a fleeting sense of happiness with some anxious moments along the way.

Consider a simple example. The first time you performed a credit card transaction, let us

say that you were buying coffee. You provide the card with great care and concern, enter the PIN or signature with due care and anxiety, and when the green light comes up, it is a relief. The hot coffee in your hand is a place of happiness that is well earned and even cherished.

Humans are blessed with memory, and as they rinse and repeat the steps, they get familiar with the interaction type, and it no longer holds the same level of anxiety. The necessary evil of intermediated transactions is accepted and familiarized by humans. However, it is the cause of significant anxiety in every instance of interaction execution.

These interaction structures have further reduced us to mere statistics. Individuals do not have their individualities protected — they are just one among the many that go through the assembly lines of interaction structures, with no control and lots of anxiety during the process, aspiring to reach those fleeting endpoints of happiness.

Anxiety at the start, patience in the middle, and hope of happiness at the end.

3 The Structure of Value: What Barter Got Right

Before examining what went wrong, let us examine what once went right.

Consider barter — not as primitive inefficiency, but as structural wisdom we abandoned too quickly.

A shepherd trades two sheep for a bag of grain. What is happening here? The shepherd does not consult a market price for sheep. The shepherd does not calculate the fair value. The shepherd asks only: will I be happier with the grain than with these two sheep? The answer is personal, contextual, and is only known to the shepherd.

The grain-holder asks the same: will I be happier with the sheep than with this grain? If both answer yes, they trade. If either answers no, they don't. The trade happens if and only if both gain in their own frames.

Notice what is absent: no external measure, no intermediary's definition of worth, no anxiety about whether the price is fair. The value is personal. The interaction is bilateral. The outcome is equilibrium — both parties happier than before.

This is not nostalgia. This is structure.

Barter worked because it preserved what subsequent systems destroy: the participant's constitutive role in value. The shepherd's sheep were not "10 coins waiting to be discovered." They were the shepherd's sheep — valuable to him in his context, valuable to the grain-holder in hers, valuable differently to each, and valuable only in the interaction that brought them together.

Before the trade, the sheep existed in a state of possibility. They could become grain, or cloth, or nothing at all, depending on whom the shepherd met and what that person needed. The trade did not discover a pre-existing value. The trade created value by collapsing possibility into actuality — an actuality that left both participants happier.

Barter failed to scale not because its structure was wrong, but because its implementation was limited. Two people must meet, must each have what the other wants, must agree in the moment. These are coordination problems, not structural ones.

The question is: can we solve the coordination problems while preserving the structure?

4 The Seventy-Year Error

In 1948, Claude Shannon founded information theory with a deliberate simplification: the meaning of a message is irrelevant to its transmission. A bit is a bit, regardless of who sends it or who receives it. This was brilliant engineering — it enabled the digital revolution.

But scope became a foundation.

Alan Turing's computation was similarly anonymous: the tape has no owner, the symbols belong to no one. Edgar Codd's databases were observer-independent: the data is what it is, regardless of who queries it.

Each abstraction was correct for its purpose. Each abstraction removed the participant. And when these abstractions became the foundation for systems that handle value, not just information, the removal of the participant became catastrophic.

4.1 Value Is Not Information

Value is not information. Consider the following differences:

- You cannot copy value (that is counterfeiting)
- You cannot delete value (that violates conservation)
- You cannot observe value without participating in it (the illusion of market price)

Value has a different structure than information, a structure that requires the participant to be present, not as metadata, but as a constitutive dimension.

For 70 years, we have built value systems on information foundations. The symptoms are everywhere: double-spend problems require global consensus, reconciliation requires intermediaries, trust requires third parties. These are not engineering challenges to be solved. They are structural consequences of a category error — building with the wrong mathematics.

4.2 The Money Error

Barter could not scale, and ingenious minds created a generalized proxy for value: money. Money solved the mismatch inefficiencies — the shepherd no longer needed to find someone who wanted sheep AND had grain. But this solution came at a profound cost.

By abstracting value into a universal measure, money made a fateful assumption: that value can be separated from the participant who values. The shepherd's sheep became

10 coins — the same 10 coins whether he was desperate or comfortable, whether the buyer was a stranger or a friend, whether the sheep were beloved companions or excess inventory. The context collapsed into a number. The participant disappeared into a price.

This was not merely an inconvenience. It was a category error — treating value as if it were information. Information can be copied, transmitted, and stored independent of who created it. Value cannot. Value exists only in the entanglement of participant, context, and content. Strip away the participant, and you do not have objective value. You have no value at all — only a number that claims to represent it.

Every system built on this foundation — from banking to databases to blockchains — inherits the error. They can process the number. They cannot preserve the value. This is why intermediation feels so alienating: the systems literally cannot see you. They see only the information shadow you leave behind.

4.3 The Cryptocurrency Attempt

Bitcoin and the cryptocurrencies that followed attempted to address this foundational error by reducing the degree of intermediary control. But they did not eliminate the intermediary — they replaced one (banks) with another (miners and consensus protocols). The participant is still external. The value is still anonymous. The structure is still wrong.

Blockchain asks: how do we prevent double-spending of information that represents value?

The right question is: how do we build systems where value is not information in the first place?

5 Societal Structures as Interaction Intermediaries

Throughout history, societal structures have acted as intermediaries and arbitrators of interactions between individual participants. Whether financially incentivized — where the largest economic power ultimately controls outcomes — or community-centric — where central groups set the rules — the individual has rarely been in control as a participant of any interaction. They have a choice, a vote, and must hope to be on the side of the majority.

The internet replicated these structures in digital form, aggregating power based on a new asset: data. Data of the individual, left behind as they go through the assembly line of interactions, is harvested, mined, and used to control the individual in subsequent interactions through information asymmetry.

Consider a user of Uber launching the app. The user is blinded by information of supply. Past behavioral data — time sensitivity to get to work, derived as a pattern — may be used to extract the best price for the intermediation, with both sides blinded during the price discovery process. The participants are not in control of the value, context, or outcome of their interaction, even though the interaction appears digitally bilateral.

To enable the primary human need of happiness, we need a different structure: one where the participants of an interaction control all aspects of that interaction — value, context, and outcome — in a way that is personal and controllable. A model where the value of

the interaction is valuable to the participant.

6 Humanizing the Network

The internet has transformed the world over the past 25 years, creating enormous value for businesses and step-change convenience for people. Digital has become integral to everyday living — shopping, learning, eating, social interactions, business processes, regulatory governance, money management. With constantly improving global connectivity, digital is now present in most societal interactions.

But the current internet model suffers from the pre-digital framework of power aggregation through interaction intermediation. If we build the digital society on this model, we automate and optimize the older inefficiencies of societal intermediary structures, increasing the anxiety of participants as values stay relative and outcomes stay controlled.

The convergence of blockchain, artificial intelligence, and peer-to-peer networks opens a different possibility — one that addresses the hitherto unaddressable aspect of intermediation: trust and transparency. Giving what the individual wanted all along: the sense of control. Eliminating the insecurity in interactions, providing confidence and a state of happiness — longer and hopefully continuous.

This can be achieved by integrating the participant's context into digital interactions and making the context of the participant the interaction intermediary, thereby making values personal and providing participants complete control of the outcome.

Not merely context-aware but participant-constitutive. The network does not observe your context and adjust — the network enables you to create value that is yours by definition, entangled with your participation, meaningful only through your interaction.

A humanized internet where participants constitute value.

7 Personalized Value Network

As digital moves from the periphery to the center of societal interactions, the participant-constitutive network makes this transformation possible. In this new world, networks deliver the personalized value expectations of participants, unique to each digital interaction. The network supports heterogeneous value transfers and the specific privacy, security, and trust needs of each interaction.

A network where the user's computation, value, trust, infrastructure, and storage preferences are a foundational construct — baked into the fundamental design, not a feature provided by systems and applications controlled by their creators.

A value network where personalization is a right, not a choice.

8 KRAMA: The New Digital Order

KRAMA is a participant-constitutive computational framework that enables personal value transfer in a personalized global value network. Using the participant-constitutive paradigm, KRAMA digitally represents human individuality and recognizes it in the smallest units of interactions, giving participants full control and removing insecurities.

8.1 Barter at Scale

KRAMA solves the coordination problems of barter while preserving its structure. A global network where value remains personal. A digital system where participants constitute meaning. Barter at scale. Happiness, systematized.

Value in KRAMA is not another currency. It is an outcome of free-form value discovery, left to the participants of the interaction, with myriad dimensions and aspects to support the inherent creativity of the world and the individuality of each participant. It puts them in control as it was meant to be, leaving them happier.

8.2 The Fourth Dimension

KRAMA does not add a feature to existing systems. KRAMA operates in a different category — one where the participant is not external but constitutive, where value is not a number but an entanglement, where happiness is not hoped for but structurally enabled.

For seventy years, computation has operated in three dimensions:

- **WHAT**: The content, the data, the message
- **WHERE**: The location, the address, the storage
- **HOW**: The process, the algorithm, the computation

KRAMA adds the fourth dimension:

- **WHO**: The participant, constitutive of value itself

This fourth dimension is not metadata. It is not a field in a database. It is a fundamental axis of the space in which value exists. Adding WHO does not extend the existing framework. It replaces its foundation, from the flat space of information to the rich geometry of value.

In this geometry:

- Value is not a point but a superposition of possibilities
- Interaction is not transfer, but mutual transformation
- The outcome is not determined externally but is constituted bilaterally.
- Happiness is not fleeting, but structural

8.3 The Promise

Every interaction in KRAMA is a barter – personal, bilateral, and equilibrium-seeking. The shepherd trades sheep for grain and both are happier. But now the shepherd can trade with anyone in the world, for anything they mutually value, with full control over every dimension of the interaction.

The coordination problems are solved by the network. The structure is preserved by mathematics. Happiness is enabled by design.

Welcome back to the age of happiness. Welcome to KRAMA.

The individual is the fundamental unit of human society.
It is time for our systems to recognize this.

KRAMA: Where value is personal, interactions are bilateral, and happiness is structural.

A Note on the Series

This document is the first in the Contextual Compute series. What it describes intuitively — the participant as constitutive of value, the fourth dimension of computation, barter at scale — is given mathematical form in CC2 through CC4, translated into a normative protocol specification in CC5, and realized as a live network in CC6 and CC7.

The shepherd's question has an answer. The series is that answer.