



Arne Timm



The Ecolomy Story or what is ecolomism?

Mountain View, January 5:	The first meeting with my bosses	p. 2
Mountain View, January 7:	The second meeting with my bosses	p. 3
Pacifica, January 8:	My first meeting with the Chico from the Cubar	p. 4
Sausolito, January 9:	I meet Dago Tomspin	p. 5
Palo Alto, January 10:	I meet Guy Suzuki	p. 7
Pacifica, January 11:	My second meeting with the Chico from the Cubar	p. 8
Pacifica, January 13:	My third meeting with the Chico from the Cubar	p. 9
Mountain View, January 14:	The third meeting with my bosses	p. 10

Dude is living in the Californian Bay Area in a maybe not too distant present - three world powers, OSA, EUPA and INA, divide the planet into their spheres of interest. Dude is software developer at a major search engine company and suddenly finds himself confronted with a herculean task, which at first appears insurmountable.

Mountain View, 5. Januar: The first meeting with my bosses

I am a software developer at Joogle! Everyone knows. On the first working day of the year I received a call to attend a meeting of the board.

Hehe, don't get me wrong. I'm not vice president or so, just a simple nerd. My bosses Ark, Sarge and Parry (cough), you know, multi-billionaires - Forbes Magazine named them to be among the 5 most powerful guys in the world. So, I jumped on my road bike, straight across the Joogle campus. Ark, our CEO, welcomed me: „Hey Dude. Happy New Year. Thank you, that you have time for us ...

... we just sit here together and talk about the climate conference in EUPA. Then we came on the economic crisis to speak and Parry said he understands nothing of that what the economists say - weather somebody can tell him in nerd language what's going on and what that means for us. The database says you're nerd and economist. Maybe you can help us.“

Me: Aah. Thank you Ark. Hi Sarge, hi Parry. Happy New Year. What exactly is the problem?

Sarge: Exactly this is the question! What is the cause for the whole bullshit we are faced with: climate change, economic crisis, capital destruction in the magnitude of world wars ... is it the turbo-capitalism?

Me: Hmm. I believe the core problem is, that no one can rule effectively global capitalism. For this purpose it would need a world government. However, the politicians of the different states can not even agree on minimum measures to the environment protection or to the control of the financial markets. Drastic, worldwide co-ordinated measures would be necessary, otherwise...

Parry: ... that means, we should not blame the politicians, but rather the free market system, because it cannot be regulated effectively anymore due to globalization?

Me: Enterprises practice profit maximisation. This is their rule of the game and that means necessarily minimization of costs - also by the underestimation of ecological and social resources in the not regulated global area. While closed domestic markets are efficiently adjustable, enterprises can optimise production costs at the expense of the environment or migrant workers because of globalisation.

But also taxes. Thus, the non ungovernable global market economy leads inevitably to the exploitation of resources. Every uncontrollable system leads, by the way, to the collapse - just because nobody can prevent this with an uncontrollable system. Like an organism which is struck by cancer.

Sarge: Does it mean, we cannot turn away the climate change and the next depression because nobody can trim the global economy and society effectively on sustainability?

Me: Not with the methods of the national economy. This is, as if one wants to drive a server with a not network-compatible operation system.

Sarge: Dude that makes me sad somehow. The imagination, that we can't avoid worst case scenarios. And all as a matter of system failure. Bah! What an unworthy end. I mean, we are Joogle! If someone in the world can develop a system that works globally and sustainable - than probably we can, or what?

Ark: That's what I think. Maybe quite new possibilities arise for us. Dude, from now you are released from the OS team. Your job is now to design a sustainable economic and social system that can be implemented globally. It would be great, if we can speak about the requirements in one month. Good luck, Dude.

Santa Cruz, January 6

Today I rode with my Cadex road bike absolutely CO₂-correctly to Santa Cruz at the Pacific coast. I love the Pacific. I was born at the Pacific Ocean.

During the ride over the hills I just had enough time to think about yesterday. Absolutely cool. Own project. A lot of freedom. One month reflection about a sustainable worldwide implementable economic and social system. Sounds somehow impossible.

Globally implementable would mean that all countries agree with it. He He. The INESE government does not even like to discuss about human rights. What do we dream of? At best the companies themselves could ensure that their factories or suppliers in INA produce more ecologically friendly. But that reduces profit. I believe, a three-legged ballerina is easier to be found, than an enterprise which renounces voluntarily profit.

How wonderful, the sundown behind the Pacific Ocean! Good bye, wonderful world. Good bye 10.000 years of human civilization. 200 years of industrialization, 50 years of globalization and now the climate collapse ... however. The enterprises have also nothing of it if climate effects threaten the people, make markets insecure and the Maldives drown. Maybe they would give up the profit maximisation, and for it invest in sustainability if they knew that global competitors also do this?

That is there are two absolute requirements for the design of a sustainable worldwide implementable economic and social system. I have to tell this to Sarge, Ark and Parry.

Mountain View, January 7: The second meeting with my bosses

Parry told me, that we meet for lunch at the "University", a mouth-watering restaurant in Mountain View.

Ark: Hi Dude. That was quite fast. Go ahead.

Me: There are two indispensable requirements for a sustainable worldwide implementable economic and social system. If you don't like them we don't need to proceed.

First. This system requires an absolute separation of economy and finance on the one hand and politics on the other side. That is, the economic and financial policy would be made, in principle, by the companies or organizations, which are deployed to manage the system. In contrast to governments who are national authorities, enterprises as global authorities are able to implement worldwide changes.

Secondly. We live on a planet with limited resources. Hence, there can be neither theoretically nor practically boundless growth. So this new economic system would have to operate with relativization and not with maximization of profit. That is, the companies would have to qualify profit in favour of sustainability targets like CO₂-reduction. At least until they have reached completely sustainable value added chains.

Ark: How would all this work practically?

Me: Let's say, a number of companies and groups decide to establish a sustainable economic system, because they are convinced that one may not leave the welfare of the planet and the world markets to the countries, as politicians evidently are not able to agree to effective worldwide measures.

These companies could create an economic space and equip it with obliging rules for all players: Consumers and sellers of goods and services. These rules could aim on sustainability and could be implemented globally - everywhere in companies which belong to this economic space. Also in INA. No western politician could effect this.

Ark: Where is this economic space, physically seen? On our servers?

Me: A virtual global single market. A portal, a platform. Maybe not on our servers, but on servers of our server farms. For the users, whether businesses or humans, own laws and currency would apply. Perhaps there would be interfaces to national single markets.

Parry: However, wouldn't the governments consider this virtual global single market as a black market and shut it down?

Me: Not, necessarily. Since it is sustainable, it is ideologically superior. After all, the companies have agreed to relativize profit to save the world. To move away from profit maximization! This is a paradigm shift. The acceptance depends on the design of the interfaces to the territorial instances. For example for taxes. I am not so far. Should I proceed?

Sarge: Sure man. Perhaps you will have a first system design in a month.

Pacifica, January 8: My first meeting with the Chico from the Cubar

Today I rode with my Cadex road bike absolutely CO₂-correctly to Pacifica. I love the Pacific. I was born at the Pacific Ocean. On my ride over the hills I had enough time to think about yesterday. System design. They are nuts. I thought they will stop the show and say: Forget it, enterprises will never give up the profit maximisation voluntarily. And, that it's impossible to separate politics from the economy. System design. Crazy agenda. One cannot simply come along and introduce a new world economic system?!

Though, ... Sarge, Ark and Parry - they already have power. And dough, too. Some more of these guys and they possibly could establish their own economic system. There are more than enough reasons. System design? This has nothing to do anymore with macroeconomics ... maybe it is metaeconomics?

Today, the monetary policy of the OSA affects investment decisions of companies in EUPA ... the speculation plan of a hedgefonds at any commodity exchange affects the prices for bread everywhere in the world. It's not only that everything interacts. The market participants are not even clearly allocated. People can be voters, customers, employees, shareholders, stakeholders and much more in one person.

Puuh complicated. I think I ride to the Cubar now. And then - una cervesa, por favor, Guadalupe.

The Cubar was empty and Guadalupe not there. Instead, a chico behind the bar. It turned out, a guy from EUPA. He studies some semesters political science at the State University, he said. Hehe. Maybe he can help me with my system.

"Hey Chico", I said. "What's going on in EUPA? You were the good guys at climate summit in Hopenhagen." ¡Un saludo! I toasted my beer.

The Chico: Better no result than one nobody keeps. Where I come from - from GERMANY - we are the only country that fulfilled the Kyoto-protocol. But this even because the CO₂-savings of the less industrialized GDR could be calculated in addition by the reunion.

Me: Oooh. DERMAN. One question. GREASE is supposed to bust. Do the DERMAN tax payers have to pull the GREASE trough, or how is this case regulated in your union?

The Chico: I believe at the end of the day DERMANY will pay. Maybe we want to redress that we have incited two worldwars. Eeemmm, and practiced genocide in an industrial manner.

Me: Ho ho. You could use these people now well. I read that your demographic pyramid is up-side down. How should fewer and fewer people in EUPA generate more and more economical growth? Do they plan to find oil?

The Chico: Economic growth in the past was also generated by new indebtedness. Debts, burdens for future generations which will, already seen demographically, never been able to pay them back. They were accumulated by a substantially larger population. Actually, one needs to find oil. Who wants to inherit the debts of his parents? Clan liability! The baby boomers will look at the debt service at some point as reparations to the excessive past that has brought our earth to the edge of environmental and economic depression. It takes away their scope of action to face their own reality and to shape their own future.

Me: You mean due to the generation contract all the retired people must be brought trough. Additionally, debts must be paid back which have been accumulated in the last 40 years among much better demographical and global competitive terms.

The Chico: Yes, and all that without the possibility to use the growth tool indebtedness anymore. Because of insolvency! More than that: in DERMANY for example trillions Euros time bombs are lurking in form of pension liabilities for the civil servants of the baby-boomer generation. There are no provisions for it. Politicians don't like to talk about it. Finally, it is also about the own pension which must be still gained or be financed by new indebtedness or cuts in other areas. I think it is the variety of loads for the next generations that will define the mood in EUPA. Indeed, also measures to meet the climate change must be financed - even for developing countries - everything already promised.

Me: And everything will be paid with debts again?

The Chico: Bail out banks. Save countries. Everything with new debts. The cause of the problems should be the solution. In principle, the politicians now have no other option but inflating away the debt with methods of financial repression. So keeping interest rates low by central reserve bank manipulation and at the same time fiddling the bond market by pushing of bond loans via equity capital regulations, etc. ... the depositors stand there empty-handed ... that is not sustainable.

Sausalito, January 9: I meet Dago Tomspin

This morning Sarge called. It just occurred to him that he met Dago Tomspin at a charity dinner last year. Also a billionaire. That's the way it is. Billionaires know billionaires. And nerds know nerds. Anyway, he wanted to tell me that Dago Tomspin re-nounced maximization of profit and since then, buys up virgin forest to keep it from slash and burn. Really efficient climate measure, I would say. Of course, I would like to meet him.

Then I rode with my Cadex road bike absolutely CO2-correctly to Sausalito, a suburb at the other side of the Golden Gate Bridge where Dago Tomspins foundation has its headquarter. Skyline Boulevard parallel to the coast and then across the Golden Gate. Dago Tomspin welcomed me on a terrace with the view on the bay.

Me: Dago, before you've done business on a grand scale. Today you are fighting for the rain forest. Do you think that managers can improve the world also in her jobs?

Dago: In general, managers can manage everything. Even an environmental organization. If the shareholders of a company assign the management to make the world a better place they will organize appropriate measures. But shareholders expect profit. Also growth.

Growth creates jobs. Growth creates economic wealth. Growth always finds capital. Countries want to increase their gross national product every year and companies their profit quarterly. Growth is the sacred cow of our society. Everything is subordinated to growth. But, no lion catches 10 percent more booty each quarter. We only have limited resources on our planet. There can not be endless growth. Our planet already is in a dramatic condition.

Me: I am busy with a sustainable market economy. How could one bring companies' shareholders to renounce profit and therewith give the management scope of action for environmental enhancements along their value creation chains?

Dago: You will always find a few stockholders who think in ethical terms and long term markets. To the others you must say that the single product leaves less gross margin, but contrariwise more products will be sold. Because customers will find it surely great if they get sustainably produced products for the same price, just because the stockholders renounce profit.

Me: Thank you Dago. Can you give me any other advice?

Dago: Think in humans. Evolutionarily we are not programmed to solve problems that lie in distant future. That must be compensated by the system. And finally: We face the ultimate challenge. The world merges to a global civilisation. If we want to merge the world's cultures, we need something holy, that we all can share. No god. No sacred cow. And it can also not be the profit. It is our earth from whose molecules all life came into being, and which we need to live. Good Luck, Dude.

San Francisco, still January 9

Exhausting day, today. Thinking in humans... canonize the earth. Is Tomkins an Indian? Well, they kept the earth and have definitely not industrialized it. They lived sustainably. However, it has not been useful to them against the weapons of the conquerors from EUPA. Is our culture superior to theirs?

Is an Indian more worth than me, because his CO₂-emission tends to zero? Actually, when he doesn't bomb down the prairie with a pickup truck. Who is going to establish rules for the new sustainable worldwide implementable economic and social system - if not the politicians? Do the companies elect a legislative authority? What's about judiciary and executive? Should the companies also organize this, too? Gee! Perhaps I should tell Sarge, Parry and Ark that's not easy with this system. And what name should it have? Jack? Here in OSA we call everything Jack, for which we have no name. Car lifters, sailors, sockets ... Jack ecolomy? Ecolo→gical Economy?

Palo Alto, January 10: I meet Guy Suzuki

This morning I called Guy Suzuki. He is venture capitalist. He was formerly also Mec evangelist at Eppl. You know ... the first phat computer ... the first awesome cell phone. Anyway, he owes me a favor, since I translated him when he had an accident with this only Spanish speaking guy. When I was nerd at Allpop, one of Guys projects.

From San José to Palo Alto. I ride my Cadex road bike absolutely CO2-correctly along the El Camino Real. It's the street where I live. "The king's way", that makes one feel better living there. Could also be named Pan California. To the south one can drive the kings' way another 300 miles to San Diego. Guy waits for me in his office. Maybe he can help me.

Guy: Hi Dude, old nerd. Tell me about your sustainable economic system. What are the good news for the people?

Me: Guy, as you know: Capitalism is the operating system of the economy and the society. You also know that the system crashes sometimes. And that it requires and expends too many resources - and that it can't be administrated worldwide efficiently.

Well! In capitalism there are, in principle, two forms of organizations. Full-profit corporations and non-profit-organizations, like environmental organizations. That is one optimise costs in his global value added chains at the expense of the environment, and then the others try to repair the damages.

The new global and sustainable economic operating system, hmmm ... , lets call it "ecolomy", has a new legal form for companies, which intends that they renounce quantitative profit according to a certain quota and stick the money into qualitative improvements of their value creation chains in order to make them more sustainable. It is no environmental tax, with which others do something, but rather a voluntarily self obligation to make the own processes and methods steadily more environmentally friendly.

Guy: That is, the quota is not to be of use for development of more environmentally friendly products, but rather for more environmentally friendly methods and processes of production. Energy savings, reduction of CO2 by shortening of transits? Internalization of external costs? Externality?

Me: Yes, in principle. Because the nature has, however, no cash box to compensate them for abuse, it adds up to an avoidance of external effects. The new legal form would prescribe also ethical standards as renunciation of child labour or fair remuneration of workers though the whole value-added process. The fact that the products themselves become more sustainable, for example by using renewable raw materials or by using less energy in production, should have to be regulated by the market. I have in mind a system function, but I am not yet so far.

Guy: And who determines the quota for the companies?

Me: The economic area could be administrated by an organisation which the enterprises install themselves. That would define a catalogue of measures that are supported in principle. That is, the companies therefore could assert expenditures for it within their quota. Of course, the catalogue would be ongoing complemented. The companies would determine the quota level by themselves respective their shareholders. The quota would also not have to be fixed but could be changed annually. Of course, the measures must be verifiable. The quota could be indicated on product packaging. Perhaps, one could name it "e-correction".

Guy: And who elects this ecolomy government? Who verifies the measures?

Me: Well, I have not thought through everything. But it is conceivable that companies elect or determine the ecolomy administration. This takes over legislature for the sustainable economic space and formulates the sustainability constitution. Judiciary and executive one could leave with the countries. They already have infrastructure for it. The collaboration can be regulated via interfaces. By the way, Dago Tomspin mentioned, that the earth should be established as holy in the constitution, because it is the only thing that all world cultures share together. Can you also give me any advice?

Guy: Hmm. The constitution should also contain risk standards. Dude, we are both product guys. We love awesome products and services. This is not an end in itself, our customers love us for it. What the investment banks make endangers the real economy. Profit as an end in itself. They should go to Vegas for gambling. In my opinion, the banks in this economic space should not be allowed to speculate with the money they get from the reserve bank. Rather a boring banking than one that endangers the economic space. The role of the single person in the system must also still become clearer. Good luck, Dude.

San Jose, January 11: My second meeting with the Chico from the Cubar

Today, I cruised around. I had to think about a lot of things. Now, Guy also talks about the people. People consume. The first civic duty. Many on credit. This generates growth and jobs. However, are they sustainable? ... Well, the people. As customers they would be of course instances of the economic space. They also would acknowledge the constitution of the holy earth? Would this make them to citizens of the virtual economic space? Or social system?

... all this can only work globally, if it is fair-minded. If states, companies and people are equal→ly treated in each case. Equal is fair.

... I have read: In order to restrict global warming to less than two degrees, every person would have to limit the CO₂-emission, which is added to him, to less than 2 tonnes per year. Now. Im→mediately. Not sometime. We have here in the OSA at the moment 20 tonnes per head, per year [4]. Car, air con→ditioning, pool, TV, heating ... if everybody would have an emission budget of 2 tonnes per year, the sustainable Indian could sell 1 tonne to a rich guy.

Finally, I arrive at the Pacific and I drive the Pacific Coast Highway northward to Pacifica. Maybe I meet again the Chico from the Cubar.

In any case, the ecolomy platform could mana→ge the CO₂ balances of companies and human beings. Ok, a campfire might be difficult to record. But other cases? From energy costs one can devi→ate the CO₂-contingent. Also automatically and in real time, if the energy provider would be an ecolomy company or a full profit company that supports ecolomy interfaces. Maybe the Indian gets for 1 tonne of buying power CO₂ credited on the ecolomy platform?

Finally, I arrived at Pacifica. Again the Chico is behind the bar.

Me: Chico, imagine, the companies would like to set up own, simpler, more efficient and more sustainable economic spaces, as they can find them today on the different domestic markets. How could they convince the politicians to accept meta-economic spaces with an own regulatory and financial policy?

The Chico: Forget this. Politicians do not like simple systems, because a simple system gives less politicians and civil servants employment. They prefer complex systems, because they are the only ones which are paid to deal with it. Well, tax consultants and lawyers, too. No one has

less interest in changing a system as the one who benefit most from it. By the way, the EUPA union doubled every established post. Now, it has even a superior foreign ministry. With 7.000 new established posts. And now, tell me which the new boss title is for 7.000 new functionaries ...

Me: Ehh, „EUPIC foreign minister“?

The Chico: His title is „Upper Representative for Foreign Policy“. That is he has nothing to say. The foreign ministers of the member states keep doing their own foreign policy. The politicians call this “integration”. I call it “creating established posts”. Democracy is maybe be the biggest achievement of our civilization. But also social systems go through evolutionary changes. You never know. All these career politicians cost. The decision-making costs for democracies are higher than those for dictatorships, where only a few decide. And those of the EUPIC UNION are the highest in the world because it is a bureaucratic Moloch in more than 20 languages. But dictatorship? No way! I believe you have to convince the voters of a better system. Then maybe they can convince the politicians. Or deselect them. Everything else would be a step back.

Pacifica, January 12: Mein third meeting with the Chico from the Cubar

Today, again I drove to Santa Cruz. But via Pacifica, because I liked to ask the Chico from the Cubar some questions.

In the meantime, I reflect our yesterday's conversation. He wears me down. What shall I do with the growth? Must such a system be much more radical? 9 billions people in 2050. Everyone wants to eat, watch TV, driving, swimming pool ... travel, breathe ... that's a tricky situation ...in nowadays more consumption is rewarded. One receives discounts. By two, get three. In order to be sustainable, additional consumption should be punished. Also additional energy consumption, at least of not sustainably produced energy. Actually, the system has all the information on people and companies to manage sustainability. What if the purchase prices also have an e-correction?

...On the one hand, there is the average EUPIAN with 10 tonnes of CO₂-emission per year, and the OSA citizen with 20 tonnes. And the Indian with ... well, let's say 0,1 tonnes? If the Indians would buy from companies with ecolomy leagel form, he may pay 50 cents for a pack of pasta. Somebody with an attributable CO₂-emission level of 2 tonnes pays for the same pack in the same shop a purchase price of let's say e\$ 1,40. That would surely also be the price on the price tag. And anyone who has a emission level of 10 tons per year maybe pays e\$ 3,50? So the Indian gets discount, which is funded by the high level waste producer and the companies win a new spending target group ...

Gosh! This ecolomy makes me mad. Why should one with 20 tonnes CO₂-emission participate in such an economic system? Maybe one adapts his home to 12 V solar power, sells the car, drives only by bicycle and downshifts to the Indian category. 50 cents for a pack of pasta. That's a great deal. And one who cruises the Pacific with a super yate that sucks 100 gallons per hour, won't be bothered by spending more money on gasoline.

One ge→nerally has to accept that any other human has a fundamental right to the same amount of oxygen, as oneself. Finally, we live in the OSA. 50 years ago black people were not allowed to drive in the same bus with the white. And now, they should concede to every person the same right for CO₂-emission ... never say never.

Isn't this system a mad bureaucratic juggernaut? All the information one needs. Doesn't it need infinite resources and processing power in order to get and value all the entire information? But why? If someone makes a trip the system would know by cross-linking departure and destination and airplane type and could calculate and assign the attributable CO2-emission. If one buys a TV, the system would also know the model and the use of resources from manufacturers' sustainability balance.

Quantum computers could provide the performance for such a system and quantum cryptography could guarantee absolute safety. That's for sure. At Jooble we already have quantum chips in some areas in use.

... Does one get the pasta also cheaper if he has 10 children? Anyhow,, that are 10 new potential CO2 emitters and consumers of oxygen ... Maybe 2 billion people could live on this planet as AMERICANS. But we would need six planets and atmospheres when all humans have their consumption and CO2 level ... Ah. There is the Cuba.

Me: Hey, Chico, imagine a virtual global economic and social system would for its members, so companies and people, administrate their civil needs like tax computations. Via standard interfaces, which are the same for all states. They not need to worry about anything ...

The Chico: No politician has an interest at the fact that the system runs more efficiently. In EUPA there are also too many instances. Regional policy, county policy, state policy, EUPEAN policy. Everybody knows that there are too many civil servants. What will you do with them if you have a high-performance system administration? All these financial administrators, who became superfluous by standard interfaces? Should they all retire?

In the OSA it has less public sector and less taxes, but therefore the politicians are almost busy with fundraising and have barely time to administrate, manage or create the society. Or, they create only for lobbies. This endangers democracy.

Which politics fields should remain then with the countries when they join in ecolomy and accept that they themselves encash no more taxes but receive dues via standard interfaces which are gained on a meta level?

Me: Maybe security policy, social policy, everything with terrestrial reference ...

Chico: Maybe a new global party should be founded that operates regionally and runs for office in parliaments of different nations and propagates ecolomy as a sustainable global economic and social system. The system could finance itself with a transaction fee, then it would be easier for the people to elect it.

Mountain View, 13. Januar: The third meeting with my bosses

Yesterday, I called Sarge and told him that we can now discuss the basic architecture of ecolomy. On my way I reflected my last meeting with the Chico. Founding a global party. Perhaps there will be indeed different platforms, use the ecolomy functions and the same database.

Sarge, Ark and Parry are waiting for me in a meeting lounge. They look at me full of expectation.

Me: So, let me go back a again ... government intervention on global markets, whether taxes, subsidies or other national rules per se are unfair, because they affect only companies in respective countries. A global economic order would have equal rules for people and businesses in all countries. As the politicians of the nations are subject to growth targets, they can not agree on effective sustainability measures.

Since politics failed to shape a sustainable future we simply make a separation of economics and politics and migrate the global economy and the people step by step onto a sustainable global economy platform.

The deal with the companies is basically: They get a sustainable, predictable, not by politics and speculation unpredictable market. In return, they subordinate themselves under a sustainability constitution and relativize profit maximization in favor of transformation of the industrial landscape into a green industry. So, the managers, as usual, pursue their company's objectives. Through the voluntary sustainability quote for companies in ecolomy they would obtain budgets and scope of action for improvements. No one knows better than the companies itself, where the mud is in the global value chains. Last but not least, they would save huge sums which are spent today in national lobbying to influence policy.

The deal with the policy in principle: Take care of the local tasks. Take care of the people, education, infrastructure, security. Therefore, the platform via standard interfaces provides taxes to national governments for their budgets for education, infrastructure etc. In this way no country could be played off against another, and in an absolutely cross-linked world tax evasion would be a thing of the past. In case that governments, which are democratically elected support the ecolomy interfaces, ecolomy would be a democratically legitimated economic system. Moreover, it would be legitimized by the people and companies who commit to the system.

And the deal is with people: The global community needs leadership. This does not exist. Hence, we try to get the people on a platform that has fixed sustainability in its constitution and provides a systemic leadership. Perhaps we can convince people of the justice of an individual price building. We can offer them to administrate their CO2 balances ... Aaah, of course, not us, but the ecolomy administration. And we, Joogle, offer perhaps the infrastructure! Everything is just a mind game! Or?

Parry: This global economic and sustainability administration, who will lead it?

Me: A President. An administration. The President of ecolomy would be probably determined by the companies who protect the system, so maybe cover the currency with their company shares. The administration would be sworn to the constitution - to honor the earth, as Dago says. Like a reserve bank is, or should be only committed to the stability of a currency, the administration would be only committed to the sustainability of our planet respective a sustainable global control. Independently! Neither the companies could influence it, nor the policy. A meta system, which would stand above the macro and micro economic structures, but integrates them with interfaces for transparency and transaction.

Certainly there would also be a reserve bank which equips a banking system with money. There would be commercial banks and private banks. But not investment banks, no gambling, no artificial financial products, derivatives, certificates and the whole poison. All this turned out to be an end in itself: Makes a few rich and many poor. The Wall Street boys have all made dependent on something that nobody needs: financial instruments that nobody understands any...

Ark: Hey dude. I think, your system is great. With our mobile devices as payment and life tools for the absolute cross-linking everything will become possible, soon. Sounds interesting. But another question: Now and then I am jogging along the Pacific. I don't think that the water level rises really. Don't we run the risk to pit on a hype that has been declared by an industry that profits from it?

Me: Yes, I know. The climate has been changing forever. Ice ages, etc. It is not only about environmental sustainability but also about the future viability of financial systems. Not everybody is a billionaire. Some grandma fears for her small pension and regarding the ocean I say to you: even if global warming is not human-made and not even harmful, and even the water would not rise. There is still the poisoning by CO2 and other gases and substances. The ability of oceans to absorb CO2 and produce oxygen decreases. The rain forests become less and our atmosphere is not infinitely receptive. The fact that the ecological systems are not yet tipped over does not mean that they are infinitely resilient.

Ark: Ok. Can we prevent climate collapse?

Me: One does not burn over 200 years sextillion tonnes of fossil energy and blow the exhaust into the air, without having any consequences. You can simulate this simply at home in your closed garage with your cars engine running ... but seriously: The best thing that can happen to the environment, is a global economic depression since everything comes to a halt and the earth can recover.

If we want to preserve the ecosystems from collapse and in the same time want acceptable economic and social conditions, we maybe really need a new economic system, like ecolomy.

Parry: Have you already solved all functions?

Me: No. For example, I do not know how one could deal with economics of scale. If one would prohibit returns to scale, that would be a great lever to counteract exploitation of resources. But, hardly a business model would work anymore ...

Ark: Dude, would you waive on a third of your purchasing power, to join a sustainable economic and social system?

Me: Ark, I'm already at the good in the Indian category. The question is, whether you would participate in a sustainable economic system - of course only privately seen.

Ark: If I would lose a third of my purchasing power - I wouldn't starve. If the system works and others would also join in and it could really help to keep the earth's resources and to prevent the climate collapse: I would go for it!

Me: Shall I continue working on ecolomy?