



What can you find in these documents about the need to carefully link words to things that are not words? Call this "sovereign naming".

Sovereign naming, in the sense you describe, is a strong through-line in these documents, even where that exact phrase is not used. The core theme is that certain key words must be tightly, honestly, and repeatedly anchored to experiences, realities, and inner states that are **not** themselves words, or else both liberty and thinking corrode.

Prime words and non-verbal anchors

Several passages explicitly distinguish between words that can be defined in other words and “prime” words that must be grounded in direct experience. These prime words get their meaning only when they are tied to non-verbal realities such as fear, aliveness, or being.^[1]

- You note that *fear* “is best given meaning by pointing with poetry or physical expression not to other words but to an internal experience,” and propose calling such a term a “prime word,” a set of marks bound to something that is not words.^[1]
- You make the same point about *alive*: “what it means to be alive must be felt before it can be said. An AI can emit words that are such that if a human had said them we would intuit feeling... But where is confidence in feeling when an AI speaks?”^[1]

This is a direct articulation of sovereign naming: some words have to be owned by the experiencer and referred back to their own non-verbal life, not just to linguistic networks.

Devitalization and re-vitalization of language

There is an extended reflection on how political and cultural processes hollow out fundamental words, and on the need to re-bind them to non-verbal referents.

- You describe “devitalization of language”: “Life and civilization supporting language has been devitalized. The vital meanings in the necessary fundamental words has been deliberately and by accidental complicity made meaningless.”^[1]

- The remedy is “re-binding the great words to things which for each one of us are not words,” so that “we shall once again be able to speak meaningfully to each other.”^[1]

This is sovereign naming as a civilizational repair strategy: re-attaching “great words” (liberty, justice, integrity, hero, etc.) to lived referents and not allowing them to float free as tools of manipulation.

Freeorder and the naming of a new pattern

The Freeorder Bridge text gives a clean example of naming as world-making: a concept is said to “tend to non-existence” if it has no name, so a new word is consciously forged and tied to a definite referent.

- “Whatever is without name tends to non-existence. Therefore, if something important is newly understood, and has no name, we should find a word for it. In this case the new word is freeorder.”^[2]
- Freeorder is explicitly defined as “balances among designed and spontaneous orders that best support quest,” with quest itself pointing to patterns of exploration and adventure in actual lives, not a verbal abstraction.^{[2][1]}

Here, sovereign naming consists of (a) coining a word, (b) orienting it to a specific non-verbal pattern (a balance of orders that supports lived quest), and (c) insisting that this word not be allowed to drift into meaning “spontaneous order only” or any other reduced sense.^{[3][2]}

Protecting key words from capture

There are several places where the documents describe how adversaries deliberately detach words from their original experiential anchors, and how defenders of liberty must resist that.

- You sketch a strategy “speaking from the point of view of aspiring tyrants”: “Systematically look for all the words that mean things that can obstruct your quest for power. Having found them either make them meaningless or make them mean something the opposite of what was originally intended.”^[1]
- Examples include *profit, integrity, hero, justice*: someone does something bad “and explained it as pursuit of profit,” after which “anyone who sought to profit was regarded as morally corrupt”; similarly, a hypocrite called a man of integrity leads to “many truly good people of integrity” being smeared by association.^[1]

Sovereign naming, in this light, is refusing to surrender those words, and “fighting for them” so that “you do not strip our language of words essential to victory.”^[1]

Words, order, and expectation

You repeatedly tie the use of words to Hayek's idea that "order" is defined via "expectation," and then press on the philosophical and political implications of that linkage.^[1]

- You frame the "obsessive devotion to precision in use of words" as essential to shifting expectations about where goods come from—away from command and towards freeorder.^[1]
- You ask "How is good mental emotional balance achieved between the use of designed word orders and spontaneous word orders?" and link that directly to pedagogy: "how do we teach children to think about and use words? After all, they grow up needing to deal with realities that are more than words."^[1]

Here, sovereign naming is about ensuring that key terms (order, freedom, justice, etc.) generate expectations that track real processes in the world, not fantasies or propaganda.

Sovereign naming as a freeorder practice

Across the materials, sovereign naming shows up as:

- Coining new words when necessary and tying them to real patterns: *freeorder*, *forge*, *quest*, *Emergence*. These are always defined in terms of non-verbal realities: ventures, practices, balances, and lived adventures.^{[2][1]}
- Defending old words from semantic sabotage by re-anchoring them: *liberty*, *hero*, *integrity*, *justice*, *profit*. The strategy is to keep their referents clear (e.g., non-aggression, truthfulness, value creation, redress of actual harm) rather than letting them become floating evaluative noises.^{[4][1]}
- Insisting that meaningful discourse requires that, for each participant, some words terminate in introspective or observational givens—"things external to consciousness like prices, counts of things, trends" or "things knowable only by introspection"—rather than in endless verbal redefinition.^[1]

Taken together, the documents treat careful linking of words to non-verbal realities as a precondition for freeorder itself. Without sovereign naming, freeorder cannot be discussed, taught, or defended; with it, people can once again use language as a tool for aligning with reality rather than as a substitute for it.

*
**

2. Freeorder-Bridge-0.95.txt
3. Threads-OmniOutliner-Text-to-Summarize-6-Oct-2025.txt
4. News-OmniOutliner-pdf-to-Summarize-6-Oct-2025.pdf