
**Law of the Ant: Private Property, Externalities, Public Interest, and the
Conditional Correlation of Self-Interest**

LIE Chun Pong
Research Scholar

doi.org/10.51505/IJEBMR.2026.11019 URL: <https://doi.org/10.51505/IJEBMR.2026.11019>

Received: Oct 12, 2026

Accepted: Oct 21, 2026

Online Published: Oct 30, 2026

Abstract

This conceptual paper develops the “Ant Principle” as an integrative framework for understanding the institutional conditions under which private self-interest aligns with, or diverges from, collective welfare. Drawing on property-rights economics, transaction-cost theory, collective-action theory, public choice, and evolutionary biology (kin selection and inclusive fitness), our paper argues that the correlation between individual incentives and social outcomes is neither automatic nor inherent; it is tactically with understanding with mediated. The framework specifies a causal sequence linking institutional rules and property-rights arrangements to the distribution of private benefits and costs, individual behavioural responses, coordination outcomes, and ultimately the degree of convergence between private returns and social welfare. The biological analogy is treated strictly as a comparative heuristic that highlights how evolved coordination mechanisms in eusocial insects achieve alignment without conscious contracting, while human societies must construct formal and informal institutions to approximate similar results. Our paper clarifies the distinctiveness of the Ant Principle relative to Coase, Demsetz, Ostrom, and related traditions, with a more advance system tactic of human understanding of collective outcome approach, which defines the welfare criterion employed, incorporates distributional conflict and power, and derives a more advance set of conditional human and institutional propositions. Our paper, aim to bridge up the microeconomics to macroeconomics. Implications for new institutional design, environmental governance, and the limits of both markets and states are discussed.

Keywords: property rights; externalities; self-interest; public interest; institutional design; collective action; inclusive fitness; transaction costs, tactics understanding

1. Introduction

A central and enduring question in economics, political economy, and institutional theory concerns the conditions under which the pursuit of individual self-interest contributes to collective welfare and the conditions under which it undermines it. Adam Smith’s insight that individuals pursuing their own gain may be led, as if by an “invisible hand,” to promote socially beneficial outcomes remains foundational (Smith, 1776/1976). Yet the subsequent development of theories of externalities, public goods, common-pool resources, transaction costs, and

collective action has shown that this alignment is fragile and contingent (Pigou, 1920; Coase, 1960; Hardin, 1968; Olson, 1965; Ostrom, 1990).

This paper proposes the “Ant Principle” as a conceptual framework for organising these insights and for clarifying the institutional mechanisms that mediate the relationship between private incentives and social outcomes. The principle draws its name from the ancient injunction, “Go to the ant, thou sluggard; consider her ways, and be wise” (Proverbs 6:6, KJV), and from the observation that ant colonies achieve high levels of coordination and collective survival through individual behaviours that appear self-interested yet contribute to colony-level fitness. The analogy is employed strictly as a comparative heuristic with the implication of the human institutions advancement.

1.1 Research problem and objectives

Existing theories already establish that institutional arrangements shape the relationship between individual incentives and collective outcomes. What remains under-specified is a concise, integrated account of the causal sequence through which property rights, externalities, transaction costs, and collective-choice mechanisms produce convergence or divergence, together with an explicit statement of the conditions under which the correlation holds. The objectives of this paper are therefore: (1) to define the Ant Principle as a conditional theoretical framework with an implication of a universal “law”; (2) to specify a causal mechanism linking institutional rules to welfare outcomes; (3) to distinguish evolutionary coordination mechanisms from conscious human economic and political processes; (4) to clarify the welfare criterion employed; and (5) to identify the distinctive analytical contribution of the framework relative to Coasean bargaining, Demsetzian property-rights evolution, Ostromian collective action, and public-choice analysis of government failure. Our paper aim to advance to conventional Coase theorem, with a more sophisticate system, which similar to the ant’s queendom, with less contractual arrangement, but more tactics of understanding.

1.2 Contribution

Our paper’s contribution the explicit integration of established theoretical traditions into a more causal sequence, the disciplined use of the biological analogy as a comparative device that highlights the role of low-cost coordination mechanisms, and the derivation of conditional propositions that can guide both further theoretical refinement and institutional diagnosis. In this respect the Ant Principle functions as an organizing framework that makes visible the institutional contingencies already implicit, which our paper can bridge up the microeconomics to the macroeconomics.

2. Conceptual Methodology

This is a conceptual synthesis and integrative theory-development exercise rather than an empirical test or systematic literature review. The approach proceeds in four steps. First, core theoretical traditions relevant to the self-interest–public-interest relationship are selected: classical political economy (Smith), property-rights economics (Demsetz, 1967; Merrill &

Smith, 2017), externality theory (Pigou, 1920; Buchanan & Stubblebine, 1962), transaction-cost and bargaining analysis (Coase, 1960), collective-action and common-pool resource theory (Olson, 1965; Hardin, 1968; Ostrom, 1990), public choice (Buchanan & Tullock, 1962), and evolutionary explanations of cooperation in eusocial insects (Hamilton, 1964; inclusive fitness theory). Second, these traditions are compared with respect to the institutional conditions they emphasise and the mechanisms they identify. Third, points of complementarity and tension are identified, particularly regarding the relative roles of formal rights, informal norms, evolutionary selection, and deliberate collective choice. Fourth, an explicit causal sequence is constructed that links institutional arrangements to behavioural responses and welfare outcomes, and a set of conditional propositions is derived.

The biological analogy is used solely as a comparative heuristic. It is not claimed that ant colonies operate through conscious economic calculation, contractual exchange, or intentional institutional design. Rather, the analogy draws attention to the possibility of high-level coordination emerging from individual-level behaviours shaped by selection pressures, and thereby highlights the institutional engineering problem faced by human societies that lack equivalent genetic relatedness and behavioural programming.

3. The Ant Principle: Self-Interest, Foresight, and Collective Outcomes

The Ant Principle may be stated as follows: under institutional arrangements that align private benefits and costs with social benefits and costs, and that keep transaction and coordination costs sufficiently low, the pursuit of individual self-interest tends to generate outcomes that support collective welfare; when those conditions are absent, private incentives diverge from social welfare and collective action or institutional redesign becomes necessary.

The principle is deliberately conditional. It is not presented as a universal scientific law that holds under all circumstances, but as a theoretical framework that organises the relationship between incentives, institutions, and welfare. Retaining the term of “law” with “Principle” acknowledges that the relationship is mediated by institutional design and is therefore variable across contexts.

3.1 Clarifying the Biological Analogy

A frequent source of confusion in popular and some scholarly treatments of ant colonies is the assumption that worker ants receive direct reproductive rewards, such as mating rights with the queen, in exchange for their labour. This is biologically fit with the understanding of the tactics of understanding of the collaboration agreement in the economies application. In the overwhelming majority of ant species, workers are sterile or functionally sterile females. Queens are the primary reproductive Ants; they typically mate with one or several males) and store sperm for lifelong egg production. Males (Ants) are produced for mating and generally die shortly thereafter. Workers perform foraging, nest maintenance, defence, and brood care; their evolutionary “return” is explained primarily by kin selection and inclusive fitness. Because of haplodiploid sex determination, full sisters share on average three-quarters of their genes by

descent, making the indirect fitness benefits of raising sisters often higher than the benefits of personal reproduction under many conditions. Inclusive fitness theory formalizes the condition under which altruistic behavior is favored: $rb > c$, where r is the genetic relatedness of the recipient to the actor, b is the fitness benefit to the recipient, and c is the fitness cost to the actor.

The analytical value therefore lies in the system of reproductive “wages” paid by the queen to workers, which demonstrates that high levels of coordination and collective survival can be sustained by individual behaviors whose proximate motivation is shaped by evolutionary selection rather than by contractual calculation. Human societies can be evolved behavioral programming in eusocial insects. Consequently, they may rely on tactics to understand and internalize property rights, collective contribution and outcomes, contracts, norms, and institutions to achieve comparable (and usually more limited) alignment between individual actions and collective outcomes. This novel paper solves and advances the Coase institutional problem rather than abolishing it.

3.2 Self-Interest with Foresight

At the first level, the ant’s industriousness, gathering and storing food when it is abundant, illustrates intertemporal optimization and foresight. Economically, agents who maximize immediate consumption without regard for future scarcity or the effects of their actions on the resource base may undermine the conditions of their long-term prosperity. Smith’s baker, who supplies bread in pursuit of profit and thereby feeds the community, remains the classic illustration of the first layer of the principle: self-interest, disciplined by exchange and competition, can generate socially valuable output. The second layer emphasizes sustainability: self-interest that fails to internalize future consequences or external effects can destroy the very system that makes individual prosperity possible.

4. Private Property Rights as Incentive-Aligning Institutions

Well-defined and enforceable private property rights assign to an individual or group the exclusive authority to use, control, and transfer a resource. They perform several economic functions: they create incentives for investment and conservation by aligning benefits and costs; they reduce conflict over scarce resources; they enable voluntary exchange; and they facilitate the internalization of externalities (Demsetz, 1967; Merrill & Smith, 2017). When a farmer holds secure title to land, the returns from irrigation, soil conservation, or crop rotation accrue primarily to the farmer, strengthening the incentive to invest and maintain the resource. In the absence of clear rights, the incentive structure shifts toward short-term extraction, the classic tragedy of the commons (Hardin, 1968). Although property rights may reduce transaction costs by providing a clear framework for negotiation and exchange. Uncertain ownership raises verification, enforcement, and dispute-resolution costs, impeding the movement of resources to higher-valued uses. Secure titles, contract law, and reliable courts serve as economic infrastructure that transforms potentially destructive self-interest into productive activity.

But some property regimes are not automatically optimal. Fragmented exclusion rights can produce the tragedy of the anticommons, in which multiple veto holders prevent productive use (Heller, 1998; Buchanan & Yoon, 2000). The design of property rights must therefore balance the benefits of exclusivity against the costs of fragmentation and coordination failure. Moreover, the initial assignment and subsequent evolution of property rights are themselves products of political and social processes that may reflect bargaining power, historical contingency, and distributional conflict rather than pure efficiency considerations.

5. Externalities: The Primary Source of Divergence

Additionally, an externality will occur when one party's actions affect another's welfare without the effect being mediated through the price mechanism (Buchanan & Stubblebine, 1962). Negative externalities (e.g., pollution) cause private marginal cost to fall short of social marginal cost, leading to overproduction relative to the social optimum. Positive externalities (e.g., basic research, vaccination) cause private marginal benefit to fall short of social marginal benefit, leading to underproduction. Formally, when $MSc = MPC + MEC$, a profit-maximizing firm equates MPC to marginal revenue and ignores the external cost, producing more than the quantity at which MSc equals marginal revenue.

So, we have to rely on internalization mechanisms; this paper suggests rights-and-trade systems, to utilizing internalization rights (regulation), liability rules, and the assignment or clarification of rights that enable reduce transaction cost. Particularly, information availability, enforcement costs, feasibility, and the number of affected parties are involved. The Law of the Ant Principle emphasizes that internalization is the institutional process that restores the correlation between private and social returns.

6. The Coase Theorem, Transaction Costs, and Tacit Coordination

Coase (1960) demonstrated that, in the absence of transaction costs, parties affected by an externality can bargain to an efficient outcome regardless of the initial assignment of rights, provided those rights are clearly defined. The theorem underscores the importance of property rights as a precondition for bargaining and highlights the practical limits of private negotiation when transaction costs are high, information is asymmetric, or the number of affected parties is large. Air pollution in a city or global climate change illustrate settings in which private bargaining is prohibitively costly. However, the Coase theorem has important limitations in addressing the central problem of resource allocation, namely, how to achieve an optimal balance across multiple dimensions of social welfare. Its solution depends heavily on contractual arrangements and low transaction costs. In real human systems, however, coordination does not always require explicit contracts. It may instead emerge through what may be called a "tactics of understanding system," in which agents adapt and coordinate through shared norms, local information, and repeated interaction, similar to the decentralized organization of an ant colony.

The ant-colony analogy is useful here precisely because coordination in colonies does not rely on explicit contracts. Evolved behavioural routines, chemical communication, and genetic

relatedness produce low-cost coordination that approximates the outcomes that human societies achieve only through costly formal institutions. Human societies must therefore invent functional substitutes, property rights, contracts, norms, monitoring systems, and political procedures, to reduce the transaction and coordination costs. The distinctive emphasis of the Law of the Ant Principle relative to a pure Coasean analysis is that it draws attention to both formal and informal (including evolved and norm-based) mechanisms that lower the cost of achieving incentive compatibility, and that it treats the failure of either markets or governments as an occasion for institutional redesign rather than as a permanent preference for one organizational form.

7. Public Interest, Government Intervention, and Distributional Conflict

7.1 Defining Public Interest

Moreover, in the terms of “public interest,” “collective welfare,” and “social welfare” are often used interchangeably, yet they are not identical. In this paper, social welfare is understood primarily in efficiency terms, the maximisation of the sum of individual utilities or the achievement of Pareto improvements and Kaldor–Hicks improvements, while recognising that distributional equity, sustainability, and the protection of basic entitlements constitute independent normative criteria that societies may prioritise. An institutional arrangement can increase aggregate surplus while imposing disproportionate burdens on particular groups. The Law of the Ant Principle framework treats efficiency as the primary analytical criterion for assessing incentive alignment, but explicitly notes that political legitimacy and long-term stability often require attention to equity and to the perceived fairness of the distribution of gains and losses.

7.2 Government as Both Solution and Problem

Indeed, many public goods (non-excludable and non-rivalrous) and common-pool resources generate free-rider problems that markets alone cannot solve. Government can compel contribution through taxation and can supply the good directly. However, public-choice analysis reminds us that politicians, bureaucrats, and organised interests are themselves self-interested actors (Buchanan & Tullock, 1962). Rent-seeking, regulatory capture, bureaucratic slack, and the concentration of benefits and diffusion of costs can produce government failure that is analogous to market failure. Institutional design must therefore align the incentives of public with the public interest through electoral accountability, transparency, and balances, with performance-sensitive mechanisms, recognising that if only relied on the government nor the system alone is never perfect, such as Coase theory, Nevertheless, the Coase theorem has significant limitations as a theory of resource allocation. While it just explains how parties may reallocate resources through bargaining when property rights are clearly defined and transaction costs are negligible, it does not fully resolve the broader problem of achieving an optimal and equitable allocation across multiple social dimensions, when transaction cost are high enough to deal with. In practice, its applicability is constrained by high transaction costs, asymmetric information, unequal bargaining power, and the difficulty of coordinating many affected parties.

Moreover, in the reality of human society, effective coordination in human systems does not necessarily depend on formal contracts (such as the example of the Law of the Ant). It may arise through an emergent “tactics of understanding system,” whereby individuals coordinate through shared expectations, norms, local knowledge, and repeated interactions. This form of decentralized coordination resembles the self-organizing behaviour of an ant colony, where collective order emerges without central direction or explicit contractual agreements.

7.3 Power, Distributional Conflict, and Institutional Capture

Therefore, property rights and regulatory arrangements are not neutral technical devices; they emerge from and are sustained by political processes in which bargaining power, information asymmetries, and historical inequalities shape outcomes. Institutional rules may systematically favour organised interests at the expense of diffuse or less powerful groups. A complete account of the relationship between self-interest and public interest must therefore incorporate the possibility of institutional capture and the distributional struggles that determine whose interests are counted as “public.” The Law of the Ant Principle framework treats these power dimensions as endogenous with more advance features of the institutional environment that affect both the definition of rights and the feasibility of internalisation and collective action.

8. Causal Mechanism and Conditional Propositions

Our integrative contribution of Law of the Ant Principle lies in the explicit causal sequence it proposes:

- (1) Institutional rules and property-rights arrangements** → determine the distribution of private benefits, costs, risks, and exclusion powers.
- (2) Distribution of private payoffs** → shapes individual incentives and behavioural responses (effort, investment, conservation, free-riding, and rent-seeking).
- (3) Individual behavioral responses, aggregated under given transaction and coordination costs** → produce patterns of cooperation, conflict, overuse, underuse, and efficient allocation.
- (4) Resulting allocation tactics of understanding** → generate convergence or divergence between private returns and social welfare (efficiency, and secondarily equity and sustainability).

A feedback loop-hole exists: when observed welfare outcomes and distributional consequences influence subsequent political struggles over institutional rules, so that the sequence is dynamic rather than one-directional. Although market failures may justify by government intervention, but gov failure is also possible. When gov systems fail, corrective mechanisms such as the law of the ant framework address with institutional coordination and mutual understanding coordination, are needed to realign public policy with the public interest. This way can restore the social order and lower the transaction cost.

From this sequence, the following conditional propositions follow:

Proposition 1. When goods are private, excludable, and rivalrous, externalities are minimal, and property rights are secure and well-defined, self-interest and social welfare are strongly positively correlated.

Proposition 2. The presence of significant externalities weakens the correlation; the correlation can be restored to the extent that institutional mechanisms successfully internalise external costs and benefits.

Proposition 3. For pure public goods and many common-pool resources, the correlation is under pure self-interested internalization with transformation; that is why sustainable outcomes require either community-based allocation with effective mechanisms or hybrid “Hero” arrangements.

Proposition 4. High transaction and coordination costs impede both private bargaining and collective action; institutional innovations that lower these costs expand the domain in which self-interest can be aligned with social welfare.

Proposition 5. Because institutional rules are themselves the product of processes, power asymmetries and distributional conflict can produce rights structures and regulatory regimes that systematically misalign private incentives with broader social welfare; so, diagnosing such misalignment by the “rights”, “internalize the public incentive into the private one” and “mutual understanding” is a necessary step in transformation improvement.

9. Conclusion

Our Law of the Ant Principle offers a compact, novel advance and organizing framework for the institutional conditions under which private self-interest supports or undermines collective welfare. Our novel theory integrates insights from property-rights economics, externality theory, transaction-cost analysis, collective-action theory, public choice, and evolutionary biology into an explicit causal sequence and a set of conditional propositions. Our distinctive contribution lies in the clarity of that sequence, the disciplined comparative use of the biological analogy, the explicit treatment of both market and government failure, and the incorporation of power and distributional conflict. Additionally, the correlation between self-interest and public interest is not inherent; it is institutionally constructed. When property rights are internalized, tactics are understood, transaction costs are manageable, and collective-choice mechanisms align reasonably well with social objectives, the invisible hand functions effectively. The practical task of economic policy and institutional design is therefore not to choose between self-interest and public interest, but to craft arrangements that make them converge. Moreover, digital technologies alter transaction costs and thereby shift the domain of the Ant Principle. The ant does not, in any conscious sense, choose between its own survival and the colony’s survival. Human societies must deliberately construct the institutions that make individual diligence serve collective flourishing. The Law of the Ant Principle is offered as a guide to Human society that may restore order when the government fails.

Our paper bridges the gap between microeconomics and macroeconomics. We hope our paper can contribute to society and the world.

References

- Buchanan, J. M., & Stubblebine, W. C. (1962). Externality. *Economica*, 29(116), 371–384.
- Buchanan, J. M., & Yoon, Y. J. (2000). Symmetric tragedies: Commons and anticommons. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 43(1), 1–13.
- Coase, R. H. (1960). The problem of social cost. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 3, 1–44.
- Demsetz, H. (1967). Toward a theory of property rights. *American Economic Review*, 57(2), 347–359.
- Hamilton, W. D. (1964). The genetical evolution of social behaviour. I & II. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 7(1), 1–16, 17–52.
- Hardin, G. (1968). The tragedy of the commons. *Science*, 162(3859), 1243–1248.
- Heller, M. A. (1998). The tragedy of the anticommons: Property in the transition from Marx to markets. *Harvard Law Review*, 111(3), 621–688.
- Merrill, T. W., & Smith, H. E. (2017). *The Oxford handbook of law and economics: Property law*. Oxford University Press.
- Olson, M. (1965). *The logic of collective action: Public goods and the theory of groups*. Harvard University Press.
- Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pigou, A. C. (1920). *The economics of welfare*. Macmillan.