JOURNAL ACADEMICA

VOLUME 11, NO.1, June 20 2022

M. Dobrovolny / K. Daghbouche

JOURNAL ACADEMICA • NEW YORK

VOLUME 11, NO. 1, JUNE 20 2022

EDITOR IN CHIEF

S. Feigenbaum

TABLE OF CONTENT

ISSN 2161-3338 • www.journalacademica.org

Journal Academica Vol. 11(1), pp. 3-10, June 20 2022 - Political Science - ISSN 2161-3338
online edition www.journalacademica.org

Discussion Note

Legitim Political Freedom: A New Environmental Paradigm

Martin Dobrovolny*
Olomouc (Czech Republic)

Received May 24 2022; Accepted June 15 2022

ABSTRACT

In our modern societies it is often emphasized that citizens have both rights and duties towards each other. Individual actors are given the opportunity to pursue their individual interests as long as they do not obviously inflict harm on others. Today, however, it has become clear that the opportunities that our liberal democracies make available for individual actors have led to major collective disadvantages: class divisions, poverty and environmental problems worldwide.

Keywords: Liberalism, Ecology, CO2

LIBERALISM IS OUT OF DATE

In our modern societies it is often emphasized that citizens have both rights and duties towards each other. Individual actors are given the opportunity to pursue their individual interests as long as they do not obviously inflict harm on others. Today, however, it has become clear that the opportunities that our liberal democracies make available for individual actors have led to major collective disadvantages: class divisions, poverty and environmental problems worldwide.

To the best of our knowledge, our consumer societies have been continuously reducing the remaining natural area, in favor of new buildings, infrastructure, industrial products and their waste. The deterioration of the planet's ecosystems has not only led to an extreme species death in the animal and plant world, but also to a high risk of ecological collapse.

If we are to regard ourselves as rational and moral agents, we should relieve our nature, the basis of our life, at least to the extent that its persistence becomes likely. This goal could be achieved by limiting our ecological footprint (according to current calculations for sustainable ecosystems) to an absolute budget. Based on this budget, all countries should be allocated a capped carbon emission quota (according to their population), which is then shared equally between the citizens. Since any form of environmental pollution (ecological footprint) can be converted into CO2 equivalents, setting an absolute CO2 emission budget is not only possible, but without any alternative.

*Corresponding author: martin.dobrovolny33@gmail.com

RIGHTS AND PREFERENCES

In order to ensure stability and growth in the state, as early as 1651, *Thomas Hobbes* rationally justified why people living in societies should accept a social contract; most people are afraid of anarchy and prefer the security a state can offer. Laws and regulations as well as civil rights and duties have since changed continuously, in line with the compromises that the various sections of society have negotiated at any given time. Today's most developed welfare states have increased their service offerings so extensively that they finally got people providers, meanwhile citizens got service recipients.

However, our welfare societies lack a sustainable foundation since the service offerings are based on an economy that generates from unlimited access to production and consumption. When it is undisputed that our economy is directly linked to a continuous reduction of natural resources and ecosystems, our current social contract becomes illegitimate. Established legislation should admittedly limit various irregularities (for example laws in favor of a certain nature conservation), but in the absence of a focus on specific over-consumption, we will never reach the decisive goal. To avoid a weak economy, nation states are not even interested in calculating a sustainable limit of our consumption. Leading politicians rarely look beyond their term of office and in favor to stay popular.

Regardless of nature's ecosystems, Eastern European communists for 40 years sought to limit human urge for boundless unfoldment. The ideology of owning and managing means of production together should lead to an ideal society, without class divisions. However, people could not be left behind unmotivated for realizing their own ideas. When Communism capitulated in 1989, *Margaret Thatcher* seized the opportunity to proclaim the final victory of liberalism. Her TINA principle "There Is No Alternative" has since, unfortunately, become a recognized paradigm.

In the Western world, we today perceive ourselves as free and enlightened people. However, which freedom we enjoy and which we are entitled to is very diffuse. As preference-driven hedonists, surrounded by ever-changing products, conventions and competing demands, we must balance family, work, friends and ourselves. Walking this tightrope, we rarely consider our (common) environment to be more important than our (individual) needs – when push comes to shove.

Despite all the environmental measures, we still release more CO2 into the atmosphere every year than the year before. A known fact can obviously be so unpleasant for us that we push it aside, so that it no longer bothers us or finds its way into our logical thought processes. To avoid stress, evolution has shaped us to suppress negative mindsets, especially when they compete with each other that seem more useful to us in the short term. Psychologists describe this well-known effect as dissonant behavior.

We have a hard time blaming ourselves; after all, our social contract is continuously adjusted on democratic basis. However, the question of whether we were ever ready enough for democracy, can be raised. In his latest book, *Francis Fukuyama* said that the spirit of the world and our democracy have ended up in an identity crisis, split into a multitude of different interest groups. He sees our immaturity today as a by-product of our liberal democracy; we have been infantilized and depoliticized. Our desired medicine (democracy) has made us sick (immature).

THE PRECAUTION PRINCIPLE

At all times, we have the political responsibility to define the knowledge that our society should be dominated by. Based on our environmental problems, we must, enlightened and pragmatic, put a new concept of formation to the forefront. A sustainable basis for the planet's ecosystems must come into play now.

Olaf L. Müller, German professor of philosophy from Humboldt University in Berlin, presented in 2009 a brilliant idea with the potential to minimize the world's climate and pollution risk. He pleads for "a sin account for all" with a free allocation of individual climate quotas. In such a system, CO2 becomes an overriding currency that will move human consumption to a justifiable level. Since we don't know when we cross the threshold of an impending (and not reversible) disaster scenario, we should, based on the precautionary principle, enter into a new social contract. In this, we commit ourselves to limit the planet's maximum advisable CO2 emissions via climate quotas, distributed equally among all people in the world. Internal purchases and sales on an individual basis would be possible since the total amount of CO2 allowances will not increase in this model. The idea of individual climate quotas is radical, but gives us a concrete and targeted proposal for a new environmental paradigm: If we accept the logic of mathematics, there must be a concrete sum X that determines the maximum CO2 emissions we can afford to emit in relation to the planet's ecosystems. According to current calculations, this limit corresponds to an emission of approx. 2 tons of CO2 per person and year (which would be at least four times less than many of us are used to). We can of course hope that the current calculations made by our best scientists from the international panel of climate change are too careful, but as long as we don't get an updated information, we need to accept the actual measurements.

Right now, there is no legitimate argument that supports a higher average consumption, at least not in our western part of our world. Developing countries can thus argue that they have only to a small extent contributed to CO2 emissions since the industrial revolution began in the West, and that they will therefore reserve the right to more emissions in the years ahead. This is understandable, but does not lead anywhere in terms of daily ongoing environmental degradation worldwide (especially in developing countries). There is no time to discuss historical justice as our ecosystems are tipping. In purely rational terms, today we should acknowledge a revised TINA principle: the footprint we leave behind must remain below the planet's sustainability limit; There is no alternative.

Should the population worldwide increase in the future, our individual climate quotas would automatically be reduced accordingly, it is simple mathematics. We know that population growth and poverty are linked. Our self-interest in development aid (education, poverty reduction, etc.) would therefore even increase in the future(!)

RESOURCE DISTRIBUTION

In our modern societies, we value security, medical care, education, infrastructure, etc. In order to keep the state with its political institutions functional, we must necessarily leave some of our available resources (as a tax) to our public systems. But how much of our individual quota would we be willing to set aside for the benefit of our society (including social institutions)? A well-staffed public sector requires resources that automatically eat up a huge part of our total quota. Since the sum of the total

national CO2 quota may not be exceeded, we would need to select or deselect public measures and welfare systems on a new basis, still democratic, but much more committed. Supposedly, most of us would not any longer accept resource intensive science projects, for example geoengineering or space travel, as this does not concern us directly. Rationally, we want to keep as much prosperity as possible for ourselves, here and now. If the framework of available resources is physically given, no one can bring phantom resources into the environmental debate (such as money). We can look forward to the public distribution debates, a more exciting democracy would be hard to imagine!

SELECTIVE ATTENTION

Today's debates about environmental pollution often focus selectively into certain directions; for example, the impact of the transport industry (air traffic, cruise and container ships, trucks, cars), the energy industry (oil, gas production, wind farms), food production (deforestation, depletion of soils ad sees, chemicals). We also like to point out moral problems inherent in global commodity production (genetic engineering, animal cruelty, child and modern slave labor). However, we can save ourselves from attacking certain industries. The struggles with the lobbyists and their good lawyers would in any case take far too long in relation to our conservative legislation. In addition, we lack a moral guideline for distributing necessary cuts between industries, looking for associated jobs, etc. Ultimately, we are the buyers of the industry's products and will never be able to act neutrally in this debate. Our consumption patterns change in step with the industry's product strategies. We are often fooled into buying so-called environment-friendly products, but do not see the whole picture: Which electric car buyer really cares to look at the total footprint of his car? The extraction of the natural resources required for production (like rare metals) and the later scrapping (especially of the battery) put a greater strain on nature than cars with combustion engines do. New rules and laws to curb unfortunate external effects always lag behind. In the meantime, we have once again increased our ecological footprint. The carousel only rotates from one spin to the next, in step with changing fashions or our attention at a given moment. We can save ourselves all the hassle of getting "greener" by buying new technical equipment, the effort ultimately works against its purpose, because our illusion of temporary good conscience only prolongs the injury process, we are in.

INDIVIDUAL CO2 QUOTAS

Our dilemma will resolve itself once we recognize our legitimate consumption quotas. Say that we have 1.5 tons of CO2 available per capita and year (after we have democratically decided what share we are willing to set aside for the state apparatus, for example 0.5 tons). From now on we would (individually rationally) preferably buy goods that have a low ecological footprint. It should be completely unproblematic to integrate the footprint into the barcode of any industrially produced commodity. The distribution of products without marked footprint would no longer be allowed. Payment would have to be made with our personal bank card (or cash, with our ID card) so that our consumption / footprint could be collected in our own CO2 account. Our energy and fuel consumption could also be easily converted to CO2 equivalents. Larger investments (for example construction or purchase of a house) should be able to be amortized over several years (and persons) and in the event of resale, the remaining quota could be transferred to the new buyer. For the

sake of fair rules, we should vote for the best possible CO2 calculations, systematically controlled by the state. Even the energy from the wood we burn in the fireplace in our house could be measured with a mandatory heat sensor mounted on top of the chimney. This proposal was actually put forward in Denmark recently (of tax reasons). So, what about the cozy fire we enjoy after sawing off few branches in our garden? - let go. Not everything can and should be measured. It is enough to record our industrial CO2 consumption to achieve our goal. Only when every purchase has an impact on our personal CO2 account, we would select products that have not been shipped over long distances or resource-intensively manufactured. We would probably have our own vegetable gardens and orchards again, or maybe even go fishing. Great!

SUSTAINABLE PRODUCTS

Goods or services that we do not really need, would probably disappear from the market. Our sharpened understanding of the production cost would measure the value of the product no longer just with money, but mainly with CO2. Based on our limited consumption quotas many existing jobs would of course disappear. However, high purchasing power would in any case be less important. Wealthy people would certainly buy carbon quotas to at least partially maintain their habitual consumption, but neighbors and society in general would likely see them as somewhat immoral. Who would then, still proudly, want to park two big SUVs in front of his house? The new environmental paradigm of equal CO2 quotas would change our mentality. We would take care of the things we already own as much as possible and otherwise only buy what we wanted and could afford in terms of our carbon account. Private companies would have to completely rethink their production in line with our realigned demand. New, local businesses would emerge on a large scale as the transportation advantage will bring win-win situations for nearby consumers.

For the system to work, future commodity production in the private sector must underlie a new premise: the owners (shareholders) of a company must bear the risk of the CO2 costs of the entire production line. An example: Let us assume that a factory has a total footprint of 10,000 tons of CO2 (including building construction, machines, company vehicles, raw material, energy, transport, etc.). Let us further assume that the production consists of 100,000 goods so that the footprint per product corresponds to 0.1 ton. If all goods are sold, the CO2 account of the company would go back to zero (all CO2 units of the sold goods move to the accounts of the buyers) -which confirms that the production in fact was sustainable. The products that are thrown on the market must be so good that people buy them despite their limited CO2 quotas. However, if the company wouldn't sell all the goods, the owners will be left with a negative CO2 share (on their company shares) - and will thus be in debt to society. If only 95,000 goods would be sold, 5,000 will be left in a warehouse. The leftover goods cannot be given away for free either, unless some people are willing to strain their individual CO2 accounts by receiving these goods(!) The negative CO2 balance from the company will thus be 5,000 x 0.1 = 500 tons of CO2. Let us assume that the company is divided into 10,000 shares (ownership interests). In our example, each share will then have a negative balance of 500: 10,000 = 0.05 tons. It would be rational to demand that shareholders equalize their negative balance sheets from their private CO2 accounts. This may sound brutal and unfair, but who else would make up for the

environmental degradation caused by the production of the remaining 5,000 items? Environmental economists have argued for many years that no one is making up for the diffuse, negative external effects from our global trade. My suggestion here solves this problem. We can easily imagine that companies will henceforth think twice before launching new products on the market. If so, it would be very environment-friendly products, adapted to our new preferences.

Back to our personal consumption: once we have recognized our legitimate CO2 quota, we will, for the sake of our CO2 account, completely voluntarily, cut down resource-intensive activities (like motorsports, flights, cruise boats, construction and heating of large houses and cottages, driving cars, buying meat or long-distance goods, etc.). We would prefer to live close to our workplace so that we can take the bus or the bike more easily. It wouldn't bother us to see our neighbor drive past us with his car, even if it rains, because we know we are getting something in return to our effort. In nowadays rules it has no practical significance if we leave the car - while the world otherwise does business as usual. Of course, we can be idealists or martyrs, but how many of us will try to defy the crowd until it (maybe) follows us on a beautiful day? No one wants to be the stupid one. It's also not really motivating to aim for a common goal before most people agree.

FREEDOM VS. CEILING

It may sound strange, but an equal consumption budget for everyone actually protects our freedom to the *maximum*. As it is well known for communities, everyone's political freedom ends exactly where the freedom of any other member begins. Based on the principle of equality, we therefore must recognize our share of the common good. Great philosophers like *Kant* or *John Rawls* explained to us perfectly the need to restrict political freedom in the social collective. In our globalized world equal distribution of our commons would mean that everyone would have to accept his CO2 budget. People can heat their house or drive their car, but, for the sake of justice, only according to their budget. We will naturally reshuffle our individual priorities and preferences, and each of us will still be able to do it in his or her own way. We remain hedonists, but must adhere to a given environmental framework. Those who demand a higher CO2 quota for themselves must make themselves aware that they exceed the collective average limit (because someone else then necessarily gets less). It is conceivable that the welfare service of the state has room to grant the most disadvantaged a higher CO2 quota. This may, for example, apply to people who are ill and need special treatment for various reasons. Here, just as before, public funds will be democratically allocated in order to maintain a social society, as we want it. We will continue to pay attention to the most disadvantaged, but our morals must be compatible with our environmental framework. Our new overarching goal (emissions goal, consumption goal, fairness goal) will ensure that we can no longer dispose of illegitimate natural resources. We will, of course, reshuffle our individual priorities and preferences. Who would still take the plane for his summer holiday if his annual quota then would go down by 50%? Anyone demanding a higher CO2 quota for himself must be aware that he is exceeding the collective average limit (because then someone else would necessarily get less). If we wanted to help disadvantaged people more than the state could offer, we would need to give them a part from our own budget or vote for more social distribution at next elections. However, our

overarching goal must be to ensure that we no longer have illegitimate natural resources at our disposal.

WHICH COUNTRY SHOULD START?

In relation to its population, Norway has a huge access to fossil energy resources (oil, gas), but would in fact be able to cope well with existing (sustainable) hydropower. Without using much of their emission quotas, the Norwegians would be able to heat their houses or even charge their electric cars. No country in the world could initiate a sustainable environmental policy more easily than Norway. That gives Norway an extraordinary responsibility to open the door into this new paradigm. Norway would then surely stop selling its hydropower to Germany (which only wants to embellish its green energy and CO2 statistics) in order to rebuy dirty coal power from Germany at the same time.

However, it would make little sense if Norway decided to adhere to its legitimate emission quota alone. If we look at the moral change regarding future environmental problems among the young generations, there is hope of receiving support from Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland, the Netherlands and perhaps Germany (at least the debates are constantly on). These or other EU countries should consider entering into an agreement on an absolute emission limit (according to the number of their population) as soon as possible.

Let's do a little thought experiment across the western world: What about populous developing countries such as Ethiopia or Bangladesh. Would they, in a real democratic election, agree to such a CO2 policy? Wouldn't they be very interested because their average consumption only corresponds to approx. 0.7 tons of CO2 (the poorest of them probably even less - and that is many hundreds of millions of people)? If all these people had been allocated a free quota of 2 tons of CO2 annually, they would in fact receive a natural citizen's wage because they would be able to sell parts of their emission quota to rich consumers in the West. Since wealthy people want to maintain a high standard of living, they would be willing to pay well for extra CO2 quota units (quota prices and their development may be interesting, but it does not really matter to reach our goal).

Quota purchases would not be immoral, but could be seen as modern development aid. The money transfer could also be seen as a compensation for previous historical injustice that has arisen amongst developed and developing countries. Quota trading between individuals should not be confused with the "grandfathering" model that was staged so far. The later model was based on the fact, that the largest industrial pollutants were allocated free CO2 certificates(!) which they would then be allowed to sell in part if they improved their emissions. In the absence of a closed system, this whole quota trade unfortunately turned into a sham. It is impossible to set an authentic market price for carbon emissions as long as our total consumption exceeds the planet's sustainability. If the central bank prints more and more banknotes, it will eventually lead to price inflation with a subsequent economic catastrophe. If we distribute phantom CO2 certificates (allowances of pollution) it will lead to an environmental catastrophe.

Postponing to set a budget of sustainable CO2 emission quotas (to the populations of each country) will only lead to even greater problems tomorrow. Countries that do not commit to a specific "emissions agreement" should be asked for an official reason. Meanwhile they should get categorically excluded as trading partners, even if that would give worse economies on both sides. We are not in a war situation, but we are still in

the middle of an extreme situation where sustainable rationing of natural resources is the key into our future. We would have to accept that we will only be able to consume products that can be manufactured in our own country or in countries that are bound by the same agreement. Most countries would probably argue that such an emission budget will be too demanding for them. We can then only refer to the *new* TINA principle; There Is No Alternative (doing it differently). If a country really began to commit to its legitimate emissions quotas, signaling and spiraling effects would most likely ignite the debate across all the world's news channels. People would then, to a much greater extent, reflect on their actions and ongoing justifications.

COURAGE FOR GOALS

The ecosystems of our forests, landscapes, rivers and oceans should serve as the common good for everybody. The problem is that our liberal democracies do nothing to limit or even counter our consumption. The environmental protection that we practice has no absolute goal and therefore only leads us to lose valuable time. It is of little use to selectively protect individual parts of nature, while the sum of the remaining ecosystems is getting smaller every year. Our engineers and scientists are unable to specify the “real transmitters” of all diffuse emissions that our industrial products leave behind. Meanwhile our pollution accumulates on and around our planet. However, by (re)calculating all our industrial recovery of natural resources, manufacture and transport into CO2 equivalents, we can easily gain the ecological footprint of all industrial products that we consume. Once all industrial products are marked, every consumer would know exactly how to choose among them.

In a world of eight billion people, it must be clear that we cannot use our natural resources without a certain limit. Once we recognize that this limit exists (and demand it politically) we at least steer towards a legitimate goal. Measuring our personal footprint would be a necessary evil, but essential for a fair distribution of our available resources. This is the only way we can save our vulnerable world for us and our future generations.
17-year-old *Greta Thunberg* from Sweden represents our next generation. Her clairvoyance and courage made us aware of our lethargy towards the ongoing ecological catastrophe and set in motion climate demonstrations in many countries. With her simple question, how to explain our lack of ecological responsibility to our children, she hit our Achilles heel. In fact, our politicians have no sensible answer to her. According to *Hegel*, all our actions steer towards a historical truth. Perhaps our time has been waiting for *Greta* and her actions to usher in the new paradigm shift we are now ready for. Our goal must be to live in a better world, as equally free people, at least politically. *Pericles* said 2,500 years ago that courage is the key into our freedom. In contrast to antiquity, our modern democracies have been most concerned with the division between rights and duties. What they did not do, was cultivating courage as an important virtue. However, today we just need the courage to take drastic steps. We have to free ourselves collectively from the environmental crisis we have ended up in. We have to recognize our rights and duties on the basis of a new paradigm.

There is no alternative.

Journal Academica Vol. 11(1), pp. 11-15, June 20 2022 - Astropolitics - ISSN 2161-3338
online edition www.journalacademica.org

Discussion Note

The Genus Question

Karim Daghbouche*
GridSAT Stiftung, Hannover (Germany)

Received February 24 2022; Accepted June 16 2022

ABSTRACT

Today is a scary and dark day, as humanity moved forward to the brink of nuclear extinction questioning its own genus. From an astropolitical perspective, humanity neither requires more democracy nor weapons targeting each other. But it needs a new human narrative.

Keywords: Civilization, Humanity, Democracy, Coinage Monopoly, Monopoly on Violence, Cryptocurrency, Complexity Theory, Non-Monetary Economy

CIVILIZATION AND HUMANITY

Civilization is a spiritual condition. A condition, where changes in knowledge and technology are collaboratively shared for the balanced improvement of the living conditions of a genus altogether.

It requires faith.

Therefore, civilization cannot be measured by the degree of technological capabilities. Those who do however, by even transforming nuclear capabilities to threat the whole genus and its habitat, are at least equal to humanity's most primitive and perverse excess.

DEMOCRACY

Democracy is a charming form of government, full of variety suggesting legislative and executive power to the people with equality, freedom, and justice. Nevertheless, constitutional democracy establishes limits to the popular will passing into despotism:

Although designed to be spiritually empty at its core, almost all current democracies pursue absolute power in a cruel and oppressive way claiming both:

- coinage monopoly
- monopoly on violence

COINAGE MONOPOLY

While the coinage monopoly was successfully defeated by various courageous icons of the *Cypherpunk* initiative (Wikipedia-contributors, Cypherpunk 2022) such as *Philip R. Zimmermann* (Wikipedia-contributors, Phil Zimmerman 2022) by taking encryption technology notwithstanding of violating then current U.S. Export Controls in 1991 into the public domain (214 years after *The Second US Continental Congress Declaration of 1776* (Wikipedia-contributors, United States Declaration of Independence 2022)), *Bitcoin* technology finally paved the way not only to free democracy but potentially all the people in the world in

*Corresponding author: karim.daghbouche@gmail.com

2009 (Wikipedia-contributors, Bitcoin 2022).
In this sense, the ever-debated pervading evil of democracy being the tyranny of the majority proves to be a factor. Else January 9 2009 would be celebrated more than *Independence Day*.

MONOPOLY ON VIOLENCE

Ironically, the most promising way to free the people from *MAD* policies of mutual assured destruction (Wikipedia-contributors, Mutual assured destruction 2022) and all other forms of non-democratic oppression, may just be to render cryptography impossible altogether:

COMPLEXITY THEORY

As threatening as it may be perceived, especially for cryptocurrencies which just defeated the coinage monopoly, the current cryptographic infrastructure is built on sand unless important mathematical conjectures are either proven, refuted or proven to be unprovable (Wikipedia-contributors, P versus NP problem 2022), i.e., any cryptographic function - specifically SHA-2 (Wikipedia-contributors, SHA-2 2022) - is formally weak with regard to theoretic brute-force physical cost theorems.

CRYPTOCALYPSE

Assuming a sudden failure of all complexity-based cryptographic infrastructure in a disruptive black swan event (Wikipedia-contributors, Black swan theory 2022): Whether caused by rumor of a theoretic, non-constructive or constructive proof (E. Abdelwahab, Constructive Patterns of Logical Truth 2016), (E. Abdelwahab, On the Dual Nature of Logical Variables and Clause-Sets 2016), (E. Abdelwahab, #2SAT is in P 2018), (E. Abdelwahab, The P vs. NP Problem - J.Acad. Lecture Series - Lecture 1/2 2018), (E. E. Abdelwahab 2021) and/or just by an actual implementation causing, e.g., a SHA-2 collision, the consequences will range from compromised nuclear command and control chains, instant shutdown of stock exchanges, total depreciation of cryptocurrencies and stop of any kind of online transactions with an evaporation of all and any social accounts to going off the online-grid for powerplants, fuel stations, i.e., a collapse of the global digital infrastructure.
And there is no contingency plan. While in theory, OTP (Wikipedia-contributors, One-time pad 2022) and QKD (Wikipedia-contributors, Quantum key distribution 2022) could provide with complexity-independent cryptography, real-world implementations may serve despotic monopolies with the defense sector and intelligence agencies at the most. This is due to the required infrastructure excluding the 99% who serve the 1% (Wikipedia-contributors, 99%: The Occupy Wall Street Collaborative Film 2022) from the cryptographically secured economic system.

NON-MONETARY ECONOMY

As a consequence of a broad cryptographic failure, the social contracts of *Hobbes, Locke*, and *Montesquieu* (Wikipedia-contributors, Social contract 2022) cannot be maintained any longer proving *Rousseau* to be right with the social contract being indeed not a willing agreement, but a fraud against the 99% committed by the 1% (Wikipedia-contributors, The Social Contract 2022). But the by far most important impact would result from the complexity theoretic implications for the global society by a quantum leap reduction of complexity in science and technology yielding:

- any vaccine & cure
- quantum computation
- learning becoming trivial
- truly distributed networks
- perfect hard- and software
- curing cancer and diabetes
- quality food for everybody
- optimal parallel computing
- proteins decomposing plastics
- formal proving becoming trivial
- material design on isotopic level
- borderless language to connect peoples all around the world
- accurate weather-, earthquake- and other natural phenomenon predictions
- moving people, goods, and information fastest, cheapest, and most ecological
- humanity relieved from trivial creativity making the evolutionary leap to spirituality

Fostered with an Open Everything collaborative commons policy (Wikipedia-contributors, Commons-based peer production 2022), including Open Source (Wikipedia-contributors, Open-source software 2022), Open Data (Wikipedia-contributors, Open data 2022), Open Access (Wikipedia-contributors, Open access 2022), Open Education (Wikipedia-contributors, Open education 2022), and distributed value-creation processes (Wikipedia-contributors, Grid computing 2022), the non-monetary economy (Wikipedia-contributors, Non-monetary economy 2022) will not only be an option but the necessary consequence enabling zero marginal cost economy (Wikipedia-contributors, Jeremy Rifkin 2022), post desire-, post-scarcity-, and truly open societies with laterally scaled solutions for any kind of computable problem.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This discussion was initiated and is maintained by *GridSAT Stiftung*, a German non-profit foundation.
GridSAT believes that Open Everything with Open Source, Open Data, Open Access, Open Education, distributed value-creation processes, and free transactions on absolute non-profit-based distributed grid technology, is the catalyst for a better, more sustainable future for the benefit of all peoples.
In an effort to encourage the world community to embrace their personal and social responsibility, and industries to embrace their industrial responsibilities in matters of equal opportunity and justice, *GridSAT Stiftung* is committed to foster its technology with non- compromising Open Everything.
Special thanks to *Phil Zimmermann* for an always inspiring dialogue and to *Jeremy Rifkin* for publicly sharing his vision (Rifkin 2015).

REFERENCES

Abdelwahab, Elnaser. „Constructive Patterns of Logical Truth.“ Editor: S. Feigenbaum. *J. Acad. (N.Y.)* (Journal Academica Foundation) 6, Nr. 2 (July 2016): 99-199.

—. *The P vs. NP Problem - J.Acad. Lecture Series - Lecture 1/2* . Editor: S. Feigenbaum. Journal Academica Foundation. Multimedia edition 23. October 2018. https://youtu.be/uo9za6AGarQ (Accessed on 24. February 2022).

—. „#2SAT is in P.“ Editor: S. Feigenbaum. *J. Acad. (N.Y.)* (Journal Academica Foundation) 8, Nr. 1 (October 2018): 3-88.

—. „On the Dual Nature of Logical Variables and Clause-Sets.“ Editor: S. Feigenbaum. *J. Acad. (N.Y.)* (Journal Academica Foundation) 6, Nr. 3 (September 2016): 202-239.

—. Efficient method for logical completion of a deductive catalogue used for general constraints treatment in the extended relational database concept. United States Patent 11,113,281. 7. September 2021.

Wikipedia-contributors. *Jeremy Rifkin.* The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jeremy_Rifkin (Accessed on 24. February 2022).

—. *United States Declaration of Independence.* The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Declaration_of_Independence (Accessed on 24. February 2022).

—. *The Social Contract.* The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Social_Contract (Accessed on 24. February 2022).

—. *Social contract.* The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_contract (Accessed on 24. Februray 2022).

—. *SHA-2.* The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SHA-2 (Accessed on 24. February 2022).

—. *Quantum key distribution.* The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quantum_key_distribution (Accessed on 24. February 2022).

—. *Phil Zimmerman.* The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Phil_Zimmermann (Accessed on 24. February 2022).

—. *P versus NP problem.* The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/P_versus_NP_problem (Accessed on 24. February 2022).

—. *Open-source software.* The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open-source_software (Accessed on 24. February 2022).

—. *Open education.* The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_education (Accessed on 24. February 2022).

—. *Open data.* The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_data (Accessed on 24. February 2022).

—. *Open access.* The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_access (Accessed on 24. February 2022).

—. *One-time pad.* The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/One-time_pad (Accessed on 24. February 2022).

—. *Occupy Wall Street.* The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Occupy_Wall_Street (Accessed on 24. February 2022).

—. *Non-monetary economy.* The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Non-monetary_economy (Accessed on 24. February 2022).

—. *Mutual assured destruction.* The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mutual_assured_destruction (Accessed on 24. February 2022).
—. *Grid computing.* The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grid_computing (Accessed on 24. February 2022).
—. *Cypherpunk.* Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cypherpunk (Accessed on 24. February 2022).
—. *Commons-based peer production.* The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Commons-based_peer_production (Accessed on 24. February 2022).
—. *Bitcoin.* The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bitcoin (Accessed on 24. February 2022).
—. *Black swan theory.* The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Black_swan_theory (Accessed on 24. February 2022).
—. *99%: The Occupy Wall Street Collaborative Film.* The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/99%25:_The_Occupy_Wall_Street_Collaborative_Film (Accessed on 24. February 2022).
Rifkin, Jeremy. *The Zero Marginal Cost Society.* ENVIENTA Open Source Ecology. 18. Jun2 2015. https://youtu.be/MBlWEOHqdOU (Accessed on 24. February 2022).

ISSN 2161-3338 • www.journalacademica.org