

MATERIAL WORLD – BASIC ELEMENTS & FUNCTIONS

1) WORLD AS SUCH

> It all starts with what's there by nature. Namely areas and connected spaces & resources.



CORRECT ATTRIBUTION

> Logically, all humans have the Same Right to the World.

STATUS QUO: Same Right to the World ignored > Violated in ANY current structure.



SETTING ECOLOGICAL LIMITS

> Human activities can be enriching, but also destructive. Thus, it sometimes takes limits...
> To protect nature, to keep this world a beautiful place.

Process: Definition of minimum standards or max. emissions.

Governance: Political decision-making.

Feasibility: Easiest if a) all have equal chances b) all are concerned equally.



DEFINING ZONES: OPEN OR EXCLUSIVE? Incl. connected right & duties.

Process, Governance, Feasibility: Similar to above.

2) EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS TO AREAS

> Most areas on earth (except open sea and Antarctic) are hold by someone.
> This exclusivity is often called 'property' today. But: Classical property is illegitimate here.



CORRECT ATTRIBUTION = FOLLOW-UP of correct attribution of world as such

> Exclusive rights to areas can only be correct if connected to the Same Right to the World.
> Communities etc. are NOT all humans = New exchange required in any case:



EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS TO AREAS in line with SAME RIGHT TO WORLD

WORLD NOVELTY: Same Right to the World made handy > Via tokens that all get equally.

> Pioneering concept <http://start-hugo.com/key.pdf>

Process: Exchange according to individual preferences.

Governance: Self-regulating.

> Changing to a correct system is essential. Starting with...

SIGNIFICANCE of Same Right to the World * QUALITY OF COORDINATION *

SAME RIGHT TO WORLD →	HONOURED (HUGO)	IGNORED (TODAY)
CLEAR WORLD ORDER →	YES > Equal tokens and highest offer = conclusive all the way	NO > Bad excuses & conflicting power instead of clear principle
REAL PEACE →	YES > Peace is based on just checks & balances	NO > What's called peace is in fact accepting injustice

SIGNIFICANCE of Same Right to the World * ABILITY TO ENSURE ECOLOGY *

SAME RIGHT TO WORLD →	HONOURED (HUGO)	IGNORED (TODAY)
BASIC FLEXIBILITY → ... At setting effective ecological limits	EASED > All can get their share WITHIN what's sustainable + Process easier because all are concerned equally	HINDERED > Pressure to get something OUTSIDE what's sustainable + Process complicated by one-sided interests
CLIMATE JUSTICE → ... Namely where limits may mean higher prices	EASED > No social problem: All also GET more	HINDERED > Social problem: Many pay more, but get nothing
SAFETY OF EXISTENCE → ... Namely independent of certain jobs	EASED > Less unnecessary costs, more to reach oneself + Better chance to reach overall-effective solutions	HINDERED > Unnecessary costs, less to reach oneself + Difficult to reach overall-effective solutions

3) GOODS & SERVICES

> Even if some brain is added :-) They're done on areas + connected resources. Thus...

 CORRECT ATTRIBUTION = FOLLOW-UP of world as such & exclusive rights to areas

- > Material goods are automatically attributed along the material flow:
- > Exclusive rights to areas may include the right to gain stuff, which can then be property.
- > Special case: Goods like houses, cultivations and excavations etc. block areas, thus...
- > Immobile thing must be part of an integrated system (see Hugo's combined token system).

PRODUCTION of GOODS & SERVICES

- > Some are done out of direct self-interest. (Whatever is a potential private business).
| Governance: Self-regulating.
- > Others are only done by joint coordination (E.g. public goods not paid by specific users.)
| Governance: Political decision-making. (What to do and who pays for it?)

SIGNIFICANCE of Same Right to the World * PRODUCTION-OPTIONS & POSITION *

SAME RIGHT TO WORLD →	HONOURED (HUGO)	IGNORED (TODAY)
PRODUCTION CHOICE ... Subsistent or buy & sell in exchange	STRENGTHEND ————— > Basically all options: Thanks to equal access to areas & resources	WEAKENED ————— > Restricted options: Because of missing access to areas & resources
NEGOTIATING POSITION →	STRENGTHEND ————— > Better chance of good pay: Thanks to having alternatives	WEAKENED ————— > High exploitation-risk: Because of NOT having alternatives

EXCHANGE between GOODS & SERVICES and AREAS & RESOURCES

- > I) Because areas are often used indirectly (via products or renting).
- > II) Because there can be a mutual interest to hold/use more or less.

SIGNIFICANCE of Same Right to the World * WAY OF USAGE & BALANCE IN SUM *

SAME RIGHT TO WORLD →	HONOURED (HUGO)	IGNORED (TODAY)
FREE CHOICE —————→ ... Of using areas indirectly or holding oneself	FINE ————— > Exclusive rights to areas updated every year	DISTORTED ————— > Many areas blocked for decades or centuries
MATERIAL BALANCE —————→ ... Whether holding or using average, more or less	FINE ————— > Average share = free More = money out Less = money in	DISTORTED ————— > For many (resp. most): Already using less than an average share costs

CONNECTION between EXCHANGE and PRODUCTION

- > Division of labour enables higher production. E.g. thanks to specialisation or scale. But...
- > It can also be counterproductive: Whatever nonsense done/defended in the name of jobs.

 SOCIAL TRANSFER of GOODS & SERVICES

- > To some point, people support others voluntarily.
- > Beyond that, it also takes MANDATORY transfers.

Process: One-sided = NOT self-regulating.

Governance: Political decision making (who gets and who pays).

Feasibility: The less one has to cover, resp. the more one has oneself, the easier.

SIGNIFICANCE of Same Right to the World * TRANSFER-NEEDS & MEANS *

SAME RIGHT TO WORLD →	HONOURED (HUGO)	IGNORED (TODAY)
NEED @ AREAS →	RELIEVED > All humans profit of average share WITHOUT transfers	BURDENED > Means absorbed for what all should get automatically
NEED @ PRODUCING →	RELIEVED > Good basis to do more oneself = less need for transfers	BURDENED > Often missing basis = inflated need for transfers
NEED @ DAMAGES →	RELIEVED > Less destruction by war etc. = less need for transfers	BURDENED > Lots of destruction by war etc. = inflated need for transfers

 CONNECTION between MODERN SOCIAL TRANSFER and PRODUCTION

- > In a world that can hardly produce enough, all hands are needed. However...
- > In a super-productive world, ideas like "universal basic income" may be more efficient:
- > E.g. freeing potential wasted in nonsense-jobs, or stopping actions with negative effects.
- > Easiest if BOTH is possible: Good basic safety AND good extra-pay for doing the work.

SIGNIFICANCE of Same Right to the World * POTENTIAL FOR SOLUTIONS like UBI *

SAME RIGHT TO WORLD →	HONOURED (HUGO)	IGNORED (TODAY)
BASIC SAFETY →	BOOSTED > More covered otherwise, more means to cover the rest	HINDERED > Less covered otherwise, less means to cover the rest
GEOGRAPHICAL REACH →	BOOSTED > Comprehensive solutions easier in a balanced world	HINDERED > Comprehensive solutions difficult in an unbalanced world