WORLD FEDERATION

Democratic Meritocracy and the World Federated Economy

François Lépine

Version 0.15 · Published November 14, 2026

F.Lepine Publishing · © 2026 François Lépine

This is an open-source working proposal for a worldwide economic and political system. Contributors are invited to exchange ideas, test the possibilities, and help develop the proposal. Reply to a chapter question or bring a question of your own to the discussion forum.

worldfederation.one

Contents

Preface 3

1. The World We Are Trying to Build 5

2. From National Competition to World Federation 9

3. Resources Available to the World 13

4. Manufacturing and Worldwide Distribution 17

5. Democratic Meritocracy 21

6. What Counts as Merit? 25

7. Current Contribution and Lifetime Contribution 29

8. Education and the Beginning of a Working Life 33

9. What Every Generation Needs to Learn 37

10. Universal Healthcare and Support for Inability 43

11. Choice, Responsibility, and Basic Support 47

12. Retirement Through Accumulated Merit 51

13. Justice Through Protection and Rehabilitation 55

14. Crime and the Loss of Merit 59

15. Prison, Severe Crimes, and Human Rights 63

16. Merit Commissioners 67

17. The Midpoint Rule 71

18. Terms, Reelection, and Limits on Power 75

19. Oversight, Appeals, and Correcting Mistakes 79

20. The System in Everyday Life 83

21. From Vision to a Workable Model 87

Preface

A proposal for worldwide cooperation and lifelong recognition of contribution

François Lépine

Revised manuscript November 6, 2026

Preface

This book develops a proposal for a World Federation that combines worldwide economic cooperation with democratic leadership based on demonstrated competence. Its central aim is to connect access to resources, recognition of contribution, and essential protection throughout a person's life.

The starting document, Democratic Meritocracy and the World Federated Economy, recorded the founding discussion on November 2, 2026. The original outline had twenty chapters. Chapter 9 of this twenty-one-chapter edition asks what every generation needs to learn and how citizens can revise the Federation as the world changes. The book develops these ideas through explanations, fictional examples and proposals for mechanisms that remain open.

The distinction between an established direction and an unresolved choice matters throughout the book. The proposed income proportions, the accumulation curve, and the crime illustrations are not final formulas. Federation powers, enterprise ownership, currency, assessment procedures, retirement funding, and several safeguards still need decisions. Additional institutional suggestions in this manuscript are identified as recommendations, options, or design proposals.

No fictional example describes an actual person or promises a particular income. Numerical examples illustrate a relationship or a statistical idea. They do not establish prices, entitlements, or penalty schedules. This is a conceptual manuscript based on the founding document, rather than a research survey or a completed constitution.

The purpose is to make the vision readable and open to serious examination. Each chapter asks what a principle would mean in practice and where further work is necessary. The final chapter proposes a way to test the model before asking anyone to depend on it.

Questions for discussion

- What would you need to see in a practical trial to judge whether the two systems work together?
- Which part of the proposal would benefit most from an example or a clearer explanation?

Join the discussion online →

1. The World We Are Trying to Build

"A person needs food whether they were born near fertile land or far from it."

A community needs medicine whether its government is powerful or weak. A capable person can contribute to humanity even when the place where they live offers few chances to demonstrate it. These ordinary observations are the starting point of this book.

The proposal is to organize human cooperation around the people who need resources and the people who can contribute, across the whole world. It joins a World Federated Economy with democratic meritocracy. The economic framework concerns access to resources, production, and distribution. The political framework concerns who receives responsibility and how their competence is judged.

Together, they describe a society in which essential support belongs to everyone, contribution receives recognition, and authority rests on demonstrated ability subject to democratic choice. This is a direction for building institutions. It is not a claim that a complete system can be introduced tomorrow.

A shared world with different lives

Worldwide cooperation does not require everyone to live the same way. People can keep their languages, traditions, interests, and local attachments. A fishing community, an agricultural region, and a large city face different daily tasks. Their institutions need room to respond to those differences.

What changes is the use of division as a barrier to access. The accident of birthplace should not decide whether a person can obtain an essential resource, pursue an education, or offer their abilities to a wider community. Geography would continue to affect what can be produced and what it costs to transport. Political exclusion would no longer be accepted as a sufficient reason to deny access.

This distinction matters. A World Federation cannot remove distance or manufacture unlimited materials. It can change the rules under which people cooperate across distance. Its success would depend on making those rules fair, understandable, and useful in ordinary life.

Two systems that need each other

An economic framework can connect resources and demand while still leaving power in irresponsible hands. A political system can elect capable people while leaving the necessities of life inaccessible to many. The proposal therefore brings economic organization and the selection of leadership into the same discussion.

The World Federated Economy asks how available resources can serve manufacturers and consumers everywhere. Democratic meritocracy asks why a particular person should be trusted with a particular

responsibility. Both questions lead to evidence: what exists, what is needed, what has been accomplished, and what can reasonably be done next.

This does not make every decision a technical calculation. People will disagree about priorities, acceptable risks, and the meaning of a good life. Competent leadership must make those disagreements visible and help people decide among real choices. A record of accomplishment supports trust; it cannot replace public judgment.

Recognition without abandonment

The economic idea gives a central place to merit. A person's work, skills, usefulness, and past contribution would influence their revenue and the additional resources they can enjoy. Necessary work would count even when it attracts little prestige. A cleaner who makes a public space safe and usable contributes to the same society as an engineer who designs its equipment.

Recognition would also continue through time. Present work would form the larger part of working revenue, while accumulated merit would acknowledge past contribution. A lifetime of useful effort should have lasting value, including when a person grows old.

At the same time, essential support would not depend on winning an economic comparison. Healthcare and education would remain available throughout life. People unable to work or study would receive comfortable support. Students would have the resources to learn and become independent. Those able to participate but choosing otherwise would retain a more modest basic provision.

> *"The guiding distinction is between unequal recognition of contribution and the equal protection of people."*

Different responsibilities and efforts may lead to different material advantages. They do not determine whether someone deserves food, safety, or care.

Power has to answer for itself

A system that evaluates contribution gains power over people's lives. That power requires attention from the beginning. An incorrect assessment can affect income. An unfair classification can make illness look like unwillingness. A manipulated election can give the appearance of merit to an unqualified leader.

Merit commissioners are proposed to oversee the system under law. Their own selection would depend on demonstrated competence and democratic election. Their compensation would occupy the middle of humanity's economic distribution, and their service would be subject to elections and a proposed twenty-five-year maximum.

These measures express an intention to restrain power. They still need institutions that make them effective. The book therefore examines appeals, independent scrutiny, transparent reasoning, and

correction of errors as design proposals. Trust should grow from how decisions are made and repaired, rather than from the title of the person making them.

A vision that can be questioned

This book deliberately begins with an ambitious objective. Humanity should be able to cooperate at the scale of its shared needs while allowing different people and communities to flourish. Calling that objective utopian acknowledges the distance between the vision and a workable institutional design.

The chapters that follow develop the founding proposal without pretending that every mechanism has been settled. Numerical examples remain illustrations. Suggested safeguards and transition methods are proposals for further discussion. Where a choice has practical consequences, the book explains those consequences rather than hiding them behind a promise.

The test is concrete. Can someone learn without falling into deprivation? Can useful work receive fair recognition? Can a sick person live with dignity? Can a community obtain what it needs without political exclusion? Can an official be challenged and removed? A World Federation becomes meaningful when its answers improve the lives people actually live.

Questions for discussion

- How do we measure whether the Federation is improving people's everyday lives?
- What institutions make the guarantees of food, safety, healthcare, and education effective in daily life?

Join the discussion online →

2. From National Competition to World Federation

A World Federation would still need government. People would continue to make shared decisions, administer services, resolve disputes, and protect one another. The founding proposal moves beyond competing national barriers; it does not assume that authority or disagreement will disappear.

The useful question is therefore how to organize authority so that cooperation can extend around the world without putting every decision in one office. A federation has to hold together two needs: common rules where people depend on one another, and local freedom where communities can responsibly decide for themselves.

What borders would stop deciding

The proposal challenges the use of national divisions to control access to resources and opportunity. If a manufacturer needs a material that exists in another region, the relevant questions should concern availability, legitimate demand, and the practical cost of moving it. A line on a map should not itself make the manufacturer ineligible.

The same principle applies to people. Education and healthcare would belong to the framework of shared support. Their availability should not turn on the bargaining strength of a person's place of birth. This does not resolve where someone may live, how migration would operate, or how service capacity would expand. Those questions need their own rules. It establishes the direction in which those rules should work.

Removing an exclusion does not remove the need to manage an activity. Food still requires inspection. Construction still requires safety standards. A resource agreement still needs enforceable terms. The Federation would replace fragmented barriers with accountable arrangements, whose particular form remains to be designed.

Authority at a useful scale

The founding proposal leaves the division of powers open. A practical design option is to assign each responsibility to the smallest level that can carry it out fairly and effectively, with wider institutions handling problems that exceed that level. This is a recommendation developed here, not an adopted constitutional rule.

A neighbourhood can often identify a damaged walkway more directly than a worldwide office. A regional institution may be better placed to coordinate a water network serving several communities. Shared arrangements may be necessary when a supply chain crosses many regions or when an institution denies a person's basic protections.

The relevant scale can change.

"A local water problem may become regional when an upstream decision affects other communities."

An economic disagreement may become worldwide when a dominant supplier can exclude users across the Federation. The design needs a way to move a problem to the appropriate level without allowing every inconvenience to become an excuse for central control.

Written powers, public reasons for intervention, and a process for resolving jurisdictional disputes are possible safeguards. The precise bodies that would exercise them remain open.

Common protection and local difference

A federation should make it possible for people to live differently within common protections. Language, architecture, cultural life, and many choices about public spaces can remain rooted in local circumstances. Shared participation need not erase a community's identity.

Some decisions would require a common boundary. A local authority could not make universal healthcare conditional on a favourable merit assessment while still claiming to follow this proposal. Nor could a regional institution abandon a prisoner to dangerous survival conditions. These would contradict protections built into the founding vision.

The difficult cases fall between clear local discretion and clear common protection. Who determines whether a service is adequate? When does a local choice impose an unfair cost on others? A constitution would need to describe the standards and the way such disputes are judged. Good intentions cannot perform that work on their own.

Consider a district where a religious council organizes a harvest festival and its neighbours use a secular growers' association. Both can negotiate a grain reserve with the Federation. Neither should have to adopt the other's calendar, beliefs or form of association. Within either district, a resident must be free to practise a faith, change it or live without one. Access to the shared grain cannot depend on worship, assent to a doctrine or deference to a local leader.

People should be able to propose different ways of meeting a common need and choose which arrangement to join. If one group prefers a cooperative store and another prefers direct household deliveries, ask whether both can fulfil their commitments to neighbours. A worldwide agreement has to protect the person who chooses differently within their own community as well as the community that chooses differently from its neighbours. No office should make cultural conformity a condition of participation.

Democracy continues across levels

Democratic meritocracy would apply the same basic question to different offices: what evidence shows that this person can carry out this responsibility? The evidence relevant to a local service administrator would differ from the evidence relevant to a leader coordinating worldwide resource access.

The electorate cannot simply be assumed. Residents affected by a local decision, workers affected by enterprise leadership, and people subject to a federation-wide institution may each have a legitimate voice. How those voices are organized is a design question. The source does not establish a single voting method or a final structure of representation.

> *"Whatever form is chosen, an election must give people a meaningful choice."*

A list of approved candidates is insufficient if approval is controlled by an unaccountable circle. Equally, public voting cannot evaluate accomplishments fairly if the records are fabricated or incomprehensible. Democratic legitimacy and reliable evidence have to be developed together.

The danger of concentrating power

A worldwide institution could solve problems that fragmented authorities cannot easily address. It could also concentrate mistakes and abuse across a much larger population. That possibility is a reason to design limits into the Federation from the start.

Proposed protections include separating administration from final adjudication, publishing institutional responsibilities, and allowing affected people to seek review beyond the office that made a decision. Later chapters examine these arrangements in more detail. They remain recommendations until the project adopts a constitutional design.

The transition also matters. The founding discussion supplies no agreement to dissolve existing countries or override communities. Building a federation would require legitimate participation, negotiated responsibilities, and ways to maintain services while institutions change. A worldwide objective does not grant a shortcut around consent.

The Federation would earn its place by making cooperation dependable. People should be able to identify who is responsible for a problem, what rules apply, and where a decision can be challenged. A wider political structure becomes valuable when those practical relationships are clearer and fairer than before.

Questions for discussion

- What authority belongs to worldwide, regional, and local institutions?
- What would replace the competing national structures?

Join the discussion online →

3. Resources Available to the World

Every resource, wherever it is located, should be accessible to consumers and manufacturers throughout the world under fair common rules. That is the economic starting point of the project. It means that location should affect the practical conditions of access without becoming a political privilege that excludes everyone else.

The founding proposal names three influences: supply, demand, and transportation. They provide a way to begin asking useful questions. They do not yet form a complete allocation system, and they cannot make a limited resource satisfy unlimited requests.

Knowing what is actually available

Supply means more than knowing that a material exists underground or in a warehouse. A useful account has to distinguish what could exist, what can currently be obtained, and what is ready to deliver. Extraction, processing, safety, and maintenance affect the quantities that can reach people.

Consider a hypothetical region with a deposit of a mineral used in several industries. Its geological presence says little by itself about next month's usable supply. Equipment may need repair. Processing capacity may be limited. A production schedule may already commit part of the output. Treating the whole deposit as immediately available would create promises the system cannot keep.

A proposed resource register would therefore distinguish estimates from deliverable quantities and show the assumptions behind each. Such a register is a new design suggestion. It would need verification, protection of legitimate confidential information, and rules against strategic misreporting. Publishing unreliable numbers would spread confusion more efficiently.

Demand contains different kinds of requests

A request for a resource does not explain its urgency. The same material might support essential infrastructure, ordinary consumer products, or optional luxury goods. The founding document leaves the order of priority during shortages unresolved.

One option developed here is to protect clearly defined essential needs before allocating the remaining supply among less urgent uses. This would fit the wider commitment to basic support, but its categories and procedures would require explicit agreement. An agency should not be able to label its own project essential merely to move ahead of others.

Demand also needs evidence. An enterprise could overstate its requirements to hold a larger reserve. An allocation office could favour familiar institutions whose paperwork is easier to process. A workable model would compare requested quantities with actual capacity, expected use, and the consequences of delay, while leaving room to challenge an assessment.

The purpose is to make the demand visible enough to judge. It is not to assume that every request deserves approval or that an official can know every person's preferences.

"Seasons change what a community needs and when it needs it."

In Québec, a household may have to secure winter heat months before the cold arrives. In Bali, farmers in the subak irrigation system have coordinated canals, water allocation and the work of maintaining them across generations. Their water temples are part of how that cooperation is organized. A reserve of heating fuel and a shared irrigation gate are different answers to the same obligation to think ahead. Industrial output or access to advanced machinery tells us little, by itself, about the foresight of the people who live in a region. UNESCO, The Subak System of Bali

When communities pool resources, they can keep a local calendar of the months when a shortage would do the most harm. That calendar can include a freeze, a dry season, a harvest, a religious observance or a period when a road becomes impassable. Ask residents what must arrive, by when, and what they can offer in return or in another season. Check the claims and give neighbours a voice when they rely on the same supply. A common right to resources may require a different delivery date, quantity or locally acceptable substitute.

Distance still has a cost

Transportation remains part of the proposal because resources have to move through physical space. Handling, storage, energy, equipment, and time can all affect delivery. A distant consumer may face a different delivered cost from a nearby consumer even when both have equal eligibility to obtain the resource.

For a hypothetical batch of material, a producer might quote a base amount for the material itself, while a distributor identifies processing and transport separately. This separation is a possible accounting approach, not an adopted price formula. It would help explain which differences arise from distance and which arise from other decisions.

There are choices to make about essential services in remote places. The Federation might share some delivery costs across the wider system, support local substitutes, or invest in better transport. Each option has costs and distributional effects. Worldwide access requires examining those choices rather than pretending that remote delivery is free.

Access does not settle ownership

Making a resource available worldwide does not answer who owns it, who operates its production, or how the people living near it participate in decisions. The source leaves those matters open. This book does not convert the access principle into an assumed right to take material from a community.

A resource arrangement must also decide how to account for local burdens. Extraction may occupy land, consume water, or create waste. The recommendation here is that these effects form part of any proposed supply assessment and approval process. Environmental limits and community participation are extensions developed in this manuscript, rather than mechanisms already established in the founding discussion.

Availability should mean lawful and responsible availability.

> *"A manufacturer cannot claim unlimited access while shifting the consequences of production onto people who have no effective voice."*

What happens when there is not enough

A shortage exposes the difference between a principle and an operating system. If two legitimate users need the same limited quantity, an office must choose how to divide it, delay a request, or find a substitute. A general statement about cooperation does not decide the case.

Possible tools include transparent priority rules, temporary rationing of essential uses, queues for less urgent requests, and incentives to increase supply where doing so is responsible. These are options for testing. The project has not selected one universal shortage mechanism.

Any mechanism should disclose the shortage, explain the allocation, and provide a route to challenge factual mistakes. It should also be temporary where the problem is temporary. Emergency discretion should not quietly become a permanent privilege for the best-connected users.

The aim is a world in which an ordinary person or producer can understand the terms of access. What is available? What can be delivered? What is the cost? Why was one request prioritized? A resource system becomes fairer when those questions receive clear answers and when the answers can be checked.

Questions for discussion

- How would limited resources be allocated during shortages?
- How would essential needs be weighed against discretionary demand?

Join the discussion online →

4. Manufacturing and Worldwide Distribution

"A resource becomes useful through the work that turns it into something people can use."

Materials have to be processed, components made, products assembled, and finished goods delivered. A World Federated Economy must connect those activities as carefully as it connects a consumer to a source of raw material.

The founding principle is straightforward: manufacturers should be able to obtain the resources needed for production, and their finished products should be available to consumers throughout the world. The practical challenge is to organize that access while respecting limited capacity, costs, and different needs.

Following a product through the system

Imagine a hypothetical workshop producing household water containers. It needs material, moulding equipment, energy, skilled operators, quality checks, packaging, and transport. Access to the material solves only one part of its task. If a machine fails, the workshop still cannot deliver its promised output.

The example shows why a production system has to distinguish resources from capacity. A region may have abundant material but insufficient processing equipment. Another may have trained people and idle machinery but lack reliable supplies. Connecting those capacities could improve access, provided the proposed connection is practical and its costs are understood.

The Federation would need information about these relationships. That does not necessarily require a worldwide office to dictate every production decision. Shared standards for reporting availability, placing orders, and explaining constraints could support cooperation among many independent organizations. The institutional form remains open.

Production has costs beyond transport

Supply, demand, and transportation are central to the source. A finished-product price or allocation calculation must also address the work and equipment required to make the product. Maintenance, energy, rejected output, and safe operating conditions cannot be ignored merely because the proposal seeks to limit greed.

A possible accounting approach would make the main categories visible: inputs, labour, equipment use, distribution, and any permitted surplus or reserve. This is a design recommendation. The project has not chosen a currency, a price-setting method, or a rule for enterprise profit.

Visibility would help distinguish a real production burden from a charge that comes from an exclusive position. It would not make every disagreement disappear. Organizations may reasonably differ about how

much maintenance to plan or which equipment to purchase. Their judgments would need evidence and accountability appropriate to the decision.

Enterprises and their freedom to act

The source applies democratic meritocracy to business leadership but does not settle the ownership of enterprises. Public organizations, cooperatives, privately owned firms, and mixed arrangements raise different questions about funding, risk, authority, and voting.

This manuscript therefore treats enterprise form as an open design choice. The access principle can be examined across several forms without pretending they are identical. A small workshop and a network supplying essential medicine would not necessarily need the same governance arrangements.

An important test is whether those arrangements allow useful initiative. People need ways to propose a product, obtain a fair assessment, and begin production without already controlling a large institution. At the same time, public support for an enterprise requires a way to evaluate its use of resources and to stop financing activity that does not work.

The detailed rules for investment, reserves, losses, and closure remain to be developed. A federation cannot promise every enterprise permanent survival simply because its founders intend to contribute.

Distribution reaches an actual person

> *"A product is not meaningfully available worldwide if it appears in a catalogue but cannot reach the person who needs it."*

Distribution includes storage, local access points, delivery reliability, repair, and clear information about use. Different communities may need different arrangements.

A remote settlement might benefit from shared deliveries and a local repair service. A dense city might need many convenient collection points. Those are hypothetical examples of adapting distribution to circumstances. They are not prescribed institutions.

Product quality also matters. A cheap item that fails quickly can consume more materials and effort than a durable alternative. The proposal does not yet establish product standards, guarantees, or rules for repairability. Developing them would help connect the goal of worldwide access with the usefulness of what people actually receive.

Coordinating without promising perfection

Demand can change faster than production. Equipment can fail. Estimates can be wrong. A responsible system should expose these limits early enough for people to adapt. Concealing a delay to protect an institution's reputation makes the rest of the system plan around an event that will not happen.

Possible safeguards include delivery reporting, independent quality assessment, clear rules for recalling unsafe products, and alternative suppliers where feasible. These recommendations would require testing. They should be judged by whether they reduce harm and improve service rather than by the amount of administration they create.

Worldwide distribution would not mean shipping everything from a single centre. Some products may be best made close to their users; others may depend on specialized facilities serving many regions. The decision should follow evidence about capability, cost, resilience, and need.

The economic objective is fulfilled when a useful product moves from responsible production into a person's daily life under understandable terms. That is the connection the Federation must build: resources become capacity, capacity becomes useful goods, and useful goods become accessible support for human living.

Questions for discussion

• How would ownership, currency, enterprise funding, and production costs work?

• How would supply, demand, and transport shape distribution?

Join the discussion online →

5. Democratic Meritocracy

> *"Anyone asking to lead should be able to explain what they have already done that prepares them for the responsibility."*

This is the central demand of democratic meritocracy. Candidates present their experience, accomplishments, and evidence of competence. Voters decide whom to trust on that basis.

Promises would still have a place in explaining intended action. A community needs to know what a candidate proposes to do. But a promise would no longer serve as the main evidence that the candidate can do it. A credible direction must be connected to demonstrated ability, sound judgment, and an honest account of limitations.

Merit belongs to the responsibility

Competence is specific. A person who leads a successful engineering project has shown something valuable, but that achievement does not automatically prepare them to direct healthcare or judge criminal cases. The relevant question is how their record relates to the actual duties of the office.

Each position therefore needs an understandable description. What decisions does its holder make? Which resources do they control? What knowledge and judgment are required? Which results can fairly be attributed to their work? Without this clarity, an election may reward general fame while calling it merit.

This principle also protects less famous candidates. Someone who has improved a small local service may show more relevant ability for a local office than a celebrated person whose experience lies elsewhere. The scale and visibility of an accomplishment matter less than its relationship to the task.

A record people can examine

The source requires candidates to present their curriculum and accomplishments. It leaves the verification process open. A design proposed here is a common public record that distinguishes the candidate's claim, the supporting evidence, and any contested interpretation.

For a hypothetical service director, that record might explain the original problem, their actual authority, the resources available, the actions taken, and the result. It should also identify the people and institutions whose work made the result possible. A leader should receive credit for leadership without appropriating the whole team's contribution.

Failures belong in this record too. A candidate may have inherited an impossible timetable or made an avoidable mistake. Those are different situations. Explaining what happened, what was learned, and how later decisions changed gives voters more useful information than a flawless collection of promotional achievements.

Verification cannot become a hidden power to select the winner. Reviewers should check claims and identify uncertainty, while voters retain judgment within whatever lawful eligibility rules the Federation eventually adopts. The composition and independence of the verification process remain design questions.

Democratic choice remains real

People with strong records can disagree. One may favour a more cautious investment; another may judge a faster expansion worth the risk. Their competence does not resolve the public choice between those directions. Voters still have to consider priorities and consequences.

The democratic part of democratic meritocracy is therefore essential. A technical panel cannot substitute its preferences for the community's merely by calling one plan more professional. Expertise helps people understand available choices. It does not make the effects of those choices belong only to experts.

The source has not specified the electorate, voting method, term length, or eligibility rules for each office. Those arrangements should be chosen with the same concern for meaningful participation. Relevant questions include who is affected, how minority voices are heard, and how a losing side retains the ability to scrutinize the winner.

Opportunity to demonstrate ability

> *"A system based on past accomplishment can reproduce past exclusion if it ignores who had a chance to accomplish anything."*

An impressive record may partly reflect access to excellent training, powerful contacts, or unusually large resources. Another person may have achieved more with much less support.

The recommendation here is to judge accomplishments in context and create routes for people to demonstrate ability at an appropriate scale. Apprenticeships, supervised responsibilities, and smaller elected offices are possible routes. Their design must avoid making unpaid service the price of entry for people who cannot afford it.

Education can improve opportunity, but it does not remove every barrier. Caregiving duties, disability, geography, and prior discrimination may affect a person's record. These considerations do not require inventing achievements. They require evaluating real achievements with an honest understanding of their circumstances.

Leadership in business

The founding concept also applies to business leadership. The same demand for relevant evidence would guide the selection of people entrusted with enterprises. Yet a business has several possible constituencies: workers, owners, users, and communities affected by its operations.

The project has not chosen who would vote in each enterprise or how ownership rights would interact with election. A cooperative, a privately financed workshop, and a major public utility may need different arrangements. Applying one voting formula everywhere without addressing those differences would leave important conflicts unresolved.

What carries across the different settings is accountability for the responsibility assumed. A candidate for enterprise leadership should show the ability to organize useful work, manage resources, and respond to the people affected. Results should remain open to examination after selection.

Democratic meritocracy is thus an ongoing relationship between a record, a responsibility, and public trust. Election gives someone an opportunity to serve. Their conduct in office supplies the next evidence by which that trust can be renewed or withdrawn.

Questions for discussion

• Who votes for each kind of office?

• How are candidate records verified, and how would democratic selection work in businesses?

Join the discussion online →

6. What Counts as Merit?

"The cleaner washing a supermarket floor at night performs work that other people depend on."

Customers may never meet them. Their work may attract little attention. It still makes the space usable, supports the business, and contributes to the lives of people who pass through it.

That example anchors the meaning of merit in this project. Contribution cannot be measured only by prestige, credentials, visibility, or the income a person already receives. The system must recognize useful work where it actually happens, including work that becomes visible mainly when it is left undone.

Several questions about contribution

The founding discussion identifies skills, current capacity, the difficulty of learning and performing work, social need, demand, usefulness, performance, and demonstrated accomplishments. These are starting factors. Their relative weight has not been chosen.

Each factor asks a different question. Skill concerns what someone can do. Performance concerns how well they do it. Social need concerns why the work matters. Demand concerns how much of that contribution is being sought. Difficulty concerns what acquiring or exercising the ability requires. Accomplishment concerns what has actually been achieved.

The factors can point in different directions. A contribution may require little formal training but be physically demanding and essential. Another may require years of study but have limited current demand. A fair assessment has to explain how it handles those differences instead of hiding them inside an unexplained number.

Work that is easy to overlook

Many useful activities do not fit a conventional paid job. A person may care for a relative, help maintain a community space, create cultural work, or develop a method that others use freely. The source explicitly leaves recognition of these contributions open.

This manuscript recommends giving such work a route to recognition where its contribution can be reasonably demonstrated. That recommendation does not mean every private activity automatically earns income. It means the absence of an employer should not by itself settle the question.

For caregiving, a future model might examine the responsibilities involved, the time and capacity required, and the support already provided. For creative work, it might distinguish producing work from its later usefulness or reception. These examples reveal why a single output measure will not fit every contribution. The project needs field-specific judgment within common protections against arbitrary treatment.

Individual work and shared results

Useful results often come from groups. A hospital service, a public transport network, or a manufacturing enterprise depends on people with different responsibilities. Some contributions are easy to name; others sustain the conditions in which the visible work succeeds.

An assessment should ask what a person was responsible for and how their contribution can be identified without assigning them the entire result. It should also avoid punishing one worker for every failure in a system they do not control. A delayed delivery caused by a broken regional network is different from a delay caused by repeated neglect of assigned duties.

The proposal developed here is to combine role-based expectations with evidence of actual performance and context. Team results may inform the assessment, but the reasons for the individual's evaluation should remain understandable. The method and the appeal process would need testing before financial consequences were attached.

What a measure can distort

Any measure can encourage people to optimize the measure instead of the useful activity. Counting completed tasks may reward speed while hiding poor quality. Counting hours may overlook a better method that reduces the time needed. Counting popularity may disadvantage work whose value appears slowly.

This does not make measurement useless. It makes judgment and review necessary. Several kinds of evidence, sampled checks, and discussion with affected users may provide a better picture than one score. These are design options rather than established procedures.

Assessment also has a cost.

> *"If recording a contribution takes more effort than making it, the system has become a burden."*

Routine work should have a proportionate process. Unusual or contested claims may need more detailed examination. The goal is reliable recognition with administration that serves the work.

Merit does not measure a person's whole worth

An economic assessment is limited to the responsibilities assigned to it. It cannot establish the total value of a human being. Someone with little recorded contribution may be young, ill, excluded from opportunity, or living through circumstances the assessment does not capture.

The founding discussion mentioned harmful selfish conduct as well as crime, but did not define a wider penalty system for selfishness. This book recommends keeping criminal sanctions tied to defined law and resisting vague penalties for unpopular attitudes or private beliefs. That boundary protects the merit system from becoming a general instrument of moral surveillance.

A person's religion, opinions, friendships, or lawful criticism of the Federation should not become substitutes for evidence about contribution. This is a proposed rights safeguard consistent with the need for accountable assessment. Its constitutional form remains to be agreed.

Imagine two workers who keep water flowing. One operates a computerized plant. The other organizes repairs to open channels with a crew, basic tools and knowledge of a seasonal river. To judge their merit, look at the water people actually received, the failures each worker prevented, the responsibilities each carried and the resources each had to work with. The price of their equipment tells us little about their respective contributions. Each should be able to present evidence in a locally meaningful form and challenge an assessment that confuses unfamiliar customs with poor performance.

Changing judgments as needs change

Demand for a skill can rise or fall. A method can become obsolete. A person can improve, retrain, or take on a different role. Current contribution therefore needs periodic reassessment, while accumulated merit preserves the fact that earlier work mattered at the time it was performed.

This distinction allows the system to recognize change without rewriting a person's whole history whenever society's needs shift. It also sets up the next question: how should present and past contribution combine into revenue? A workable answer must honour useful effort while remaining clear enough for the people whose lives depend on it.

Questions for discussion

- What is measured, who measures it, and how are unlike contributions compared?
- How are caregiving, unpaid service, and creative work evaluated?

Join the discussion online →

7. Current Contribution and Lifetime Contribution

"A person's present work and their past contribution both deserve recognition."

They do different jobs in the proposed economy. Current contribution reflects what the person can usefully do now. Accumulated merit preserves recognition of what they have already given over time.

The founding discussion proposes that revenue draw on both components, with current contribution receiving the larger share during working life. One example assigns 70% of working revenue to current contribution and 30% to accumulated merit. Another assigns two-thirds to current contribution and one-third to accumulated merit. The choice remains open.

Why two components matter

A system based entirely on present output could forget a lifetime of effort when someone slows down. A system based entirely on history could make new contributors wait too long for fair recognition and could reward an old record regardless of current responsibility.

The two-component approach tries to keep both concerns visible. Someone beginning a career can be recognized for a useful current role. Someone who has contributed steadily for years gains a lasting historical foundation. Changing work would affect the current assessment without automatically erasing the past.

This is the purpose of the proposal, not proof that a particular ratio will achieve it. The result depends on how both components are measured and funded. A reasonable-looking percentage can produce unreasonable outcomes if the underlying scales are poorly designed.

What the percentages do and do not tell us

Suppose, only to illustrate a split, that a hypothetical monthly revenue is one thousand accounting units. The 70/30 example assigns 700 units to current contribution and 300 to accumulated merit. A two-thirds division would attribute about six hundred and sixty-seven units to the first and three hundred and thirty-three to the second.

This example divides a total that has already been assumed. It does not explain how to determine that total, how a new worker qualifies for it, or how much either component can buy. The accounting units have no proposed exchange rate. They are used only to make the proportions clear.

An operating model must answer a deeper question: is revenue calculated by combining two independent assessments with weights, or is a person's total entitlement first established and then described in two parts? Those approaches are not interchangeable. The founding discussion has not chosen between them.

Building accumulated merit

Merit could accumulate by hour, month, or another defined period along a curve. The source leaves the interval and the curve open. The design has to decide what is being accumulated: hours alone, assessed contribution over time, or some other credited quantity.

Hours alone would be simple but would overlook differences in responsibility and usefulness. A fully individualized calculation could recognize those differences but become complex and vulnerable to inconsistent judgments. A model combining standard role-based credit with limited adjustments is another possibility. Each option requires comparison.

The shape of the curve matters too. A steadily rising curve may preserve recognition over a lifetime but create very large differences after long service. A curve with diminishing additions could limit that divergence but would need to show that long contribution still leads to adequate retirement. These are design choices to test, rather than settled features.

Interruptions raise further questions. Education, illness, caregiving, unemployment, and voluntary inactivity are different circumstances. The source does not state whether each earns historical credit. A future model should describe those periods explicitly instead of quietly treating every gap as failure to contribute.

Avoiding a closed hierarchy

Accumulation can become an obstacle to opportunity if seniority dominates every other consideration.

> *"A capable new worker should not need decades of history before their current contribution can support a good life."*

This is one reason the current component carries the larger proposed weight during working life.

Likewise, earlier merit should not give someone automatic authority in a different field. Economic recognition, professional competence, and eligibility for an elected responsibility are related but distinct matters. A high historical balance does not establish that someone is the right person to direct a particular service.

The recommended safeguard is to evaluate these questions separately and explain their relationships. The economic system should reward contribution without turning a record of past work into a general right to command others.

Records people can understand

A person should be able to see what period was assessed, what credit was recorded, and what effect it had on revenue. This manuscript proposes a personal account with clear statements, correction procedures, and limited access for officials performing a defined task.

That account need not expose a person's detailed health or family circumstances to employers or the public. The institution calculating an entitlement may need a verified status without receiving every sensitive detail behind it. Privacy and audit requirements have to be designed together.

Errors also need repair. Missing records, duplicated contributions, and incorrect classifications can change a person's long-term position. A correction should reach both the current payment and the historical record where appropriate.

The two components offer a useful way to discuss a lifetime of contribution. Their value will depend on whether people can understand them, whether newcomers have a fair start, and whether a long working life leads to dependable support when current work ends. Retirement therefore requires its own design, beyond the initial working-life percentages.

Questions for discussion

- Is the revenue balance 70/30, two-thirds/one-third, or something else?
- How does merit accumulate, and how does it convert into revenue?

Join the discussion online →

8. Education and the Beginning of a Working Life

Learning is part of preparing to contribute.

> *"A student should have enough support to study, live adequately, and develop independence."*

The founding proposal gives students a comfortable baseline of resources and revenue, together with universally available education.

This approach recognizes a simple dependency. A society that wants capable contributors must make it possible to acquire capacity. It cannot demand demonstrated competence while leaving people without a fair way to learn, practise, and enter useful work.

The conditions for studying

Tuition access alone does not describe the full cost of education. A learner also needs somewhere to live, food, materials, and time. Personal circumstances can create further needs. The source establishes comfortable student support but leaves its detailed scope and administration open.

A future model should define what a normal educational path requires at different stages of life. A person studying near home may need different assistance from someone whose course requires specialized facilities elsewhere. Equal opportunity may therefore involve different practical provisions.

The model should also avoid confusing comfort with unrestricted consumption. Student support has a purpose: adequate living conditions and the freedom to develop ability. The exact standard and discretionary allowance remain to be chosen. They should be understandable to students before a course begins.

A path can change

People do not always know at the start which work suits them. A course may reveal a stronger interest elsewhere. A person may struggle because the teaching format is unsuitable, because they need additional preparation, or because the field does not match their abilities.

Universal education throughout life allows these discoveries to become changes of direction. It would be inconsistent to offer education in principle while making one early mistake permanently disqualifying. At the same time, an institution needs a fair way to distinguish genuine study from enrolment used solely to obtain a higher support level.

A student who changes direction needs to know which courses still count, what preparation the new branch requires, and how to request a fresh assessment. Chapter 9 takes up what everyone should learn and how a teacher can recognize readiness for advanced work.

From a qualification to a useful role

"A graduate enters working life without a long employment record."

The source directly addresses this problem: their initial assessment should recognize present capacity, the difficulty of acquiring their skills, and society's need for those skills. Accumulated merit would then grow through actual contribution.

A qualification is evidence of preparation. It is not evidence that every graduate already performs at the same level as an experienced practitioner. The transition needs opportunities to work within an appropriate responsibility, receive supervision where needed, and demonstrate competence in practice.

Consider a hypothetical person completing technical training. Their education may qualify them to begin work in a maintenance team. Their current revenue would need a basis that recognizes this useful capacity without inventing years of past service. As their actual work becomes visible, their performance and historical record can be assessed.

The project has not defined entry-level revenue or the treatment of probation and apprenticeship. These mechanisms should give beginners a genuine start while protecting the people affected by inexperienced work.

Education across a lifetime

A person may need to retrain when a field changes or when their health makes former work unsuitable. Another may return to education after years of caring for someone. The proposal keeps education open throughout life, rather than restricting it to a period before employment.

This creates questions about support during retraining, the treatment of accumulated merit, and the availability of study places. The current manuscript recommends preserving an accurate historical record while assessing the new learning period under explicit rules. It does not assume that study automatically earns the same credit as paid work.

Education also has value beyond occupational preparation. People may learn to understand their communities, express themselves, or take part in shared decisions. The source speaks of personal emancipation. A future model should explain how it supports that wider purpose alongside the need for useful professional capacity.

Who educates and who checks quality

Making education universal requires teachers, facilities, materials, and reliable administration. Those resources must themselves be produced and maintained. The project has not selected a funding model or a single form of educational institution.

Possible arrangements include institutions operating under common access guarantees with locally adapted teaching. The central tests would be whether learners can enter, whether the education builds real capacity, and whether poor provision can be identified and improved. These are proposed criteria, not an adopted inspection system.

Students need a voice in reporting obstacles. Employers or public services can provide evidence about preparation for particular roles. Neither group alone should control the whole purpose of education. Learning serves the person as well as the immediate needs of an institution.

A beginning that does not require an inheritance

The combination of accessible education, adequate support, and recognition of new capacity is intended to make a working life possible without a privileged starting position. No arrangement can guarantee identical outcomes. It can remove some avoidable barriers and create a fairer opportunity to demonstrate ability.

The important promise is practical: a person who is willing and able to learn should have a credible path toward contribution. That path needs real places to study, enough support to complete the work, and a fair first opportunity to use what has been learned. Democratic meritocracy depends on those conditions if demonstrated merit is to be open to everyone.

Questions for discussion

- What support allows students to live comfortably while learning?
- How does evaluation account for unequal access to education and starting opportunities?

Join the discussion online →

9. What Every Generation Needs to Learn

Imagine two towns that draw their water from the same river. A drought comes. The upstream town wants to save its harvest. Downstream, families need drinking water, and the mill that employs half the town needs water to run. A student from either town could grow up to help decide what happens to both. What should that student learn before a neighbour asks why their town should give up anything for the other?

Learning to face what is happening

There are two kinds of work to do here. The mental work begins with fairly simple questions. How much water is actually available? Who measured it? How long could the shortage last? A student should be able to tell the difference between a measurement, a prediction and a rumour. A good exercise is to have students write down what would change their minds, then give them new evidence and ask them to explain what they revised.

The emotional work begins closer to home. A student whose father works at the mill may feel angry before anybody has finished speaking. That anger tells her what she stands to lose. It tells her very little about what the farmers upstream have done. She can name her fear of losing the family income, listen to a farmer explain what a lost harvest means, and still argue for keeping the mill open. Students can practise this in pairs. Before either proposes a solution, each describes the other's concern well enough for the other to recognize it. Both may leave the conversation still disagreeing. They have learned something if they can disagree honestly and keep working.

A common education with different ways to learn

Start early. Give every child access to history, to the basics of the economy and to the experience of solving a problem with someone else. Then pay attention to how each child learns. One may understand the river by building a model. Another may need to walk its banks, read a map or talk through what happens when a gate closes. Ask each to show what water reaches the next town and why.

> *"The question is equally demanding whichever route brings the child to an answer."*

When a pattern emerges, act on it. A teacher can offer a different way of learning immediately or arrange a short trial in a field where the student shows promise. Effort matters. A learner who avoids the difficult part of an assignment needs a chance and a responsibility to attempt it. A learner who has made that effort and still struggles may need a different method, more preparation or a different branch. The teacher needs evidence to tell those situations apart.

Access to an advanced course with scarce equipment or supervised places should depend on demonstrated readiness. Suppose a student wants an advanced electrical workshop. After instruction, practice and a fair practical assessment, they still cannot isolate a circuit safely. The advanced place should go to someone

ready to use it. Show the student the specific skill they need, offer a foundation course or a trial in another branch, and let them ask for a fresh assessment when they can demonstrate progress. Any learner, including an adult returning years later, should be able to check where they stand and try a new direction. That keeps public resources available for training people can use and gives the next decision a basis in what the person can do today.

Economics from the household to the world

Everyone needs enough economics to follow decisions that affect their life. Start with a loaf of bread. A family can compare its price with what remains in the weekly budget. Follow that same loaf one step further. Who grew the grain? Who owns the mill? Who paid for the fuel and the road? What happens to the price if a harvest fails, and who still needs bread after their buying power runs out?

Now give the class a map and a limited grain supply. Ask them to feed two regions through the next harvest. One has grain in storage. The other has more people, less grain and a damaged rail line. Students must distinguish need from the ability to pay, account for transport and explain who waits under their plan. Everyone should get this far. A student who wants to study trade, finance or distribution in depth can go further. The rest should leave able to question a budget, a price or a public claim about a shortage.

Let each class bring its own seasons and beliefs into the exercise. One group might plan grain deliveries around a winter road closure, another around the rains, and another around a festival for which families prepare months ahead. Ask residents who observe that festival and residents who do not how each would use the same store of grain. The class must produce a workable agreement that leaves both free to choose how they live.

The history we owe our children

Industrial capitalism gave innovation a powerful boost. Investors could back a promising machine, and an inventor who solved a production problem could see it used across an industry. In Britain's cotton trade, water-powered spinning machinery produced yarn far faster than hand spinning. Ask the class to follow a piece of cloth all the way back. Some of the cotton that fed Manchester's mills was grown by enslaved people in the American South. In Britain, children worked factory shifts so long that Parliament intervened. Its 1833 Factory Act required schooling for younger children in the factories it covered. Even an eight-hour shift for a nine-year-old was legal under that reform. Let students weigh what progress meant to the buyer of the cloth and to the child who helped make it.

Students should also learn how concentrated wealth can give a few owners power over public decisions. That is a route to oligarchy. The East India Company offers a particularly stark case of commerce backed by military force. A trading company raised an army, conquered territory and gained control of tax revenues in parts of India. A different legacy appears in the climate record. Coal, oil and gas powered industrial growth. The greenhouse gases released by burning those fuels warm the planet, and many of the

people who bear the consequences had little say in how that wealth was made. A history class should follow who made each decision, who benefited, and who had the power to object. Those are fair questions to ask of a Federation as well.

What war consumes and what cooperation can build

War consumes steel, fuel, skilled labour and years of human life. A bridge destroyed in a morning may take years to rebuild. During those years, a farmer takes the long way to market and an ambulance takes the long way to a patient. Even the region that wins control of a resource can end up poorer than it would have been under an agreement to share it.

History gives us a concrete choice to examine. In 1950, with Europe still rebuilding after the Second World War, the Schuman Declaration proposed pooling French and West German coal and steel production, with participation open to other European countries. Materials used to arm rivals could also supply homes, railways and workshops. Put the declaration beside a map of the industrial regions. Ask students what each country gave up, what each stood to gain and what assurance its former enemy would need before agreeing. That is one historical route into the idea behind the World Federated Economy. Students can examine how far the lesson travels and where the comparison breaks down.

What each generation must reconsider

The idea can reach people through schools, libraries, adult courses and public meetings in the languages people use at home. A class might ask people in both river towns to record what they remember of an earlier drought. Keep their accounts alongside the water records, the decision that was taken and the objections that were overruled. Years later, a new class can ask whose warning proved accurate and whose loss never appeared in the official report.

> *"Each generation should review both what it teaches and how the Federation actually works."*

Between those reviews, a changed river, a new technology or evidence of harm should be reason enough to reopen a decision. Suppose a water agreement promised each town half the former river flow. A generation later the river carries much less water. Keeping the old promise on paper cannot give either town its share. Learners and residents should examine the new measurements, hear from those who would lose water under each alternative, and put a revised rule to the responsible public body. Its reasons for accepting or rejecting the change should become part of the record the next generation inherits.

Students should be just as willing to question the integrity of the officials who run a system as the validity of the rule itself. Those are different questions. An honest water board can be administering a rule that no longer works. A board member can also falsify a shortage to steer water to land they own. The first case calls for a better agreement. The second calls for independent investigation and, if wrongdoing is

established, enforcement of the law. People in either town must be free to raise the question. Calling their disagreement disloyal would make both failures harder to discover.

The standard of education must hold as the world changes. When the river shrinks, the honest lesson gets harder. Students must be able to say who will carry a loss, defend that choice to the people affected, and change their judgment if the evidence calls for it. A child taught that way may grow up to find a mistake in one of our own rules. We should want that child to have both the ability and the courage to tell us.

Five questions for every review

A class, a council or a family can use this checklist. Apply all five questions to the same decision. For each answer, name someone affected, say what evidence supports the answer and record what still needs to change.

1. Peace. Are we at peace, or has someone simply stopped speaking because it feels dangerous to object? In the two river towns, we should hear from the families at the far end of the pipe as well as the people who control the gate. Peace requires equanimity toward all beings. Giving in to arrogance, abuse or greed may quiet a dispute while leaving its cause in place.

2. Forgiveness. What harm occurred, what led to it, and what would help this person change? Justice protects the people who were harmed, requires accountability and seeks repair. Forgiveness leaves room for the person who caused harm to grow. Understanding the source of an act can guide education, therapy or supervision at the level needed, where change is possible. The wrongdoing can still carry consequences. The person who was hurt retains the right to safety and to decide whether to have further contact.

3. Compassion. Have we taken the well-being of everyone affected seriously? Compassion and loving kindness require us to find out what people need, including those who cannot speak for themselves. Ask the families who still lack clean water whether the agreement has improved their lives. Their answer matters more than our good intentions.

4. Gratitude. What do we enjoy today that earlier generations struggled to make possible? Follow clean water back through the work of the people who laid the pipes, fought for access and maintain them today. Learning that history can turn an ordinary drink of water into an occasion for gratitude. Apply the same honesty to democratic meritocracy. Does it distribute wealth fairly and help people feel that their contribution is valued? It deserves continued support for as long as it serves those purposes better than the alternatives people can demonstrate.

5. Presence. What are we avoiding because it is painful or inconvenient to see? Mindful incarnation begins with being present in one's own body. Notice the urge to look away or dismiss the complaint. Stay long enough to hear it, examine the facts and take the next practical step. If the tap is still dry, go to the house and see. An uncomfortable fact faced today gives the next generation one less wrong to put right.

Historical readings

Science Museum Group, Textiles Gallery guide · UK Parliament, The 1833 Factory Act · UK Parliament, Parliament and the East India Company · IPCC, Climate Change 2023, Summary for Policymakers · European Union, Schuman Declaration, May 1950.

Questions for discussion

• What evidence should a learner be able to present when asking for another chance at an advanced course?

• Who should be heard when a community reviews what its children learn about a past decision, especially if people still disagree about its effects?

Join the discussion online →

10. Universal Healthcare and Support for Inability

"Healthcare would remain available to everyone throughout life."

A person would not have to earn treatment through a high merit record, maintain employment to keep access, or prove that recovery will produce an economic return. Care is part of the common protection the Federation undertakes to provide.

The founding proposal also establishes a comfortable minimum for people medically unable to work or study. Their support would be comparable in comfort to the support available to students. Inability would not be treated as a voluntary refusal to participate.

Care and income answer different questions

Universal healthcare concerns a person's need for care. Income assessment concerns contribution and support. These systems interact, but one should not become a hidden condition for the other. Someone seeking treatment should not first have to persuade a merit office that they have contributed enough.

The principle extends through difficult circumstances. A person who has committed a crime still retains essential care. Someone choosing not to work still has healthcare. A retired person does not lose access when current contribution ends. Those commitments are part of the source's distinction between privileges that may vary and protections that remain.

The scope of services, funding, and organization have not been settled. A future model must describe what universal access includes, how providers obtain resources, and how waiting and capacity constraints are handled. Declaring access universal is an obligation to build a functioning service, not an assertion that resources have become unlimited.

Recognizing inability fairly

The medical system would establish when a person is unable to work or study. The purpose is to distinguish inability from a genuine choice not to participate. The source does not specify a diagnostic list, assessment procedure, or review interval.

This manuscript recommends assessing practical capacity in context rather than treating a diagnosis alone as a complete description of a person's life. Two people with the same named condition may have different limitations.

"Someone may be able to perform a task briefly but unable to sustain a regular schedule."

An assessment should record what the person can sustain over time.

A fair process should explain its conclusion in terms relevant to the support decision. It should also allow evidence to be updated when circumstances change. The professionals evaluating capacity would need independence from incentives to reduce support simply by narrowing the recognized category.

Partial and changing capacity

The founding discussion leaves partial capacity open. A person may be able to contribute a few hours, study in a flexible format, or perform one kind of work while another is inaccessible. Treating capacity as all or nothing would make those situations difficult to handle fairly.

A proposed approach is to combine comfortable support for recognized limitations with proportionate recognition of feasible contribution. Its financial rules would need testing. If every small contribution immediately removed more support than it earned, the arrangement could discourage participation. If assessments ignored a substantial recovery of capacity indefinitely, they could also become unfair.

Temporary limitations require attention as well. A person may need a period of rest, treatment, or adaptation without being assigned a permanent status. The practical objective should be continuity of care and adequate living conditions while a reasonable assessment is made.

No particular taper, timetable, or definition of capacity is adopted here. The requirement is that a future model address these transitions explicitly and allow people to challenge errors.

Comfort includes the ability to live

Support for inability should provide more than the narrow means of remaining alive. The founding document speaks of dignity, comfort, and whatever development or emancipation is possible for the person. That requires attention to ordinary participation in life.

Someone may need an accessible home, help reaching services, adapted learning materials, or assistance with daily tasks. These examples show why a uniform cash amount may not provide comparable comfort to people with different needs. The project has not decided which needs would be met through services, equipment, money, or a combination.

The recommendation here is to define adequacy by practical living conditions and verified needs, while keeping the administration proportionate. People should not have to repeatedly demonstrate the same stable limitation merely because offices cannot share an authorized confirmation.

Privacy and the ability to appeal

Medical evidence is sensitive. An office calculating support may need confirmation of a recognized limitation without needing a person's entire clinical record. This manuscript proposes limiting information to what each decision actually requires and recording who is authorized to access it.

An appeal should address the support decision and the relevant evidence. It should not require a person to publish private information to obtain a fair hearing. Where a decision is disputed, temporary arrangements may be necessary to prevent the review process itself from causing deprivation. Their form remains open.

Wrongful denial should also be correctable beyond the immediate payment. A person may have lost recorded contribution, educational access, or an opportunity to work under suitable conditions. Repair needs to consider the actual consequences of the error.

A system that supports participation

Recognizing inability should not erase a person's agency. Some people will want to learn or contribute within their capacities; others may have little capacity available. Support should make appropriate participation possible without requiring someone to risk their health to prove goodwill.

The Federation's responsibility is to distinguish circumstances carefully and provide a dependable floor. Contribution can receive additional recognition. Healthcare and comfortable support for recognized inability establish the conditions under which a person's life remains protected when contribution is limited or impossible.

Questions for discussion

• How are partial capacity and temporary limitations assessed?

• How is inability distinguished from voluntary nonparticipation or lack of opportunity?

Join the discussion online →

11. Choice, Responsibility, and Basic Support

The proposal allows an able person to choose neither work nor study. That person would still receive lodging, food, necessities, basic comfort, and basic access to the internet and technology. Their provision would be modest and would exclude luxury.

This is a deliberate difference in material reward. Studying and contributing should offer a more comfortable life than voluntarily remaining outside both. The founding discussion describes the basic level as austere enough to encourage participation. That intention must operate within the continuing commitment to essential care and humane living conditions.

What the basic level is for

Basic support prevents nonparticipation from becoming abandonment. It also leaves room for choice.

> *"A person is not forced into a particular job by a threat to remove food or shelter."*

They may decide that a modest life is enough, while understanding that greater discretionary access generally follows contribution or recognized study.

The support would include a small discretionary allowance. A person could make choices within it rather than receive every optional item requested. The original examples of chocolate, cigarettes, and alcohol illustrated competing purchases; they did not establish a benefit list or a right to particular products.

The distinction should therefore be expressed through a clear standard of living and a limited budget for optional consumption. It should not require officials to supervise every harmless preference. The detailed amount, permitted arrangements, and delivery method remain open.

A voluntary choice has conditions

Someone is not voluntarily refusing an opportunity merely because they are currently unemployed. A willing worker may find no suitable opening. A learner may be waiting for a course. A person may face an inaccessible workplace, a transport barrier, or responsibilities that the system has failed to recognize.

The source establishes medical inability as a separate category and leaves other barriers underdeveloped. This manuscript recommends recognizing lack of reasonable opportunity as distinct from deliberate refusal. That is an extension requiring agreement and practical rules.

An institution making a nonparticipation decision would need to identify what the person could reasonably do and what opportunity was actually available. A generic statement that work exists somewhere would not answer whether a particular person can access it. Nor would a person's rejection of one unsuitable offer establish rejection of all contribution.

Encouragement without humiliation

There is a real tension between making support intentionally austere and preserving dignity. The project should address it directly. Incentives can come from the additional comfort, autonomy, and recognition attached to contribution. They should not depend on unsafe housing, inadequate nutrition, untreated illness, or public shaming.

The recommendation here is to define the protected floor before deciding how much distance should separate it from other levels. Once that floor is established, the difference can concern discretionary resources, space, convenience, and optional consumption within humane limits. The source has not selected the exact boundaries.

A basic provision that is deliberately confusing or unreliable also creates pressure, but of a kind that undermines the proposal's guarantees. People need to know what they can rely on even when they have chosen a modest level of participation.

Returning to contribution

People change their minds. Someone who spends a period outside work and study may later want to learn a skill, help with a community task, or enter a job. The system should offer a practical route back.

This manuscript proposes a clear change-of-status process, with support continuing while the new activity is verified. The exact arrangement needs to avoid both accidental deprivation and indefinite claims without participation. A person should be able to ask what evidence is needed and when the new assessment will take effect.

Past contribution raises a separate question. Someone may already have accumulated substantial merit before choosing a break. The source does not explain how the historical revenue component would interact with basic nonparticipation support. It would be an error to assume that all past merit disappears, or that it automatically entitles the person to every working-life benefit. The model must choose and disclose the relationship.

Applying the distinction to real lives

Consider two hypothetical people who are not currently employed. One is capable of available work, has access to suitable study, and declines both. The other wants to work but cannot reach an accessible workplace. Their visible status is similar. Their circumstances are different.

The first fits the intended nonparticipation category. The second reveals an unresolved opportunity problem. A fair process must gather enough evidence to tell the difference without treating every applicant as dishonest. Simple cases should be handled simply; disputed cases need an understandable review.

Caregiving is another important example.

"A person supporting a dependent relative may already be contributing in a way ordinary employment records do not capture."

The evaluation of such work, discussed earlier, must connect with support classification so that one office does not recognize a contribution while another calls the same person inactive.

Responsibility belongs to institutions too

The proposal asks people to contribute according to their abilities. It also asks institutions to provide education, healthcare, fair evaluation, and access to opportunities. These responsibilities depend on one another.

A federation cannot fairly encourage participation while leaving willing people unable to enter it. Its basic support arrangements should therefore be assessed alongside the quality of its opportunity system. The intended choice becomes meaningful when people have a credible path to something more comfortable and useful, and a secure minimum if they decide not to take it.

Questions for discussion

• What essentials and discretionary allowance would basic support include?

• How would the system establish that someone is able to contribute but chooses not to?

Join the discussion online →

12. Retirement Through Accumulated Merit

"A lifetime of contribution should continue to support a person when current work decreases or ends."

This is the purpose of accumulated merit in retirement. Useful effort would build a historical foundation that does not vanish when the person can no longer maintain the same pace.

The founding proposal intends that foundation to become substantial enough for a good retirement. It does not establish a retirement age, a benefit formula, or a funding system. Those details are necessary if the intention is to become a dependable entitlement.

Working revenue is not a retirement formula

The 70/30 and two-thirds/one-third examples in Chapter 7 divide working revenue between current contribution and accumulated merit. Neither tells a retired cleaner how much they will receive when their current earnings stop.

When current work ends, several different arrangements are possible. Accumulated merit might be converted under a separate retirement rule. An independent universal retirement floor might be combined with contribution-based additions. A funded reserve or a system supported by current production might provide the resources. These are alternatives to examine, not decisions already taken.

The model must identify what is promised and where the resources come from. A recorded entitlement does not itself produce housing, food, care, or services. Retirement remains a claim on the useful capacity of society, whether the accounting is organized through reserves, current contributions, or another agreed mechanism.

What a good retirement means

Adequacy should be considered in terms of life rather than only a percentage of past income. A retired person needs a secure place to live, ordinary necessities, healthcare, and room for a comfortable personal life. Different health and housing circumstances may affect what those conditions require.

The source does not define a common retirement standard. This manuscript recommends establishing an adequate floor first, then assessing how accumulated merit provides additional comfort above it. That approach preserves the distinction between basic protection and recognition of contribution.

It also prevents a long history of low-prestige but necessary work from leading automatically to insecurity in old age. The cleaner whose work supported public life for decades must have a meaningful place in the retirement design. Recognition that never becomes adequate material support would fail the proposal's purpose.

Lives do not follow a single pattern

Some people begin paid work young. Others spend longer in education. Some move through illness, caregiving, retraining, and part-time contribution. A retirement model that assumes an uninterrupted full-time career would need to explain what happens to everyone outside that pattern.

The treatment of non-employment periods remains open. The project must decide which periods receive historical credit, which receive a separate support guarantee, and how partial contribution is recorded. Those decisions should be visible early enough for people to understand their future position.

Cross-regional movement matters too. A person may contribute in several parts of the Federation. Their record should not become unusable because they moved. A portable account is a design recommendation that follows naturally from worldwide participation, but it would need common standards and a way to reconcile inconsistent records.

Continuing to contribute later in life

The source recognizes current contribution during working life when circumstances allow it, while intending accumulated merit to support retirement. It does not say that everyone must continue working until medically incapable. It also does not set a final age at which work ends.

A future arrangement needs to balance choice, capacity, and predictable entitlements. Some people may want to continue useful work. Others may need to reduce their responsibilities after physically demanding service. A single age rule may be simple, while a more individualized system may better reflect circumstances but require additional judgment.

If retired people contribute voluntarily or part-time, the model must state how that affects revenue and historical credit. Rules that repeatedly withdraw support when someone tries a small activity could make continued participation unattractive. Rules that allow unlimited combinations could have costs the system has not planned for. Testing is necessary.

Funding a promise across generations

> *"Retirement links the people who contributed before with the people producing goods and services now."*

The promise therefore has to survive changes in population, productive capacity, health needs, and the distribution of work. This is an accounting and institutional problem that the founding vision leaves unresolved.

Possible models should be tested under difficult assumptions as well as favourable ones. What happens if production grows slowly? If the cost of essential services rises? If many people retire at the same time? These are hypothetical stress tests, not forecasts.

A clear adjustment process would also matter. People should not discover that their accumulated record has lost most of its practical value through an obscure change. Publicly explained rules, protection for established expectations, and a process for reviewing major changes are recommended safeguards.

Retirement as remembered contribution

The idea of accumulated merit gives retirement a place in the whole life of a contributor. Work is not treated as something society can use and forget. Its recognition continues beyond the moment of production.

To fulfil that idea, the project needs more than a rising historical balance. It needs a defined entitlement, adequate real provision, portable records, and a funding arrangement that can be examined. A good retirement is the point at which the system demonstrates that its memory of contribution has practical meaning.

Questions for discussion

- When can someone retire?
- How does accumulated merit become sufficient retirement income after current contribution stops?

Join the discussion online →

13. Justice Through Protection and Rehabilitation

A justice system must protect people from harm, respond to wrongdoing, and help prevent its repetition. The proposal gives rehabilitation a central place while retaining meaningful consequences. Therapy, education, and reform would be preferred where they can work. Confinement would remain available where protection or the seriousness of the crime requires it.

These purposes can overlap.

> *"A person may need secure confinement and still benefit from education and treatment."*

Another may be held accountable without imprisonment. The important question is what response is justified in the case, within protections that apply to everyone.

Begin with the harm and the people affected

The founding discussion focuses mainly on consequences and rehabilitation. A developed model also needs to address the people harmed. This manuscript recommends that victim safety, access to support, and a clear account of the proceedings become explicit parts of the design.

An injured person may need care, protection against further contact, recovery of property, or help dealing with practical consequences. Those needs should not disappear while institutions debate the offender's future. Nor should access to support depend entirely on whether a conviction can be obtained.

The details remain open. Financial repair, support services, protective measures, and participation in proceedings each require their own standards. The principle proposed here is that rehabilitation and attention to victims should operate together rather than compete for recognition.

Establish responsibility before imposing a penalty

An allegation is not a completed judgment. A system that can reduce accumulated merit or confine a person needs a reliable process for determining what happened and what responsibility the person bears.

The source does not provide a full procedure. This manuscript proposes defined offenses, notice of allegations, access to relevant evidence, a meaningful opportunity to respond, impartial adjudication, and review of contested decisions. These are recommendations for the Federation's future design rather than a description of current law.

The need for protection may sometimes arise before a final decision. Any temporary restriction should have an identified basis, be proportionate to the risk, and receive prompt review. A temporary measure should not become an indefinite punishment without a finding of responsibility.

Rehabilitation has to be concrete

Rehabilitation means more than requiring someone to say that they have changed. It should address the factors relevant to the wrongdoing and support the abilities needed to live without repeating it. Education may help someone acquire useful skills. Therapy may address an identified need. Supervised participation may allow progress to be observed.

No single course will fit every person. The response should connect the person's circumstances to specific goals and available support. The project has not established a clinical model or a universal program, and this book makes no claim that one treatment can resolve every form of offending.

> *"Progress should be judged through relevant evidence over time."*

Completion of a program may be useful information, but it is not automatically proof of safety. Likewise, a person's difficulty expressing themselves should not by itself establish refusal to change. Professional judgment needs reasons that can be examined.

When confinement is needed

The founding proposal rejects automatic imprisonment for every offense. It allows confinement when necessary to protect others, when reform outside prison is insufficient, and for severe crimes such as the atrocities discussed later.

A future system must decide who assesses those conditions, what evidence they consider, and how often continued restrictions are reviewed. It should distinguish the consequence attached to a proven offense from an assessment of future risk. Those questions may interact, but they are not the same judgment.

An individual can receive rehabilitation inside prison. Access to education remains part of the proposal even under confinement. Secure custody changes freedom of movement and privileges; it does not cancel the possibility of development.

Consequences that support a return to life

Loss of merit is proposed as a major penalty, examined in the next chapter. Other restrictions may also be considered under clearly defined law. Whatever the combination, the system should state how a person can meet obligations, challenge errors, and eventually resume lawful participation where release is appropriate.

This manuscript recommends planning the practical transition rather than treating release as the end of institutional responsibility. Someone may need housing, treatment continuity, education, or a supervised entry into work. These are proposals for reintegration arrangements, not benefits already specified in the source.

Victim protection must remain part of that planning. A person's return to the community does not require contact with the people they harmed. Their interests may need to be handled through separate support and protection measures.

An institution that must also improve

A justice system should evaluate its own work. Did it establish responsibility fairly? Did it protect people? Were penalties proportionate? Did the available support help people avoid further harm? Were errors identified and repaired?

These questions cannot be answered by a single count of convictions, releases, or completed programs. The recommendation is to examine several kinds of outcome, with independent scrutiny and attention to the experiences of affected people. The measures themselves would need safeguards against distortion.

Protection, consequences, and rehabilitation form the direction of the proposal. Making them dependable requires careful procedures and adequate services. The purpose is to hold people responsible in a way that respects the people harmed, reduces further danger, and preserves the possibility of constructive change.

Questions for discussion

- How are rehabilitation progress and the risk of further harm assessed?
- When is confinement necessary, and how are release decisions reviewed?

Join the discussion online →

14. Crime and the Loss of Merit

Accumulated merit would create lasting economic advantages. The proposal also makes it subject to loss when a person commits a crime. Serious harm should affect the privileges a person retains from earlier contribution, rather than leaving those advantages untouched while others bear the consequences.

The intended principle is proportionality: the loss should correspond to the seriousness of the offense and the harm caused. The founding discussion gives two illustrations, one concerning theft and one concerning murder. Both require further rules before they could operate fairly.

What a merit penalty would affect

A merit penalty would reduce the recorded historical entitlement or the advantages attached to it, depending on the accounting model eventually chosen. The source has not established merit units, a conversion into revenue, or a detailed penalty schedule.

That distinction is important. Reducing a record by a stated quantity has no clear practical meaning until the effect on income and retirement is known. The same nominal reduction might have very different consequences for people at different stages of life.

Essential care and basic human rights would continue.

> *"Loss of accumulated merit would not authorize deprivation of food, safe shelter, healthcare, or humane treatment."*

The penalty would reduce the additional advantages a person receives above that protected minimum.

The theft illustration

The original example suggested a loss of merit equivalent to one hundred times the value stolen. It was an illustration of a strong consequence, not an adopted rule. The source explicitly identifies its unresolved relationship with proportionality.

If a hypothetical theft involved ten monetary units, a hundredfold calculation would produce one thousand monetary units before any conversion into merit. That arithmetic does not justify the penalty. It does not establish how much merit is equivalent to that amount, whether intent or circumstances affect responsibility, or how the result compares with other offenses.

A fixed multiplier can also encounter unequal histories. A young person may have almost no accumulated merit. A long-serving contributor may have a large balance supporting retirement. A future law must decide whether the penalty is capped, how different cases are compared, and whether anything can be carried forward. None of those choices has been made.

This manuscript recommends testing penalty ranges against realistic life histories before selecting any multiplier. It also recommends rejecting a conversion that creates permanent deprivation or makes a minor offense economically unrecoverable. These are safeguards proposed here, rather than revisions already adopted by the project.

The murder illustration

The founding discussion proposes loss of all accumulated merit for murder, probably accompanied by imprisonment and intensive rehabilitation while confined. This expresses the severity with which the proposal treats taking a life.

A complete law would still need defined offenses and standards of responsibility. It must distinguish the facts and legal findings relevant to different cases instead of relying on one general label. The manuscript does not supply that criminal code.

Total loss also raises a rebuilding question. If a person later contributes lawfully during rehabilitation or after a justified release, can new merit accumulate? The source does not decide. Allowing some route to future recognition may support rehabilitation, but any arrangement must remain consistent with the sentence and protection of others. This requires explicit design.

Responsibility and material repair

> *"Reducing the offender's merit does not automatically compensate the victim."*

A deleted entitlement does not itself restore stolen property, pay for care, or repair a damaged home. The penalty and the process of repair must therefore be distinguished.

This book proposes examining restitution and victim support alongside merit loss. Their order, funding, and relationship remain open. The system should explain whether a reduction releases resources for repair, changes only future entitlements, or has another economic effect. It should avoid counting the same resource twice.

Dependants also require attention. A penalty imposed on one person may affect others sharing their household. Their essential support must remain protected, and any further effects should be examined rather than treated as irrelevant. Responsibility for an offense does not automatically transfer to a child or partner.

Law rather than general disapproval

The source briefly mentions harmful selfishness but leaves the category undefined. This manuscript recommends that economic penalties require a clearly defined offense and an authorized judgment. Officials should not be able to erase contribution because they dislike a person's opinions, lawful choices, or criticism.

The standard protects contributors and administrators alike. A published legal basis makes the accusation understandable, the evidence relevant, and the appeal possible. Vague moral authority makes each of those protections weaker.

Wrongful penalties and restoration

A system capable of removing merit needs a way to restore it after error. Reinstating a balance may be only part of the repair. The person may also have lost payments, retirement provision, opportunities, or access to optional goods during the wrongful decision.

The recommendation is to preserve a clear record of the judgment and its consequences so that correction can reach the actual harm. A successful appeal should not leave an invisible penalty in another office's records. Independent review and coordinated correction are developed later in the book.

Merit loss can express accountability only if its effects are understandable and proportionate. The next work is therefore to define those effects, compare them across cases, and keep the protected floor intact. A severe consequence should be a reason for greater precision in judgment.

Questions for discussion

• How are proportional merit losses determined for different offenses?

• How would monetary harm be converted into merit without removing essential rights?

Join the discussion online →

15. Prison, Severe Crimes, and Human Rights

Severe wrongdoing can justify severe restrictions on freedom. The proposal retains secure confinement for crimes against humanity, repeated murders, and other atrocities. It also keeps an unqualified boundary around essential care: even a person responsible for terrible harm remains entitled to food, shelter, safety, healthcare, and humane treatment.

An early idea of exile or abandonment to survival conditions was explicitly withdrawn from the founding discussion. The accepted direction is secure confinement with strict limits on privileges, together with continuing protection and access to rehabilitation. This chapter develops that accepted direction.

What confinement takes away

Prison restricts freedom of movement and control over daily life. It can also restrict optional entertainment, access to discretionary goods, and other privileges under defined rules. The intended experience is more restrictive than life on the basic support available to someone who voluntarily chooses not to work or study.

The distinction should be implemented through lawful restrictions and secure conditions. It should not be achieved by making food inadequate, exposing people to violence, or withholding necessary care. Those actions would contradict the proposal's boundary.

The precise privileges, restrictions, and prison regime remain to be designed. The institution should be able to explain why a restriction exists, whom it applies to, and how it is reviewed. Security and accountability require specific rules rather than an undefined demand that life be as unpleasant as possible.

Protection inside the institution

> *"The people held in prison need protection from one another and from abuse by staff."*

Staff also need safe conditions and clear responsibilities. An institution cannot claim to protect the public while allowing uncontrolled harm within its walls.

This manuscript recommends independent inspection, confidential reporting routes, records of serious incidents, and a process for investigating misconduct. These are proposed mechanisms. Their authority, access, and relationship with courts remain open.

Some separation may be necessary to manage an identified danger. Any such measure should be governed by evidence, health considerations, and review. A category of serious offense should not become an automatic permission for degrading treatment. The duty of care continues under the most secure conditions.

Rehabilitation under strict limits

Education and therapy remain available during confinement. Their purpose is to support understanding, responsibility, and whatever constructive development is possible. Severe restrictions do not make every form of learning or change pointless.

A person might study, receive treatment for an identified need, or perform suitable work within a secure setting. The source does not define prison labour, remuneration, or whether new merit can accrue. Any such arrangement would need explicit protection against exploitation and a clear relationship to the sentence.

Participation in rehabilitation also requires honest assessment. Completing a course should not automatically erase the seriousness of an offense or create an entitlement to release. Refusing an unsuitable intervention should not automatically be treated as proof of permanent danger. Decisions need a reasoned connection between evidence, purpose, and consequence.

The question of release

The founding proposal does not establish sentence lengths, parole rules, or a final standard for release. It would be misleading to turn the commitment to rehabilitation into a promise that every person will eventually leave confinement. It would be equally misleading to assume that no decision can ever be reviewed.

A future design must identify which authority determines the original restriction, how continued confinement is justified, and what review is available. The seriousness of proven conduct, the sentence, and the assessment of current danger may each matter under whatever law is adopted.

Victims and affected communities need reliable information and protection within that process. Their safety should be addressed through practical measures rather than left to reassurance alone. The project has not yet chosen how their participation would operate.

Atrocities and institutional responsibility

Crimes against humanity may involve organized power and many participants. A justice system needs the ability to examine responsibility beyond the person who directly carried out a harmful act. Orders, planning, control, and deliberate assistance may be relevant under a future criminal code.

This manuscript proposes that responsibility be determined individually through evidence, rather than assigned collectively to a population, profession, or community. It also recommends institutional independence where the accused once held authority over investigators or judges. These are design recommendations requiring further legal work.

The Federation itself must remain subject to scrutiny. Worldwide authority would create no moral exemption for officials acting in its name. If its institutions participate in serious harm, their conduct must be examinable under clear rules.

Keeping the boundary when it is hardest

> *"The protection of basic rights is tested most sharply when the person concerned has caused extreme harm."*

Anger, fear, and grief do not remove the institution's responsibility for how it acts. A sentence can be severe while remaining governed by law and essential care.

The accepted proposal makes that boundary part of the Federation's identity. There would be secure confinement where justified, restricted privileges, and continuing opportunities for rehabilitation. There would be no abandonment to dangerous survival conditions.

Making the boundary real requires resources, trained staff, oversight, and remedies for abuse. Human rights in prison are therefore an operating responsibility. They must appear in the conditions people experience, including when public sympathy is absent.

Questions for discussion

• How would secure confinement preserve food, shelter, safety, healthcare, and humane treatment?

• How would restrictions and rehabilitation be reviewed over time?

Join the discussion online →

16. Merit Commissioners

Merit commissioners would oversee the institutions that evaluate contribution and administer the merit system. They would be elected on the strength of demonstrated competence, accomplishments, and sound judgment. Their authority would be governed by law.

The title matters because the role is institutional and accountable. Commissioners are not given an undefined power to judge the worth of every person. They would lead offices responsible for assessment, auditing, monitoring, and related decisions within responsibilities that still need to be precisely established.

Responsibility before authority

The first task in designing an office is to state what it must do. A merit administration would need reliable records, understandable assessment standards, timely decisions, and correction of errors. It would also need to identify manipulation and ensure that similar cases receive consistent treatment.

Those responsibilities do not necessarily belong to the same person. The founding discussion groups several functions under commissioners and their offices but leaves their separation unresolved. This chapter recommends distinguishing administration, audit, investigation, and final adjudication.

Administration would operate the process. Audit would examine whether it is working accurately and lawfully. Investigation would establish facts where misconduct is alleged. Adjudication would resolve contested responsibility and authorize penalties within law. The names and institutions could differ, but the separation would make it harder for an office to judge its own conduct without external scrutiny.

Commissioners and professional staff

Commissioners would hold leadership responsibilities. Auditors and judges would keep their professional titles and duties. Ordinary staff would perform regular jobs under the normal merit system. The special compensation rule for designated senior offices would not automatically extend to everyone in the organization.

This distinction allows the institution to employ technical specialists, record administrators, support workers, and other staff without turning every employee into a political officeholder. It also makes responsibility clearer.

> *"A commissioner may be accountable for a defective policy even when a staff member applied it correctly."*

The boundary requires written rules. Which decisions can staff make directly? Which require a senior authorization? When must a disagreement move to a judge? The source does not yet answer these questions. A future design should make the answers visible to employees and the people using the service.

Competence for the role

A commissioner needs more than success in earning personal merit. They need relevant ability to interpret standards, supervise administration, recognize conflicts of interest, and exercise judgment over decisions affecting others. Their record should show how they have handled responsibility and corrected mistakes.

The electorate and eligibility rules remain open. A local office may require detailed understanding of local work, while a wider office may need experience comparing practices across regions. The election process should connect the evidence to the actual scale and duties of the responsibility.

This manuscript recommends public descriptions of the role, verified candidate records, and an account of relevant conflicts. Those arrangements should inform democratic choice without allowing incumbent officials to exclude challengers merely because they disagree about policy.

Applying common standards to different work

A merit office will encounter contributions it cannot evaluate by one simple measure. Cleaning, care work, technical research, enterprise leadership, and creative activity require different kinds of evidence. Commissioners would need access to appropriate expertise without surrendering accountability to an invisible panel.

A proposed arrangement is to develop field-specific assessment guidance within common standards for evidence, explanation, privacy, and appeal. Specialists could advise on the work. The institution would remain responsible for the decision and its reasons.

The process should also learn from experience. Repeated successful appeals may reveal a defective standard. Large differences between offices may reveal inconsistent practice. Monitoring is useful when it leads to correction rather than simply producing more records.

Mutual monitoring and its limits

The founding proposal calls for commissioners and their offices to monitor one another. That can expose discrepancies and make local wrongdoing harder to conceal. It can also fail if offices protect one another or accept the same mistaken assumptions.

This manuscript therefore recommends combining mutual monitoring with review that is institutionally independent of the original decision. Chapter 19 examines who could hear an appeal when a commissioner's own office made the disputed decision. Mutual monitoring would be one source of evidence, not the whole guarantee of fairness.

"Conflicts of interest should be identified before a decision."

An official should not assess a close associate's contested entitlement or decide a complaint about their own conduct. The project needs a practical reassignment procedure so that declaring a conflict does not simply leave the case unresolved.

An office people can use

The experience of the person approaching the institution matters. They should be able to understand the application, provide relevant information, receive a reasoned decision, and ask for correction without needing specialist knowledge of the administration.

The recommendation is to design explanations and assistance as part of the service. A person with limited literacy, a disability, or a language barrier should not receive a worse outcome because the office communicates badly. Different channels of access may be necessary.

Commissioners would thus be judged by the reliability and fairness of the institutions they lead. Their success would appear in accurate records, proportionate administration, accessible decisions, and problems that are corrected. The next chapters consider the special restraints intended to keep that authority connected to the wider population.

Questions for discussion

• How are administration, auditing, and judicial decisions separated?

• Which offices are led by commissioners, and how do they monitor one another?

Join the discussion online →

17. The Midpoint Rule

Merit commissioners and the senior judges or auditors covered by the proposed rule would receive compensation at the middle of humanity's economic distribution. Their position would remain at the fiftieth percentile while they held the office. They would not move above or below that rank through the ordinary compensation curve.

The rule connects the material position of those overseeing the system to the middle position of the population. As humanity's circumstances change, their compensation would change with the reference distribution. The intent is a stable relative position rather than a permanently fixed amount.

What the middle means

"The fiftieth percentile refers to the median."

In an ordered set of incomes, it is the middle position or the value separating the lower and upper halves, subject to the statistical convention used. It is not necessarily the arithmetic average and is not half of the highest income.

Consider five hypothetical monthly incomes in accounting units: one thousand, fifteen hundred, two thousand, three thousand, and twelve thousand. The median is two thousand. The arithmetic average is thirty-nine hundred. Half of the highest income is six thousand. These are three different figures.

The example exists only to explain the distinction. It supplies no proposed income level or currency. The actual reference population and measurement would have to be defined before the rule could operate.

What belongs in the comparison

The source describes the middle of humanity's current economic curve but does not define the curve completely. Is it based on individual income, total compensation, or available resources after essential services? Does it include children, students, retirees, and people receiving basic support? How are different living costs compared?

Each choice affects the result. Comparing cash payments alone may overlook housing or other provision supplied directly. Comparing nominal amounts across regions may overlook different costs. Counting households instead of individuals changes what the middle represents.

This manuscript recommends a published definition of total relevant compensation, a clearly identified reference population, and a transparent method for comparing real purchasing capacity. These are new design recommendations. The statistical method and the institution responsible for it remain open.

The incentive and its limits

The rule aims to prevent designated officials from using their authority to climb the normal compensation hierarchy. Their relative position would be fixed. Improving general living conditions could improve their own absolute circumstances along with those of the population.

That connection does not automatically eliminate corruption. An official could receive hidden gifts, benefit a relative, gain influence, or trade decisions for a future opportunity. A rule about official pay needs conflict-of-interest protections, disclosure requirements, and independent scrutiny if it is to serve its purpose.

The midpoint may also move while some groups remain in difficulty.

> *"A rising median does not prove that everyone is doing well."*

Officials must therefore be accountable for the system's full responsibilities, including protection of people below the middle. Their salary cannot be the only measure of institutional success.

Benefits and existing assets

The project has not settled what happens to merit accumulated before taking office. Nor has it chosen rules for existing assets, outside income, gifts, household income, or official benefits. These matters could undermine the midpoint principle if ignored.

An officeholder might receive median salary while enjoying exceptional housing, allowances, or outside revenue. Whether and how those items enter the rule requires explicit decisions. Necessary work expenses should also be distinguished from personal consumption so that oversight does not become unworkable.

A possible approach is to define the office's full personal compensation package and require a separate declaration of interests, while preserving lawful pre-existing rights under published rules. That is an option for evaluation, not a completed settlement.

Accountability despite fixed rank

The founding discussion says the covered official's position would not rise or fall within the curve while in office. It also leaves misconduct sanctions unresolved. The fixed rank must not be interpreted as immunity from investigation, removal, or other lawful consequences.

This manuscript proposes distinguishing ordinary compensation from sanctions. The salary rule would govern lawful service in office. Proven misconduct would be handled through a separate procedure that could include removal and defined penalties. The treatment of prior merit and retirement would need explicit law.

This proposal requires agreement because the exact interaction has not been adopted. A credible system cannot leave the contradiction hidden: officials should know both what compensation is guaranteed during proper service and what consequences can follow wrongdoing.

Retirement at the midpoint

After sufficient service, covered commissioners would receive retirement at the midpoint level. The source makes the entitlement conditional on accumulating the equivalent qualification. It does not establish the required years, treatment of partial service, or effects of misconduct.

The proposed twenty-five-year maximum is a limit on service, not an automatic statement that twenty-five years are required for retirement. Those are different rules. A future model should state how entitlement builds, whether the median continues to be updated after retirement, and how the arrangement is financed.

The midpoint rule offers a clear institutional idea: those entrusted with administering merit would share the economic position of the middle of humanity. Its fairness depends on precise definitions, full accounting of compensation, and accountability that continues when the officeholder breaks the rules.

Questions for discussion

• How would the median economic position be calculated?

• How do misconduct sanctions and prior accumulated merit interact with fixed compensation?

Join the discussion online →

18. Terms, Reelection, and Limits on Power

Merit commissioners would serve fixed terms and could seek reelection on the strength of their performance. Voters could renew their mandate or choose someone else. A proposed maximum of twenty-five years would place an outer limit on service.

These arrangements serve related purposes. A fixed term gives the officeholder a defined period in which to carry out the responsibility. Reelection allows useful experience to continue when voters judge the record favourably. A service cap prevents repeated success from becoming unlimited tenure.

A term needs a practical length

The source does not select a term length. A short term may keep officials closely exposed to electoral judgment but can make long work difficult to complete. A long term may support continuity but leave poor performance in place too long if other removal mechanisms are weak.

The decision should consider the institution's actual tasks. How long does a major administrative improvement take? How quickly can a serious mistake affect people? What other forms of oversight operate between elections? These questions are more useful than choosing a number for its appearance of firmness.

This manuscript recommends comparing several term arrangements through scenarios before adopting one. It does not turn the twenty-five-year cap into five five-year terms or any other unstated structure. The maximum and the length of an individual mandate are separate choices.

A record for reelection

> *"The officeholder's record would become evidence in the next election."*

That record should include service quality, consistency of decisions, handling of complaints, use of resources, and correction of known defects. The exact measures have not been chosen.

Counts alone can mislead. An office may process many cases by rushing them. Another may receive more appeals because it explains appeal rights clearly. A fair assessment needs context and outcomes rather than one attractive number.

The recommendation here is a public account that combines comparable information with a reasoned explanation of significant decisions and independent findings. Protected personal details would remain private. Candidates should be able to challenge inaccuracies in the account, while voters should be able to see what remains disputed.

The incumbent's advantage

An official already in office controls information, has public visibility, and works with people who may depend on the institution. Even without direct misconduct, those advantages can make competition unequal.

Possible safeguards include separating election administration from the office being contested, giving challengers fair access to public institutional information, and prohibiting the use of official resources for personal campaigning. These are proposals developed here. The broader election law remains open.

> *"Staff should not have to demonstrate political loyalty to keep an ordinary job."*

People using the service should not fear that supporting a challenger will affect their assessment. A meaningful election requires protection of those relationships as well as a formal vote.

Counting twenty-five years

The proposed maximum raises several questions. Would it count all service across covered offices, or only time in one position? Would a break reset the clock? Would temporary appointments count? Could someone move repeatedly between related titles?

This manuscript recommends a cumulative lifetime limit across offices included in the rule, with interruptions leaving prior service counted. That is a new interpretation offered for discussion, not a rule already established in the source. It would make the limit harder to avoid through a change of title.

The precise list of offices and treatment of short acting appointments would still need definition. A person should know before accepting a role how the service will be counted. The record should be maintained independently enough that an incumbent cannot quietly amend their own eligibility.

Removal before a term ends

An election is not a sufficient response to every problem. Serious misconduct, incapacity, or abuse may require action before the next scheduled vote. The founding discussion raises removal and sanctions as safeguards but does not establish the procedure.

This book recommends a defined process that separates allegations from findings, provides an opportunity to respond, and identifies an independent authority capable of acting. Temporary suspension may sometimes be necessary, but it would need a reason and review. Rival officials should not be able to remove one another through unsupported accusations.

The relevant standards should distinguish misconduct from lawful disagreement. An unpopular policy choice within an official's mandate is not automatically corruption. Deliberate manipulation of a person's merit record is a different matter. Public confidence depends on judging those situations with precision.

Continuity without permanent officeholders

Service limits create a need for orderly succession. A commissioner should not become irreplaceable because procedures, records, and relationships exist only in their memory. Institutions need documented responsibilities, trained staff, and a clear transfer of authority.

Outgoing officials may still have useful knowledge. The project could consider limited advisory roles, provided these do not recreate the same power under a different title. Restrictions on influence, access, and future employment would require further design.

Renewal should be judged by the institution's ability to keep serving people through leadership changes. Experience has value, and so does the opportunity for another capable person to lead. Fixed terms, honest electoral review, and a meaningful outer limit can connect those values when the rules are clear and enforceable.

Questions for discussion

- How long is each term?
- How does the proposed twenty-five-year limit count transfers and interrupted service?

Join the discussion online →

19. Oversight, Appeals, and Correcting Mistakes

A system that assigns income, records contribution, and authorizes penalties will make mistakes. It may also be misused. The question is whether a person can identify the problem, obtain a fair review, and receive an effective correction.

The founding discussion proposes mutual monitoring between commissioners and raises independent appeals, removal, and sanctions as additional safeguards. Their institutional form remains open. This chapter develops a possible framework for discussion. It does not present those recommendations as an already agreed court system.

The first protection is an understandable decision

"A person cannot challenge a conclusion they cannot understand."

A merit decision should identify what was assessed, the evidence relied on, the rule applied, and the practical effect. It should explain how to request correction or review.

This does not require disclosing another person's private information or publishing every internal working note. It requires enough relevant explanation for the affected person to see whether the decision fits the facts and the rule. Where information must be protected, the review process needs a lawful way to examine it.

Clear reasons also help the institution. They expose inconsistent standards and make training more concrete. A decision that cannot be explained may be revealing a defect in the process rather than merely a communication problem.

Correction and appeal are different tasks

Some errors are straightforward. A month's contribution may be missing, a name confused with another, or a payment calculated from an outdated record. A simple correction process should resolve those cases without requiring a formal hearing.

Other disputes concern judgment: whether a contribution was fairly assessed, a limitation properly recognized, or a penalty proportionate under the rules. Those cases may require an appeal to a body that can reconsider the evidence and reasoning.

The design proposed here gives ordinary correction a clear route while preserving access to independent review. The original office could correct an obvious error promptly. It would not have exclusive final authority over a serious complaint about its own conduct. Exact deadlines and levels of appeal remain to be designed.

Independence needs a structure

Calling a review body independent does not make it so. Its members may depend on the same leadership for appointment, budget, promotion, or future employment. They may share relationships with the officials whose decisions they examine.

A future model should therefore identify who appoints reviewers, who can remove them, how their resources are secured, and how conflicts are handled. It should also define the authority of a successful appeal. A review that can criticize but cannot secure correction may offer little practical protection.

Possible arrangements include separate appointment routes, protected terms, reassignment when conflicts arise, and public reporting of systemic findings. These are options for comparison. The project has not selected a single institutional form.

Keeping review accessible

An appeal right is weak if people cannot use it. Language barriers, disability, lack of digital access, fear of retaliation, and the complexity of the process can all obstruct a challenge. The institution needs ways to receive a person's concern without requiring expert drafting.

This manuscript recommends assistance appropriate to the case, clear explanations of required evidence, and more than one access channel. It also recommends prohibiting adverse treatment simply because someone uses a lawful review process.

Interim support may be necessary where a disputed decision threatens essential living conditions. That support would not decide the appeal in advance. It would prevent the time taken to resolve a dispute from defeating the proposal's protected floor. The exact test and arrangement remain open.

Repairing the effect of a mistake

A corrected label is not always enough. An incorrect assessment may have reduced current revenue, accumulated merit, retirement provision, or access to education. A wrongful criminal decision may have caused much greater harm. Remedies should address the consequences that can reasonably be established.

The proposed framework would restore affected records, correct connected payments, and notify other offices where the error spread. It would also provide a process for considering additional repair. The source does not establish compensation rules, so this chapter leaves their form for later design.

Corrections must reach downstream systems. If the appeal changes the official record but an enterprise still relies on an obsolete finding, the person remains affected. Reliable record links and authorized notifications are therefore part of the remedy, with attention to privacy.

Learning from patterns

Individual appeals can reveal institutional defects. Repeated errors in one category may indicate a confusing rule, inadequate training, a biased assessment method, or deliberate misconduct. Offices should not treat every case as isolated when the evidence points to a pattern.

This book recommends periodic analysis of decisions and appeals using protected or aggregated information where possible. The aim is to improve the underlying process. A high number of complaints is a signal to examine, not automatic proof of poor performance; accessible complaint channels may themselves increase reporting.

Independent findings should lead to an identified responsibility for action. Someone must decide how the rule changes, how staff are trained, and whether earlier cases need reconsideration. Otherwise oversight risks becoming a report that everyone acknowledges and no one applies.

Who can change the rules, and who checks the change?

No design deserves permanent trust simply because it once worked. Every generation must ask two questions. Does this rule still serve people under present conditions? Do those entrusted with it act honestly, even when the answer costs them something? A rule worth keeping must protect basic human rights and each person's freedom to learn and pursue a fuller life according to their capacities and will. It should also recognize people who invest time and resources, take on responsibility and sustain a worthwhile effort. Someone who contributes more can earn greater recognition. Someone who can contribute less keeps the same basic rights.

There must be room for thinkers and philosophers to question the ends of a policy, for people who live under it to speak from experience, and for creative alternatives to receive a fair hearing. Consider a proposed change to merit assessment. Its sponsors say it will reward initiative. A carer points out that the proposed measure counts paid hours but misses the nights she spends caring for someone. An auditor could run both rules against anonymized cases and publish who gains or loses. If a sponsor owns a service that would profit under the new rule, the public needs to know that before a vote. A rule can be defective even if everyone acted honestly. A conflict of interest calls for a separate inquiry.

One possible safeguard is to publish the text, the evidence, the interests of its sponsors and the strongest objection before the authorized body decides. Independent auditors could check effects after adoption. Courts could hear challenges under the law. Constables would enforce lawful orders and investigate suspected wrongdoing within their authority. Peaceful opposition belongs in public debate and has to remain protected. The power to propose, decide, audit and enforce a change should be divided so that people who benefit from a decision cannot also settle complaints against it.

“A change should have a stated purpose, a way to judge the outcome and a date to revisit it.”

If it strips people of basic rights or evidence shows it is doing harm, there must be a lawful way to suspend it, repair the harm and reconsider it. These are proposed safeguards. The Federation would still have to define who has each power and how a challenge reaches them. The obligation is to remain open to improvement while making it difficult for someone to smuggle a private advantage into law under the name of progress.

Authority that accepts correction

The merit system should be judged partly by how it responds when challenged. An office that admits an error and repairs it may be acting more responsibly than one that preserves an attractive record by discouraging complaints.

Independent review, proportionate procedure, and effective remedies would give practical meaning to accountability. They would also protect honest officials by distinguishing reasonable disagreement from misconduct. The Federation's credibility would rest on its willingness to make decisions examinable and to change them when the evidence requires it.

Questions for discussion

- How are wrong decisions challenged and repaired?
- What independent review could prevent commissioners from shielding one another?

Join the discussion online →

20. The System in Everyday Life

The following people and situations are fictional. They illustrate how the proposal's principles might meet ordinary life. No income amounts, final entitlements, or adopted procedures are implied. Where a story uses a design suggestion developed in this book, that status is stated.

A system can look coherent when each rule is described separately. Daily life brings the rules together.

> *"Someone can be a learner and a caregiver, a worker and a patient, or a retired contributor who still helps their community."*

These overlaps are useful tests of the design.

A student preparing for independence

Mira begins a technical course. Under the founding proposal, education is available and she receives a comfortable baseline of support. She does not need to prove years of previous work before she can eat adequately, obtain materials, and concentrate on learning.

Partway through the course, Mira struggles with design calculations but does well tracing faults on a practice circuit. Her instructor offers a short trial in maintenance. Mira demonstrates the prerequisites and chooses that branch. If she later wants to return to design, she can study the mathematics and ask to demonstrate her readiness again.

The case tests whether student support genuinely serves development. If changing an unsuitable course destroys access to support, the formal freedom to learn becomes much narrower in practice.

A graduate taking a first role

Jon completes training and joins a maintenance team. His current capacity can be recognized from his preparation and the useful role he is ready to perform. His accumulated merit begins to grow through actual contribution.

He is new, so some responsibilities remain supervised. The project has not chosen an entry-level revenue formula. A tested model would have to show how his current component supports a good beginning without pretending he has an experienced worker's history.

The practical test is whether a new contributor can enter on fair terms. A system that requires accumulated merit to obtain every worthwhile opportunity would block the very people expected to build it.

A cleaner whose work is dependable

Leila cleans a supermarket after closing. Her work requires care, physical effort, reliable attendance, and attention to the space others use. It is a contribution explicitly recognized by the founding proposal.

Over many years, Leila builds accumulated merit. An assessment based only on formal qualifications would miss much of her value. An assessment based only on speed might encourage incomplete work. The proposed approach in Chapter 6 would consider the responsibility, actual quality, and relevant working conditions.

Her case tests the promise to recognize essential work without prestige. That recognition must appear in current living conditions and eventual retirement, rather than only in respectful language.

A skilled worker facing changed demand

Arun has developed a specialized production skill. For years, demand for his work has been strong. A new method changes the need for that particular process.

His past contribution does not become imaginary because the method changes. Accumulated merit preserves its historical recognition. His current assessment, however, must reflect what he can usefully contribute now. Lifelong education offers a path toward learning a related skill.

The rules for support during retraining remain open. This case tests whether the two-component model can recognize an honest history while adapting to changed needs. It also asks whether institutions provide a real retraining opportunity before classifying a displaced person as unwilling to work.

A person with limited capacity

Sofia has a health condition that prevents a regular working or study schedule. In this example, a medical assessment finds that she cannot sustain work or study. She receives the comfortable support described in Chapter 10 and continues to have access to healthcare.

Sometimes she can carry out a small activity. The source leaves partial capacity unresolved. Under the option developed in Chapter 10, support and proportionate contribution could coexist, subject to tested financial rules. She would not have to treat every attempt at useful activity as a risk to all essential support.

The case tests whether assessment reflects sustained practical capacity. It also tests privacy: an office may need confirmation of a limitation without every employer or neighbour receiving her medical history.

A person choosing the basic level

Elias can access suitable work and study but chooses neither. He receives basic lodging, food, necessities, and modest discretionary access. He can use the internet and ordinary technology, while optional purchases require choices within a limited allowance.

His circumstances differ from Sofia's inability and Arun's need for a new opportunity. The distinction is central to the proposal. It would be unfair to merge their cases simply because none is currently in full-time work.

Later, Elias decides to enter a course. The proposed return-to-participation process would give him clear requirements and a predictable change in support once participation is established. The exact timetable remains undecided.

A retiree relying on a long contribution

Tomas has contributed through several roles over many decades. He now wants to stop regular work. His historical record is intended to provide a foundation for good retirement, and healthcare continues.

Tomas can see the years of contribution on his record. Until the Federation sets a retirement formula, he cannot tell what income those years will provide. A future simulation would need to show how his actual contribution history produces an adequate entitlement and where the supporting resources come from.

Tomas occasionally teaches a practical skill to younger people. Whether that activity earns new merit, and how it interacts with retirement, requires an explicit rule. His case tests both the adequacy of accumulated recognition and the freedom to remain active later in life.

A commissioner facing a complaint

Nadia is elected to oversee a merit office. Her compensation occupies the median position under the proposed midpoint rule. The ordinary staff in her office remain under normal merit arrangements.

A contributor challenges one of the office's assessments. Under the independent-review framework recommended in Chapter 19, Nadia's own office could correct a simple error but would not control the final appeal against itself. A successful challenge would lead to corrected records and relevant payments.

If evidence instead showed serious misconduct by Nadia, the fixed compensation rule would not settle the case. The relationship among salary, removal, penalties, and retirement remains to be defined. Her story tests whether the institution is accountable even when the problem concerns its leader.

A person rebuilding after an offense

After a proven offense, Davi receives a merit penalty and a structured rehabilitation requirement. This example assumes a lawful finding and leaves the amount unspecified. The original theft multiplier is not applied automatically.

If protection requires confinement, rehabilitation can continue there. If a non-custodial response is justified, he may continue living in the community under defined conditions. In either case, essential care remains protected. The victim's safety and practical needs require attention in their own right.

The future model must decide how new contribution can be recognized after a penalty and how progress affects restrictions. Davi's case tests whether accountability has a clear consequence and a credible route toward lawful participation, without making victim protection depend on optimism.

Looking across the examples

These lives show why categories must connect. Education affects opportunity. Opportunity affects whether nonparticipation is voluntary. Current contribution affects revenue. Historical recognition affects retirement.

> *"Justice can affect merit without removing essential rights."*

Oversight must be able to correct decisions throughout the system.

The proposal becomes workable only if those connections are designed together. The examples do not prove that the system will succeed. They give the project specific situations against which to test its rules before asking people to depend on them.

Questions for discussion

• How would the proposed rules work for a student, cleaner, retiree, or person unable to work?

• Where would everyday examples reveal decisions still to make?

Join the discussion online →

21. From Vision to a Workable Model

The founding vision has a clear direction. Resources and finished products should be accessible worldwide. Responsibility should be entrusted through democratic judgment of relevant accomplishment. Contribution should receive present and lasting recognition. Education, healthcare, and essential support should remain available throughout life.

The work ahead is to turn those commitments into institutions and calculations that can be examined. This chapter proposes a development path. The founding discussion did not adopt a transition plan, and no stage described here is an authorization to replace existing institutions.

Separate commitments from choices

The first task is to maintain a clear record of what the project intends and what it has yet to decide. A commitment to worldwide access is different from a choice of ownership system. A commitment to accumulated recognition is different from a selected income equation. A commitment to human rights is different from a complete appeals procedure.

This manuscript has developed options for the unresolved areas. Those options should be recorded as recommendations until they are explicitly adopted, revised, or rejected. Doing so prevents a useful suggestion from quietly becoming a rule simply because it appeared in a chapter.

A proposal register could identify each issue, its founding principle, the available options, the reasons for preferring one, and the decision still required. The register would make later revisions easier to follow and allow readers to disagree with a mechanism without losing sight of the objective it serves.

Define the institutions and the economic units

The Federation needs an agreed division of responsibilities among local, regional, and worldwide bodies. It needs an account of who votes for each office, how competence claims are verified, and how officials can be removed. The source leaves these matters open.

The economy needs definitions of ownership, enterprise funding, exchange, production costs, and the unit in which entitlements are recorded. It must say whether merit is a record of contribution, a direct purchasing instrument, or something converted into revenue under separate rules. Those possibilities have different consequences.

Public services also require a funding model. Universal access to education and healthcare does not explain how staff, facilities, and materials are supplied. The model must connect its promises with the real productive capacity needed to fulfil them.

Build calculations that expose the choices

"An income model should start with clearly defined inputs and produce results a person can trace."

Test the 70/30 and two-thirds/one-third examples from Chapter 7 against the same working lives. Compare what each person could live on under each split, and examine other balances if both leave gaps.

The historical curve needs its own testing. The project should examine a new worker, a steady long-term contributor, a caregiver, a person with partial capacity, and a person who changes fields. Retirement calculations must then show what happens when current work decreases or ends.

These simulations should use declared hypothetical assumptions rather than appear to predict actual incomes. They should report who gains, who loses, and which cases remain unsupported. A model that works only for an uninterrupted career has not yet addressed the population described in this book.

Test shortages and difficult circumstances

Resource access should be examined under both adequate supply and shortage. How are essentials identified? Who decides between competing requests? Can an enterprise challenge a mistaken estimate? How are communities near extraction protected? The proposal requires answers that remain usable when cooperation is under pressure.

Justice proposals need equally careful comparison. The project must define offenses, responsibility, penalties, and review before applying merit loss. The hundredfold theft example needs evaluation against proportionality and different life histories. Chapter 14's example of total merit loss for murder raises further questions about essential support, dependants, and future rehabilitation.

Institutional stress tests should include misconduct by a commissioner, a corrupt network of offices, a large record failure, and an incorrect denial of support. The purpose is to discover how the protections operate when the people entrusted with them are mistaken or untrustworthy.

Invite criticism from different responsibilities

Economic modelling alone cannot settle the project. Contributors doing routine work, people receiving support, educators, healthcare professionals, enterprise operators, legal specialists, and affected communities will notice different weaknesses.

The recommendation is to ask concrete questions and publish responses to major objections. How would a cleaner understand an assessment? Could a student change direction? Would a person with fluctuating capacity risk losing support by trying to work? Could a community refuse an irresponsible resource arrangement? Could an official be removed without partisan manipulation?

An objection should be answered through a changed design, supporting reasoning, or an honest acknowledgment that the issue remains unresolved. Repeating the vision does not resolve a defect in the mechanism.

Begin with reversible learning

If the project proceeds toward practical testing, an initial stage could use fictional cases and parallel calculations without changing anyone's real support. Later, voluntary and limited trials might examine administrative processes or forms of cooperation within existing lawful arrangements.

This is a proposed sequence, not an adopted implementation plan. Any real trial would need consent, clear scope, protection of essential services, data safeguards, independent evaluation, and an exit route. Participation in a demonstration should not put a person's food, housing, or healthcare at risk.

Larger institutional changes would require a different level of legitimacy and preparation. Existing assets, obligations, public services, employment relationships, and accumulated retirement expectations cannot simply be ignored. A transition would need negotiated rules and continuity of provision.

Keep the standard of success human

"The project should be judged by what happens to people."

Begin each review with the five questions in Chapter 9 about peace, forgiveness, compassion, gratitude and presence. Record what people actually experienced under each heading and what should happen next. Can they obtain necessities? Can they learn and develop? Does useful work receive fair recognition? Are limitations treated with care? Can ordinary people understand decisions and challenge errors? Does leadership remain accountable when its own interests are involved?

Every generation should reopen those questions, and serious new evidence should prompt a review sooner. The public record should show what an earlier rule was meant to achieve, whom it helped or harmed, what changed, and why people kept or revised it. Schools can use that record to teach the next generation how to judge the Federation by its conduct.

The vision invites people to think beyond inherited divisions while taking practical responsibility seriously. The next step is to make its choices explicit, test its mechanisms, and revise what fails. The aim remains a shared world in which access, contribution, and human protection can support one another throughout a person's life.

Questions for discussion

- Which institutional, economic, and mathematical questions must be resolved first?
- How could present institutions move toward this system? No transition plan has yet been agreed.

Join the discussion online →