

Realising every human's Same Rightf to the World...

How can one possible be against it?

This is an extension of 'History' 2.0 – recommended to read that first >> <https://start-hugo.com/History-2.0.pdf>

OPENING REMARK.

Compare "what if"-worries with 'what if NOT'.

What's Project Hugo suggests is new. VERY new. So there's a lot of "Huh? But what if this or that?". Questioning everything is fine of course. However...

Also consider the price of NOT acting:

If there's 1001 beer, and no. 1002 is "not easy to understand", giving up on it isn't too tragic. But...

>> If there's no system for the Same Right to the World, giving up on it because it's "not easy to understand" is FATAL.

And if adapting to a just basis looks challenging at first, think again:

>> Why should anything great be impossible if the Same Right to the World is realised?!

Anyway. Let's go through all groups of worries...

"There's no reason for a new system" – "Better don't go to the new system"

"Better go for something else" – "Better reach the same in a different way"

"Impossible to leave what's today" – "Impossible to handle the new system"

"There's no reason for a new system"

* *"There's no such thing as the Same Right to the World."*

> Would "there's no women's right to vote" be a "reason" for not introducing it? Of course not. Rights can be declared. The question is: Is claiming a right too presumptuous?

>> Today, people claim areas of this world without exchange with the others.
Claiming the Same Right to the World as all other humans is LESS presumptuous!

* *"What makes sense has certainly been thought on since long."*

> A system directly among all humans – a condition for realising the Same Right to the World – was unthinkable before the internet.

So, all they could do was to talk the Same Right to the World away. Or to avoid reasoning at all.

E.g. look at property theories regarding areas. Summary (from Wikipedia, German version):

"Original occupation, Appropriation through work, Legalization of existing situation." Oh well...

- "Legalization of existing situation" says it all: There is no conclusive concept to rely on.

- "Appropriation through work" doesn't answer who HAS the right to work on it.

- "Original occupation" assumes no one else wanted it. Against all evidence, seeing all the wars.

Also, before the web, it was simply impossible to ask all humans.

= The concept of "original occupation" would be wrong even if it WOULD be true.

So, time for something NEW!

>> With always new people on this world, it takes a continuously updated concept. And what any number of humans can claim conflict-free at any time is... The Same Right to the World.

* *"What's today evolved over a long time – so it must be the best."*

> Evolution follows what's physically possible. = Connecting all humans WASN'T before the web.

Also, a rights-system is different from products or business models which can mutate daily...

>> There's no natural competition in rights-systems. A key feature of rights is being valid for all.
= A rights-system takes CONSCIOUS conceptual change.

"Better don't go to the new system"

* *"It's too risky. What happens if people are lazy, or behave crazy?"*

> Exchange doesn't require cooperation. So, different from there...

>> Should some don't make the best out of their right, all others would get MORE.

* *"No one will build houses anymore if one can't block them."*

> As long as people want to live in houses, they will be built.

What counts is clear attribution. Incl. clear conditions for change of hands.

>> Investments in immobile works that someone wants are covered by the transfer fee.
In any stage.

* *"With parallel relation of transfer-fee and area-compensation, houses will be neglected."*

> Buildings have related costs today too. And aren't neglected. (Or IF, then because areas can be held WITHOUT compensation to all humans – a potential business even if buildings decay.)

To neglect houses etc. would also destroy the potential transfer fee.

And a lower transfer fee might actually attract MORE people to that area.

>> There are better ways to save Area-Tokens. E.g. take the good transfer fee and move.
Or hold the beloved place together with other loved ones.

* *"What about essential infrastructures or landmarks?"*

> Where the duties of a holder exceed his profit (public parks, monuments, roads, bridges etc.) people will hardly run for holding these dutiful areas. Thus...

>> Even the greatest open infrastructure doesn't cost Area-Tokens.
(And should there be a competition to sponsor the whole humanity, fine too :.)

* *"A system where all get the same undermines the reward for labour."*

> The Right to the World isn't a result of labour. It's there even if all would live on light and air.

If doing a good job leads to a higher share of the product, fine. But:

Nothing gives the right to hurt others human's Same Right to the World.

As little as being a good cook gives the right to eat other humans.

>> If holders can't take out money just by sitting on areas, that BRINGS good rewards for labour.
And if areas can't be blocked one-sided, ALL have the full options to profit from great efforts.

* *"But what about farms, factories, managing companies etc. who need bigger shares?"*

> Where people produce or handle things for others, the circle is: Buying Area-Tokens from others and getting the money back via what's charged in prices for products and services.

What's different from today:

>> With the continuous option of getting any area oneself, there's basically always the choice to do things oneself.

* *"EMOTIONAL VALUE must be taken into account too."*

> Of course emotional value matters. But it's pervert if it's used as an alibi for injustice:
Emotions don't give the right to profit at the expense of others.

>> Equal distribution of Area-Tokens gives ALL humans the opportunity to follow their emotions
and personal preferences – incl. exchange with other passions.

* *"If more humans are well off, pressure on the environment will increase even more."*

> Ecology shall not be an excuse for injustice.
(Else the "ideal" world would be one so unjust that most humans disappear.)

>> Ecology must be pursued without violating every human's Same Right to the World.

* *"Areas are exploited if there can be change of hand."*

> If today's blocking of areas would prevent exploitation, there would be no ecological problems.
Where losing a good transfer fee isn't enough to be careful, it takes limits anyway. And...

>> On a balanced basis, it's actually EASIER to set the necessary limits.

"Better go for something else"

* *"Some should be more equal than others."*

> It may not be said in these very words. Yet...

>> Any deviation from the Same Right to the World MEANS exactly that.

* *"Communal solutions would be more humane."*

> Realising the Same Right to the World isn't a question of "private or communal property".

As inclusive as certain communities may be in themselves... "Us all" isn't all humans!

As it says at a gate to a historic commune: 'The commune premises are private area.'

>> To give ALL humans humane perspectives, it takes an exchange-system among all humans.
(And ignoring that ISN'T humane.)

* *"A market can never be the solution."*

> Then why people go to food markets, flower markets, flea markets, supermarkets... Seriously:

If persons or communities hold areas, they take everyone's Same Right to the World.

Thus, exclusive rights to areas a commodity by their very existence. And...

Not giving something in exchange "because we don't like markets" is cheating all humans.

>> The distribution of exclusive rights to areas can only be correct with a market.
Although a NEW one.

* *"Better freeze the prices where they are."*

> Please note the difference between today's structure and a just system:

- Today (rent values skimmed by holders, and the rest of humanity cheated anyway)
trying to reduce rents by administered prices may be somewhat "social".

- In the new system (rent values to all humans) administered prices for some privileged one's
would only create unfair disadvantages.

>> In a BALANCED system, there's no need to freeze privileges. Quite the opposite:
With honest prices, all humans profit from a full average share.

* *"But what about the poorer one's in expensive regions?"*

> An average share may be smaller in size in highly sought after regions. But why should people in
less favourable regions subsidise people in more favourable one's?!

>> If Area-Tokens are sold in exchange for other things, the 'poor rich' can ask the 'rich rich'
to buy some extra for them. But the 'poor poor' sponsoring the 'poor rich' would be absurd!

* * ->

* *"The distribution of areas should be need-based."*

> It's a noble reflex to help those in need. But keep in mind: THIS is different from production.

- At products and services, it takes support for those who can't earn themselves.
- At the Same Right to the World, all get an average share anyway. If needing even MORE, e.g. for medical reasons, that's part of various social/insurance systems. In any case...

>> Should a deviation from the Same Right to the World really be needed, it works best if the means are equally at hand everywhere: One can only give what one has!

* *"Better distribute areas by who influenced their value."*

> Attribution-by-influence is never conclusive.

All can say anything. "Area only valuable because of me", "only because of the surroundings"... In reality, there are influences from around the globe why areas & resources are wanted.

Actually, attribution-by-influence is even absurd:

Imagine you produce something and get nothing because its value is claimed by 1001 influencer (up to customers saying "why pay, it's only valuable because I want it"). Likewise...

>> The Same Right to the World shall not be killed by whatever "influence"!

"Better reach the same in a different way"

* *"Better realise the Same Right to the World without a technical mechanism."*

> Equal distribution of areas WITHOUT an exchange-platform among all humans is an illusion. Without exchange with all humans, one can't even KNOW what an average share is.

>> **The Same Right to the World can only be reached thanks to a systemic tool.**

* *"It would be quicker to build on existing concepts."*

> Short cuts save time if they leave to the destination... But waste time if they're misleading.

Today's -isms (be it as something to devote or something to fight) don't really help precision.

Also, engagements typically follow patterns of "good guys vs. bad guys", or certain good deeds.

All necessary or good maybe. But far from caring about SYSTEMIC vacuums resp. chances...

And far from scalable and conclusive, as necessary for global balance and real peace.

>> **To be REALLY quick... Speed up going to the required new level.**

* *"Parallel relation between transfer fee and annual compensation for area is not perfect."*

> Only a world WITHOUT immobile things would allow a "perfect" economic system.

As long as people want settlements, it takes a compromise.

A way "as if" immobile things would be mobile would be great, but isn't in sight. Meanwhile:

>> **Compared to today's full ignorance and one-sided blocking of areas...**

A proportional relation, with choice of what one finds ideal, is still a big step ahead.

* *"Distributing Transfer-Tokens to all humans is not really founded".*

> Different from Area-Tokens which are founded by all human's Same Right to the World, Transfer-Tokens are a helping tool to reach a system at all.

To keep it as fair as possible, there are less Transfer-Tokens in the system than Area-Tokens (so they're mainly bought and sold before and after transfers).

>> **The point is to reach this: 'Below the line, immobile things are mostly paid in normal money, while the Same Right to the World is always ensured.' Improvements thereto welcome!**

* *"Why not doing it in a different rhythm?"*

> In theory, the process should be nonstop. In practice, people need time to think things through.

On the other hand, the longer the period, the more compensations differ from the actual value.

>> **Update considers both sides: Practical reasons as well as accuracy.**

"Impossible to leave what's today"

* *"Those who profit from today's situation won't take part."*

> This isn't about an individual decision. This is about a change in the rights system. And...

>> A rights system isn't 'opt-in' :-)

* *"People will not vote for a just system because they're egoistic."*

> The problem here is thoughtlessness, not egoism:

>> Egoistically, about 90% are better off right away.

* *"Many vote against their own interest, hoping to profit from today's way themselves one day..."*

> Assuming that some wouldn't want to profit quickly is no reason for not creating a just system.

Also, many confuse the Same Right to the World with redistribution. THERE, there's 1001 aspect. Not only profit, also fair extent of transfer, functionality (will it affect productivity?) etc. But...

>> THIS is a matter of principle. A matter of 'no violation'.

And in the classical 'no stealing' case, the majority-question isn't even raised.

* *"It's brutal if people have to change."*

> It's more brutal to leave billions of humans in disadvantaged situations!

Also, no one has to flee: An average share is always covered by the Area-Tokens everyone gets. And if not ready to cover EXTRA shares, it's still possible to use less at the SAME place.

>> If some want to sponsor special above-average cases within their communities, fine.
But not at the expense of all humans please!

* *"One can't change the system because areas are already paid."*

> Paid what? Paid who? As for transfer fees for immobile works, paying a predecessor was fine. They will also be covered when moving on. The crux is...

Payments may have contained sums for selling other human's Same Right to the World. If changing to a just system, that part may be "lost". However...

>> One shall not hang on to injustice because some already paid for the "right" to commit it.

* *"...But there can be hardships."*

> In many cases, the unjust part is amortised since long. By years of free use.

In other cases, don't feel too sorry for speculators who wanted to make money on an injustice.

If a loss in the unjust part is REALLY a hardship, it can be balanced in local social systems. Which have less costs if the world changes to just structures:

>> In sum, there will be LESS hardships to cover than with endless injustice.

"Impossible to handle the new system"

* *"It's too expensive to run an additional system."*

> A system for the Same Right to the world is additional in the sense that it fills a vacuum. Yet... It doesn't mean more costs in sum:

Today's vacuum isn't free of charge! "Regulating" the world by war etc. since a conclusive system is missing is expensive. Plus, the uneven basis brings social costs and economic shortcomings.

>> **A conclusive system SAVES expenditures. Also at the land registers that it takes anyway. With a logical platform, showing rights to areas and confirming changes is super simple.**

* *"Believing in a balanced system is naive – one can't change human nature."*

> If "human nature" means some will always try to get more than others, that'll hardly change... But that's exactly why it takes the missing system!

>> **Area-Tokens equally distributed to all humans set an unshakable basis. All are welcome to make MORE out of that basis – but it's always there.**

* *"One can't ignore the question of power."*

> Of course not. That's why it takes good systems: Potential force should only be there to back non-violation principles. As at 'no stealing' – with a system to prevent/proof/sanction it. But...

At territories, today, potential force is a factor in the distribution itself. And the power it takes to conquer/defend them favours aggressive guys (a reason for male-dominated societies?).

>> **With the new possibilities of the web, effective checks & balance are possible at areas too.**

* *"But at areas, it's not as simple as in normal 'no stealing'..."*

> Yes and no. Indeed, respecting the Same Right to the World requires a specific system. But then, preventing non-violation is already integrated:

>> **Occupying areas without validating them by Area-Tokens would be a self-proven crime. Silly. And easy to sanction: E.g. all could freely use the "non-belonging" areas and houses :-)**

* *"There's no world government – and there shouldn't be one."*

> There are good reasons why there's no classic world government (e.g. risk of dictatorship). But 'form follows function'...

This is essentially different from tasks that require hierarchical structures or "decision makers":

>> **A decentralised system where all take their decisions themselves has no place for dictators.**

* * ->

* *"A global democratic process requires an eternity."*

> Speed follows function, too.

Haggling about redistribution, joint activities or general limits can be endless indeed. But:

>> *To install an exchange-platform, usable by personal preferences, can be decided quickly.*

* *"Such as system is against this or that culture."*

> The 'golden rule' (treat others the way you want to be treated yourself) is essentially part of any culture's ideals. And:

The 'no stealing' principle is basically in place around the world already.

>> *A system for the Same Right to the World is a big step on the path declared since long. It just takes quite a kick to discover that.*

Below the line...

>> *There's no reason for NOT going for a just system.*