

WORLD-LAB

# THE DIGNITY OF NATIONS

*A new economic system for the third millennium*



**IDEAAZIONE**  
EDITORE

“Beyond Adam Smith and Karl Max” should be added to the meaningful subtitle of this book, which offers an original and surprising basis for interpretation of the economic events at everyone’s reach.

World-Lab’s original review shows how the modern Economic Science, the way it is conceived and taught nowadays, despite its growing formality, has gradually lost its contact with reality and become “mathematic charlatanry” and, what is worse, it is getting closer to an ideology than to a science.

The pushiness of the single line of thought upon which the “Globalized Market Only System” Economy was built, along with the arrogance of mainstream economists, TINA (There Is No Alternative) followers, underline this regression.

Fortunately, World-Lab reveals, in this context, the existence for the modern economies of an uncommon way out from the ultra-liberal and collectivist drifts, which can be easily adopted and tested locally and which can lead to environmental and social sustainability in a relatively short time.

In other words, another world is possible and, according to World-Lab, it is forthcoming.

## WORLD-LAB

World-Lab is a “liquid network” of international experts with different scientific and cultural backgrounds, who operate under the common framework of the [www.worldlabnetwork.ru](http://www.worldlabnetwork.ru) website.

They share the view that the current widespread western development model is leading to a rapid collapse of the entire ecosystem, but the unexpected way out they promote, which initially favors the role of civil society over politics, can rekindle the hope for a better world.

All of the experts contributed, in various ways, to the creation of this book, which they consider a collective work.

**World-Lab**

# **THE DIGNITY OF NATIONS**

*A new economic system for the third millennium*

## **THE DIGNITY OF NATIONS**

*“This economy kills”*  
(Evangelii Gaudium-53)

### **Pope Francis**

#### *Introduction*

Nowadays we are witnessing an extremely uncommon event. Against the extraordinary Science development in the different branches of knowledge, with tangible and spectacular results, it looks like economy is stuck on a dead end.

Neither all the economic magazines with their articles full of mathematic formulas nor the prestigious public recognition won by famous economists can deny this truth.

In fact, taking for granted that the desired goal of economy research is to identify an architecture of the economic system that can lead to sustainable development and full participation of every man to the production and consumption of the generated wealth, it is not possible to admit, as of today, that the finish line is close.

This stalemate of the economic science could not be so serious per se, as could be the stalemate of any other science.

What is serious is that the other sciences and the technologies descending from them are evolving quickly, and that, in a different economic system, this could help generate enough wealth to guarantee a decent life style to the whole of humanity.

And what is worse is that the rhythm of the scientific and technological development makes the stalemate of economy even alarming, even for the luckiest minority of humanity, because the economic machine, as it

works today, can put in danger the very future of the ecosystem. Therefore, instead of rejoicing for the success achieved thanks to the scientific and technological progress in the conquest of space, which could give humanity the chance to escape if necessary, we should probably start to ask ourselves if it wouldn't be better to try to get some advancement in the economic science. This could help find innovative ways to generate and distribute wealth that could give a chance to evolution - the origin of which transcends us and the target of which we ignore - on our little blue planet.

In front of this kind of situation many of you have probably wondered if it is a character of human nature to make any proposed theoretical solution, once applied, invariably collapse towards extreme and, finally, intolerable degenerations.

If this was the case, considering the very slow progress of the social conscience level of humanity, we could say that the research of an economic system such as those dreamed of by everyone is a wild-goose chase.

And the obvious deduction, very repugnant indeed, would be that the human being was a fatal error of evolution or of a Creator, depending on everyone's belief.

Luckily, this is not the case and, as we will see, it is still reasonable to hope in a better future thanks to an upcoming metamorphosis of the economic and social system.

This metamorphosis, which will follow the rules of a re-founded economic science, can moreover be achieved in a "short" time, considering the size of the phenomenon.

## **A. THEORETICAL ASPECTS**

*An idea that founds a practice*

### 1. A NEW SCIENTIFIC APPROACH TO ECONOMY

#### *Preamble*

For the first time in history, humanity is facing a systemic crisis which could be even fatal for it, as its environmental component could potentially cause, in a relatively short time, a collapse of the entire ecosystem.

The reason for this crisis, as of others in the past, is not to be found in some natural disaster or adverse cosmic event, but in the unsustainable structure of the current economic system.

It is a reason of human origin, the removal of which appears, at least potentially, within man's means.

In the past in fact, based on a similar conviction, these crises, substantially dominated by their social-economic components, gave rise - in the wake of a widespread discontent in large parts of the population - to social upheavals, the goal of which was to modify the structure of the economic and institutional system in the hope for a better future.

It is true that this hope, after a little while, vanished. However, every crisis gave birth to a promising alternative, at least worth experimenting. Today the situation is different.

In fact, after the painful past experiences both on a social and environmental level, the modern economic system, globally spread over much of the planet, appears *without* credible alternatives.

In other words, at the beginning of the third millennium and for the first time in its history, humanity is projected at great speed towards lethal depths, without any reasonable hope of salvation.

And the thesis we support here is that economists are entirely responsible for this.

Their fault is to have focused their reflection *only* on a specific economic modality, represented by the Market, thus endorsing the idea that this

represents the entire field of the economic science.

This means excluding from this scientific field every other economic modality alternative to the Market, and relegating it within the scope of cold planners or even in folklore i.e. to anthropologists.

The result is the *self-limitation* of the horizon in the search of economic architectures different from the one, now prominent, that implies the substantial omnipresence of the Market and that has already widely shown its dangerousness.

Therefore, today, the economic science is on a dead end and it is incapable to show some way out to a humanity dragged to suicide and ever more conscious of this. It does not really matter if this is due to incapability or unconsciousness.

What matters now is to get out as quickly as possible from this situation, which can only happen thanks to a new comprehensive economic vision, possible only with the introduction of a re-founded economic science.

Only a comprehensive vision will in fact be capable of bringing to the surface the entire range of options that can be included in a new, more complex economic architecture, particularly those options that are currently in a *dimmed* area, and that can be immediately and independently experimented by the vanguards of civil society that are more resourceful and sensitive to social and environmental problems, in view of their improvement and validation.

This will result in a chance, given to *everyone*, to begin satisfying some of their material needs in a new and more fulfilling way, fully respecting the human and environmental health and thus allowing the community to take, right from now, an unhoped-for way out that today is *hidden*.

The above mentioned re-foundation of the economic science, of which we will know the impact in the future, will be made possible, in particular, through a certain number of innovations which we will explain in the following pages.

### 1.1. *The basic economic paradigms*

Following a functional order, the first of these innovations consists in the

definition of the *basic economic paradigms*.

According to a *primordial*, dichotomist concept, an Economic Paradigm is the *way* in which whatever group of people (a Nation, a tribe, a family) can *organize* itself in order to satisfy the needs of its members, both on an individual and on a collective level.

### Heteronomy Paradigm

In its first variant, that we will call Heteronomy Paradigm, the group is structured like a *community of subjects* that produce in competition among them *for third party* consumers, based on a wide range of *individual* requests coming from such consumers, which requests they constantly try to satisfy.

Thus, an economic production-exchange-consumption circuit is formed, where the decisions are made at the *base*, at each actor's level, no matter if he is a producer or a consumer.

Therefore, in terms of volumes and production typology, the group as such, potentially extended to the whole of humanity, does not have the *ability* to focus on any specific goal, neither to plan the different production phases in order to achieve such goal. As a matter of fact, the group does not even have the *need* to plan anything because the offer adapts automatically to the demand at every stage, as if guided by an "*invisible hand*", and vice versa (*self-regulation*).

### Autonomy Paradigm

In the second variant, that can be called Autonomy Paradigm, the group acts like a *collective subject* that produces for *itself* in order to satisfy both *collective* and *individual* needs, answering to the demands coming from each member of the group, which it tries to quantify and satisfy with precision. Thus, an economic production-consumption circuit is formed, where the decisions are made at the *summit*.

The group counts only on itself in order to achieve its goals, which means it needs an accurate *planning* of the production process.



## 1.2. *Consequences of the definition of the two Paradigms*

As mentioned before, the definition of the two economic Paradigms is part of an *alternative* scientific approach with respect to the economic sphere. Even though this is an *innovation* in such context, at first sight it looks very unrealistic and consequently devoid of operative consequences. However, it is not.

### 1.2.1. *Classification aspects*

This is clear from the *very beginning*, essential for any and all approaches, concerning the *classification* aspect, in which the above mentioned innovation implies looking at the area of investigation in a new way in order to create a new order, or better, an order *tout-court*: this is the essential precondition to take rational decisions.

As regards classifications, first of all it must be pointed out that the goal of a classification is to isolate the economic events produced by actors that deploy *homogeneous behaviors*.

In economics, the behavioral distinction is the *main purpose* of a classification, as also confirmed by orthodoxy. And this is particularly true for a *significant* classification, i.e. one that can bring *information* and *order* inside the area of investigation or, if you prefer, that can remove some *entropy* and *chaos* from it.

Now, in order to achieve this goal, the *classification criterion* has a crucial role.

#### 1.2.1.1. *Classification criteria*

The economic orthodoxy, as shown in the United Nations System of National Accounts used as a reference framework by the experts of various Countries, approaches the complex field of Economics starting with a classification of the *producing subjects* and, influenced by the preconceived “Market Only” ideology or, if you prefer, by the current reality that is sort of pasted to it, distinguishes them in “market” producers and “non-market” producers based on their selling their production at an “economically significant” price, or at a *null* or *conventional* price.

The new approach, on the contrary, is based on a classification of the *economic circuits* created by the different communities, both existing and potential, and distinguishes such circuits in a dual way depending on the consumer of a given product or service being totally unrelated to its production (Heteronomy Paradigm), or taking part in the production process and sharing, *jointly* with the other members, the relevant economic result (Autonomy Paradigm).

Already in this phase it is clear how the new classification, unlike the current one, is based only on a *behavioral dualism*, which shows up when the group applies respectively *individualism* or *solidarity* and interfaces with an *organizational dualism* related to the economic circuit the group decides to implement. Cybernetics (the discipline that deals with the control of living and artificial *systems*) distinguishes the organizational dualism respectively in feed-back, which generates *self-regulation*, and feed-forward, which generates *planning*.

However, the current classification is based on a surely impartial, but essentially *formal*, criterion, that undergoes a double failure, i.e. both in clearly *distinguishing* the actors in terms of behavior and in *informing* about the kind of behavior of the economic actors.

In fact, as we will see further below, if it is true that all the producers operating in the Market sell their products at a price of the same nature, a fact that “implies” a similar behavior, this is not the case for the “nebula” of other actors that apply prices of different nature, going from “price zero” to the “cost price”, which presumably “implies” a dissimilar behavior.

Having said this, the real problem of the current classification is the absolute lack of *information* about the kind of *behavior* of the actors, that prevents those that want to analyze the causes of the positive and negative aspects characterizing the different economic systems to progress towards a better system.

#### 1.2.1.2. *Behavioral aspects*

Under this essential aspect, is it undeniable that the new classification

criterion makes a new clarity.

In fact, in the Heteronomy Paradigm, the human group entrusts itself to a regulatory automatism in a *passive* way, and the consequences will affect the group both on a social relationship and environmental impact level.

Moreover, this regulatory automatism, notwithstanding all the inconveniences that come with its oscillatory trend, brings the systems to a (pseudo)balance as far as the system itself is inserted in an unaltered context.

However, when the context changes (e.g. following important scientific and technological progress), the system becomes unstable and repositions itself – always oscillating - on new pseudo-balances that can even be considered as new *Economic Ages*.

Substantially, in the Heteronomy Paradigm the system adjusts itself until it reaches some sort of (only temporary) *stability* (negative feed-back), while in reality it is permanently subjected to an *expansive instability* (positive feed-back) if confronted with the scientific and technological progress, a progress that has always gone with Humanity and that, nowadays, seems to walk at a very fast pace.

In the Autonomy Paradigm, on the contrary, the group performs an *active* role, planning its production based on the individual and collective demands of its members, which, as we can deduce and will see better further below, allows it to control any unwanted drifts as concerns both the social relationships and, especially, the impact of the productivity on its habitat.

It is now clear that the classification scheme pertaining to the new approach is “*upstream*” of the one used by the economic orthodoxy, because, as it considers the economic circuits, that obviously include the producers as well, it indirectly classifies these latter too into *hetero-producers* and *self-producers* (this latter a “heretical” category, as we will see further below) according to the circuit they belong to.

1.2.1.3. Exhaustiveness

The fact that the new classification is focused on the economic circuits means that, despite any appearances to the contrary, it will be more *exhaustive* than the former one.

As a matter of fact, as the *economic circuits* produce tangible effects, no matter if they are monetized or not, formal or informal, they are all visible and all registered, classified and analyzed with the same scientific dignity in the new approach, thus offering to the user a fully lighted economic vision.

In the orthodoxy classification, on the contrary, the role of the *producers* of particular circuits may be ignored for a number of reasons together with the circuits they have created, which, remaining unregistered, simply disappear.

This is the case of the *self-producing* - but still *producing* - *family*, whose economic circuit is assigned by the new classification a prominent role in the Autonomy Paradigm, if only because it represents the economic production-consumption method that can guarantee, even now, the sustenance of a large part of the world population.

On the other hand, orthodoxy assigns the family, in a completely *arbitrary* way, the only role of consumer, i.e. a role that, by chance, is functional to the Market producers (perhaps the reflection of a monomaniacal tendency of today's economists), as if the domestic self-production was a disturbing element in the vision of what the orthodoxy considers the ideal architecture of the economic system.

The same can be said about other economic circuits, like the Local Exchange Systems (LES), based on the use of an own currency, which, even if by far less important than the domestic self-production, are included in the new classification under the Heteronomy Paradigm. However, the *producers* of these circuits are *ignored* by the orthodoxy, because they operate as individuals in an informal way.

1.2.1.4.        *The research of new ways*

The new classification is unsuitable on the one hand for correctly distinguishing the economic actors according to a criterion that is assumed as being related to a certain behavior and for throwing light on said behavior and, on the other hand, for showing an exhaustive overview of the various types of economic actors; so it does not allow the observer to understand the *true origin* of the harmful social and environmental drifts we are witnessing today and to foresee how fatally such drifts will evolve if new and well hidden ways, which the rough orthodoxy's classification does not help to come to light, will not be taken.

It is precisely with reference to this last *essential aspect*, i.e. the possible discovery of new ways different from the "Market Only" System, the only one possible according to orthodoxy, that the new classification, sticking to the comparative logic and using an euphemism, proves to be much more effective than the former one.

You will probably think this is easy, because it looks hard to find *new ways* inside the class of the "No-Market" producers, the only one "open" of the two, if one can only follow a *tautology* "track", in that the researched producer will have to sell his production at an "economically not significant" price, i.e. it will necessarily be a... "No-Market" producer.

However, it is more appropriate to say that, regarding the possibility to find new ways, the new classification is much more *prolific* than the orthodoxy's one, which seems to be *sterilized* on purpose, giving to the new Economic approach a decisive value. This possibility does not come so much from the identification of a new class of circuits, identified by the Heteronomy Paradigm, where the initiative is in the hands of the *producers* (a class represented only by the Market, which however also includes the LES, a type of *surrogate* circuits of the Market, and Philanthropy, which supports the Government) as from the identification of the *new* class of production-consumption circuits identified by the Autonomy Paradigm, based on planning, and where initiative is in the hands of *consumers*.

These circuits include the domestic self-production, the self-production performed by big *public* Communities and the self-production performed by big *private* Collective subjects, like the consumer cooperatives producing

individual *public utility* services, or by *intermediate-size* Communities like those managing Mutual Aid Societies and Clubs, thus giving rise to a “family” of economic modalities that looks heterogeneous but, in reality, is equated by an unexpected “genetic similarity”.

And it is precisely the analysis of the *differences* characterizing the subjects of this “family” (the number of members, the kind of production, the relationship between the number of working members and the total number of members and many more) that a *second innovation*, which translates into the opening of a *new research area*, is brought about after the *first innovation* of the economic science, represented by the identification of the two basic Paradigms and of the classification resting on them.

Before entering deep into this research and pursuing the goal to find *new* production-consumption circuits suitable for starting, and being an integral part of, a more complex structure of the economic system that can guarantee at least social and environmental stability, it is appropriate to *analyze in depth* the *nature* of the behavior of a human group according to its using *passively* an economic modality that regulates itself within certain limits, or deciding to adopt a modality that requires a programmatic *active* role by the group, in order to satisfy the *individual* needs of its members (the only field in common between the two paradigms, because we can find collective needs only in the Autonomy Paradigm).

### 1.3. *Economic behavior and socio-environmental impact*

As already mentioned, the economic circuits identified by the Heteronomy and Autonomy Paradigms are supported by behaviors based respectively on *individualism* (which requires *competition*) and *solidarity* (which requires *collaboration*).

In terms of consequences we can say that, on an *individual* level, *competition* brings about stress, which contributes to the *evolution* of the single subjects (Market’s *enterprises*, Philanthropy’s NGO and LES’s *individuals*), while *collaboration*, as in the Autonomy Paradigm, favors *staticity*, or even an *opportunistic* behavior of the single subjects (members of the different self-producing Communities).

During the research of *new* circuits to be created inside the Autonomy Paradigm, or rather during the research of “new paths” that can be taken to escape the current situation, it will be necessary to consider these harmful individual behaviors in order to restrict or stop them.

The consequences of such behaviors on a *collective* level are the opposite. A reason for that can be found in the different relation that the two Paradigms have with *information*, a typical “intangible” good (which can be given away... while keeping it).

In fact, in the Autonomy context there is a natural inclination to give away *information* unilaterally and for free, not only inside the self-producing communities, but even among the various communities; this happens because such transfer creates an advantage for the recipient without creating a disadvantage for the subject that shares it.

Actually, the one who shares the information gains, at least potentially, a *direct* advantage as he encourages the beneficiaries to act in the same way, and an *indirect* advantage as he helps its society to evolve, and in future he will benefit from this evolution.

On the contrary, because of the existing *competition* inside the Heteronomy Paradigm, the free transfer of *information* in this context creates an advantage for the potential *competitor* and this produces, as with “tangible” goods, a relative disadvantage for the subject who shares the information (we can therefore say that *competition* “materializes” the information).

In this context, the natural inclination of the subjects will be to preserve the information, a source of individual power and development. They will hide it, even if this will be a *disadvantage for the community* (which is what basically happens with the big multinational chemical, pharmaceutical or food industries that operate on a global level).

Therefore, although it is clear how different the economic modalities of the two Paradigms are, both on an organizational and a behavioral level, it is necessary to further analyze, as far as possible, the *nature* of such behaviors, in order to find out what is the real connection between them and the relevant effects, both as concerns the *social* relationships and the connection between the community and the *environment*.

A substantial difference between the economic circuits defined by the two paradigms is that while in the Autonomy Paradigm a *natural* logic

is followed, according to which it is *need* that determines the *production* of the goods that will satisfy it, in the Heteronomy Paradigm the *opposite* takes place.

In fact – and this is pretty clear with reference to the Market - what creates an income for the potential consumer is the participation (in some way) in the production that supplies him/her with the income (represented by money, the “universal equivalent”) that, depending on its potentially... *unlimited* amount determines the volume and the range of purchases aimed at satisfying a potentially... *unlimited* need. Therefore, the double rule is: a) produce everything and at full capacity, as long as it can be sold (exchanged with the “universal equivalent”), in order to maximize the purchasing capacity of products with a decreasing utility, until their uselessness or disutility; b) acquire these things, or otherwise the dynamic trend will dangerously reverse.

Even in the other two variants of the Heteronomy Paradigm, the situation is the same, as in the economic circuits activated in Philanthropy and, though to a lesser extent, in the LES, it is always the amount, respectively, of the NGOs’ incomes (that represent, in this case, the solvency of the potential recipient/consumer), or of the income generated from work that determines the volume of consumptions, even if, as we will see further below, the socio-environmental effects change dramatically compared to the Market, both because of the different *nature* of the circuits used in the two variants and because of their *limits* (particularly with reference to LES).

To sum up, while in the Autonomy every member tends to express the *minimum* level of demands that anyway satisfy his/her real needs, in the Heteronomy, well described by the Market, a *preliminary* research of solvency takes place, that turns, independently from the role of protagonist or follower in the production process, into a race to *maximize* the income. We can imagine the socio-environmental consequences caused by this competition that, in order to *maximize* consumptions, creates an uncontrolled *escalation* which is destined to crash violently against the social and environmental tolerance limits if *adequate measures* are not put in place.

This latter individualist, exuberant and *expansive* behavior can in fact affect



others by contamination and end up characterizing the whole group, regardless of the will of the individuals. A behavior that is completely different from the more cautious, supportive and *parsimonious* one prevailing in the group in the first case, in which every single actor keeps his freedom of choice.

With an allegory, we can affirm that the economic circuits created by the two Paradigms can be compared to a cyclist who, in the Heteronomy, is on a *bicycle* and therefore, if he pushes on the pedals, he will move forward, but if he stops he will fall (need of growth), while in the Autonomy he is on a *tricycle* and therefore, as he does not have to deal with instability anymore, he is free to calibrate the ride according to how far he wants to go on (compatibility with zero growth).

### 1.3.1. *The economic Paradigms and the evolution of the systems*

If in the early days of social organization, in a tribal context characterized by basic demands and rudimentary manufacturing equipment, the small-scale economic modalities of the Autonomy Paradigm appear more suitable, it is clear that with the development of production technologies and the ensuing division and specialization of work there emerges the need of enlarging the social contexts of reference and move from short production-consumption circuits to longer production-exchange-consumption circuits.

Moreover, as the planning efficiency decreases, because it is strictly connected to the use of an *information* on the needs that is more and more hard to obtain in a wider and heterogeneous field, it is natural that the economic modalities of the Heteronomy Paradigm, especially the Market, appear more appropriate and end up, as already said, by asserting themselves.

It is therefore understandable that, as a consequence of the technologic development, the expansive behavior represented by the Market has succeeded, but this is quite alarming, because this economic modality has spread rapidly and excessively, producing harmful consequences on a socio-environmental level, that are amplified by the technological

development; and also because of the clear incapacity both of the “surrogated” modalities of the Paradigm (LES) and of the public Administration (a subject of Autonomy), together with its philanthropic “crutch” (a subject of Heteronomy), to face them.

But it is also understandable that, following the development of the new Communication and Information Technologies (CIT), some economic modalities of the Autonomy Paradigm, a supportive environment where parsimony prevails, *innovative modalities*, identified in particular in the new area of research opened by a renewed economic science, can gain a potentially important, if not crucial, role in *specific* areas, but with positive repercussions on the *entire* system.

These local modalities can, in particular, easily take root and spread starting from territorial pockets, more and more common even in the more “developed” Countries, where many unused human resources and many unsatisfied essential needs coexist; the result is that these areas turn from a “contagious breeding ground” that can weaken the system into places where practices of great economic and, last but not least, pedagogic value take place.

It is in this direction that we must *explore* and, as new opportunities emerge, *undertake* roles that are respectively of the Economic science and of the civil society (in particular, adequate Philanthropy’s Moral Entities that operate in synergy with Market’s businesses, as we will see further below), in order to create a positive socio-economic dynamic that the Government may support at a *second stage*, showing that a redeeming metamorphosis of the system is possible not through *politics*, but through the private *local* action integrated in a *global* vision (a “glocal” logic).

This is the only way the future economic structure can be shaped and new CIT can give a decisive help.

But again, all must begin with the development of the economic science that has to show the path to be followed, trace the contours of the scenery that may be shaped and, moreover, recommend the concrete action the active forces of civil society must undertake.

This is the goal and meaning of this brief essay.

It is now the moment to analyze the different economic modalities of the two Paradigms in order to examine the prospective role of *each*

*The dignity of nations*

*modality* inside the system and then consider which can be the socio-environmental consequences of the new economic system that could possibly stand out.

## 2. THE PARADIGMS AND THEIR ECONOMIC MODALITIES

### 2.1. *The Heteronomy Paradigm*

We can affirm that the Heteronomy Paradigm has all the chance to be familiar for everyone.

Surely, it is familiar to those economists who think that the Heteronomy Paradigm faithfully explains how the *Ideal Market* works: they are devoted followers of this type of Market, which actually embodies the Paradigm under almost every aspect.

Perhaps it is less familiar for common people, faced every day with the multiple *discrepancies* between the *Ideal* and the *Real Market*.

Housewives know some of them really well, such as the *informative dissymmetry* between the producer and the third party-consumer, one among the many important ones. Fortunately, this dissymmetry has been recently “noticed” by the economic orthodoxy and, as a consequence, in some Countries a legislation has been introduced that forces the producers to supply *information* about the products (such as the Country of origin, the ingredients, any chemicals used, the expiry date and so on), information that the producers are reluctant to give (printing them in a font size that is “invisible” without hand lens, in multiple languages etc.). However, this rule won’t help mothers, for example, to choose a snack for their children among the many produced on an industrial level using ingredients from the five Continents and from Countries in which the food industry legislations, when existing, are different from one County to the other (it is urgent to go back to the old self-produced “bread, butter and honey”).

These discrepancies, after all, are always present and are *spreading further* despite the numerous rules aiming at making reality correspond to the

theoretical model expressed by the Heteronomy Paradigm, fancied by those who can take advantage from the its preconditions and by the obliging economists who are officially busy to study it in order to *guess* its consequences.

The fact that the only macroscopic *certain* consequence - which is leading humanity to a catastrophe widely announced and already on its way, produced by the overflowing pervasiveness of an *unbalanced Market* in the economy - is visible to everyone but invisible to the economists' eyes, is a real "mystery".

Therefore, economists still think that the Market is substantially valid, and this is not so bad, but, what is worst, they are sure that the Market is undoubtedly capable of managing excellently, anyway better than any other possible alternative, *every* level of human life.

Forever and ever.

This idea of the Market as a "universal, unique and eternal" economic modality, so loved by the economists, implies a definition of events such as unemployment or the environmental devastation as failures of the *real* Market that have to be corrected in order to bring back the "naughty boy" on the right way.

However, in reality, the Market is only one of many economic modalities, inevitably characterized with *strengths* and *weaknesses* like all others, which was born in a particular space-time context and has developed enormously, thanks to its suitability to the scientific and technological context and to its evolution, to the point of reaching an "abnormal" role in today's world.

This means that such a development of the Market shows not only its *many credits*, which nobody could deny, and *benefits*, arising from such credits, which nobody would want to give up, but also, and quite violently, its *limits*.

The critical phenomena that are progressively gathering are not at all a consequence of occasional and fixable "failures" of the Market, as asserted by the economists, but *inevitable* consequences of the "Market Only" idea (and not of the Market *in se*), among which a possibly fatal impact on the ecosystem.

In other words, it is unreasonable to think that the Market could

manage alone the destiny of humanity, even only to satisfy *individual* needs, because the satisfaction of *collective needs* naturally rests on public communities (even though nowadays such needs are “eroded” by an ever growing “outsourcing” of *competences* through contracts with “experts”, and even of *handwork*, by the systematic use of temporary employees supplied by temp agencies).

This is why, besides the Market and its protagonists, other economic modalities represented by the producers and the *solvent* consumers of their production, have appeared spontaneously inside the Heteronomy Paradigm; the role of these modalities is to fill the spaces that the Market and, in those Countries where some sort of public welfare exists, the Governments have left empty.

On the one hand we are talking about the “Philanthropy” modality, in which non-profit private subjects supply, in competition among them, certain services to *non solvent* consumers; on the other hand, we are talking about Local Exchange Systems that can be assimilated to “small-scale closed markets” with an *internal currency* and in which the third party consumer’s solvency is obtained, as in the Market, by exercising an activity inside the circuit itself.

These latter, even though they are with full right a part of the Heteronomy Paradigm, can be considered as “unusual” in its context, because they are based on a *delimited* human group (a characteristic that is typical of the alternative Autonomy Paradigm, as the *collective subject* that practices it is delimited by definition), *unlike* the other two economic modalities of the common Paradigm, i.e. Market and Philanthropy, because the human group at their base is potentially represented by the *entire humanity*; and in fact, some producers of these two modalities serve *third party* consumers, respectively *solvent* and *non solvent*.

Now let’s analyze the already mentioned economic modalities of the Heteronomy Paradigm.

### 2.1.1. *The Market*

Although, in order to survive, a great part of the world population has to

count on domestic self-production (the smallest economic modality of Autonomy) and on an *informal* economy of proximity, as well as on other people's generosity (this is the case of Philanthropy, which is a *formal* modality of Heteronomy) and on the large Communities referring to the public Administrations (an Autonomy's modality), we can say that in modern economies the Market represents a largely prevailing modality, at least as concerns the produced and *accounted* goods.

The main structure on which the entire structure of the current systems rests is represented by the producing businesses on the Market, characterized by different company models (corporations, partnerships, cooperatives).

Businesses act as a natural springboard for those who identify their personal achievement in the economic achievement, and are even worshipped by them, regardless of what they produce (butter or weapons... business is business).

For the ones with a more gregarious nature, businesses are like *mums* and *nurses*, as among the economic subjects they are those that "produce work" and an *income* for their workers.

In other words, in the collective imagination of the "Market Societies", businesses are seen, regardless of their activity, as a source of *work* and *income*, i.e. the first step of a new economic circuit, that has to be supported with all possible means but also with the important collaboration of solvent consumers.

Consequently, the economists, who are vestals of the "Market Only" System, considering the rule "producing for consuming" obsolete, support the idea of "consuming for producing", warning people not to fall in the "paradox represented by parsimony", according to which the moderation in consumption, a virtuous behavior (recognized virtuous even by economists, who therefore call this a paradox), is dangerous (surely so for their "Globalised Market Only System", which they consider *ideal* despite its socio-environmental consequences).

The "Market Societies" that consider a housewife as a woman that *doesn't have a job*, do not appreciate the work carried out in the Autonomy Paradigm, in which the rule is "producing for consuming as much as is necessary to satisfy a real need".

This can be acceptable for the domestic self-production, where work is not paid, or for the Mutual Aid Societies (Clubs) as their members work free and voluntarily.

However, it seems that this underestimation of work extends to the workers in the Public Administrations, as, according to a very diffuse idea, these are paid with the money *stolen* (through taxation) from the Market and its operators, i.e. manufacturers (businesses and their staff) and consumers. This is true, except that the money “stolen” is also used to *pay* the *collective services*, i.e. those that can be supplied only to the entire community and that are sold, for their nature, at *zero price*, even if they have a *cost*, and they are produced even though their benefits, unlike those of the agricultural production, are not so evident. This is the case of the defense services during times of peace, but also of other services, e.g. those supplied by the financial police, that many would be happy to avoid.

It is clear, however, that should the Market’s businesses operate within insufficient regulatory constraints (that would require an investment in resources both for being conceived and enforced), every system almost exclusively based on the Market would *implode*.

In other words, despite the repeated “laissez-faire” appeals of the producers, the Market, in order to survive, needs a strong regulatory support, especially when there is a lack of civic-mindedness among the group of people that practices it, provided it does not end up in an oppressive bureaucracy.

However, even if important rules are given, the current Market systems, that do not have any *economic balance* and are merrily leading towards a “Globalised Market Only System”, seem to suffer permanently because of endogenous reasons.

So they could end up fighting for survival in a social environment where discomfort is partially cured by a *modest*, scattered monetary assistance (especially in western Countries, irremediably *atomized* on a social level) and where calm is maintained through a well nurtured and advertised “lack of alternatives”, associated to some form of more or less hidden tyranny.

Of course, today’s economic systems are different – sometimes very

different - from one Country to the other. However, though different, they are associated by a tendency of the businesses to occupy the economic spaces once managed by the subjects of the Autonomy Paradigm.

Such a continuous erosion of the role of these subjects within the system takes place because the shift towards the Market, which is usually followed by expansion and industrialization, implies immediate *advantages* for the consumer; in reality – as a great part of the costs are charged to the community and the environment – it implies some *inconveniences* too, so much so that looking at what is happening on a global level the balance, contrary to the economists' promises, appears to be completely negative. Businesses have always been asking for “less State”, meaning a minimization of the role of the public administration at all geographical levels, with reference both to the *collective services*, a field that remains still its exclusive jurisdiction, at least as a frame, and to the *individual* public benefit services that can be supplied to individual users and are paid by them based on the acquired quantities; for these latter the public administration is criticized on grounds such as scarce productivity and, consequently, increasing prices.

In fact, the Market has already largely consumed, practically everywhere, the areas in which the public Administration operates and that refers to the *largest-scale* public variant of the Autonomy Paradigm.

The same can be said of the *medium-scale* private variants of the same Paradigm, especially the ones that refer to the Mutual Aid Societies whose production has historically concentrated on social security and financial services that prefer the large scale.

The economic production-consumption circuits adopted by these variants, with the gradual increase of *third party* customers oriented towards the large-scale economies, have gradually *diluted* in the big production-exchange-consumption circuit corresponding to the Market. This phenomenon appears particularly shocking with reference to the domestic self-production.

In fact, in the most “developed” Countries the Market has basically swallowed up the economic space usually taken by the *smallest scale* variant of the Autonomy Paradigm.

Taking a closer look, the economy of the “developing Countries” is still



essentially based on the *necrosis* of the domestic self-production, which is the distinctive sign of a “developed” Country, as it is taken for granted that the natural direction, common to all countries, constantly and progressively leads to a “Market Only” model - a direction that, according to the economists, must be maintained until the entire humanity will have put its destiny in the “invisible hand” of the Market or in the - ever more visible - hand of the humanity’s dominant minority, greedy and blind, which tries, in the best parasitic tradition, to kill the host organism that represents its habitat.

Today, a reaction by the collective immune system is urgently needed and must necessarily translate into the reconquest of some room for action by the Autonomy Paradigm. This reconquest will certainly not take place using the existing and/or extinct modalities, but thanks to the coming to the fore and spreading of *innovative* modalities that will be born of a renovated vision of economy.

It is clear, however, that the system will always be based on the Market’s businesses, but these will be inevitably influenced, in positive, by the changes in context.

And this will happen both on a *behavioral* level, which means that there will be more social and environmental responsibility, and on an *activity* level, as activity will be more focused on the high capital-intensive productions of functional goods and other production inputs, suitable for the large scale.

### 2.1.2. *Philanthropy*

Looking at the economic events in the light of the basic Paradigms, it is possible to say that in the Heteronomy “family” there is another economic modality in which non-profit subjects, competing against each other, supply services to a *non-solvent third* party: Philanthropy.

The producers are the Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) which are called *philanthropic* just because they offer their services (care, environmental, cultural etc.) essentially *for free*, covering the costs through *private* financial and in-kind supports coming from their social base and

from other donors, as well as through *public* financial supports.

In compliance with the logic on which the membership Paradigm is based, in Philanthropy there is an initial chase for the resources that represent the assets of the various NGOs, the goal of which is to make their target users solvent.

This is the field in which a great part of the competition between NGOs takes place, which sometimes goes on until the users have been acquired. The economic circuit put in place by Philanthropy is ruled, like the other circuits of the Heteronomy Paradigm, by an “invisible hand” whose global work is unknown to the community that adopted it, because it is the result of the decisions taken by the individual actors, in this case producers and donors.

Because Humanity has entrusted the current system, which is essentially based on the Market, to that same “invisible hand”, and because the system robs and ruins the environment and brings discomfort and poverty with it, the Philanthropy modality has a certainly useful role even though it deals with the negative *effects* of the system.

This palliative function is however destined to decrease vis-à-vis the success of the system that will be described further below, and hopefully this will happen for other commendable activities too – as for instance post-war reconstruction – that have been made necessary by the “despicable” behavior of men and Nations.

It is quite credible, and in any case desirable, that the NGOs, which are currently involved in never-ending repairing activities recalling the work of Sisyphus, use their resources to fight against the *causes* of social discomfort by supporting, through the training of human resources that will be created in the new variants of the Autonomy Paradigm, the metamorphosis of the system, helping it to get rid of the self-destructive behaviors that presently characterize it.

### 2.1.3. *Local Exchange Systems*

Looking at the economic phenomena in the light of the two basic Paradigms, it is worth noting that inside this “family” the Market has

another unsuspected little brother.

Actually, in most part of the Western Countries some particular small scale production-exchange-consumption modalities have been recently introduced, which we will conventionally call Local Exchange Systems (LES).

In these systems, ignored by the Revenue Agency even if they form part of the economy sphere, single people operating *informally* are engaged in supplying goods and services produced by them to other people taking part in the initiative (and to their families, that is the smallest statistical consuming units) at a price expressed in an “internal currency”.

LES, in other words, represent a form of “*multilateral barter*” and they can also be considered as a modern expression of the informal neighborhood economy that in the past, and even nowadays in some Countries, manifests itself through the *gift* or forms of *bilateral barter*.

Economically speaking, they surely have a significance, because they activate, in the territorial context in which they are created, own dynamics *additional* to the Market ones.

Their main value in connection with this study is to show that the Market, *large-scale* by nature, lets fatally uncovered, on a territorial and social level, some “spaces” that could be used more efficiently on a *small scale*, even inside the same Paradigm.

In the abundant literature on this subject, the LES are considered “alternative” compared to the current system and its one-way evolution carried on by the economic orthodoxy, because they use their own currency instead of the common one, and so they bring some hope for change.

After having identified and described the two basic economic Paradigms, it is easy understandable that the LES are nothing else but “children” of the Heteronomy Paradigm, like the Market, and very similar to this latter; the only difference between the two is the small dimension resulting from the use of an own currency. In this respect, it is interesting to see how, during the current economic crisis, the cause of which can be only found in the system in charge, where the Heteronomy Paradigm reigns, the intellectual vanguards keep “generating” palliative solutions, but all belonging to the same Paradigm.

This demonstrates that the civil society is incapable of conceiving an economic circuit other than a *long* production-exchange-consumption circuit with the producer and a *third party* consumer as main subjects, and it appears that the *short* alternative production-consumption circuit, i.e. self-production, has been permanently removed (due, as we will see, to the economists' serious and unmistakable guilt).

The strength of these small-scale variants of the Heteronomy Paradigm resides in the use of a currency with restricted value in the same way as if it were a currency with general value. We will describe in detail, further below, how these variants can be outdone by adopting innovative solutions, on a small scale as well, but belonging to the Autonomy Paradigm, that "paradoxically" use the general-value currency - *generated* in their context and, obviously, in a totally legal way – as if it were a restricted-value currency.

It is important to note, as from now, that the consequences of these variations of the Autonomy Paradigm, relatively small-scale as well, will have quite different effects than the LES's, and this certainly at a macroeconomic level, as they allow the start of a deep metamorphosis in the system, but also at a *pedagogical* level, as they factually show the importance of *solidarity* in economics.

The LESs, on the contrary, being part of the Heteronomy Paradigm, envisage the *competition* among the operators and therefore *exclude* the weaker subjects that turn to them, as their last hope, for being included economically and, consequently, socially.

These harmful effects are accepted, without batting an eyelid, by the supporters of the LES, because in economy the principle of *competition* is universally accepted today, even if it is obvious that economic professionals have been hiding the alternative solutions based on mutual *solidarity*, that are at the root of the Autonomy Paradigm, according to which, in a group of people that produces for itself and its members... there is room *for everyone*.

This is an obvious thing that, in any case, it is important to underline, as nowadays, in a world dominated by the so called "unique" and "obsessive" idea of the "Globalized Market Only System", a percentage of unemployment is considered as inevitable, and in some cases, even

“desirable” according to the scientific orthodoxy... if this can be called science... and every innovative initiative is enthusiastically welcomed by the mainstream media apparatus, if successful, even with hosannas... as long as it is included in the Heteronomy Paradigm and thus foresees *competition*.

This is the case of the micro-credit, supported with great fervor from the Western “crowned heads”, too.

This initiative finds a place in the areas left out from the Market as well as from the Autonomy Paradigm, the potential of which is still unknown due to the *amblyopia*, a pathology usually known as “lazy eye” that now affects the economic science and allows only traditional, *spontaneous* and low performance expressions of this Paradigm to come to reality.

Unfortunately, for those who hope for a healthy and redeeming change of direction in the system, the micro-credit option can appear really disappointing in the new light of the two basic Paradigms.

Actually, one of the effects of micro-credit is that it can extend the Market boundaries to include economically deserted areas by uprooting the only small local existing vegetation that is part of the Autonomy Paradigm in order to create room for “*little plants*” of the Heteronomy Paradigm, watering them with a capital sprinkled drop by drop and thus creating a poorer version of the Market called “Barefoot Capitalism”; as a result, the previously existing solidarity is replaced with a “war between poor”. This is why it is urgent to go back to the Autonomy Paradigm through appropriate new and modern variants.

## 2.2. *The Autonomy Paradigm*

As for the Autonomy Paradigm one can definitely say, unlike the Heteronomy, that it is basically unknown to the professionals as well as to common people.

Even though the contacts with subjects that operate under this Paradigm is part of everyone’s daily experience one can definitely claim that, before being made explicit here, it could have easily remained an “unidentified economic concept”, a sort of *alien*.

In fact, merely claiming that *all* the existing economic procedures, different from those previously mentioned and which belong to the Heteronomy Paradigm, are all part of the same “family” rouses by itself, major concerns because each of these is generally considered an independent case.

Nowadays, in fact, it is hard to glimpse, through the dense fog created by the economists, some sort of affinity between production-consumption dynamics implemented respectively by a public Administration, a mutual association and a housewife actively engages in house work or, better said, by the group of people at the core of said figures respectively formed by the large public and private Communities, by the intermediate private Communities and by families.

If then one claims that the economic circuits identified by the Autonomy Paradigm are implemented by the system’s *auto-productive collective subjects*, it has good reason to be considered, in every aspect, a “Heresy” because it breaks, in one blow, two true *dogmas* of the economic orthodoxy. According to the first dogma, the system’s producers are all *individual subjects* with a legal personality (Institutional Units, grouped in Institutional Sectors) whose production is directed to *third parties* (other Institutions), no matter if they are producers of the same institutional Sector or other Sectors, or final consumers; i.e. families (grouped in the Family Sector) that are the Institutional Units of the system, whose only purpose, according to the economic orthodoxy, is that one.

The second *dogma*, states that a producer can also, to some extent, produce *for itself* but in this case it will be considered *ancillary* activities, functional to the *main* activity whose resulting production has to be *completely* transferred to a *third party*.

In other words, even though a mutualistic nonprofit association, like a photography Club, produces services exclusively for its member through the voluntary work of said members, according to these *dogmas*, it can’t be (except sacrilege) considered a *private auto-productive community* characterized by a specific behavior in line with its nature, but a *hetero-productive* individual that supplies for free (or at least at a price not economically significant) services to a *third party*, in this case, represented by *families* (represented by each members) and therefore Institutional Units of another Sector which main and only purpose,

according to the aforementioned arbitrary convention of orthodoxy, is to be final consumers.

The photography Club's *auto-production*, on the other hand, could be, at most, confined to *ancillary* activities such as cleaning the premises where the *main* activities of the association are carried out for a *third* party represented by the *families* of the members.

And then again, according to the orthodoxy, the economy is a reality in which producers and consumers are rigidly separated from each other; the photography Club, organized on a corporate level as nonprofit, should not be different from a *philanthropic* nonprofit organization even though this one, very different from the previous one, is definitely *heteronomous* up to de point where it can give rise to an economic circuit that can be potentially extended to the whole of humanity and has, therefore, a distinct *economic behavior* different from any club as it is always in constant *competition* with other similar associations in the race to find the resources to make, indirectly, solvent the biggest portion of its potential customers; customers who remain, however, completely *foreign* to the production at the core of the implemented circuit.

And indeed the Orthodoxy, as if to purposely hide the behavioral differences instead of showing them as it falsely claims to do, merges the two associations in one institutional Sector called Nonprofit Organizations at the Families' Service (Third Sector for the current ideology).

And it is precisely to avoid mergers of economic entities of different nature and behavior that certainly does not help to see clearly and instead prevents the identification of areas where find new ways, that the formulation of the Autonomy Paradigm proves its usefulness.

Besides, according to orthodoxy's dogma, not only is the photography Club not different from a philanthropic association, but it also should not differ from a Market producer (both are *individual* producers that work to satisfy a *third party* and whose auto-production is confined to *ancillary activities*); were it not for the fact that it sells its own production at an "economically significant" price.

This is the only reason why orthodoxy separates the latter from both the philanthropic producer (heteronomous) that sells its production to third

parties at *price zero* and therefore economically not significant, and from the mutualistic producer (autonomous) who sells its production to the families of the members at a *cost price* (as close as possible to zero) having to balance its budget, considered by orthodoxy alone, as “economically not significant”.

Such an approach to the economy, again, if it were to remain would be *lethal* for the development of Economics, which has already “fossilized” in the “Market only” ideology, which should instead evolve and show the civil society the way to safety from the looming catastrophe which a guilty caste does not want to see and, above all, does not want it to be seen.

The new approach, as it can be inferred, strives to highlight the *behavioral diversity* of the economic actors and therefore rejects the two orthodoxy’s *dogma*, which leads to the amalgam of their behaviors instead of the *clarification* of them, this being the essential condition to understand the behaviors at the root of all evil and upon which we can build a new hope. Therefore, the new approach explains the *mutualistic* communities, i.e. the productive communities in which the members in addition to being consumers are also shareholders of the production activity, not only as *collective producers* (breaking the first *dogma* of orthodoxy), but also *auto-producers* (breaking the second *dogma*), differentiating their activities according to the need they satisfy, *collective* or *individual*.

These *collective auto-producers* form the Autonomy Paradigm, which translates into a new accounting system for the future, into a Super-Sector that controls three Sectors made up of *Large Communities* (divided in Public and Private), *Intermediate Communities* and *auto-productive Families*. This accompanied by a second Super-Sector identified by the Heteronomy Paradigm that groups the economic circuits, previously examined, which are implemented by *individual producers* (divided by type) that produce exclusively for *third parties* and whose potential auto-production, restricted to *ancillary* activities, is related to the heteronomous main production (whose recipients would be also share).

In conclusion, the violation of said *dogmas* represented by the introduction of the concept of auto-productive Communities would probably be considered Heretic in the sense of deviation from the “truth”, but in



reality it represents the overcoming of the major *obstacles* in which the Economic science is now stranded.

Besides, if the “truths” of the orthodoxy are those ones that led humanity to its current situation, already deplorable in itself and which prospects are even more tragic, it is probably wise to distance ourselves from them. In fact, their result so far has been to prevent the emergence of the concept of the economic Paradigm, of dual nature, and in particular of a Paradigm (complementary to the one represented by the Market) that represents the other half of the economic sphere (Yin Economy). Exploring this Paradigm is the only opportunity to catch a glimpse, within the system, of potential *counterweights* to the Market capable to give to the system itself, now stiffened on Heteronomy, the *resilience*, which it completely and tragically lacks and for this, it is headed to its end.

Therefore, let us open the doors to an economic Heresy that aims to preserve the ecosystem, humankind included, essential condition to ensure that the phenomenon of evolution continues to take its course.

Before reviewing the economic modalities of the Autonomy Paradigm is appropriate to add more information in order to dispel doubts in advance and avoid confusion and concerns that may arise from the Paradigm’s name itself.

In fact, the term “autonomy” in the current language is synonymous of “total independence” and therefore of “absolute absence of ties” in relation to the surrounding context.

But this is not, of course, the case of the auto-productive communities of the Autonomy Paradigm.

If one wants to relate the current meaning of autonomy to these communities it is important to distinguish their *producer* role from their *consumer* role.

Starting with the first role one can say that such a community can certainly be considered an *independent* producer in the usual sense, that is of independent from the external context, but *only* in terms of *operation*, because having its own solvent clientele (a part of which the community can also ensure by itself, a partial or total solvency through the remuneration of work performance), it produces in function of what is requires by its members.

This community, in its producer role, differently from the Market companies, is not subjected to “business death” caused by a potential, sudden, lack of demand.

Such community could, on the contrary, be hardly considered *autonomous*, independent from the external context, in terms of *production chain* because, even with reference to a range of *extremely limited* production and even restricted to a single item such as bread, it will still have to get some outside inputs (raw materials, energy...), deriving from high capital intensity productions and therefore attributable, at least at first glance, to Market companies.

In this case, with reference to the *producer's* role, *autonomy* is intended in a very *specific* sense.

Now turning to the role of the *consumer*, if it is true that an auto-productive community can be considered independent from the external context with reference to a specific *limited range* of goods and services; it is also true that to consider it *autonomous* in the common meaning of the word, it is entirely unrealistic as it would require that the auto-production is extended to a range of goods and services able to satisfy *all individual* and *collective* needs of the families of said community.

Therefore, referring to the *consumer's* role, it will consider a *very partial* autonomy.

To summarize the concept of *autonomy* that characterizes the auto-productive communities of the Autonomy Paradigm must be understood in the way in which these communities *operate* and yet in regards of a particular and *limited range* of goods and services.

In short, it goes without saying that an *autonomous* auto-productive community in the literal sense of the term, that is able to produce *everything* its families need and, furthermore, without depending from the outside, in other words an *self-sufficient* community, is a real *utopia*.

We will not, for brevity issues, review the cases of *proximity* autocracy that have, for different reasons, seen the light throughout History, in the Phalansteries, in the Kibbutz and in the Countries with a collectivist economy, that have now disappeared.

Autocracy, as we all know, does not belong in this world for it is neither desirable nor, in general, viable, except probably inside a still unknown

primitive tribe that lives of *hunting* and *harvest*, and therefore should be placed in the land of dreams or, rather, of nightmares.

These long and staid clarifications, which may seem like a pointless series of platitudes, are useful because whenever auto-production is mentioned, besides the domestic kind, namely at a *community level* even when it refers to a hundred families and the production is limited to a *narrow* range of goods and services the interlocutor replies with remarks that clearly refer to *autocracy* that the auto-production may bring to mind, by a dangerous delusion.

The rejection of the “communitarian” *ideology* from which autocracy, its extreme and utopian exponent, descends, regardless of the prevailing Paradigm in the community that aspires to it (a country could, for some reason, turn to autocracy even if its economy was essentially Market oriented).

Unfortunately, this rejection comes from the generalized absorption of another opposite *ideology* that shows the *social atomization* and the *individual competition* on a global level, the key for a *utopic* never ending material progress.

In conclusion, we reaffirm that the new economic vision here mentioned and the research that it allows, aims to open doors that nowadays have been kept hidden, which lead to *unexplored* paths, different from the ones beaten by *ideologies* until now (which, based on *irrefutable ideas*, inevitably lead to dead ends or the abyss), indicating the new *praxis* that can be freely adopted by civil society if, and to the extent that they will prove to be functional to the individual and collective needs of the humanity, nowadays disillusioned and without hope, creating a new Resurgence that aims for a world in which everyone can live with dignity, in peace and in harmony with nature.

### 2.2.1. *The Large Communities*

As mentioned, the Autonomy Paradigm groups the *auto-productive Communities*.

The *Large Communities*, here in discussion, are formed by citizens that

refer to a constitutional local administrative Authority (a Municipality, a Region or a Country).

They can be represented by a legal person of *Public law* (Public Administrations) and, in which case, they will be called *public Communities*; or they can be represented by legal person of *Private law* (cooperative) and, in which case, they will be called *Large private Communities*, in order to separate them from other smaller private *Communities*.

#### 2.2.1.1. *Public Communities*

Throughout history, *Public Communities* are born and provide themselves with a legal form of *Public Law*, in order to *auto-produce collective* services that each of them need at its own administrative level, starting with the most “noble” ones, meaning those that influence all the others, that is *legal services*.

But, in addition, even those, no less important related to defense (inside the Communities of a higher level), public order and legal and administrative services.

These services can be called *auto-produced* in the *strict sense of the word* if the public Community is ruled by a *direct Democracy* or by a similar governance practice that can be said to be a variation of this, which makes it similar to a private Community characterized by a board of members (in this case the citizens) and by an administrative council (government) elected by the board.

These governance practices could take place in ancient times, when public Communities were of relatively small size (although their influence extended to larger unstructured communities, that were generally subdued to them and therefore of no influence to the public affairs), but can be viable in some sort of modern version and even more so in the near future, thanks to the development and diffusion of new ICTs.

Nowadays, with the general diffusion of *representative Democracy*, characterized by a Parliament formed by *delegates*, coming from different Political Parties, elected by citizens, the collective services’ *auto-production* can be called *spurious*.

2.2.1.2.          *Private Communities*

Despite that, as mentioned, the main purpose of the public Communities is the auto-production of *collective* services, in almost every Country they also *auto-produce*, in a *spurious* way due to the lack of direct Democracy, also some *individual* services, deemed of *public utility* that generally become “natural monopolies” as they require solid infrastructure, subject of public investment (railways, water and electricity distribution systems, etc.).

These days, in the wake of the “Market only” ideology, we witness a boost towards the *privatization* of these services.

In fact, it is a pressure carried out by large private companies that present their candidacy for the management of these services, to the “representatives” of the citizens.

This pressure, source of potential corruption, is justified by the inefficiency of the public administration, which is frequently proven, and essentially due to the *spurious* nature of auto-production that entails the presence of *intermediaries*, who are usually inadequate and cause of wastefulness.

Such *privatization* today is only intended as transfer of the management of these services to Market companies that means a switch of Paradigm, from Autonomy to Heteronomy.

However, this does not imply the elimination of some sort of “wealth’s subtraction” by third parties (who, as private subjects, will inevitably tend to maximize their profit, even where it is *undue*, to the disadvantage of the *quality-price ratio* in the supply of the services and, even at the expense of the *environment* during the production of the services as well) and therefore the advantage for the consumer citizens, which should be the only purpose of such transfer, is not necessarily granted neither on an individual nor collective level.

Therefore, it is not with the change of Paradigm that the frequently deplorable situation will be improved. If that was the case... it would be well known.

In the near future; however, when the Autonomy Paradigm will occupy the space it is entitled to (which can happen due to the increased interest that the consumers will draw from this dynamic) and it will have exercised its

*pedagogic value* on the neo-producer consumers, it could take place, for the individual services of public interest, an auto-production in the *strict sense of the word* through a “*privatization* within the Autonomy Paradigm”, probably the most appropriate way to guarantee the consumer’s interest...even in a “representative” Democracy.

Basically, the *Large Communities* (e.g. the citizens of a Municipality), already represented by a Public law legal person, will *also* be able to get a *Private Law* legal person, creating in this case a *consumer Cooperative* in order to auto-produce an individual service of general interest (e.g. water supply).

The public Communities will therefore still be able to dedicate themselves to auto-production, preferably in the *strict sense of the word* (under a direct Democracy or under a similar hybrid form), but *only* in regards to *collective services* of their exclusive competence as they are generally supplied at a *null price* financing the costs with a *generic tax system*.

The new vision on the Economy thus calls for a precise *delimitation*, which often results in a *contraction*, of the area of interest of *public Communities* through a specific *privatization* of public utility services that are supposed to be in their hands, within the Autonomy Paradigm, which seems susceptible to preserve at its best the *individual and collective* interest of the (producer)-consumer citizens.

### 2.2.2. *Intermediate Communities*

The *Intermediate Communities* discussed here are formed by all the communities with a *Private Law* legal personality (Benefit Societies, Cooperatives, Associations), with an *intermediate* dimension between the families and the *large communities*, and with a *mutualistic* purpose, in the precise sense that they are devoted to *auto-production* and therefore they implement a narrow circuit of production-consumption on a *local scale*.

As explained in section 2.1.2., they should not thus be confused with Nonprofit Associations with a *philanthropic* purpose, usually called Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) which are part of the Heteronomy Paradigm as they produce for no solvent *third parties* carrying out an

economic circuit, which is based, potentially, on the entire humanity. Historically *Intermediate Communities* rise in social and territorial areas of little interest for the Market and/or for the public Communities to which they belong to.

In those social environment characterized by a relative *poverty*, *Intermediate Communities* are organized by taking a *Private Law* legal person in order to formally auto-produce *pension and financial* services leveraging on *mutualistic solidarity*.

Similar communities can rise in relatively *isolated* areas, usually in order to auto-produce public utility services, such as drinking water or electricity supply (hydroelectric, wind, photovoltaic), for specific and geographically limited consumers, represented by the families of the resident members. With their rise, both have proved that mutual solidarity does not only represent a *social value*, in *certain situations* it can also represent an undeniable *economic value* that can compensate, on the one hand the lack of trust of the Market's financial companies in the single members and, on the other the shortcomings of public institutions.

It is interesting, for the purpose of this study, to analyze the evolution of these mutualistic initiatives throughout time and in the context of the development model that we know today.

What is clear is that most of them, although they kept not only their original names (Mutual pensions and insurances, Cooperative Banks... Consumer Cooperatives) and also retained their original legal form, have gradually changed their *economic nature* going from the Autonomy Paradigm to the Heteronomy.

This is the case, in particular, of those initiatives that saw the opportunity to extend their offer to third party consumers, and therefore they have *understandably* tried to lower unit costs of the offered services through economies of scale, affordable thanks to a *low work intensity* production.

Those that have maintained a mutualistic nature, in the sense used here based on auto-production, are not casually those that born in isolated areas and whose purpose is the auto-production of services (water or energy supply) which, even though characterized by a *low work intensity* production too, they did not have the opportunity to extend their clientele, for this is confined to the families of the resident members,

which got together precisely due to their territorial isolation.

According to literature on the subject of consumer cooperatives, it seems that no *goods* (bread) or *service* with *high work intensity* (hairdresser) had taken part in the production range of these mutual initiatives.

Both have spontaneously found a better place, on the one hand, in the domestic auto-production (this is the case of consumer goods, mainly of agriculture and specific services for people and things) and on the other hand, on a growing level, in the Market.

A conclusion that can be drawn from the previous considerations and that, at first glance, seems to be the most reasonable, is that the mutual *Intermediate communities* can find their economic relevance in *specific* conditions which took place in the past, but disappeared over time.

In other words, it looks seems that the mutual *Intermediate communities* (auto-productive, in the “heretic language used here) have run their course.

However, a more detailed analysis reveals that, actually, the *completely opposite* is more valid.

In fact, on closer inspection, the *Intermediate communities'* auto-production was born to do *only* what the families' auto-production cannot do, and that is to deal with those economic activities in which the number of consumers not only matters, but is essential.

And, interestingly, this role has never betrayed.

It is no accident that, within this kind of economic procedure remain essentially the Clubs, i.e. associations that auto-produce cultural, sports and entertainment services (it is not possible to play boules or dance *in the intimacy of the family*).

In other words and going back in time, because with the savings of only one family, for example, could hardly buy a *plow*, it seemed convenient to auto-organize themselves in Communities and put together all the savings and use, taking turns, part of the collective savings temporarily unused at a *conventional* cost (interest) which, the more the *solidarity* was invoked, it could end up being very low or even null (mutual solidarity pays off).

But if the Community, temped by profits, opens its door to the exogenous demand expressed by *third party* customers that becomes permanent, the



costs of the necessary raw material (deposits) will increase as well, as the *third* party money saver submits to competition and, under a regime of perfect competition, the pure profit, object of desire, tends rapidly to zero and everything vanishes (in the best tradition of “mirages”).

On the contrary, even if the collective’s *bread* auto-production, made with an alternate work of the members, could have been more convenient than the domestic auto-production (less work, less energy consumption) this did not take place, probably because it could upset, with promiscuity involved and the consequent disputes, a social order that for many reasons was intended to be preserved with privacy (atomization has a cost).

Therefore, the auto-production of private communities, while supporting the Market on its territory for *economic* reasons, was leaving, for *social* reasons, a space that could have been potentially left by domestic auto-production to the Market itself.

In other words, the auto-production of private communities, not even in a territory suitable for it (good and services with *high work intensity*), has never had the opportunity to *face directly* neither the domestic auto-production nor the Market.

Unlike in the past, nowadays the socio-environmental and technological conditions seem united to allow the economic modality that can be implemented by the *intermediate* auto-productive Communities, a new and sufficiently important role in order to allow the other economic modalities, starting with those implemented by families’ Market, and others to follow, to occupy each the place suitable for them inside an unprecedented system whose economic structure can guarantee at least social and environmental sustainability.

More precisely, if one considers, on the one hand that many goods and services are still the result of the domestic auto-production, the smallest version of the Autonomy Paradigm that does not allow *economies of scale* that the “artisanal dimension” and the related production equipment allows and where “one person has to do it all” and therefore not even a limited *work categorization* finds its place; on the other hand the entrance in the Market’s sphere of action of *high work intensity* services (where, for profit, it is likely to be practiced the renowned “exploitation of man by

man”), and of goods where quality is essential and for which industrial production, that aims to economies of scale, is hardly compatible with the preservation of quality and health of the products and the environmental protection. A direct comparison between these economic modalities with the *intermediate* private communities’ auto-production appears, already at first glance, in favor of the latter.

The hasty reader, at this point, could ask why, if what previously mentioned is true, that is that the auto-production initiatives carried out by the Intermediate communities can to the extent in which they auto-produce adequate goods and services, gain a new relevance, they haven’t succeeded yet.

The answer is that the future auto-productive Intermediate communities will be very peculiar, not only in their *constitutive* aspects and in their *operation mode*, but also in their *birth* and therefore have nothing to do with the past experiences.

And, because in this case the scientific economics orthodoxy did everything in its power to restrict any research in this field, they *have never emerged*, not even on a theoretical level.

As mentioned earlier, these variants will be the subject of subsequent considerations in order to specify in detail, not to get an opinion of value by self-referential commentators, but to spur the dynamic forces of the civil society to implement and disseminate them.

These forces need to understand, in particular, that the new variants that will rise are not “little formulas”, among a thousand others, emerged from someone’s vivid imagination, but *necessary steps* for a society that begins to realize that it is in a narrow alley that leads to the abyss and wants to change its course, *hidden passages* that emerge thanks to a 360 degree exploration of the surrounding territory to which the reader is invited to participate.

### 2.2.3. *Small Communities*

*Families* form the smallest auto-productive communities.

The domestic auto-production, main character of the real economy

so important as to represent the main economic modality for most families in the world, and often the savior of the ever-growing part of the population of the industrialized economies, it is basically absent in orthodox economics.

In this case the family, as previously mentioned, is seen only as a *consumer*, i.e. a subject with a role generally, and to the extent of its solvency, functional for the Market.

Otherwise, it will have the role of *unwanted client* of the welfare managed by the Public Communities of which it belongs, at best, or it will be a Philanthropy *beneficiary* (even though in many Countries the fate of insolvent families is much worst).

In conclusion, for orthodoxy, not only families do not produce for third parties, and so far it is fine, but they don't even *auto-produce*.

One would say that their auto-production is considered a disturbing element inside the *ideological* vision of a "Market only" economy, a *bad practice* that should be buried; and therefore, it is shamelessly ignored by the orthodoxy and excluded in the national production statistics.

The only exception is the families that own and run an agricultural business, which global production also includes the one, very difficult to separate from the rest in statistics, dedicated to the consumption of the producer family and that is defined, almost *accidentally*, "auto-produced".

Having said this, it is now clear that, to the extent that the Intermediate Communities' auto-production will spread in the system, the goods and services subject to domestic auto-production, particularly those produced because of a lack of alternatives, which, moreover, will take place in a better position in relation to most high work intensity production activities that are today incorporated in the Market.

And a better placement will take place also, and especially, regarding the activities today subject of all the panoply of "successful" and even "alternative" private initiatives such as LES and others, generally financed by public funds given their heteronomous thus in compliance with its orthodox character (but also *autonomous*, as long as they are "harmless", like "urban vegetable plots" and similar) that, as it is now clear, even though it is still somewhat useful, it makes no difference.

What we would like to highlight in this chapter is that, even though the

system that probably will manifest as a consequence of the desirable diffusion of the private auto-productive Intermediate Communities, a small and specific part of the economic activities will remain in a domestic environment, and this is good, because it has a value that goes beyond the *economic* aspect and which belongs to other spheres such as the *relational, emotional and pedagogic* one.

Besides, a residual part of the domestic auto-production remains even inside the “Market only” systems, and not only in those families affected by unemployment, and it remained also in the “State only” systems in which families were fully employed, willingly ...or not.

That is to say, that the family as an auto-productive setting should never be underestimated.

And the western intellectuals, who disdainfully judge the “extreme” importance given to this setting by traditional cultures, insult their own intelligence.

In fact, the economic structures largely and *deliberately* set on domestic auto-production that characterizes some societies, have been conceived by their founders with the purpose to reinforce and expand their populations through demographic development to which these economic set ups, once they have been followed by adequate social settings based on “gender”, lend themselves admirably.

Such a vision of the founders ( who, given their distrust of money, defined as “devil’s excrement” because of its illusionistic qualities, have given way to the domestic auto-production confining currency to a minimized and functional Market to the auto-production) has proven to be “prophetic”, because the societies based on this concept keep growing as expected, both in absolute and, especially, in relative terms.

In fact, the pathologic race for money and consumption that today afflicts the West that has surrendered to the “Market only” (where Finance governs and growth represents, absurdly, a necessity, otherwise the system will implode), is undermining the societies that are part of it both in terms of *social values* and, as confirmed by demographic growth, their own *existence*.

Fortunately the evolutionary *drift* of the traditional systems towards the “Market only” system is not a necessity, despite what it is still advertised.

And neither is the alternative *drift*, represented by “State only”, despite what it is still advertised, under an alleged scientific mask, in a specific moment in history (the *industrial stage* of the “Market only” drift) characterized by the rise of a potential overturning in the balance of power between capital and labor.

This latter is the only alternative, in terms of *economic structure* to the “Market only” system that has been experimented by the communities that have managed to escape the traditional systems, and whose outcome could have hardly been different from what it was, as it, even though not characterized by an inherent need of growth and for chasing money and consumption, seems inadequate to human nature, at least as how we know it.

Another alternative, in terms of *economic architecture* is, as mentioned, possible anyway, and its placement among the others can be explained by the following *categorization*.

This alternative, lacking the excesses of the “Market only” system despite being still based on the Market (or rather, on a “genetically modified” version of it), is environmentally sustainable.

Moreover, given the *dynamic* nature of its architecture, in the sense that each family can choose the economic area and the Economic Paradigm in which wants to “export” its resources (work and talents) and from which “import” goods and services that it needs, seems appropriate to Man, as it can accompany him during his evolution and on the path towards the fate that, for better or for worse, he will freely choose.

### 3. CATEGORIZATION OF THE ECONOMIC ARCHITECTURES

We have, at this stage, a *classification* of the possible *economic modalities* centered on the fundamental economic Paradigms and their variations that, escaped from the entropy that previously characterized the context, gives our analysis two “families” of economic modalities clearly different from each other and internally homogeneous, despite the look, both in *organizational* terms and in relation to its main *behavioral* traits.

Based on this classification it is possible to represent the different economic system by *crosschecking* the modalities with the different types of goods and services, placing each on a *double entry table* in which cells can be ideally placed specific benefits of the “national production”, a macroeconomic magnitude “similar” to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) even though it is calculated in a different way, characteristic of each system.

Such a way to represent the economic systems, while representing a simple interpretation, definitely rough and a bit cold, will still be, as it will be seen, more useful than other criteria, far more evocative, used in socio-economic literature by historians and other analysts in order to separate the different systems.

That is how the *three* types of *ideal* architectures were outlined (three *stereotypes*, if one prefers) two of which are *extreme* (mono-paradigmatic) that were formed during the *Modern Age*, and an *intermediate* one (bi-paradigmatic) which has maintained a link with *Tradition*.

The first extreme type (3.1.) is centered only on the Heteronomy Paradigm (except for the *collective* services, which are exclusive competence of the public modality of the Autonomy Paradigm).

The second extreme type (3.2.) is centered solely on the Autonomy Paradigm and, almost entirely on the *public* version of larger scale of it.

The intermediate type (3.3.), particularly referring to the production of individual goods and services, rests instead, with variable modalities on the different procedures of the two Paradigms.

The explanation of these *ideal* types of architectures, from which can be traced, despite their apparent differences and complexity, the *real* economic systems (existent, disappeared and potential) allows:

0 To follow the broad outlines of the evolution of the economic systems *created so far* that begun with an *ancestral* form; in proximity of evolution, some of them remain (*static* version), *willing or not*, while others (*dynamic* version) evolved; however, taking a dangerous drift towards the two extreme types, mono-paradigmatic, neither environmentally nor socially sustainable (the latter, type 3.2., has already “imploded” because of the social component); and today they are already part of the extreme type 3.1. or they are really close to it, or they are definitely leading towards it.

1 To define the different types of classification and with them the different national systems to which they correspond best, based on a certain number of significant characteristics, the most important of which is the “Auto-determination”, here intended as “the ability of the single to determine the individual and collective *quality of life*”, which groups all the others with a summary evaluation of “adequacy “of the system to Man and Nature.

2 To present a *new* system of the *dynamic* variant of the intermediate type 3.3., the only one that can subdue science and technology to the will of Man, and capable to combine social and environmental *sustainability* with a certain level of *welfare*. Such a system, that takes back the thread of the bi-paradigmatic Tradition, can be a valid reference to which the vanguards of present generations can look, as a new *pole star* to follow in order to act *first* on an economic level and then on a political one, that aims to reach on a global scale a certain level of welfare that it can be passed on to the next generations.

Through a particular *private* initiative that we will describe later on, and with the help of the already mentioned vanguards, this version can take place in most countries.

3 To identify in which type of Countries development towards this new system can take place without particular issues and in relatively short time. Currently, Countries belonging to this large group are both those whose system has already “degenerated” into the type 3.1. or is very close to it, and those which are still relatively far away from it, including those that are rising from the ruins of the extreme type 3.2. implosion and, with ups and downs, continue the long “degenerative” trek towards the extreme type 3.1.

3.1. As for the Countries with a Traditional static system, the possibility of evolving towards the new system through the diffusion of the auto-productive intermediate Communities concerns in particular those Countries whose system is stuck in poverty and the related social ills, while for those Countries whose system is voluntarily crystalized in an archaic mode, an evolution towards the new system could find some sort of resistance and still take place in a longer time. The latter represents an opportunity of evolution without degenerating, at least at the beginning. "Market only"

In this extreme type, in which we can already find many Countries, are destined to converge, if nothing changes and the environment allows it, both the economic systems that are already leading to it and, although in the long term, the traditional systems currently considered, albeit late, still "developing".

### Structure

All the individual Goods and Needs (including those of public utilities) are *hetero-produced* by subjects of the individual private-industrial sphere, which operate in a competitive environment (or allegedly competitive); with the only exception of a worthless *residual* part of the consumer Goods and Services which are auto-produced in a domestic environment.

It is in the nature of the *collective* Services to be auto-produced by the community itself. However, regarding the public communities, it is an auto-production *not in the strict sense of the word* (as it would be under some form of *direct democracy*), but *spurious*, because it is managed by *intermediaries* represented by subjects of the private-social sphere (politic parties) operating in a competitive environment ("representative" democracies) or temporarily provided by a single subject (collective) that works in a monopolistic environment (different forms of dictatorship) and pursues its own interest (even though it can sometimes be the same as the community: "enlightened" dictatorship).

### Main characteristics:

- 4 "Representative" Democracy/Dictatorship
- 5 High potential corruption



*The dignity of nations*

- 6 Low *real* individual freedom
- 7 High tendency to industrialization
- 8 High Foreign Trade
- 9 Null environmental sustainability (the increase of the private and public consumption is, *contrary* to what logic dictates, aimed to support production... employment is law)
- 10 High involuntary inactivity, admitted voluntary inactivity, high “working poor”
- 11 Minimized welfare
- 12 Low social sustainability (tendency towards revolution that, without any sustainable reference model, adopts the etymologic meaning of “re-evolve” and therefore it would end up being inconclusive and ferocious)
- 13 Not sustainable demography (regression)
- 14 Rejection of gender divisions, but hypocritically practiced.
- 15 Auto-determination reserved to the strongest and null for the others (neo slavery).

3.2. “State only”

*This extreme type (collectivist), which can take place only in rare points of time-space, has been adopted for a short period of time (if measured on the evolutionary scale), in most of the “emerged lands”.*

*Today is basically extinct, probably permanently.*

Structure

Goods and Services of every kind are auto-produced by the public Sector (*spurious* auto-production, particularly in reference to collective services), except only for a small part of consumer Goods and Services that are auto-produced, *in the strict sense of the word*, in a domestic environment.

Main characteristics:

- 16 Apparatus' dictatorship
- 17 High potential corruption
- 18 Null individual freedom
- 19 High tendency to industrialization
- 20 Minimum Foreign Trade
- 21 Environmental sustainability possible only if the system is adopted on a global scale (production for consumption, as logic dictates, but awkwardly planned, due to the large size and with a low response to individual needs)
- 22 Nonexistent involuntary inactivity, voluntary inactivity forbidden, widespread "working poor"
- 23 Generalized welfare
- 24 Low social sustainability (the high potential corruption favors the tendency to implosion since the transfer of property from public to private is easier, contrary to the opposite)
- 25 Sustainable demography
- 26 Gender divisions abolished
- 27 Null auto-determination for everyone

### 3.3. Traditional

*This intermediate type, bi-paradigmatic (meaning that individual Goods and Services are distributed between the two Paradigms), represents the common backbone of those systems still rooted in Tradition. It is organized in two versions.*

*The first that can be called Traditional static type includes both those that have not yet managed to evolve, and those structurally conceived to not evolve.*

*The second can be called Traditional dynamic; first of all it includes those systems that, despite being still based on both Paradigms, are characterized by a "degenerative" dynamic, so called because it escaped to the control of the communities on which they are based, that leads them towards the mono-paradigmatic type. (3.1.)*

*In this second type finds its place a new system that can come from the diffusion of the new economic modalities of the Autonomy Paradigm, innovative and suitable for the*

*time and adaptable to all cultures.*

*This system is characterized by a dynamic that can be called “regenerative”, meaning that, although it is subject to mono-paradigmatic drifts, it is able to “regenerate” and return, thanks to its counterweights, under the control of the community which will determine (even starting from extreme pre-existent situations) the proportion between the roles of the economic modalities of the two Paradigms. And this will be performed in a democratic way, through the daily individual economic behavior in order to combine the individual and common welfare with the social and environmental sustainability. This system, making use of scientific and technological development, heads towards the future overcoming the “mono-paradigmatic “drifts, that enslave Man, and placing him with his habitat at the center.*

### 3.3.1. *Traditional Static System*

#### Structure

Most consumer Goods and Services are auto-produced in a *domestic* environment, while capital goods and production inputs are hetero-produced by private subjects (artisans and small businesses) that work locally and inside a weakly competitive environment. A single Subject that operates in a monopolistic environment supplies the Public utility's Individual services and collective Services.

According to the nature of the subject we can find, inside this static version, a Tribal and a Religious modality, certainly different on a *social* level but also on an economic level (in those Countries with a Tribal modality the production techniques, the most archaic ones, are the source of a scarce productivity and a widespread poverty).

#### 3.3.1.1. *Traditional Static Tribal System*

Main Characteristics:

28 Monarchy/(pseudo) Presidential democracies

- 29 Maximum potential corruption
- 30 Minimum individual freedom
- 31 Slow tendency towards industrialization
- 32 Low Foreign Trade (colonial exploitation, raw materials and labor at a low price versus industrial junk...modern version of “trade mirrors for gold”)
- 33 Environmental sustainability: production is, as logic dictates, aimed to consumption even in an heteronomous environment, but in a different level from one Country to the other
- 34 Involuntary inactivity potentially inexistent (considering not monetized level) voluntary inactivity admitted and practiced, generalized “working poor”
- 35 Inexistent Welfare
- 36 Essential Philanthropy
- 37 Guaranteed social sustainability thanks to the tribal/social link
- 38 Spontaneously expansive demography
- 39 High tendency to gender division
- 40 Auto-determination reserved to the elite at an industrial level, null for everyone on a collective level

### 3.3.1.2. *Traditional Static Religious System*

Main Characteristics:

- 41 Religious dictatorship (theocracy)
- 42 Low potential corruption
- 43 Null individual freedom
- 44 Moderate tendency to industrialization
- 45 Moderate Foreign Trade
- 46 Environmental sustainability: production is, as logic dictates, aimed to consumption even in an heteronomous environment
- 47 Inexistent involuntary inactivity, voluntary inactivity not tolerated, high “working poor”
- 48 Reduced welfare

### *The dignity of nations*

- 49 Reduced Philanthropy
- 50 Forced social sustainability
- 51 *Intentionally* expansive demography (this is the main purpose of religious structure and the economic system, ruled on this, is functional to it)
- 52 Absolut gender division
- 53 Null auto-determination for everyone

### 3.3.2. *Traditional Dynamic System*

#### *Structure*

The auto-production of consumer goods and services is essentially *domestic* in the *dynamic-degenerative* systems, while it is almost *exclusively cooperative* in the (innovative) *dynamic-regenerative* systems.

In the dynamic-degenerative systems the auto-production is limited to restricted narrow range of standard domestic consumption's goods and services and, with its ups and downs, tends to *shrink* giving way to the Market.

On the contrary, in the dynamic-regenerative systems, the auto-production tends to *expand* until it reaches all the *individual* goods and services (including *public utility* services), for which the auto-production, either of *final* or *intermediate* consumption, is *convenient* (including environmental costs).

This *convenience* criterion represents a safe *bank* for a possible "ideological" expansion of the Autonomy confining the advent of an "All Autonomy" system in Utopia.

The *collective* services are auto-produced, in the first case, in a *spurious* way. In the second case, they are auto-produced in *the strict sense of the term* in a Direct democracy (referendum) context by the public Communities related to the different geographic levels, with the widespread direct participation of the citizens.

Everything else (usually the high capital intensity production) is, in both systems, *hetero-produced* by private subjects (business that works with

the *wage* system in the dynamic-degenerative and with a *active* system in the dynamic-regenerative in a competitive environment (Market, also globalized, especially in regards to the means of production).

### 3.3.2.1. *Traditional Degenerative Dynamic System*

Main characteristics

- 54 “Representative” democracies/(pseudo) Presidential democracies/dictatorship
- 55 High potential corruption
- 56 Low individual freedom
- 57 High trend towards industrialization
- 58 High and growing Foreign Trade
- 59 Environmental sustainability ignored or put in second place after the (bad) growth
- 60 High involuntary inactivity, voluntary inactivity allowed, high and growing “working poor”
- 61 Low or inexistent welfare
- 62 Important Philanthropy role
- 63 Guaranteed social sustainability in the former collectivist Countries, variable in the others
- 64 Variable demography according to the different Countries
- 65 Gender division practiced in a variable way
- 66 Auto-determination reserved to the strongest and null for the others

### 3.3.2.2. *Traditional Re-generative Dynamic System*

Expected characteristics:

- 67 Direct democracy, variable modality
- 68 Low potential corruption

*The dignity of nations*

- 69 Maximized individual freedom
- 70 Null tendency to industrialization in the autonomous context and auto-restricted (even inside the participatory system) in the heteronomous context
- 71 Foreign Trade limited to capital goods
- 72 Environmental sustainability: production is, as logic dictates, aimed to consumption even in an heteronomous environment (that concerns only raw materials and capital goods, whose level demand cannot be artificially inflated)
- 73 Inexistent involuntary inactivity (in order to work in Autonomy context it is only necessary to get to work), voluntary inactivity allowed, inexistent working poor
- 74 High welfare
- 75 Weakened Philanthropy
- 76 Guaranteed social sustainability
- 77 Sustainable demography
- 78 Gender division considered taboo
- 79 Generalized auto-determination, both on an industrial and collective level.

#### 4. INTERMEDIATE CONSIDERATIONS

At this point we have a clear and exhaustive classification of the types of economic circuits that can develop in a system they can take shape, depending on their proportions they assume giving rise to different *economic architectures* with specific effects both on a socio-economic and environmental level.

Among the previously outlined architectures, it is clear that the *Traditional re-generative dynamic* system appears to be the one we should keep an eye on. It can develop through the diffusion on the territory of appropriate *intermediate auto-productive communities* that belong to the Autonomy Paradigm. They, wherever they emerge, work as *counterweight* both for the Market and the domestic auto-production, meaning that they offer to the resident families an additional context, complementary to the previous

ones, in which employ their resources and from which obtain part of what they need.

This diffusion is followed, of course in proportion, by *transformations*, in the main cornerstones of the systems in which this dynamic takes place; important transformations both on a structural and functional level: this will be analyzed in detail later.

Even though, the characteristic of the *Traditional re-generative dynamic* system will be clearer only in the course of its realization, it is already possible to catch a glimpse of how environmental sustainability can be achieved through a socio/economic system sufficiently articulated. In this system *everyone*, regardless his/her personality, can find a respectable space and a certain level of welfare, without excess or waste, can be achieved and maintained, allowing everyone to choose freely how much time dedicate to the satisfaction of material, intellectual or spiritual needs.

Until now we have found the entrance to the path we must follow, a path that, as seen, passes through the development of the intermediate type of the Autonomy Paradigm and that will need to be explored and then walked.

And it is already, on closer inspection, a good result, especially if we think that people, in almost its entirety, believe (and the propaganda is well aware of this generalized belief) that it is necessary to do something completely different, namely taking a path, in certain ways, even opposite. In fact, if now we stopped someone randomly on the street and asked them what would be their solution to have any form of hope to avoid the tragic end that otherwise awaits us; there is no doubt, that they would certainly suggest that is the *politics* that has to be changed.

In essence, the idea that the system's *behavior* and its socio-environmental effects are regulated by the architecture of the system itself is so uncommon that it would turn out as a replacement of the people in the "control room" with new representatives of the population, driven by the will to achieve the common good through *policies* able to modify the behavior of the current system.

It is understood that the interlocutor would be tragically wrong.

Not so much because the *hypothetic* success of this political adventure would at best, in throwing a little sand in the operating mechanism,



something that would benefit no one and certainly would not change the system's course, but because, simply, it is very unlikely that any "revolutionary" subject will be able to snatch the whole governance of the system from the establishment only through an election.

And experience alone should be enough to demonstrate this fact, sanctioned, albeit in a cartoonish way, by the expression "if the elections were useful they wouldn't be allowed".

In fact, the establishment by its nature is equipped to keep privileged situations.

On the one hand, by controlling the *Media* that feed the false idea that Democracy (preferable "*representative*", more manageable of the *direct* one) can allow to change *significantly* the Status Quo.

On the other hand, by secretly accumulating huge financial resources (the devil's excrement) destined to corrupt politicians and public administrators in order to maintain (when convenient) a certain immobility.

It is important to say that, in addition to those that see the *political* way as the only hope to safety, there are also others that refuse the "Market only" system because it is obviously leading to the abyss. They dream about a return to the past, to those *Traditional static* economic systems, inciting *individuals* to reduce drastically consumptions and, instead, begin to auto-produce on a domestic level or within improbable semi self-sufficient neo-phalansteries, what they need to survive.

These, even though they have highlighted the deceptive nature of the "political way" that can be called "the large way" because it implies the polarization of the *broad masses*; in reality they suggest to take a *path*, that involves a substantial *individual* transformation ("small way"); an arduous path and objectively not feasible for most people that can be seen, at best, as some sort of individual "shelter".

Paradoxically, those who propose this way in bona fide are actually doing humanity a disservice.

It is not by encouraging people to act like ostriches, hiding their head under the sand in order to escape reality, that we can avoid the tragic end, but, on the contrary by encouraging them to use all the scientific and technological tools of modernity in an "intelligent" dynamic that,

avoiding certain drifts thank to its *counterweights*, leads to achieve a *desirable* and *realistic* goal.

And if the *Traditional re-generative dynamic* system seems to represent this goal, it needs to be implemented without hesitation, at least because, thanks to its *dynamic* nature it can constantly evolve into any system configuration, even extreme ones, as long as it is *desired* by “the consumers that can at any time become producers”, which means everyone and not imposed by a few.

Consider that the *urgency* for a change of course is so high that, as we are facing a dangerous “beast”, threatening as it is *pathologically* hungry for natural resources, that can be represented by the “Global Market only”, it is important to not make mistakes and, in particular try a *useless escape* as ingeniously is suggested by those who dream of a return to the past, or face it with *bare hands*, that is with politics, as it is subtly suggested by the establishment’s propaganda.

What needs to be done, using the same allegory, is injecting “from a distance” in the threatening “beast”, that is without its knowledge and, in any way, independently from its will, a *therapeutic vaccine*, represented by a *particular version* of the intermediate private auto-productive Communities (“in between way”), in order to “cure the beast” from its pathologic hunger so that it can live in peace in an ecosystem reign by biodiversity (outside the allegory, a normalized Market that is ethic and integrated into a balanced economic system with counterweights) and continue to give its *important contribution* to its harmonic balance.

Who thinks that taking the “in between way” means to diminish as much as possible the importance of the Market is tragically wrong.

Besides, as it will be seen later on, the *Heteronomous* Market and Philanthropy’s producers will be the ones to inject the vaccine, offered by a refunded Economic science, inside the system.

The Market in the desired *Traditional re-generative dynamic* system will always have a great importance even though, as we have already mentioned and as we will see later; it will not be the same Market.

In fact, following the arrival of new *counterweights* in the system, its *area of action* will be *directly* changed and, in particular, the *behavior* of its actors, producers and consumers, as a result of an *indirect* effect of these

counterweights that can be considered a proper “genetic mutation”. When this will happen Mankind will be released from the slavery of the economic Paradigms and may indeed, subdue them and use them at best. Only then, Humankind will be able to say that it has abandoned its Prehistory and will finally begin its History.

## 5. A NEW RESEARCH AREA

The Autonomy Paradigm includes, as we have seen, a multiplicity of auto-producer subjects represented by communities that can be distinguished one from the other according to a certain number of characteristics, some of which are macroscopic like the “dimension”, used to distinguish the three main economic modalities of the Paradigm, and the “type of production” and others less striking, but no less important.

In general terms the goal we have set is to recognize the economic procedure of the Autonomy Paradigm and in particular, the version of it, on the one hand, that is able to work, in the most suitable way, as *counterweight* to the Market and, on the other, to represent a valid *alternative* to the *domestic auto-production*.

Therefore, it will be about recognizing the specific procedures both of its macroscopic characteristics and of other characteristics considered pertinent with the purpose of the research.

Among these procedures we will consider, in particular, “working-members quota”, represented by the rate between the number of working-members and the total number of the members, the “auto-production quota”, represented by the rate between production absorbed by demand of the members’ families (endogenous) and the total production, the “ownership of the means of production” and the “monetarization” of the auto-production circuit that, as we will see, will turn out to be particularly significant and perfectly adequate to the purpose.

The entirety of the auto-producing subjects described using these characteristics, including those that had the chance to see the light, can be conceptually represented by the same number of points in the *hyperspace* represented by the whole modality that these characteristics

can adopt.

On a *theoretical level* this represents the new *area of research* in which should evolve the considerations aimed to find the wanted subject.

At first, this conceptual *Cartesian* representation could appear useless and quite artificial.

We decided to use it anyway, as a “periodic table of the chemical elements”, in order to be able to find all the elements without missing any of the more interesting possible “missing elements”.

However, in *practice*, the real research will be focused on a smaller area.

In fact, because the subject will be a counterweight, in addition to the Market, also to the domestic auto-production, all the subjects that include in their coordinates the minimum dimension, which is the family, are automatically excluded from the research.

Moreover, as it happens in this kind of theoretical representation, the points of the whole hyperspace can be represented not only by the “real” subjects, meaning that they actually exist, have existed or could have an economic purpose, but also by other “imaginary” and not credible subjects.

The points that include amongst their coordinates the “intermediate community/tourist services” pair because this service is suitable to the heteronomous production only represent an example.

It is important to say, however, that among the “real” subjects, as aforementioned, and even amongst those *existed*, there are some that with all due respect, we would like to exclude from our research, even though they managed to take place in the reality despite coming from risky ideas.

Among these there are, in particular, those between the coordinates of which appear the couple “public Communities/domestic consumption goods and services”, subjects that History has presumably condemned, probably and hopefully, in a definitive manner.

These simple considerations, that may appear somewhat new, are still useful, considered that the researched subject has to act as a counterweight not only to the Market but also to the domestic auto-production, in order to delete from the “dimension” coordinate the extreme procedures and focus the research on the intermediate auto-

productive Communities.

They are useful to affirm that, for what concerns those subjects with the intermediate auto-productive communities in their coordinates; they will definitely have to *exclude* in relation to the coordinate “type of production”, all the goods and services that, even though are still part of the current domestic consumption, are typical of the heteronomous production.

In short, the research will end up to be focused on the auto-productive Communities that are characterized by an *intermediate* “dimension” and by a “type of production” represented by *current domestic consumption goods and services* compatible with the *small scale* production.

The points that include, in their coordinates, this pair, represent a group that as a whole is “notorious for its conspicuous absence” in all the economic systems that have taken place so far (generally not attractive and some, mono-paradigmatic, even dangerous and should be avoided at all cost) in the whole set identified thanks to the interpretation previously mentioned (the double entry table obtained by crosschecking the different economic modalities of the two Paradigms with the different types of goods and services) which, once spotted this *anomaly* proves its usefulness.

And this is enough to motivate the present research, in this group, of the missing subject that could prove to be “decisive”.

In fact, this group will reveal the “crux of the matter” capable of leading, in different stages, to the advent of the *Traditional re-generative dynamic* system.

Afterwards, after having identified the new variation of the economic mode of the Autonomy composed by the intermediate Communities, we will analyze the likely causes of its “non-birth”, in order to identify the solutions which better suit to their overcoming.

Basically, these solutions will turn into the presence of an external figure of the Heteronomy (Realizer).

The following step will consist in examining the strength and weakness points that are characteristic of the new economic subject, in order to calculate its chance of success as counterweight to the Market and to the domestic self-production.

5.1. *If such a theoretical comparison will have success, whoever wants to assume the role of Realizer will for sure rise above the others. This Realizer includes a part of the Philanthropy, but also a part of the Market, which, through a private initiative will start off a gradual experimentation in order to guarantee itself, in the likely case in which the expected results are confirmed, a competitive advantage in the attractivity spreading of the subject on the territory. In this dynamic, its Philantropical component will take place in order to pursue its “mission” and its component, which belongs to the Market, will find its appropriate remuneration. Procedure for the identification of the subject*

A preliminary and fundamental step of the introduction of the procedure in question consists of elucidating a new concept which we will name *attractivity*. It will be necessary to compare all the subjects examined.

#### 5.1.1. *The concept of attractivity*

It is an *new* concept which is essential when comparing the several *economic circuits* of self - production, which are not considered by the economic orthodoxy that, on the contrary, avoid them with the aim of identifying that one which seems to have more chances of success in its function, depending on the Countries, acting as counterweight for the Market or either in a complementary or in an alternative way to the domestic self – production.

The subject in question, therefore, holds a key role, and for this reason this meaning requires a definition, however brief, and furthermore a comment on its denomination.

Starting with the definition, we can say that an economic circuit of self – production is as much “attractive” as it represents a context, where, whomever looks for a job and/or goods and services which have been produced respecting both human and environmental health, can “export” labor and talents and/or “import” goods and services. These goods and services are required in an easier and more reasonable way compared to self-production frameworks, which are characterized by a similar production.

As regards its denomination it is clear that, in order to establish an

economic relationship with a completely self-producing subject, whether an “import”, “export” or “import-export” relationship, it is necessary to take part as a shareholder and therefore the epithet of attractivity refers to the capability of the subject to “proselytize”, that is to attract potential members

## 5.2. *The path*

The path of individuation of the economic subjects; in this case the intermediate self-producing Community, who are potentially more attractive amongst the ones who are “realistic and missed”, represents, the first aforementioned of three phases, which can be assimilated to their “conception”.

As inevitably, it happens in an artificial way since the natural and spontaneous seems not to take place.

Realistically it consists in specifying for each of the six main characteristics, the most dominant ones, of the trial subjects (“dimension”, “production type”, “shareholder quota”, “self-production quota”, “means of production entitlement” and “monetization”), the appropriate modality in order to obtain the “sextuple” (in six-dimensional point of space which has the aforementioned characteristics as coordinated) potentially more attractive.

- The macroscopic coordinate, even though it is not the most appropriate to be taken into consideration first, being formed by “the dimension”, is an intermediate Community, the theoretical range of the number of families which form it goes, extremely outlining, from 2 to  $N-1$ , where  $N$  represents the numerosness of the great Community, of the lowest administration level (we can say the town council or the municipality), which involves it.

However, looking closer at the difficulties related to the birth and management of a self-producing Community, they proportionally increase in relation to the number of families which they are comprised

of. When this number increases, even the potential profits of the possible economy of scale also increases, and it follows that the intermediate Communities which, at first glance, seem to have more application, are those characterized by a “dimension”, and are far removed from both extremes, which will approximately be around one hundred.

The number of families which will form the subject, or the limited number of the research subjects, will come into focus during the analysis of the other characteristics; in particular, the “production type” and the “self – production quote”, as these are somehow interconnected.

In any event, it will be precisely identified in the planning phase of the first of the experimental subjects, in addition to being confirmed by the subsequent experimentations.

In a preliminary approximation, and also to give some concrete examples, we may consider that the families number roughly 300; describing this community as the size of a “small town”. A “virtual” small town (as the family dwellings which form it, even though located in close vicinity to each other, do not form a unit which is territorially homogeneous and circumscribed, such as a real small town, but, are instead casually scattered in a wider territorial context), which we may even call “virtuous” (as it is characterized by full and permanent activity due to its construction, and, by its nature, by a potentially low environmental impact) as well as being provided with a certain amount of “resilience” in case of sudden mutation in social and economic circumstances (thanks to a certain amount of autonomy with reference to basic goods and services produced in its “small business area”, which is later outlined).

- Now, considering the second characteristic, which is also macroscopic, and which is characterized by the “product type,” we can see that the activities, which are either individually or jointly considered, and their combinations, could theoretically form a huge variety in an intermediate self – producing community.

Obviously, since it is about identifying a self–producing subject, the activities, which seem to be most appropriate at least at this stage, are those which are related to the goods and services of final consumption and current family use, which are typically assigned to the families of



the members also including those who are compatible with small scale production and with a higher labor intensity.

In other words, we have to exclude, for instance typically “heteronomous” activities such as artistic craft and tourism services, which find better placement in the Market, or the maintenance of public parks, which can find their position in the self-production of Big, public or private, communities.

The appropriate activities, which we have already mentioned, are currently placed with different proportions depending on the Countries concerned, in order of domestic self-production, where they do not always benefit from specific competences, and where they can’t however benefit from the economy of scale. These appropriate activities can also be placed in the Market with a craft, or even in an industrial setting i.e. within the Heteronym where the quality is hardly verifiable and the environmental sustainability, with special reference to the industrial productions, is by no means guaranteed.

Such activities and their associated combinations are therefore susceptible of finding a more appropriate collocation in the self-production of the intermediate community; a field which could better summarize the positive specificities of the alternative fields we have mentioned, and, being at the same time exempt from their main disadvantages.

It must be said that we can come to such an obvious conclusion only through a path of artificial conception, which is rarely conducted, and never in an appropriate way. This is the reason why the aforementioned conclusion has not found its confirmation yet, so that the intermediate self-communities have always been hinged on single and particular activities (i.e. social security and financial activities).

Moving on, particularly concerning the number of such activities, we need to observe that, with reference to the attractivity which forms the guidelines of the path, a self-producing community in order to answer in an appropriate way to the “public” who exclusively indicates a question of the safeguard of the human and environmental health, i.e. the potential no working members, has to be characterized by a relatively wide range of products. This choice not only makes the spending straightforward, but above all allows the lowering of the numerator of the ratio: “purchase

price (consisting of the purchase cost)/ ascertainable quality and environmental respect” testbed of LDL towards of the above mentioned “people”.

Stating in advance what we will later discuss when examining the genetic strengths of the LDL; one of the ways to reduce production costs is to make use of a peculiarity in the self- production field, which requires a wide range of production, consisting in the tendency of working-members to the internal mobility amongst the several production units. This tendency permits the optimization of labor use, adjusting to specific needs of the production process as well as any possible demand fluctuations.

A second method to lower production costs resides in the possibility, even though it is a remote chance, that the working-members involved in a certain production unit may accept, if there is need, a reduction in their hourly remuneration (such as through the introduction of a limited amount of unpaid overtime), to the extent that the working-members who are involved in other production units will do the same, so that the nominal restriction in the hourly remuneration will be offset in terms of internal purchasing power. This is as real as the production range of the self – producing community (and even the spending potential volume for the working-members’ families) is greater.

Therefore a wide range of production assists in making the offer attractive in comparison to the potential number of non-working members, “vestals” of the environmental safeguard and subsequently to distract their attention away from the Market offer which they can analyse, being already solvent.

With the restrictions given to the first two characteristics; the hyperspace area, which contains susceptible points of giving to the self-producing Community, has a certain level of attractivity, although this seems to be considerably reduced.

Obviously, when we gradually proceed with the path; when more adequate procedures of other co-ordinates will be progressively clarified, the number of points in the hyperspace corresponding to the self-producing Communities, which are potentially more attractive, will be further reduced in a drastic way; which will further bring into focus the

appearances of the subject in question.

It is more likely then, that at the end of the path, a limited totality of subjects emerges, which brings to mind the work of the stonemason, who, after removing the excess stone with deep cuts, finishes at the planned “sketch” of the desired sculpture. These subjects are clearly preferred over others in terms of attractiveness, and they distinguish themselves due only to slight differences i.e. (“dimension”, “production type”, “working-members quota” or “self production quota”) and, at any rate, they are without any significant effect in terms of guidelines we have adopted so far.

This whole topic can be integrated within the central unique subject, which is a reference to the economic method taken from the “golden ratio.” Originating from that, the concrete realizations and adaptations to local conditions will provide the concrete model.

-Regarding the “ownership of means of production”, it is clear that the intermediate self-producing Community, which is the subject of the research; having maximum expansion capacity due to the huge demand potential that needs met, will be required to operate in an equipped space owned by a third party, be that a private or public one, and should pay a fair rent to utilise it.

Referring to the hyperspace area, which is the place of the equivalent point to the self-producing community, potentially more attractive, this choice represents an obvious restriction, due to the self-producing Communities’ owning the means of production, or possessing in any capacity the free chance to these means, would have an almost nothing probability of birth, with all due respect to the attractiveness.

This characteristic has already been taken into consideration as it gives a clue for some approximation regarding the rent level.

In particular, for increasing demand, it is preferable that this rent is compatible with an investment realized on a wholly credited basis, meaning that the rent will have to be equivalent to the reimbursement instalments of the hypothetical credit on the basis of the required investments, for the realization of the equipped productive space. Considering the possible loss, extremely reduced or invalid, of investments, due to the absence of risk of “company mortality”, characterized by the renting self-producing

community, the economic return would mobilize both public and private investors together with the credit system, in order to sufficiently supply the demand of productive spaces, going along with the start, and giving strength to the expanding dynamic of the intermediate self-producing Communities located on the territory.

-Referring to the “monetization” of the self – production circuit when it enters into force, implies that the working-members are paid according to the work completed, and using universal money (which has circulation in the system) in which, even the acquisition price for the goods and services produced are shown. In other words, “monetization” expresses the pragmatic principle “from everyone according to one’s will and to everyone according to one’s merit”.

Such a principle is far distinguished from the ideal one, which is more commonly known as “from everyone according their abilities, to everyone according to their needs”. This theory carries more weight than the previous one, and is necessarily in applying to the domestic self-production, but it can be enacted, from necessity and/or from ideological reasons, even occurring in specific intermediate Communities, which we will later discuss.

As regards the members within the intermediate self-production Communities who are unquestionable associated, at least via individual interest, the adoption of the pragmatic principle, which is based on personal responsibility and transparency, becomes obviously necessary to its operation and attractivity, since it removes any possible parasitic behavior at the root.

-Moving on to the “self-production quote”, as expressed by the portion of the total production of the self-productive community which is assimilated from the demand (endogenic); this demand is indicated from the member’s families, be they working-members or not.

We notice, firstly, that this theoretical range compromises, by definition, from 100% to a minimum of 50%; recognizing that a value lower than 50% would place the “(self) productive” community into the Heteronomy, at least because of the current accounting convention.

It's a matter of understand why such a quote is of 100% (full self-production), that means to avoid, in a formal way the recourse to the demand (external), expressed by third families who are located in the area, a choice that is subject to reduce not only the tax duties but also different ones, which are imposed by the public Administration to the Market companies (most of them due to the conflict of interest between producers and consumers which is in use in this field to cover the latter) and which are valid for all the producers who sell to a third party.

For this purpose, we need to observe, from one side, that turning to this third party should basically contribute to cover the monetary outflow of the self-productive Community, in addition to being more unstable (this doesn't help the production planning, a factor the self-producing Community can count on, as we can see by examining its strong points). This third party is, by nature, more demanding in terms of purchase price in comparison with the members' families because it does not have, unlike these ones, all the information about the products quality and about their manufacturing process. We have also to consider that in the awaited case of the widespread circulation of the self-productive community, such a third party would gradually decrease, until it disappears because it's worth for everyone to be a member, at least a non-working member, of a self-productive community, just to arrange at the same price some information on the products quality in addition to the possibility to affect, as member, on their type and quality. To be sure that the production-consumption chain continues to exist (this contributes, aforementioned, to moderate the rent cost making the investment more sure in the creation of the production spaces), it is advisable to stare only at the demand expressed by the members' families, whose structure, can perfectly be adapted to the needs operating on the "non-working members" part.

Now, let's consider the last characteristic of the intermediate Community, the "working members quote" (WMQ), that gives a picture of the company structure with reference to the employment issue.

Before getting into considerations aimed at identifying the most adequate value for this parameter, it is better to adopt some *conventions* which allow to make the exposition better, however, without affecting the

general validity of the considerations themselves.

These conventions, very restrictive, will be then loosed when our considerations will concern situations which are closer to the reality.

The first one consists in supposing that the company structure is clearly halved in *working members*, all working full time despite the several working modalities in such context, and *non-working members*, all completely extraneous to the self- production activities.

Secondly we'll suppose that *all* the families, that are represented by the two member typologies, selected by the Realizer in the Community composition stage involve *two* persons in working age, *only one* of them being a working member, and that all family members who are not involved in self-production are busy in the monetized field of the system and all have an income.

In the considerations which we will make further below, we will add to the WMQ a second parameter consisting in "the Manpower Quote committed to self-production" (MPQ), which is calculated as ratio between the *sum* of the amounts of work done by the single families in the self-production activities in comparison with the *total* of the Community manpower.

Until the conventions previously adopted will be in force, this parameter will correspond to the half of the WMQ with reference to the Community, while at single families' level it will assume a *zero* value in the non-working members' families and a value of 50% in the working members' families. However, in the presence of employment situations *other* than the ones supposed for the working members, in other words, extending this definition even to those who work *part time*, a practice most likely common in the reality, the MPO works better than the WMQ in quantifying the Community commitment in the self-production activity and, particularly, can assume values much lower than the half of the WMQ. This means, for example, that in case all members were working members, and everyone worked part time, to a 100% WMQ would correspond a 25% MPO.

It has, therefore, a more operational characteristic than the WMQ and, in particular, can be a point of reference for the Realizer in the composition of the Community and in its development.

Having specified this point and going back to the WMQ, a parameter which we'll keep considering as it is more immediately perceived, we

observe that its range could, *theoretically*, run from 0% to 100%.

As regards the *maximum* level of the theoretical value, we can say that such an extreme percentage is only reachable in some extraordinary cases.

Without going deeper into the several typologies of extreme Communities, from this point of view we'll confine ourselves to mention the most common cases which came out in the past, some of which still stay on, while others, which have disappeared, are sometimes re-proposed as "shelter" and "survival" formulas.

These are particular Communities, theoretically devoted to *autocracy*, for sure not exercised for economic reason, because of its *anti-economic* nature, but driven by *necessity*, (i.e. kibbutz of the origins, medieval monasteries) or for ideological reasons (anarchistic communities, new phalansteries). Actually, in these Communities, where not only the WMQ but even the MPQ is equal to 100% (since "the participation of everyone to the productive activities, according to one's *abilities*" is the rule, or better still the first half of the rule, as it is completed by "the distribution of wealth produced according to everyone's *needs*"), it's difficult even only to imagine the existence of the *non-working* member.

Anyhow, in order to be born and to survive, these Communities, where the consumptions are reduced to the essential, must a) enjoy "free" use of the equipped productive spaces they need (as well as of the *lodgings*, as they are residential communities), and b) to have available, at Community level, an *external-source* income (coming from *sales* or *donations*) being at least enough to face up to the remaining current spending necessary for the operation of the self-production circuit (acquisition of inputs that can't be self-produced).

It's clear that, for these reasons *too*, these kinds of Communities, even though realizable and realized (in particular places, ages and social contexts) are far from being our ideal solution (almost devoid of "*attractivity*"). And more: the new phalansteries, which today come up again as the *only* way to be followed for those who refuse the "All-Market" lifestyle, turn into a "perfect propaganda instrument" for the establishment and its followers who, in order to maintain the *status quo*, often let such proposals be aired by the media in order to show the "only" possible alternative like a bugbear.

Now it may be interesting, to enlighten the character of the *intermediate* community which is the theme of this research, to examine an extremely frequent typology of “*small communities*”, being made of almost all the self-productive *families* (which we suppose made up of two persons too, and in working age), included in economic systems of a *Traditional static* type. In such a family the net income corresponding to a single externally employed member is enough to face the acquisition of the inputs required by the domestic self-production, as well as the remaining family spending (non- self-produced consumption goods and services, taxes and other burdens), which means that the other member can be systematically devoted to self- production.

Such a “*small community*” is, therefore, characterized by a WMO (to say so) equal to 50% and (considering that, in this case, the working “member” as well as the non-working “member” refer to the same family) and by a MPO also equal to 50% (both *halved* in comparison to the extreme intermediate communities mentioned above), and through such a configuration of these parameters it can not only feed the self-production circuit, but in most cases also extend its purchases to a certain number of consumption goods and services which are not self-produced, thus ensuring, at least in Countries where the general context is more favourable, a life level sufficient to make the domestic self-production practicable and widely expanded - and this *without any other* external money contribution. The above examples show (and this is also clear on an intuitive level) that a self-productive Community has a specific interest, in terms of *life standard* of the families composing it, in keeping itself clear from autocracy and in participating in a suitable way to the exchange with the Market or, anyway, with the money framework of the system.

The researched Community is conceived along this line, or better, the amount of these exchanges will have to be such as to make it sufficiently *attractive* amongst the broadest strata of the population or even among its near-totality, as it is only in this way that the *Traditional Regenerative Dynamic* system can shape up, which is in everyone’s best interest.

However, exchanges like these will be carried out in a particular way, as the outflow of money from the Community, which in turn corresponds to the external acquisition of goods and services, even if important, is not



fed by any monetary inflow (as the production is wholly assimilated by the endogenous demand) and the required monetary quantity corresponding to it is assimilated from the outside via “osmosis” through the individual Community families, in particular those of the *non-working members*.

This is what occurs within the self-productive Family, which is the smallest economic modality of the Autonomy Paradigm, and is itself characterized by an “endogenous demand quota” equal to 100%.

Returning to our self-productive Community (considered, on a strictly economic level, as a *large family* destined to be included in a *Traditional Regenerative Dynamic* system, and therefore widely integrated in the Market); even if we set, at a planning stage, a WMO level *equal* to that of the “*small family community*” included in a *Traditional Static System* (which can occur, as in the case in point, by adding to the working members’ families the same number of non-working members’ families, thus leading to an MPQ level of 25%, which is half in comparison to the above-mentioned family), such a choice appears anyway inadequate.

And this not only considering the spending habits of the single families composing it, that will always be characterized by a range of consumptions far beyond that which can be the subject of self-production (even though *collective* and therefore much *wider* than that of *domestic* self-production) and that must therefore set aside an adequate amount of their monetary income for purchases within the money system context but, above all, for the *functioning* of the self-productive circuit itself.

As concerns this latter point, in fact, we need to observe that contrary to what occurs in the aforementioned “economically” extreme communities, and in the domestic self-production depicted in the above mentioned model, - fields where only goods and services included in the production (raw materials and the repairing of some machinery) have an external origin, and therefore require the use of money for their purchase - the production activities in the self-productive Communities take place, as we have said, in equipped spaces owned by *third parties*, the use of which implies the payment of a rent, and, moreover, they are carried out in a *formal* way, which requires, referring to the job factor, the payment of the equivalent fiscal and social *burdens*.

Considering this, it is clear that the researched self-productive Community, at the base of a Traditional Regenerative Dynamic system, given its unavoidable, and notable, money outgoings, cannot even commit 25% of its whole manpower to the self-production, as the production volume generated could unlikely be used up by the members' families.

Let's suppose that the working members' families can spend all the income they receive to purchase self-produced goods and services: even in this case we can unlikely imagine that the non-working members' families, in the same number of the previous ones, can cover with their purchases all the mandatory money expenditures which the self-productive activity imposes.

The *non-working members*, which will have to support in the company structure the *working members* that are indispensable to produce the goods and services in the selected production range, will most likely have to outnumber these latter in order to keep respectively the WMQ and the MPQ under 50% and 25%, which we consider maximum "reasonable" values.

It's true, as mentioned before, that *in practice* the MPQ related to the single members' families can assume widely different values compared to the "extreme" ones we have conventionally chosen to make the presentation easier (equal to 50% in the working members' families and *zero* in the non-working members' families), which, dissociating the two parameters, could notably increase the WMQ, making it rise (presuming the MPQ level is the same, even to 100%, thus facilitating the production absorption. However, such a self-productive Community, limiting its target to families that are characterized by an excessively reduced level of involuntary inactivity, would loose much of its "attractivity" and employment capacity, reducing its positive impact on the system.

So let's take for granted, even though in the practice the partial work can be widely adopted, that the self-productive Community will be anyway characterized by a substantial presence of full-time working members.

Let's also take for granted the presence of a consistent number of *non-working* members and their families, already totally involved in the monetary context, the main function of which, consisting in purchasing goods and services produced by the self-productive Community they

belong to, is essential, as on the one side it assures the operation of the self-productive circuit, and on the other it allows the *full time* performance of a high number of “working members”, thus increasing the “attractivity” of the self-productive Community among the families characterized by members in search of a full time job, and as such included in the “unemployment” statistics.

This said, in the following considerations we will stick to the aforementioned conventions as concerns working times.

Having examined the subjects that push down the WMQ and MPQ *limits* of the researched intermediate self-productive Community, let’s now analyze the area related to the *lower* threshold, in order to gain a general overview – under this perspective - of the possible self-productive Communities of this type.

Starting with the *minimum* level of the *theoretical* value, represented by 0%, this is, even though *possible*, clearly inadequate for the target of this research.

Actually it’s quite unrealistic to suppose that a worker employed in a self-productive Community can’t belong to it as a member, as this represents the necessary condition for his family to have access, like those of the other (non working) members, to the goods and services produced with his contribution.

We can reasonably consider that in the researched self-productive Community the workers are *all* working members, and therefore the minimum WMQ is higher than 0%.

Having cleared the point concerning the extreme value of the minimum theoretical threshold, the scenario of which has been mentioned only because it is *possible*, let’s now direct our reflection to the *absolute* number of working members; this is appropriate in view of a realistic quantification of a such “macroscopic” characteristic of the self-productive Community, keeping the previous considerations in mind and on the basis of what we have specified referring to the other (already considered) characteristics. Actually, if we consider, to start, the production of a *single* good (e.g. bread) or service (e.g. hairdresser), we can suppose that the number of employed *working members* is equal to the amount of *workers* characterizing a small Market company devoted to the same productive activity, which,

having the residents of a small *real* village as its customers, uses means of production of the *craftsmanship* type, and on a small scale, such as those used by an intermediate self-productive Community with dimensions equivalent to a similar, even though *virtual*, village (meaning that it's lacking the house contiguity of the families composing it, which are obviously quite *real*).

Considering however that the expected production *range* in the intermediate self-productive Communities includes, as previously seen, a *large part* of the goods and services of ordinary domestic consumption compatible with a small scale production, the *absolute* number of working members, basically *defined* by the extent of such a range, will be quite *high* (more or less the number of employees of a *big* Market company, despite the amount of customers being relatively low as compared with the latter).

It's obviously difficult, at this stage, to exactly determine, the production range, an aspect which, due to the technical aspects involved, typically belongs to the experimental stage.

All the more so that even at that stage, considering the *gradual* character of its implementation, that starts with the launch of a production unit (a first germ of the self-productive community, formed by a couple of working members and around hundred non-working members) and lets the following unit come up when the first one is running regularly, the *more appropriate* production range (and relevant number of working members) will be established only *at the* end of the experimentation, when even the most appropriate amount of non-working members will be identified.

At this stage, therefore, only theoretical speculations are possible which, however, allow us to outline a possible scenario.

Let's suppose, for example, that the *definitive* production range considered *more appropriate* involves about *fifty* production units (bakery, dairy farm etc.) and services (hairdresser, car-repair shop etc.) which employ *on average* (with the understandable differences, even important ones, depending on the activities) a couple of full-time "working members" each.

This would cause *hundreds* of working members coming from *as many* families of the "virtual Village" which includes, in addition to these ones,

a *certain number* of families lacking in unintentionally inactive members, each one represented by a *non-working* member. We will find to specify this number in order to have an evaluation of the whole company structure and therefore of the researched WMQ.

In order to conduct such an exercise it is better first to quantify the value of the *global production*. This quantification allows us at a later stage to outline alternative scenarios in order to locate the most probable situation, through hypothesis on the side of this production that both types of members' families could be asked to absorb.

At this point, if we *conventionally* fix the working-member's monthly net remuneration equal to 1.000 Euro, and therefore a quantity of money which is distributed monthly amounts to 100.000 Euro, and if we then hypothesize that this quantity of money, constitutes, to use round figure, about *half* of the full production costs; we could arrive at the total amount of the production, estimated through the costs as designated to the communities' families, who can purchase it at such "acquisition prices" (among particular *plafond* having the aim of equally distributing the purchasing advantage), and this would be about 200.000 Euro.

Having specified this, we now must explore, in terms of MPQ, the zone in which this parameter is more likely to be located. Furthermore, taking the MPQ into consideration, which has a 'reasonable' upper limit of 50%, it is better to start from this limit level in order to highlight the possible difficulties connected to it; essentially, in terms of absorbing the production, in order to move, by lowering this level; to other more practicable scenarios to converge to the most suitable one.

Let's imagine therefore, that the global production, which has been previously quantified as 200.000 Euros, is destined to be absorbed, in the first limited scenario as aforementioned, by a community which is composed by 100 families of working-members, amalgamated with other 100 families of non-working members, with an average purchasing power of 1000 Euros per family.

Such a scenario envisages therefore a uniform and effective monthly purchasing power per family aligned to a purchasing *plafond*, as predicted by the management scheme, which is thought of as *unique*, and related to the monthly net remuneration of a full time working-member (fixed

plafond, in particular, at a slightly superior level to this one, in order to minimize the waste, which comes from an excessive unsold production even without accentuating possible shortages.)

For this reason we underline, where it is useful to do so, that in the context of the matter, a *shortage* is preferable to production *excess* that causes waste, and consequentially increases costs, as in the *Traditional Regenerative Dynamic* system, which takes its form in the spreading of such self – productive Communities, the families are far removed from being forced to *autarky*, and in the procurement of goods and services collectively self-produced, represents, even though fundamental, a simple opportunity.

This first scenario implies however, for the working-members' families, above all for that ones less well-to-do, an obligation which could be judged too urgent considering that to contribute to the complete absorption of the production and thereby to the efficient operation of the self – productive circuit (in order to assure the work of their own members and related income. The net remuneration which each working – member earns should generally be spent in its entirety in order to acquire self-productive goods and services by the Community (this would be the same as saying the remuneration in 'internal money' that is in 'vouchers', losing some of its 'attractivity' coming from the monetization and consequent fungibility of the family income).

It is clear that, in this first scenario, a suitable system of variable plafond depending on the needs and the purchasing capacity of families, could allow an easier absorption of the global production, through a differential amount of potential purchase and a consequent loosening of the aforementioned obligations for the well – off families.

Referring to all of the working – members families, if this would translate into a complete and effective purchase slightly *lower than half* of the production, it would mean, in the present scenario, to depend too much upon the family purchases of the non – working members for the absorption of the entire production. The non – working members' families even though having a noted interest in purchasing self – productive goods and services, can however look at the offers in the local market without any occupational hesitation and without any difficulties, being

already completely solvent.

In summary, the present scenario predicts a 50% WMO which is equal to that of the aforementioned self – productive family of the *Traditional static* economic system, and a 25% MPQ which, even being equal to *half* of that of such a family is too high given the most important monetary needs which are characterised by either the typical-family belonging to a *Traditional regenerative dynamic* system, or by the self-production circuit which is activated by the self – productive Community which are identifying here. This scenario, therefore, seems unrealistic as the hypothesized number of *non-working* members could be too *small* when put to the test.

Bringing down the “working-members quote”, we can now imagine, always schematizing, and using round figures to make the exposition easier, a second scenario intentionally excessive, in the opposite way in order to define the WMO range in a more adequate way, in which the 100 working-members’ families collaborate with 300 *non-working* members’ families, bringing the “virtual Village” to 400 families which could absorb the total production with a purchase of 500 Euro per family (always in the hypothetical case of purchases which are basically equidistributed and aligned to a unique plafond referred to the *half* of the monthly net remuneration of the working-members).

It is clear that this second scenario, once it has been provided of an appropriate system of *variable* plafonds, could guarantee to the working-members’ families, in a more smoothly way than the other one, both the possibility to fully benefit by the purchasing profit in the self-productive community (this profit obviously helps and it will be present), and a larger purchasing “freedom” for the remuneration of the working-member in case of need, given the presence of a more considerable potential demand, related to the several families of the non-working members to mobilize if necessary adapting, as a result, in real time, the equivalent purchasing plafond in order to guarantee the absorption of the entire production.

We have to consider that, if the mentioned plafond scheme hypothetically led to a global purchase for the 100 families of the working-members about 80.000 Euro, the remaining production at disposal for the 300



non-working members' families could be considered insufficient by the families themselves, allowing on an average a monthly purchase of only 400 Euro per family, that is the half in comparison to that one given to the "working-members" families.

In this scenario, which seems inadequate for the presence of *too many non-working* members, a precious resource which the Realizer doesn't want to waste, gives together with the previous one, a realistic idea of the WMQ and MPQ range, that in this last case would respectively be equal to 25% and 12,5% and would seem the lower "reasonable" limit-values of these parameters (above all considering the importance that the productive range of the researched self-productive Community could assume in the medium family consumption susceptible of characterizing the *Traditional regenerative dynamic* system).

If the previous hypothesis are close enough to the reality, on the basis of the consideration so far led, we can think, in a more realistic scenario, that the WMQ and MPQ levels are located in intermediate positions in comparison with that ones which correspond to the two scenarios aforementioned delineated.

Referring to the characteristics at issue, the conclusion we can draw is that the number of *non-working* members is a *subsidiary* variable which will be therefore weighed, case by case, deriving from the list of the "aspiring" members, in order to create, together with an adequate system of purchasing plafond, which can be modulated by productive sector in addition to the members typologies, the desired functioning conditions. They will be the prevalent conditions on the intervention territory to suggest the Realizer, each time, the WMQ and the MPQ as well as the more opportune associated plafond system which, however, will originate by the first realizations and which won't be much different from a realization to another one, at least referring to that ones which are under the same Realizer and a given territory.

Speaking of MPQ we have to underline that, once it has been quantified on the basis of the first experimentations, it seems to give an idea of the employment capability of the self-productive Community at issue. In the same way as the self-productive family which, in the Countries with a *Traditional static* system uses the 50% of its workforce of a such



“small community”, can absorb, considering its general spreading (in a spontaneous way or not), the *half* of the national workforce (the female part in the case in point).

In other words, a Big community (a Municipality, a Nation) characterized by an involuntary activity distributed in a sufficiently uniform way on the territory and whose level had a similar value of that one of the WMO which the experimentation identifies referring to the self-productive Community located in the same territory, it would be *theoretically* able to absorb it completely, spreading in the *whole community* an equivalent number of *intermediate self-productive Communities* such as that one which we have located.

This can take place only if this economic modality (which is not imposed unlike the domestic self-production in some countries with a Traditional static system) has a sufficient level of “attractivity” towards the whole population, which it is not expected at all.

We have to consider, however, that as the possible spreading of the self-productive Community at issue takes place, it is susceptible of modifying in some way all its characteristics and so its effects, considering its impact on the system. Therefore, all its employment effects have to be evaluated through an in-depth consideration. This consideration will be led later on and it can cause optimism.

We will see, therefore, that the spreading of this economic mode, won't necessary extend to the entire population, as it will cause effects on the system. These look like the situation of fully permanent activity within local Communities (National and Municipal ones) which are also characterized by relatively high inactivity involuntary levels, and much higher to that ones related to the minimum MPQ which we have mentioned.

Even referring to the WMO, which is the last characteristic examined in the identification of the researched self-productive Community, it will be so the experimentation to calculate it in a precise way and with it, the associated MPQ.

However, considering that we can have, from now, even referring to these two parameters, a first idea about the feature of the researched Community can be useful for the potential Realizers, so that they can

avoid to imagine unrealistic and unlikely viable situations. This was the only aim of the previous, boring considerations.

#### 6. COMMENTS ON THE “ROUGH MANUFACTURING”

We are aware that the first impression that we can get from the previous considerations, according to them the variance of the intermediate self-productive Communities considered more “attractive” can be engraved in *arbitrary*, is that they seem to be in the Utopia.

We have to consider, however, that in the course of History, other intermediate self-productive Communities, maybe aside from the “anarchical” communities, emerged after a similar procedure, meaning that they were first theoretically conceived, at least in the essential features, and then experimented and widespread.

It was, for example, the case of the first Medieval Monasteries and of the first Kibbutz, semi-autarkic communities which, out of *need*, considering their function of defense of the territory, where the reduction to the basic consumptions and the production range has been the main planning guideline of the Founders. An extremely simple organization that led, however, to success.

It was also the case of the nineteenth-century Phalansteries, whose ambitious function was to leap to the society model, whose organization has been so *detailed*, to turn in some cases into delirium, contrary to what happened to the aforementioned communities.

Considering that this last theoretical considerations have been based on erroneous hypothesis, concerning especially the human being and related behaviors and not answering, therefore, to a real question, had no repercussions.

The intermediate self-productive Community of the matter, being as a counterbalance for the Market, with particular reference to the goods and service of basic needs, where the quality is essential, and as alternative more “attractive” than the family self-production. It simply aspires, and this is not quite, to start a quality and quantity consolidation, of the other economic “half of the side” constituted by the Autonomy Paradigm,

the Yin component of the system, in order to have a readjustment of the system itself as a whole in the several Countries, nowadays everyone unbalanced in some way and, for this reason, suffering from social problems which rest on their present and/or from environmental problems which undermine their future and, unintentionally the derived science and technology, that one of the entire humanity.

In this case the planning of the intermediate self-productive Community, which is an economic modality called on starting the metamorphosis off, has chosen as guideline the “*attractivity*” of the Community itself towards two important social “audiences” at the basis of a very real demand of income from labour and/or safeguard of human health and of the environment (which could be joined, later on, by families who belong to a third “audience”. This includes families without an involuntary inactivity that, free from prejudices against the self-production, could be “attracted” whether to get products, for mere economic convenience or to work in the spare time or in the *freed* time (leaving even partially, a non-satisfactory activity in the monetized field and in the domestic self-production).

As we have seen, it has been conducted, by *eliminating* the less adequate modalities, related to six characteristics that are considered essential, *outlining* the profile of the researched subject, but keeping the final identification of the *sextuple* (the finish touch of the *rough manufacturing*) against the experimentation.

At this stage, the maximum planning of the intermediate self-productive Community with “golden proportions”, matter of our research, which we name “Local Development District” (LDD), can be considered concluded in its general features.

With regard to the denomination we have adopted, it underlines the productive structures and not the Community that use them as in other alternative denominations already used occasionally.

Among these we mention *Cooperative of virtual community*, *Joint Network Activity* (where the term *joint* needs to distinguish it from other *non joint* “activity networks” such as Local Exchange Systems), *Open Kibbutz* (where the term *open* explains itself with the turn-over, which is possible and likely frequent, whether working or non-working members), or Yin Company

(referring to the maternal and nourisher female nature, in contrast with the company of the competitive context, indirectly qualified by the complementary Yang term, more suitably connected with the male nature, which is more fighting, creative and adventurous).

The current denomination basically, aims at focusing on who hears about it for the first time, on a *local* dimension, even though, unfortunately, the term District is susceptible of initial misunderstandings, since it is usually connected to the *industrial Districts*, well-known monothematic economic situations -chair, glasses, shoe...- which are territorially concentrated but *poles apart* from the LDD, as they aim at The exportation on a worldwide scale instead of the local consumption.

In any case, neither the names we have been using were exempt from potential misunderstandings, as the name *Cooperative of virtual community* used to call to mind a kind of videogame, *Joint Network Activity*, lacking in territorially reference, it seemed open and widespread to the national nature and not only. *Open Kibbutz* was absorbed, despite the word *open*, to homogeneous communities on a confessional and ideological level, while *Yin Company* called to mind an Oriental philosophy school, or a Yoga institute or an Ayurvedic clinic.

Talking about the practical realization of the LDD “clones”, this requires, as aforementioned, the presence of particular external figures (“midwives”), as it happened in the past with the popular self-productive Communities, but with a very *different* role.

From one hand, if these figures as that ones from the past, put the Communities at the bottom of the LDD and provide them with facilities where they can operate, it is also true that these facilities, furthermore, only productive but not residential, are not given *for free* but under *remuneration*.

On the other hand, they also have a *new* role which is making the relationship with the self-productive Communities they created *endless*, in a kind of “maternal” relationship, with the only difference that this relationship is not based on a unilateral dependence, like that one which binds a mother to her child, but a *synergic* one, of a winning-winning sort (on the basis of the *franchising*, as we will see later on).

Thanks to this innovation, the new self-productive Communities will

be able to get out from the Plato's "world of the ideas" and to take the form on the territory, occupying their pertinence space on the economic system.

After pointed out and put another order on the economic sphere, the basic idea has been to *conceive* a subject of the Autonomy, located in an area of such Paradigm, which, even though it told itself as promising it strangely showed uninhabited, *attractive* enough for a great number of potential "audience". Its realization and spreading had to be *economically* interesting in a *direct* way for the Realizers and other stakeholders (in particular investors) and in an *indirect* way for the whole society either in an *individual* way (everyone can export work and/or import goods and services, if they find it interesting) or in a *collective* way (a working-member, ex unemployed is not a *social cost* anymore and the environmental sustainability becomes reachable).

Everything in order to make the quality of life of the poorest Countries, increasing the social sustainability without waiving the environmental one and, on the other side, to spread in the industrialized Countries a general welfare without excesses, within the context of an environmental sustainability of the Tradition, smoothing down privileges of big groups, mostly *multinational*, results of an hard *unimodal* context "All globalized Market", which is within paradigmatic terms, assailable to the *monopoly*. All this through a simple and gradual breaking his *economic sense* in a new dynamic and *diversified* context, which is assailable to the *free competition* between different economic modality that, referring to the essential goods and services, can belong to both the basic economic Paradigms. All the typologies of economic actors that we have identified, can get in the arena and this is no so far from to happen.

It will be the people, so, who have to decree the destine of each of them, through the economic behaviour taken in the everyday life.

And this, which is a *new* and fundamental thing, whatever is their belonging Paradigm.

In other words, today there is the real possibility to reach an economic context, where *who has got the means* can choose between the *bread* of a different third part producers and where everyone can choose, in every time, the proximity District where it can be good enough self-produced.

This choice possibility, even though it looks not enough, is full of positive consequences.

The detailed spreading of the LDD “clones” on the territory, which guarantees this possibility, represents, as we have seen, the inevitable condition and even sufficient, considering the following triggering of the “knock-on effect”, to reach a sustainable world and with equal opportunities where no one is condemned to a life of poverty or to welfare because of an intentionally “unbalanced” economic system and where everyone can live with *dignity* and with a clear conscience because everyone is aware not to compromise the destiny of the future generations.

## 7. BRIEF PRESENTATION OF THE LDD

After having discussed about the LDD for long time, recalling its constituent and operation characteristics and also trying to imagine (summarizing, examining it in depth later on) the economic and social effects coming from its spreading, now we have to describe its aspect in a more concretely way, from its figure point of view, by giving a general list of its production unities, indicating its possible location.

Generally, depending on the local conditions, the productive organizations of the LDD are assembled in a *Urban Pole*, where we can find that ones related to the production of *services* located, as far as possible, in a “baycentric” position in comparison with the places where the members live, and in a *Rural Pole* not too far from the urban, which obviously includes the agricultural unities and that ones connected to the agricultural and food change, where, in addition to particular services, the *goods* subsequently transported in the distribution unity of the Urban Pole, are produced.

### URBAN POLE (mini shopping centre)

0 Retail distribution unit: mini-market with *loose* products, external purchases (cleansing) or self-product items (pasta, milk and its by-

*The dignity of nations*

products... water and other draught drinks)

- 1 Bar-Restaurant
- 2 Hairdresser, beauticians, fitness
- 3 Infirmary, dental laboratory
- 4 Launderette
- 5 Textile laboratory, tailor's shop: cloths, knitwear, packaging and accessories
- 6 Repair and body shop: car repair and maintenance, building prototypes, car hiring, caravans, trailers, boats and other watercrafts.
- 7 Repairing and maintenance of electrical appliance.
- 8 Administrative unity: internal administration and supplying of several services to the families members (computer assistance, printing works, Research & Development, language courses, remedial private classes, translations, tax assistance).

RURAL POLE (Suburban Oasis)

*Goods*

- 0 Agricultural unit: *vegetable* cultivation (also in greenhouse and hydroculture) and *animal* production (dairy cattle breeding, fish farming, in combination with vegetable cultivation). Composting and energy (biogas, biofuel, solar and wind power technologies).
- 1 Vegetables Laboratory: fresh vegetables and preserved food.
- 2 Meat Laboratory: butchery, fresh meat preparation, preserved food (sausages...)
- 3 Flour processing: bakery, pastry, pasta (also stuffed).
- 4 Milk processing: cheese, butter, yogurt, and by-products of milk.
- 5 Different food preparations (coffee roasting, chocolate, sweets, ice cream)
- 6 Alcoholic and soft drinks: wine, cider, distillates, beer, juices, water on tap (filtered, sparkling, flavoured).
- 7 Joinery: small custom-made manufacture (windows, doors, furniture), reparations and restorations.

8 Multipurpose Laboratory: potteries, glass, furnishings, necklaces, toys, foundry, wrought iron.

*Services*

0 Farm House: accommodation, bar-restaurant (ready-cooked dishes, sauces), riding ground.

1 Boarding Kennels

2 Nursery

3 Rest home and accommodation for elderly people (including still active members)

4 Building unit: constructions, renovations, accommodation maintenance (electricity, hydraulics, insulation, decorations)

8. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

From a productive prospective the LDD can be considered as a *big cooperative company* that we suppose it is composed by 300 members and 100 out of them are working members.

Its production is multisector (of daily consumed goods and services), and there is a defined range of products (even if, every family through its representative in the company structure, can choose *single varieties* and make a difference in each relevant production).

It is mainly a *modular* structure, formed by small “standard” production modules, composed by several sectoral production units (bakery, hairdresser...) based on an artisanal dimension.

Nowadays (where all economies and companies are focused on an “All Globalized Market”, or at least they aim for it), all companies are looking at specializing and outsourcing of all the ancillary activities, so the LDD, seen as a company, looks pretty unusual.

This anomaly is not only due to what we just mentioned, but also to another anomaly noticeable when looking at the production outlets.

As a matter of fact, the production is mirroring, from both a quantitative and qualitative point of view, the member’s family needs; therefore it is absorbed in his entirety.



The auto-producers Community, composed by the hypothetical 300 families operating within the LDD, essentially follows the well-known prototype of domestic self-production conveying a more *advanced* form of it, leveraging on its peculiar *strong points*, as the common “genetic” heritage, which are adding extra strength and vanishing its several *weaknesses*.

The LDD constitutes therefore, in the Countries where the economic system is close to the “Traditional static”, a valid alternative to the domestic self-production susceptible, thanks to its spreading, to gradually replace this last one mentioned, and, as a consequence (given, from one side, the new solvency demand of productive structures which is addressed to the local market and, from the other side the generalisation of the specialisation in the working activity and of the company culture), to facilitate even strengthening the Market in sections which are suitable to it, with an advantage towards the welfare and social development of such Countries.

The LDD represents, actually, the “tailor-made” instrument of a return on the economic scene of the self-production in the industrialized Countries starting from the self-production of goods and services of current family consumption which, in these Countries, have migrated as a whole from the domestic self-production to the Market.

With reference to this second aim, the LDD will have to *show* in the following considerations and, above all, to *prove* through the *experimentation* that, referring to the goods and services of final consumption compatible with a little scale production and with an high work intensity, this modality is able to keep the costs on a level which is not higher than the predominant prices on the local market, referring to products with similar qualities or, better, *considered so* by the potential purchasers (the self-productive members, in the case in point), as in the Heteronomy it is hard to *verifiable*. In that case, very probable as we will see, the “clones” of such a standard economic modality will have the way smoothed for their “viral” diffusion in the industrialized countries, much to the advantage of human and environmental health.

The LDD may, in particular, take the place assigned to it in the system thanks to its *strengths* which we will now reexamine, which will be asserted

either by the non – working members or, and much more, by the working – members, in their typical role of *producers*, to benefit then from their role of *consumer*, which is common as well.

This being, by nature, in inverse relation to the “working-members quote”, in some conditions (substantial equal-distribution of the working hours among the members) can even be of *no value*.

This allows, for example, that in certain intermediate self-productive communities such as club, the “working members” can cooperate to the production of services, even individual services at “zero remuneration”, if all the members do it at the same way (this is the case in the “extreme” self-productive communities aforementioned).

However, this is not the case of the LDD in which, therefore, such a strength may then show its effects only in a partial way.

Going forward, we can mention a greater *zeal* of the working member in the working activity, in comparison to a remunerated worker of an ordinary company, as his higher productivity is translated into an interest for the self-productive Community and therefore, indirectly, even for his family. Of course, in a Community which has the dimension of a small village and where, in addition, there is a lack of territorial identity which characterizes the real village, the relationship between the community and individual interest, even coincidental as in the case of the family, can appear, straight away, very mild.

However, we must say that in a LDD the productivity of the several types of production, can be in real time easily monitored through a standard management system, supported by suitable software used in all the “clones” of the LDD and therefore, the worker who has access to such data, cannot entertain suspicions towards the fact that in other modules harbour parasitic behaviour and he can, therefore, release his eventual will of cooperation.

Another very important “genetic” strength of the LDD, is constituted by the *programming* which, in the LDD is able to completely manifest its positive effects, being supported by standard software “one-off” programmed, as aforementioned, to be used by all the “clones” referring to the same “Realizer” (an *external figure* whose important role will be described later on).

This is practicable either on the level of a single *productive module*, (a production programming which each company of the Market attempts to do, even though provisionally regarding the demand it is relatively less reliable, as coming from an *exogenous* demand and therefore not co-interested to the company productivity) or on a District level in its totality (which on the basis of precise data referring to individual production and consumption, aims to optimise the circuit of production- consumption). The programming on the *model level* requires therefore an informational contribution from the members in their *capacity as consumers* about their spending forecast which can be divided in different modalities depending on the goods and services (middle – term forecast, preventive purchase orders or reservation of particular services.)

This effort required to the consumer member may take place in the field of the Autonomy as it contributes to a more effective programming and to a consequent reduction of production costs with the advantage of the consumer member himself.

Regarding the programming on a *District level*, it consists of using data which is automatically collected at the time of purchase, due to each member whose well – known profile and historical series of purchases in the several District unities, in order to minimise the *shortage* and the *excess*, and above all this last one in the totality of the District.

A further strength, which mainly concerns the goods in particular those of the agricultural and food sector, is constituted by the lack of intermediators in the transition “from the field to fork” whose weight is often excessive.

Finally, we can recall a specificity generally considered a self – productive Community *strength* constituted by the fact that in such contexts the goods and services are obtained by members at “production cost” which, contrary to the “market price” does not include “profit”, which is understood as remuneration of the businessman activity (defined as coordination of the productive factors.)

For this reason, we have to consider that the benefit, being a balance, is characterised by an algebraic sign that can be either positive or negative. Furthermore many companies frequently, basically artisan companies, keep operating on the market even though they are characterised by a

negative profit, considering that, in these cases, the owner in addition to the businessman is even the owner of the productive structure as well as being a worker. Therefore, the income, which allows him to operate on the market, is basically attributed to the remuneration of these last two roles. It is doubtful if the aforementioned characteristics of the self-productive communities has to be considered their real “strength”.

Discussing now the “peculiar” *strengths* of the LDD, we can first of all mention the fact that, being constituted by *standard* production modules, either in terms of spaces or equipment, in the auspicious eventuality of their great expansion, the investment costs are susceptible of a relative containment with a consequent containment even of the rent corresponding to their use with the advantage of the self – productive community operating in the LDD.

Always referring to the “peculiar” *strengths* of the LDD, one of them of singular importance is constituted by the possibility to rationalise, through the internal mobility, the use of manpower in the several production modules adapting it to their own demands to their productive process (for example seasonality and/or agricultural harvest phases) or due to eventual and sudden demand variations.

Such a mobility, is obviously, facilitated by an operative multifunctional of working members, which could be encouraged, rewarding it in an individual way, but it could also derive from the spontaneous of availability of these ones, motivated by a positive relapse in the general interest.

We must note that the rationalisation of the use of manpower in a LDD could be further facilitated by an elasticity of the *total of hours* worked obtained, in addition to the extra work as in every company, even through the recourse to half-time working performance or even *occasional ones* by some of the members families. These are directories which can be more easily activated in a LDD then in a single hetero-productive company of the Market.

In the Autonomy Paradigm which is extremely different from what occurs in the Heteronomy Paradigm, it is therefore perfectly conceivable an effort or elasticity of the member in his *role of producer* in so far as he can, from this, benefit in his extra *role as consumer*.

In the self – production every effort made, either in the role of *producer* or that of *consumer*, it requires an advantage which remains “in – house”. It is therefore understandable that in the Autonomy Paradigm a certain propensity to the mutualistic *solidarity* is in force, even though in inverse relation to the dimension of the community as discussed, considering that in this context the “generous” behaviour on its basis, which can be a weakness factor of the Heteronomy can be translated into revision of a tangible economic value.

However, what mainly can play in LDD’s hands, is that in addition to add the “genetic” strengths, which it shares with the domestic self – production, to the “peculiar” ones, it is *lacking* in the weaknesses which, historically, heavily penalised the latter towards the Market and which are translated into diseconomies of various types due to its small scale (using inefficient *means of production* and a general lack of *know-how*.)

The transition of the consumer basis of the “family” to that one of the “village” which characterises the LDD as the aim of reducing the diseconomies of scale allowing, first of all, the use of professional *means of production*. These constitute a productive factor that the LDD can rightly recompense like each company in the Market that operates in the same activity of its certain productive unity and having customers of the same size of the consumer basis of the LDD.

We may object that *industrialisation* of the production which can take place on the Market allows to give, at least in the production of goods, a productivity which a productive unity of the LDD despite its superior scale in comparison to that of the family’s, can’t certainly reach. Considering this, we forget that the concept of “attractivity”, here introduced and used to compare the different economic modalities is applied to the *economic circuits*, which include the *consumers*, and therefore to the “ex works” price of the industrial product charged by the *producers* of the Market we must add the costs of the “collateral” activities (transportations and connected activities, commercial intermediaries... advertising) which we like to name in this way as they, exactly as the pharmaceutical side-effect, everyone would like to avoid it, except the economies of the orthodoxy, which they willingly considered as precious productive wealth, and the politicians of the same kind which invite to consider them as an employment

repository (it is already enough if these don't incite to the permanent civil war as remedy for the "full employment"... but for the "war car" have other official more "believable" motivations, such as the exportation of "democracy" in the "dictatorial" countries... having natural resources.)

Discussing now the *know – how*, it may be interesting to examine the *way* in which this is acquired into the several productive unities of the LDD (this allows us to start the *finishing* of the "*rough manufacturing*", that is the LDD which results from the path of individualisation as previously described.) This may indicate, from one side, as such a *modality* contributes to increase, without any costs, the quality of national human capital and, on the other side, how wide the "audience" of potential working – members is, together with that one of the potential non – working members, the LDD intends to answer.

Actually, each productive unity forecasts the presence of a member which is *responsible* for the production (generally a retired man, ex – artisan and however specialised in the productive sector of the unity) who, in addition to bringing the know – how, also has a function of "tutor-educator".

This allows most of the productive unities to use the available manpower independently from its training, which is particularly useful in order to make worth the strength, peculiar to the LDD consisting in the mobility among its productive unities.

The role of the responsible productive unities can be defined as *accompanying the operativeness*, rather than pedagogical or the transfer of knowledge, meaning that he attends to the production together with responsible working *co-members* so that they learn by doing.

A production unity of the LDD, either it is about the production of goods (cheese factory, shirt factory...) or services (accommodations maintenance, car repair shop...) takes place as a hybrid place which gives simultaneously work and training. It must not to be considered as a substitute of a *professional training School* (being different in its aim and characteristics it is instead *complimentary* to this one.)

In comparison to such varieties of Schools, it is indeed, at the same time, slightly *inferior*, as it doesn't award professional degrees, and a somewhat (much) *more*, in the meaning that it warrants a *remunerated job* (that is, actually, the aim of every professional training), remuneration which

is reciprocated, “cherry on the cake” starting... from the learning phase itself.

It is actually about a *new* structure destined to fill, in the industrialised western societies, a big *empty* in terms of accompanying to the artisan productive activity (and its social appreciation), and it is that one left by the *artisan Shop* of the traditional *economies* but even that one left by the *families* of the traditional *societies*.

In both contexts of the Tradition they “learned by doing” and making themselves useful to both themselves and the local and domestic economies.

The productive unity of the LDD, where the *intergenerational* transition of knowledge and working practices takes place (remedying the insane and ashamed waste of precious qualified human resources, which today takes place in the industrialised societies, by the high *economic* costs and, not least, *social*) represents therefore, the actual version and it is adapted to the times of the two aforementioned “institutions” which, under this aspect, are by now obsolete. In fact, the first one, however, which almost was extinguished lacks in *pupils* as there are always fewer young people, understandably, they would like to undertake a new artisanal career, in an economy which can be likened to a casino where “one must speculate to accumulate”, and the second one lacks in *educators*, because the know – how almost does not exist anymore in the modern family, which is by this time out of the habit of self-production and generally without any equipment, which appeals to the Market producer even to...sew a button on.

We can say that on an educational level the LDD summarises the mainly positive aspects of the self – productive family, of the artisanal Shop and of the professional training School, without any defects. The interest to transfer the maximum amount of know-how to the co-member in the shortest time can be considered equivalent to that one which is in force in the family (transfer which certainly takes place with less impulse in the school and which is even witnessed with suspicion in the proper artisanal Shop whose owner sees in the shop assistant the potential competitor who, to learn, must therefore put all his effort into it).

The know-how transfer is not dependent on the national community, as



in the case of the School and, above all the LDD allows *everyone* who is unintentionally too idle to work (including those who for several reasons are not admitted to either professional education or, for age reasons, to ordinary apprenticeship) as it happens in the family where all the available resources are used.

- *Weaknesses*

The LDD, having been “arbitrary” conceived in order to eliminate the “weaknesses” which characterise the different modalities of the Autonomy Paradigm, does not offer much in this regard.

It is however useful to mention two “weaknesses” which characterise all the other modalities of its “class”, these are the *intermediate self-productive Communities*, as this gives us the opportunity to underline a peculiar characteristic to the LDD which not only allows us to avoid the inconvenience deriving from them, but it also makes this peculiarity an important “strength”.

The two “weaknesses” which characterise such communities can both be derived from its dimension.

Indeed the relatively high number of members which characterized them and which, from one side, allows them to self-produce services which are not on the same level as the small self – productive Communities represented by the families, involves, on the opposite side of the coin which is translated into an objective *difficulty of birth* to which an additional *difficulty of operation* is added due to an understandable and potential internal litigiousness.

The two aforementioned “weaknesses” are revealed in this manner, however only if the analysis remains confined to the intermediate self – productive Communities how we know them, which are characterised by a *spontaneous* birth and an operation designed on *self – management* which, in fact, constitutes a *subset* of a greater set which also includes a new typology of intermediate self – productive Community of *new generation* whom the LDD belongs to.

These latter ones predict, as an additional significant *innovation* in the economic field, the presence of an *external figure* (a “*deus ex-machina*”, in the original meaning of this theatrical expression, that is a subject who comes down from another “world/Paradigm” and eliminates the



potential “weaknesses” of this Community typology), to which they owe their *creation* and *management* of the nerve-centre of their operativeness. This means that the operations connected to the *creation* of these intermediate self – productive Communities of *new generation* (recruiting and selection of members, placing the productive spaces at their disposal) however, even those ones related to the *make operative* of their self – productive circuit must necessarily be insured by an *external figure* having the a double function of a “midwife” and “incubator” to which, we will note at a later stage, an additional *monitoring* function at a “distance” will follow, allowed by an adequate management software and by the new telematics technologies, of the self – productive Community which refer to it in order to guarantee their permanency in the best conditions, a “maternity” function practised in a “remote” way (that can be assimilated to that one which takes place in the “sponsorship”).

It is in this way that such self – productive Communities of a *new generation* are redeemed by the “weaknesses” which characterise the *traditional*, intermediate, self – productive Communities and therefore, in comparison to those, they have the possibility to operate on a *wider range* of productive activities including, in particular, the important and *new* production of *goods*, allowing them to occupy economic spaces which, in the industrialised Countries, the Market has removed to the domestic self – production.

The LDD, which belongs to the new typology of intermediate Communities, is therefore free from the aforementioned “weaknesses”.

Having been conceived (carved) in such a way to be talented of the maximum “attractivity” in the *entire totality* of the intermediate self – productive Communities of its same typology, the LDD represents the “cutting edge” of this context.

It waits therefore to be experimented to demonstrate its true performance. Only the *experimentation* will allow us to discover how such modality of self – production will be revealed, on the territory a valid instrument able to support the new *mission* of special subjects of the Heteronomy (the aforementioned *external figures*) consisting in starting the economic systems such as the architecture which characterized them, to the *full permanent activity* and to the *environmental sustainability* (*mission* which

is universally attributed, wrongly to the *politics* considered as the management of the public producing Communities, Autonomy subjects), through the *conversion* of the maximum number of consumers of the market in *self-producers* (even though, basically, referring to the range of goods and services which characterise the LDD) and the *transfer* of the maximum number of self – producers, at the moment in Traditional static systems, from the narrow domestic field to one that is more efficient and developed.

Considering the above, we will not omit in the following (chapter 1.2.1. (s) B) to mention, when it will more suitable to do so, a “weakness” or at least the point that more than any others can be considered, and it is generally considered so.

## **B. APPLICATIVE ASPECTS**

### *A praxis for an ethics*

#### 1. THE REALIZER

Before exploring the characteristics and the role of the *external figure* we denominate *Realizer*, it should be underlined that this description has not to be considered as an *appendix*, however useful it may be, of the research that has led to the LDD definition.

It should therefore not be considered as a *remedy* for the *birth* and *functioning* difficulty and of a self-producing subject (deriving from the fact that it has been determined “arbitrarily”) which, as every remedy intended as *medicine*, must “necessarily” involve some *side effect*.

This is a conjecture which is clearly compromised by the attribution to *every* remedy/medicine, beside the therapeutic effect, of drawbacks, which particularly concerns drugs resulting from the Western therapeutic approach instead, wrongly considered as universal or, even worse, the *only* effective approach, sometimes against all evidence (one could almost think the multinationals in the pharmaceutical industries are not extraneous to such a generalised conviction).

On the contrary, the presence of the *Realizer*, far from having the nature of the *remedy*, has to be considered as the *natural consequence* of the idea, here affirmed, according to which the economic architectures, each defined from a specific role distribution of the possible variations of the two basic Paradigms, are *various*, and, among them, there is one (at the basis of a socio-economic system, denominated *Traditional regenerative dynamic*, which best summarizes the advantages of the others being free from their main drawbacks) which considers the strong presence of an Autonomy Paradigm’s *new* variant that could *necessarily* take shape through an *external* intervention, articulated in four phases (conception, birth, incubation, remote monitoring), since those which took shape *spontaneously* have not given a significant contribution in terms of social and environmental sustainability.

And it is likewise *natural* that a similar *consequence* embodies in a subject of the Heteronomy Paradigm which, on the one hand, because of a large and increasing *demand* arising from the widespread social unease and from the current environmental destruction and, on the other, of an *idea* capable to give a satisfying response, takes action first with a private initiative: becoming agent of an *offer* in a new market, created by it and certainly competitive, in which however it will benefit, like every company bearing *product innovation*, from an initial competitive advantage of course not ephemeral.

In this way the Realizer will be able to become the real *driving force* for LDD spread and the instrument to start a dynamic, which, through a series of “domino effects” we will examine in detail later, will lead to a deep *metamorphosis* of the system. They will give back to every single person the chance, today denied, to contribute to the environment and social sustainability and therefore to the *collective interest*, simply starting with becoming member of a LDD, taking moreover, in such way, *his own interest* and that of his family.

Through the figure of the Realizer the Heteronomy Paradigm, and particularly the Market, thanks to an innovation deriving from a *refounded economic science*, could *self-regenerate* and, maintaining an essential role, produce a sustainable system both on the social and the environmental level.

The ball is *now* in his court.

### 1.1. Nature of the Realizer

In examining the nature of the *Realizer*, it is opportune to recognize his *two* components, each of them characterized by a clear *role* and working in *synergy* that we will denominate *Sponsor* and *Executor*.

The fact that this two components are, in the practice, embodied in a single subject or in two different subjects, does not matter at this stage. After all, since the Realizer is intended, and this could not be different, to operate in a competitive setting, the desired spreading dynamic of the Districts will have as protagonist the most different typologies of

Realizers.

Here below is a description of the *roles* of the two components, in order to identify the *nature* of the more suitable subjects to play them successfully.

### 1.1.1. *Role and nature of the Sponsor*

Very briefly, it could be said that the role of the Sponsor consists in *attracting the human resources* in order to train the Community called upon to feed the self-production circuit of the LDD.

It is easy to understand that it deals with the *key role* in the composite figure of the Realizer.

Actually, although the LDD has been conceived to run with the most different typologies of human resources, it is also a fact that in the Autonomy Paradigm, in all its variants including the LDD, the human component, in all its various facets, is that on which mainly depends the *proper functioning* of the economic circuit. It is measured by the satisfaction of the self-producer collective subject, who *takes part*, in his dual role, fully (including the idea of self-produced *goods*), reaping *by himself* the benefits (as we will see later, the Realizer takes advantage just “as a reflex” of the success of the circuit, to which he gives *a lot* without detracting *anything*). This is quite different from what happens in an economic circuit implemented in the Heteronomy Paradigm: in the Market, in particular, the *human component*, which feeds the circuit, is merely *instrumental* to the interest of a “sovereign” subject turning “on” and “off” the circuit in order to have some achievements of which he takes advantage in a *direct* way. This circuit rests, as a rule, on *goods*, which is conceived by the mentioned subject: it must be “desirable”, or made it so, towards a third consumer lacking in any information about it (tendency to the *marginalization* of the human component at the consumption stage) and produced in the conditions, whatever they may be, as long as they lead to the lowest cost (tendency to the *marginalization* of the human component at the production stage).

In consideration of this role, the Sponsor, the functional component of a Heteronomy composite subject, as the Realizer is, will be coherently

represented by a Philanthropy producer, the contest etymologically “friendly for Mankind”.

It may be therefore a non-profit organisation, whose mission consists in getting together the biggest number of person around one or more goals (rooted, or not, in a *vision of the world*), which could be of economic nature (occupation, consumer protection), social (equal opportunities related to gender, support for the weakest brackets) or environmental, on whose achievement the LDD seems likely to contribute.

We observe that, in general terms, a Philanthropy producer in order to offer a service to his numerous *potential* not solvent consumers, hoping that beneficiaries could contribute to broaden his “social base”, must initially put together the necessary resources, looking for them wherever is possible, mainly among his *preexisting* social base, which is used, in other words, as leverage.

In the specific case, the situation is completely reversed.

Actually with the simple assumption of the role of Sponsor of the LDD model (certifying it, essentially, as consistent with its “doctrine”), the subject, without any resource, can offer the service for free to those who, among his social base at first, are looking for a job opportunity and/or an opportunity to acquire, at a good price/quality ratio, goods and services, produced respecting in a *verifiable* manner the human and environmental health.

After that, in the light of the advantages “its affiliates” will show to be able to obtain from the participation to the company structure of the pilot LDD and of the immediately following “clones”, the Sponsor will be able not only to attract an appropriate number of members from other “audience” of potential members, but most likely he could also “affiliate” a great part of the next beneficiaries of the participation in different “clones”, interesting them to the pursuit of its mission.

Regarding this second aspect, it must be observed, indeed, that every potential Sponsor is characterised by his own *ethics*, which will be inevitably transferred in the economic system and who will respond to his ethics, will be disposed to comply with it.

Considering that the success in the Districts depending on a certain Sponsor is much higher as the *ethics* which characterized him is in

line with the “genetics” of the LDD (which is nourished with *solidarity*, while the world, on the contrary, increasingly looks to the *competition* among socially atomized individuals as the *only* driving force for the “development”). It can be reasonably expected that the positive results achieved are properly to attribute to the implementation of this *ethics* and it is quite natural that this increases the appeal of the Sponsor from whom it comes from.

In other terms the Sponsor, who can better contribute to its success and to the consequently spread of the LDD through his effective contribution to the work of the composite figure of the Realizer, and therefore it can aspire to an associate Executor of the same level, is also the one who will be able to take the major advantage in pursuing his mission.

For other Authorities the Sponsor of the LDD could, in this respect, be a boomerang.

### 1.1.2. *Role and nature of the Executor*

Also this *second* functional component of the Realizer figure belongs to the Heteronomy but the Paradigm modality which is best suited to express it is the Market.

The *economic* interest that moves every Market producer and that the Executor finds, as we will see in detail, in the diffusion dynamics of the Districts leads him to focus his effort in the *long-lasting success* of each “clone”, which is easily quantifiable in this case because of the *standard* nature and of the *transparency* of these realities, a necessary condition for the dynamics development.

In broad terms, the Executor’s role is divided into *three* typologies of activities.

The *first one* consists in planning the management scheme of the LDD and its computerisation. This activity occurs *one-time* putting into effect the initial Executor’s investment. It is carried out *gradually* accompanying the *pilot* implementation and based on this example, further “clones” will be created, which are under the Realizer, including the Executor.

The *second*, dual activity, consists in gathering together those who,

attracted by the Sponsor, aspire to take part to a newly-established District as members with different functions (tutors, workers, non-workers); they will be integrate, with their useful characteristics already identified in the previous activity, in *databases* from which will be later *selected* those destined to build the most appropriate company structures at the basis of the different “clones” of LDD.

This activity, with reference to the first two typologies of members, is *similar* to that carried out by a *temporary employment Agency*, while, regarding the non-working members, it cannot be reflected in the existing economies because it consists in converting the highest number of totally solvent consumers to self-producer. The latter activity is strongly against the trend because today is generally supported, both at the household and at Countries level, the practice of “exporting” to “import”, which represents the very essence of the Heteronomy itself.

The *third* activity consists in obtaining equipped areas where the various production units of the Districts will set up.

This activity results in a *composite* assistance service for the investors, which in functional terms, can be divided in three components: monetary (which aims to the financing of investments), technical (aimed at the realisation and equipment of the productive areas) and commercial (regarding the renting of the productive areas).

The last two typologies of activities, which are respectively the management of the *human resources* and of the *productive structures*, are carried out by the Executor on a *contractual* basis and *at no cost* for the self-producing Community, in the context of a business affiliation (Franchising) established between the acquiring Executor (Franchisor) and the cooperative *type* Company which is under the self-producer Community (Franchisee).

Such activities of the Executor consist in *services*, generally already offered in the market by different agents, but the difference between the new offer and the existing one is significant.

The first service, referred to those who are looking for a job is, as already mentioned, generally offered, in both cases *free of charge*, by the temporary employment Agencies.

The big difference, between a case and the other, consists in the fact that



while the Agency will be able to offer a job to someone with a given work profile *only* if a company of the Market ask for an employee with the same profile, the Executor will be able to offer a work activity in the cooperative environment to *everyone* who addresses to him to be registered in the database, because, on one hand the new member will be included in a *training/employment* structure (initially as “*apprentice*” in a new generation *Artisan Workshop*) and, on the other, the Executor himself *creates* the job opportunity he will offer when he will obtain the necessary equipped area, using it in the name and on behalf of the Cooperative, as soon as the databases related to the potential members will allow that.

The difference is not a small matter.

The second service, a *pay-service*, offered by the Executor to the investors differs from those offered, which are obviously also *pay-services*, by regular companies present on the market (financial advisers, architectural firms, estate agencies) as, unlike them, the Executor accompanies them to *offer* a product, consisting in *using* specific productive areas, of which himself express the *demand*, in the name and on behalf of Cooperative companies he *creates* and *runs* by himself, at an *established* and *negotiated* price, which, we remind, is equal to the repayment installments of a credit corresponding to the entire investment.

We note, incidentally, that the turnover of the Executor originates exclusively from the implementation phase of a District, since the following remote monitoring activity, which is important for the Executor because he wants to guarantee the long-lasting success of every District and the protection of his commercial reputation and the social one of the Sponsor, is carried out for free, at practically no cost. Actually, at the implementation phase of the District, the Executor will have created an “administrative unit”, which probably will be very small in terms of worked hours, because of its high automation, which acts as relay.

Going back to the investor who relies on the Executor, the only risk, which characterized his investment is therefore linked to the lifetime of the District.

In this respect, it should be noted that, in principle, the probability that a given “clone” of the LDD, that is a producer who serves exclusively an *endogenous* demand expressed by himself, will be affected by the death

of the enterprise (despite the permanent monitoring of the Executor) is practically null and, anyway, incomparably lower to the probability which characterizes the enterprises of the Market serving an *exogenous* demand, from third expressed, with a variable nature.

Furthermore, the self-production circuit of a District, in terms of immunity with regard to a termination of its operation, is superior to the domestic self-circuit (it may be interrupted for operational incapacity of the member producer, whereas in the LDD the corporate structure may be revised, in case the monitoring should reveal some problems, in real time).

This circuit is even comparable, in terms of lifespan, to what characterises the self-production of collective services of a national Community with its own monetary sovereignty, and therefore it cannot go bankrupt.

If the valuation of the probability that the circuit of a constituting “clone” could interrupt occurs at an advanced stage of the diffusion of the “clones”, that is after that the LDD model has widely shown its stability, its result will show a null probability.

Having said that, which gives rise to hopes that the private and public investors, once the diffusion dynamic of the LDD “clones” has been started, will not miss; but it is necessary to examine more closely the *initial* stage of the desirable dynamic.

Actually, at this stage should be even valued the probability the pilot LDD circuit has, not only to start, but also to foresee its safe lifespan of its economic success.

This implies that the valuation must occur following a precise decision-making process, described hereafter.

## 1.2. *The initial Realizer*

The initial Realizer, called to operate in the *experimental* phase of the initiative to set up the first LDD, that in case of success will have the “pilot” function in the dynamic of diffusion of other “clones”, will have to invest in a totally *unexplored* field.

In general this does not facilitate the enthusiasm of who could take

this role, even though it requires, in case of success, the competitive advantage, generally not ephemeral, whose the businessman benefits, who through a *product* innovation, opens a new market where the *goods* which he offers will constitute the “original” in comparison with the following “imitations”.

Such a resilience could show, more particularly, in the Executor who, in the joint venture which associates him to the Sponsor, is the subject which invests in financial terms (basically for the realization of the computer applications which support the first activities).

In this case, however, even towards the latter, the situation could be relatively favorable.

In support of this statement, whose good basis the starting times of the desired metamorphosis of the today's economies, we have to gradually proceed.

For that purpose, we start observing that each investment faces a risk, which rests on a series of scenarios of profit/loss, each one with a change to come true. Using a Cartesian representation, we put these scenarios on the x-axis and the equivalent probabilities on the y-axis.

In the investment at issue the value of *loss* scenarios, which in such a representation would take place on the negative semi axis of the abscissa, are for sure not far from zero, origin of the representation, while the profit scenarios abundantly increase on its right.

Such a favourable positioning of the scenarios depends, basically, on the fact that the LDD's experimentation, thanks to its *modular* structure, can be *gradually* implemented, starting from a first module of initial production, which can indifferently refer to a good (bread) or a service (hairdresser), this goes either for the management aspect or for the productive spaces for which the *current* equipment can be used, whose *use* is offered in the local market.

This allows to the experimentation, since its first steps, to pass on significant information on the functioning of the global realisation, or better still, we can say that as new productive modules are added, the District has in front of it a way which is even flatter, since its strengths are, little by little, developed.

In other words, if the implementation of the *first* module had to show

poor success, even after possible adjustments and course corrections, the experimentation ends up with a very little loss.

If, on the contrary, it happens with success the Executor will proceed with the realisation of the second module and so on, until the *consolidate balance sheet* of the activated productive unities, is encouraging.

According to the expectations, this should be the case, to such an extent that, if needed, small investments which could be supported by the members families, if they wish, for example to integrate the productive equipment, in order to optimize the functioning conditions of the pilot District quickening, moreover, the realisation time. It is also reasonable to imagine that, in case of success verified in the realisation of the first pilot LDD modules, other communities take shape somewhere else, thanks to the activity of the Sponsor, supported by the novelty of the initiative and of its potentiality that the Realizer will surely spread, in order to let get other “clones” start.

This can indifferently happen, either in geographical proximity of the *pilot* realisation, in very far territorial fields, if the Sponsor has got a sphere of action geographically wide.

This won't represent a problem for the Executor: from the beginning will have to preventive its decentralized organization, or in a more realistic way, to operate in *franchising* with local existing professionals in the intervention areas which would become local Executors operating with the *logo* of the initial Realizer as well as, of course, with the same methodology and related immaterial instrumentation.

The *standard* nature of the concept and the present telematics technology allow a such *simultaneous* spreading of the “clones” which, being *private* investors of any typologies (singles, local investment funds and so on), or *public* ones may be involved in the dynamic, it will be translated for the Executor, in a Market of services with a dimension unlikely conceivable today.

Therefore, the possible *profit* scenarios can extend on the right semi-axis of the abscissas of the aforementioned Cartesian representation, without any limits.

Moving now to the probability that the different scenarios come true, being a personal evaluation, the distribution on the totality of the

scenarios can assume, as we can imagine, the most various shapes. Referring to the more pessimistic potential Executors who tend to give more chances to the loss scenarios reducing, little by little, their level in correspondence to growing profit scenarios, by reducing asymptotically the chances to zero value.

While other potential Executors, less pessimistic, will distribute the chances by themselves attributed to the various scenarios mainly preferring, even though variously, the profit scenarios.

However, considering that the loss has a low value but objectively attributable, while, considering the scenarios of possible profit, it would even be unreasonable to draw a superior line, we can deduct that the investment risk calculated by each potential Executor as an average of all the scenarios, contemplated with the respective chances attributed by the Executor itself, will always have a *positive* value, independently of the value of this distribution chance.

It will be, anyway, a risk, which is worth to run.

#### 1.2.1. One “*fly in the ointment*” we do not want to omit

That being said, we would like to return to the issue of the “weak points” previously mentioned, where the argumentation concluded, with reference to the LDD, with the substantially *absence* of them.

Such conclusion is apparently more “partisan” and less “politically correct”, so we try here to remedy it, if not for other reason to decrease the discomfort of the average reader, who is placed in front of “gorgeous” proposals, which appear too banal for being it: they could be the result of the megalomania of the proposer (if he were known, obviously).

Only now, after considering in details the implementation modality of the LDD pilot, it seems, indeed, relatively easy to define precisely the “weakest point” of the model, which the interlocutors tend unanimously to place exactly at the beginning of the experimentation.

Using an allegory, whose adequacy is sufficiently supported by the considerations above illustrated, we can imagine a) the huge employment demand (deriving also from the most “developed” Countries) and of

protection for human health and the environment (to such an extent that food is seen everywhere with increasing suspect, and every corner of the world is, more or less, polluted), today yet outstanding and with apparently no responses at the horizon, is comparable to a great pile of dry wood, abundantly wet with petrol, and b) the LDD *pilot* could be assimilate to a torch, also soaked with a highly inflammable fluid, which, once lighted up and thrown on the pile, could burn up the huge bonfire. The problem, that being reduced to the lightning of the torch, it requires a simple use of a little flame, seems therefore easily resolved. But it is not. In fact, the predominant context, where the society (referring to the great *public* modality of the Paradigm of the Autonomy) self-produces services in a spurious way (through few intermediaries, corruptible ones, who attend with priority to their affairs) and in which the Heteronomy Paradigm, represented by the philanthropic and entrepreneurial component, is completely self-referential, offers, coming back to the allegory, “lighters” and even “flame-throwers” to light “orthodox” initiatives, but it offers nothing to the “heterodox” ones which, on the contrary, is hostile to. Our torch, lacking of flames, will have to be content with a *flint* at least to burst out the *required* one, but with the *sufficient* spark.

This spark can take shape in the reality, just to give an example, through a creation of a “Club of the bread”, an association which is composed by a hundred people (a first nucleus of users-members) representing the respective families, which produces bread only for the members’ families, in the mere mutualistic tradition.

The production may take place in an oven, of a third part (private people, NGO) rented by the association for the time needed.

The manpower may be provided by a member who has got the know-how, let’s say any housewife who uses to bake at home, who will be therefore working-member user or by a few number of members who will alternate or, eventually, by the totality of the members in turns.

Even being an essentially formal aspect, in this last case the manpower may be provided for free, demonetizing mostly of the consumption-production circuit in which the use of the oven and the production input (flour, energy, water...) remain monetized, since they are goods and services acquired on the market.

The members at a “purchase cost” will purchase bread.

The quantities produced may be properly set to avoid *waste*.

Regarding the possible *shortages*, the unlucky member who would be the “victim”, can easily remedy addressing to the shop beneath his house (we say so to stress the Autonomy Paradigm, far from involving the autarky, even though on a level of a single good or service, confine himself to offer new *opportunities*).

A table which reports the “type of bread” in the lines and the “classes of quantity” in the columns, in which each family may put, telematically, the small crosses which correspond to their purchases, will have to quantify the daily demand.

The bread Club, which can be assimilated to the first piece of the puzzle constituted by the LDD, is our spark.

To burst it out, that is to realise the consumption-production circuit and to keep it alive, we need a couple of flints constituted, from one side, by a *Sponsor* authority which puts the members together and, in the other side an Executor subject, a businessman who invests in the little computer programs to use in the different operations (work distribution and related payments, stock management of raw materials, accounting). We well know that, to set a fire with the flints, even if we use an highly inflammable torch, is not so easy.

It is here that the most weakness lies or, anyway, that one which is known so, of the LDD model.

We would like to let observe that is about a “weakness” much more surmountable than that ones which characterized other “innovative economic models” and “revolutionary”, some of them even require to dispose... of a government of a Country.

Considering that, generally this is founded on the *real* power which manages the current system, the “weakness” at issue is hardly negotiable. We can conclude that facing the enormous demand, issued by families and Nations, the Humanity is not able to burst out, somewhere in the planet, the mentioned *spark* in order to light the torch and then the *stack of wood*, at this point such a Humanity is condemned to a grim destiny unfortunately together with the ecosystem which sprouts of *innocent life*. We stay hopeful.

### 1.3. *Other functions of Realizers*

At this point it might be helpful to observe that Realizers involved in the diffusion of the Districts other than being useful to itself, can be useful even indirectly.

In fact, every Realizer and particularly the Executor could, starting from a limited number of Districts located in mutual proximity, create special local authorities of "second level" self-manufacturing where self-production can happen *spuriously* (LDD are the members) or in a *correct sense* (the members are those of the Districts concerned in the spirit of "direct democracy"), aimed at the production of *intermediate* goods (cereal, milk) intended for production of individual Districts in order to ensure the highest quality of the *final* products (bread, cheese...) contributing to the preservation of human health and environment.

We should, however, examine that these self-producing "second level" Communities while being managed by experienced people such as Executors, will have to deal with private producers of the Market that could be equally competitive in quality, stability determined in specific protocols, providing a production meant for buyers in Districts and controlled by the Realizer.

Therefore, on the one hand, if it is true that in an economic system in evolution towards the *Traditional regenerative dynamic* model, sets of Districts in mutual proximity can join together to trace the production of goods and services of self-producing branches for intermediate consumption, on the other hand, is also true that this can be done, since the Districts are pragmatic and not ideological, only in cases where it may result obviously *appropriate*, as already mentioned in the definition of the concerned unprecedented system. However, what may seem more likely, much more than the gradual occupation of an area of action suited to the market such as that of the goods and services of intermediate consumption (and, even more so that of industrial goods), is that the widespread dissemination of Districts in a given territory favours the emergence of some form of *direct democracy* in the governance of the public administration of the concerned territory - that is in self-production of *collective services* and in the eventual *transferring individual service utilities* (public



transport, water supply, waste disposal and recycling...) in *Cooperative of users* (large private self-producing communities) by appearing so, depending on whether the latter services are publicly owned or in private hands, respectively privatisation inside the Autonomy paradigm or the passage to a *different form of privatisation* involving a transfer of Paradigm in the spirit of eliminating, in both cases, *intermediaries* who, by nature, subtract wealth to the circuit.

And this always assuming that the dynamic of diffusion takes on sufficient strength and even more so if, at the same time forms a Movement, even independent from the Realizers which however, follows these objectives and at the same time, puts pressure on public authorities so that, within the limits of their capabilities, encourage, or at least not hinder, the same dynamic.

A promising dynamic because it has so many positive effects and is inspired by a prudential approach based on progression and experimentation, but which, remember, will remain in the Platonic world of ideas as long as a Realizer does not strike the fatal spark which may lead to an initial experimentation.

## 2. LDD DIFFUSION ABILITY IN THE SYSTEM

*(to the attention of the Executor)*

Waiting for this *experimental event* can be interesting – i.e. trying to quantify the LDD potential market going through the “audience” of potential members, *unsatisfied* for different reasons, both in the Market as well as in the domestic self-production.

In very general terms the diffusing capacity of LDD in the economic system of a Country is, as previously mentioned, directly linked to its level of “attractivity” expressed by the number of households willing to be part of the local authority at the base of LDD in view of “exporting” labour in this context and / or “importing” certain goods and services produced respecting human and environmental health.

Such an “attractivity” is, of course, likely to have varying effects from

Country to Country depending on the main *emergencies*, which are important to them. Schematically, we can say that industrialized Countries today, after the implosion of the systems “State-only”, are all characterised by an architecture close to that of the economic system “Market Only” and to a system, formerly called “Traditional degenerative dynamic” which are well under way, i.e. the main needs are *environmental* (which, in fact, involves the entire planet) and *employment*, the main cause of which lies in the presence of an overflowing market increasingly internationalized and without valid counterweights.

Concerning Countries whose economic architecture is close to the one that characterises the *Traditional static* system and in reference to the old ones where the “tribal” variant prevails, the main emergency is instead characterised by general *poverty*, with many social problems. The most evident cause is based on the smallness of the Market which results in economic structures characterised by the abnormal presence of a domestic self-production of low productivity and with no suitable alternatives in the Autonomy Paradigm.

For those countries that have the “religious” variant of the “Traditional static” system, poverty and related social curses are largely avoided by the strict social control and at the expense of gender equality opportunities that often result in a substantial lack of freedom in the “Half female of the sky”.

Although the diffusion of LDD is most urgent in industrialised Countries for environmental sustainability reasons regarding the whole planet, LDD could therefore be particularly useful even in Countries where the system is close to both variants of the “Traditional static” system, however in this second case, the difficulties related to such a diffusion are far greater for several reasons.

In examining LDD diffusion capacities, you should still distinguish the two types of Countries mentioned.

## 2.1. Countries with “Market Only” and “Traditional degenerative dynamic” system

In industrialised Countries the LDD potential “market” quickly appears

to be quite vast. And the reasons for its "attractivity" are in its peculiar characteristics, particularly suitable to the emergency prevailing in this context and composed, on the one hand, because of its *high* employment skills (due to the possibility of "cloning") and *huge spectrum* (it is compatible with the shortage of specialization and with the availability of working hours of various kinds) and on the other hand, by its attention to *environmental health* (deriving from moving to a local and small scale production of many activities) and to *human health* (due to the verifiable quality of the products in self-production).

With a closer look into the "customers" of any potential "market", we can distinguish:

a) all the families affected, in some way, by "involuntary inactivity" (a much wider concept of the so-called *unemployment*, which is the "tip of the iceberg" of the phenomenon), are potentially attracted by job opportunities offered by LDD, and thus by an *individual need*.

b) the group of families, including those in full swing, already sufficiently *aware* of the immense *environmental* tragedy (a dimension that includes all the others) that is waiting for us, if the "development model " does not change.

It is reasonable to think that they are potentially *attracted* to the LDD in order to meet a *collective need* for environmental protection and therefore willing to become part of its base corporate just to buy goods and services locally self-produced respecting human and environmental health at least to the extent that this does not imply a *individual sacrifice*.

c) a unit constituted by the remaining families in full swing who may immediately be *attracted* to the LDD because of simple *convenience* that could be *economic*, *logistic* or other, although they may not yet adequately be aware of the problems mentioned.

In essence, the set composed by the LDD potential "customers" has been split in two subsets with a), on the one side, and b) + c) on the other, using as a criterion, the presence or absence in families of involuntary inactivity.

2.1.1. *Families characterized by involuntary inactivity*

With regard to the *first* type of “customers”, we can see first of all that the “Market Only” system (and other systems that intentionally and eagerly lean towards it) not only ravage the environment, but also create unemployment and poverty in a generalized way, often concentrated in certain areas, producing large *pockets* characterized *at the same time* by inactive human resources and unsatisfied essential needs (without this suggesting any idea of *collective local self-production* in the economists mind). Few of them bring their attention to *local* intervention, always seen as some sort of “bricolage”, even *standard* one, and therefore “otherwise global”, “alter-global” or “glocal”.

After all, since they all serve the capitalistic élites prospering on the “Market Only” system (or they are anyhow functional to it, otherwise they would be blanked out), they cannot but contribute their thinking on a *global* scale in line with the Market.

They will, at the most, distinguish their recipes in *nineteenth-century* (let the “invisible hand” rule) or *twentieth-century* ones (call in the State “visible hand”), depending on whether they belong, respectively, to the “right” or “left” wing party of their Masters.

The *first*, more cynical and impulsive party, appears to have made a deal with the devil, he who “blows evil into the hearts of men”. The few Masters in this party do their best, by maneuvering the financial instruments in their possession, to starve the majority of the population, gladly repressing with the numerous means at their disposal any popular discontent their “subjects” or “neo-slaves” might express, and aim to use the planet limited resources to their long term advantage... environmentalists, in their own way.

The *second one* is more devious and shrewd.

Its main exponents aim to widen the circle of the banquet beneficiaries in order to obtain, democratically, a consensus to the status-quo that includes their own privileges, albeit *ephemeral* (the plundering of the planet is now well under way and the race to secure the remaining resources that is part of their strategy will shortly lead to the extinction of mankind, including any “right” or “left wing” élite).

Nowadays, given the increasing role of finance in a system that is more and more removed from the people and nearing its final stage, it seems that the “right wing” is having the upper hand. Which, paradoxically (but not too much so) is to be considered a *positive* thing.

To understand that, we just have to know two truths.

The *first* is that if the extreme (mono-paradigmatic) system applying the nineteenth century recipe had confined itself to just damaging the environment, inexorably but gradually, while ensuring at the same time “full employment” (only 3-4% unemployed taken care of by “social shock absorbers”, being careful not to go below that percentage...) and a generalized, albeit fleeting, economic prosperity, mankind would have been definitely doomed, together with its habitat.

This phenomenon is known in the literature as the “boiled frog syndrome”: the allegory describes mankind behaving like the frog that, placed in a pot, first tries to get used to the water’s increasing temperature and when it realizes it is getting dangerously hot, wants to jump out, but by then it’s too late.

In fact, in such a “rosy” hypothetical scenario very few would have agreed to take the only possible way to salvation by adopting environmentally virtuous behaviors, in production and consumption, that implied however *individual sacrifice* in favour of the collective good.

Everyone, including the well meaning economists of twentieth century schools, should acknowledge that mankind’s collective conscience is still such even today that, although facing grim *global* expectations, few “subjects” (people, communities, countries) are willing to release the grip *unilaterally*.

Even at the cost of ending up like the monkey that was caught because it did not pull out of the trap the hand used to grab the peanuts, placed there as a bait, but kept it stubbornly clenched not to lose the “precious catch” (we apologize for the irreverent comparisons, please do not make fun of the party who should feel offended).

The *second* truth is that the situation that emerges more and more clearly, indicating a tragic end in a very near future as far as the environment is concerned, although quite painful in terms of *unemployment* and *poverty* at the present time, gives us perhaps the *only* possibility to create and

spread a new system.

In other words, the “Market Only” system, which seems to be increasingly driven by the cynical “right wing” élite, has certainly generated a collective concern about human and environmental health.

This concern is *due* to the belief that such degradation depends on the prevailing Paradigm’s “genetics”, making it impossible to be kept within acceptable limits, and is also *worsened* by frustration, as individuals cannot objectively put a remedy to it.

The situation also leaves unanswered a large and apparently growing *demand* for work income.

It is precisely in this *shortcoming*, paradoxically, that the “luck” of the ecosystem lies, mankind included, because it represents a sort of “Achilles heel” of the cynically piloted “Market Only” system, otherwise invincible and unstoppable in its destructiveness, and thus provides a potential opening for an adequate private entity from the “Autonomy” to enter the economic scene and, with its “viral” diffusion (like a “therapeutic vaccine”), launch a change in the system *architecture* i.e., commonly speaking, the “developmental model”.

Indeed it will be “audience” a), expressing such an urgent demand for employment, that will allow the LDD to be “attractive” also for families from other “audiences”.

Certainly those from the *second* “audience”, with its demand for environment protection (now inhibited and resulting at the most in sporadic and inconclusive protests) that every family in the “audience” will at last be able to express in its *daily activity* by becoming, to start with, a self-producer in a nearby intermediate Community, thus promoting the *collective* interest together with its own immediate *individual* interest, as we shall see.

But also those from the *third* “audience”, including many that, although not involuntarily inactive, fear the future because of a temporary job and consequently income (that already makes it difficult for them to access credit), as well as obviously their children’s future.

Again with reference to the LDD ability to spread and, more in particular, to the resulting effects on *employment*, it is important to note that an Autonomy entity, especially if characterized by a *total* operating autonomy

because it *only* responds to its own internal demand, which is precisely the LDD case, thus resembling in this respect a self-producing family, is in no way comparable to a Market business.

It should be stressed, again, that this is an “economic modality” that can be “cloned” depending on its “attractivity”, unlike a company. The employment produced by such “modality”, the LDD in this case, is given by the *sum* of people employed in the different “clones”.

Here we refer, at least for now and as is usually done, to *specific* employment, i.e. the visible one characterizing every single “clone”, leaving to later considerations an assessment of the *general* employment registered in the whole economic system following the appearance of a “clone”, which is what counts most in macroeconomic terms.

That is how the LDD, given its large *employment capacity*, can potentially respond to a first large “audience” of prospective members-workers to whom neither the Market nor other *private* self-producing Communities can respond; involuntarily inactive subjects must today rely, at best, on some form of welfare provided by *public* self-producing Communities at different government levels or on other people generosity, thanks to private *Heteronomous* entities from the Philanthropy world.

Given such a deplorable situation, the LDD could, in principle, be “attractive” to potential members-workers as soon as it could guarantee a remuneration equal to the “legal” national *minimum* wage or anyhow comparable to those prevailing in the *lower* salary ranges of the labour market.

This is because the LDD does not simply offer a job, and therefore an income, to *anyone* who wants it, which is already important in itself, but this job, unlike what usually happens on the Market, is also *secure*, always *nearby*, carried out in a *participatory* way (and not as an employee), in a wide range of fields that best *suit* the individual, and adequate as much as possible to the working *time* available to him, either below or above standard working time, or in other ways (after hours, periodical or occasional).

As regards audience a), already large but bound to grow with the spread of LDD “clones” by also attracting, albeit part-time, people in employment but unhappy with their job, our considerations on the LDD “attractivity”

may well end here.

But that is not all.

It should be noted that the LDD “genetics” and “peculiar” strengths can bring about a surprising high level of “attractivity” to potential working members, despite salaries being set at the *minimum national wage* level.

We must point out that a salary earned in the LDD should be compared to those earned in other contexts such as Market, Philanthropy or other public and private self-producing monetized Communities not so much at a *nominal* level but in terms of *buying power* in the rather large LDD production range.

In fact such a salary, unlike those offered in other areas, can be spent like them on the Market (the only place where they can be spent), but has also access to goods and services produced in the LDD at purchase prices, given by production prices, that are *different* from those in force on the Market.

For the potential working member it will then be a question, in case of the hypothetical choice between a job opportunity in the LDD or elsewhere, of taking *also* into account in his decision the difference between prices in the two purchase contexts open to him.

This will not pose particular problems, since in the LDD spreading phase, to which the above considerations on LDD “attractivity” apply, the potential working member will have access to *statistics* comparing prices in the two contexts.

The “Purchasing Power Parity” between a Euro spent in the various LDDs and a Euro spent on the local Market will be public knowledge in the different local areas, i.e. everyone will be able to know how many Euros it takes to buy on the local market, with reference to the “housewife shopping basket”, what can be bought with 1 Euro in the LDD... on condition of being a member.

It might well be the case that LDD remunerations, although *lower* in *nominal* terms than those in force on average elsewhere, are equivalent and even *higher* in terms of *volume* of goods and services that can be purchased, i.e. in *real* terms (this expression is used in specialized literature when comparing remunerations that can be spent in geographical contexts usually characterized by potentially different price levels).



Taking now into account, on the one hand, that LDD production costs involve relatively low *nominal* remunerations but also, on the other hand, its numerous and important “strengths”, we will expect in theory these costs to be *lower* in the various “clones” for an equivalent quality (or presumably so, since quality is hardly *ascertainable* on the Market) than local market prices.

With reference to the first “audience” of potential workers-members we can therefore conclude by saying that the LDD has all chances to be “attractive”, certainly in the absence of employment alternatives, but not only that.

Putting the theory to the test will say the final word.

### 2.1.2. *Families in full activity who are also environmentally aware*

Coming now to the second “audience” of potential members, whose presence is *essential* for the creation and smooth operation of the self-production circuit, it is reasonable to think that, if what we said about relative levels of purchasing prices on the local market versus LDD applies, the LDD may definitely exercise its “attractivity” *also* with this “audience”, despite the fact that, unlike the previous “audience”, the families that make it up are already economically solvent.

Indeed they should be quite happy to be part, through one of their members, of the LDD community, allowing them to acquire in such context goods and services produced *in situ* that are *verifiably* respecting the *environment* and *human health* (goods and services they would be willing to pay even above market prices), at least insofar as the prices are *no higher* than prevailing local market prices. Everything leads to believe that, even without any particular “forcing” designed to lower the costs if necessary and which may occur in any case, they might be just that, making the LDD sufficiently “attractive” certainly to anyone who, with his work, wants to bridge his family purchasing power gap and regain his own personal dignity, but also to those who look for buying facilities that will allow their family to no longer be a *victim* of product quality degradation and a forced *accomplice* of environmental degradation without having to

pay extra for it.

As an example of such “forcing” we could first of all mention certain virtuous practices that may be adopted within the LDD by its workforce, such as the introduction of “voluntary” work in the production of specific suitable goods and services, to lower the nominal (i.e. expressed in actual money) cost of labour per hour.

Such *endogenous* “forcing”, that would surely contribute to the LDD “attractivity” for “audience” b), would however be mainly formal for an “audience” a) made up of workers-members, since to the resulting decrease in total costs would correspond an increase, albeit partial, in the wages *purchasing power*. We should also bear in mind that, as soon as the first field trials will show the LDD secure *viability*, with or without *endogenous* “forcing”, the interest of *public* communities for its diffusion will emerge clearly (unemployment has high *direct* and *indirect* costs that fall back on the whole community). It cannot be excluded that, if necessary, the LDD diffusion might be further facilitated from outside (*exogenous* “forcing”), for example by local Administrations, especially those more sensitive to employment and environmental issues, in the most different ways, even at “zero cost”, starting with an increased citizens awareness of the initiative up to the enforcing, as last resort, of administrative measures to reduce the costs of *setting up* (and therefore *using*, given the rent calculation formula) production spaces needed by the LDD, to the advantage of cost containment and hence LDD “attractivity” to all “audiences” of its potential “customers”.

At this point, given that the LDD “attractivity” to “audience” b) is based on respect for the environment and human health, although we did not underestimate the importance of prices, more convenient for members, according to *statistics*, than on the local market, in order to better assess such “attractivity” we must introduce a *factor* so important that it could make the difference for some families from “audience” b) when considering the opportunity of becoming LDD shareholders.

That is the *verifiability* of product quality, which characterizes self-produced goods and services, but *not* those produced by others.

This factor, despite varying from one product to the next and being difficult to measure, is still an economic value, although *subjectively* attributable.

Such “verifiability” has an importance of its own not only with regard to consumer *goods* for the family, in particular farming products, but also for certain *services* such as the repair of cars or other technological goods, where it involves *quality* (original or non original spare parts) but also *quantity* and sometimes the very *existence* of some services that show up on the invoice.

Nowadays, in a “Market Only” system, the consumer has no choice but to *trust* the producer.

The *statistics* on relative price differences between the local Market and the various LDD “clones”, as expressed by the Purchasing Power Parity, could be just a first step in assessing the LDD “attractivity”, i.e. moneywise.

In fact, for those who must choose between the two buying contexts, what counts, rather than the *objective* statistical Parity, is not only the Parity *personalized* by their family *consumption patterns* (if you do not have a car you are little interested in the relative price of repairs), which is a more adequate comparison tool although it can only be approximately quantified and can move upwards or downwards the “attractivity” level quantified by the Parity, but also, and especially, the *Personalized Perceived* Parity. This also takes into account the importance given by individuals to the *verifiability* of product quality and will certainly work for any “shopping basket”, including the one considered in the Personalized Parity, *in favour* of the LDD “attractivity” as regards its value for money: a potential *purchasing* member may be willing to pay for a “self-produced egg” of which he knows exactly, as a *self-producer*, quality and freshness, even double the price of an egg offered on the market, and so much the better if he has to pay less for it, objectively.

To sum all this up, it must be strongly emphasized that quality *verifiability*, with special reference to essential goods and services, is a further important “strength” of self-production, resting on a mirror “weakness” of the Market of which little has been said so far, and quite reluctantly, in insiders circles (understandably so, since the “Market Only” global system is not in question and thus the problem, unsolvable by its very nature, only admits hypocritical solutions).

The subject is now even a *taboo* one with a large number of common people, and understandably so, because in a cultural environment

dominated by a “single-track thinking” focused on *Heteronomy* (where even the small bastion of home self-production has been, as far as quality verifiability is concerned, removed from collective imagination) all that is left to consumers, as we said before, is resignation.

Saying that the need for competitiveness, ingrained in the Market, can often *negatively* influence product quality (especially with scientific and technological progress acting as a powerful catalyst since, according to popular wisdom, “opportunity makes the thief”) should not shock anyone any longer (not even economists, given the recent “discovery” of “information asymmetry” between producer and consumer... sort of “reinventing the wheel”, one would say).

It is plain for everyone to see that “bad products tend to drive good ones out of the Market”, confining them in the long run to an élitist “niche” (this is the case of “*organic*” food products, those “supposed to be” as they “should normally be”).

On that regard we must point out that our essay is motivated by a number of beliefs, of which one, widely shared, can be summarized as follows: if a *heteronomous* producer believes that a certain option may have a chance, even *minimal*, to help his product success, he will not hesitate to adopt it even if it is *definitely* harmful in some way to the health of consumers or the environment. And he will do that whether such option is permitted by current legislation or not, as long as the *risk* (quantified by the sanction, together with the probability that the violation is discovered and the penalty applied) is lower than the supposed benefit.

Not to mention the fact that in the Heteronomy Paradigm one must add to the negative effects for consumers (all of us) and the environment (our common home) of such *physiological* behaviour of heteronomous producers (potentially all of us) the much more serious effects resulting from the *pathological* behavior of a more or less organized crime.

All this goes to stress that the *verifiability* of product *quality* is a *value*, as is the verifiability of *the environmental impact* of production processes.

Such a verifiability can be best ensured only by self-production, regardless of the *certifications* of various kind that have now invaded the economic scene.

Those who are particularly keen on transparency in purchasing, not

due to “paranoia” but just to a natural instinct of self-defence, should therefore *bring down* the costs of LDD production, which helps to make any participation in it a valid and “attractive” option, given our current times.

### 2.1.3. *Families in full activity and with low environmental awareness*

Of course, if the LDD production costs should turn out to be considerably lower than market prices, the LDD “attractivity” is likely to extend its effects also beyond “audience” a) and b), being also of interest to an “audience” c) made up of families with no involuntary inactivity and not much aware yet of issues related to the environment or the deterioration of quality standards of most basic consumer products, but who may just be “attracted” as buyers, trivially enough, because of the convenient prices.

That part of population from which “audience” c) is more likely to emerge can appear perhaps too large given, on the one hand, the possible *underestimation* of the size of “audience” b), which finds it difficult today to express itself since in our collective imagination the constant and widespread degradation appears to be an inescapable trend we will have to live with and might as well get used to and, on the other hand, the possible *underestimation* of “audience” a), since involuntary activity is often confused with “unemployment” which, as we said, is just the “tip of the iceberg” of this phenomenon.

In other words, “audience” a) and b), far from representing just “unemployed people” and “ecologists”, have unseen ramifications through the rest of the population that could manifest themselves with the return “in a big way” on the economic scene of self-production, as soon as it became apparent that, by becoming members of a LDD (the forebringer of such return), it will be possible to bring down the wall that actually prevents today’s consumers to *verify* the quality of products and to control the environmental impact of production processes, starting from the crucial sectors.

Such *verifiability* constitutes, in other words, a value. Certainly for “audience”

b), but also for the other “audiences” and, if we add its effects to those of other LDD “strengths”, is likely to widen significantly “audience” c), which, attracted by an increased *perception* of value for money, will emerge first from the hardly visible ramifications of “audience” a) and b) and then from the rest of society.

#### 2.1.4. *Another world is possible*

Finally, there remains one last point that will bring further *clarity* to the comparison between LDD production costs and Market prices, contributing in particular to further enlarge “audience” c) and, more in general, to enhance the LDD “attractivity” to all “audiences”.

This consists in highlighting some *hidden costs* of the products offered on the Market that, although *not showing* on the price are however *paid for* by the buyer through tax.

Many of them have to do with the *transport* required by the great distance separating the place of origins of many goods from the place of residence of consumers, a consequence of the need for competitiveness which is ingrained in the Market. Such distance is due to industrial production being concentrated in certain areas and to the sale of out-of-season farming products coming even from the opposite hemisphere, but also to the mere need for a (fictitious) wider choice of the buyer, such as the sale of plastic water bottles coming from hundreds or thousands of kilometers away.

To have an idea of the *hidden* costs charged to the community, just think of the setting up and maintenance of transport infrastructures, the public health costs associated with accidents, the pollution attributable to goods transport, the costs of related traffic control, the public cost of waste disposal resulting from the necessary packaging... up to the use of land.

These aspects, now kept under wrap but which are bound to become common knowledge as the LDD spreads, will help those who may be offered the opportunity of becoming members of a LDD, even only to purchase its self-produced goods and services, but should also induce

some thinking in the economists convinced of the ineluctability of the global “Market Only”, who continue undeterred to fly the TINA (There Is No Alternative) flag.

From what we said so far it appears that, regardless of the evolving of economists opinions, people must urgently be put in a position to choose, initially, between the Market and a highly evolved form of self-production such as that embodied by LDDs; that should bring back to this context at least part of the basic consumer goods (first and foremost farming products) as well as services, in the hope that, starting in the industrialized countries, the ranks of those serving under the AWIP (Another World Is Possible) flag will swell, taking the road of *true progress* to finally achieve the double objective of social and environmental sustainability.

## 2.2. Countries with a “Traditional Static” system

Countries where a system prevails similar to the *Traditional Static* one make up a heterogeneous galaxy that actually includes all non-industrialized or little industrialized Countries and is characterized by definitely bi-paradigmatic systems where individual goods and services of basic family consumption, in addition to being formally and informally *hetero-produced*, remain mostly in a domestic *self-production* context, just as individual services of general interest are also *self-produced* by public Communities along with collective services (the latter of their exclusive competence). The above classification distinguishes, however, Countries for which such an economic structure is the direct consequence of a “way of life” shaped in all its aspects by *religion* (incompatible with the one prevailing in “Market Only” systems) from Countries that in ways quite *different* between them and yet characterized by a “way of life” still rooted in Tradition but eager to follow in the footsteps of richer Countries, have not managed to make their economy evolve to surely direct them to the goal, albeit distant, of a “Market Only” system.

The latter, the poorest of all, are the constant “target” of international aid based on a precise logic which aims, officially, to *integrate* such Countries

in the global Market context. This logic, which turns them into “clay pots” placed between “iron pots” on the Market international competition scene, is obviously bound to fail with the just as obvious consequences: they will remain in poverty and (strangely enough) in a state of *perennial* neo-colonialist like exploitation.

The interesting aspect of this bipartition of the galaxy of Countries with a Static Traditional system lies precisely in the potential difference that can characterize the LDD spreading ability in the two cases, since it will depend on the contrast between a *propensity to evolve*, a key feature of poorer Countries (which can be exploited by “outside powers” using the “mirage” of the “Market Only” system like the classic *carrot* placed in front of the donkey), and a *resistance to evolve* that characterizes Countries with a Traditional Religious Static system, a resistance exerted by “internal powers” (as they see such evolution, and quite rightly so today, only as a fatal “drift” towards “Market Societies” devoid of any sustainability), whereby they stubbornly *dig their heels in* to avoid the “drift”, even bringing in *God's will*.

Given that the usefulness at planetary level of a LDD diffusion in such galaxy of countries, first necessary step of an evolution from *Traditional Static* systems to a *Traditional Regenerative Dynamic system*, is less due to their contribution to today's planetary environmental emergency than to internal problems (*great poverty* in one case and *lack of individual freedom* in the other), it is also a fact that the LDD ability to spread will depend not only on the severity of such problems, but also and foremost on the aforementioned *propensity to change*, *present* in Countries with a *Tribal Static Traditional system* but *absent*, at least apparently so, in Countries with a *Religious Static Traditional system*.

For a brief assessment of the LDD “market” in the group of *Traditional Static system* countries we can, given such a different propensity to change, anticipate first the emergence of a great *demand* for LDD “clones” adjusted to local situations, a demand that international aid could significantly help to *meet*, thus becoming more effective, in the poorer countries of the world where the *tribal* variant prevails.

Considering, however, that the *bipartition* of this group of Countries using a “tribal/religious” discriminator will naturally be rather approximate and



identify only extreme cases, we are left with a large number of Countries in a sort of “grey area”, where the religious component does not condition the “way of life” of people in an *absolute* way as in *integralist* countries.

It is therefore reasonable to imagine the emergence of a demand for LDD clones suitable for *gender difference* sensitivity also in the “grey area” Countries receiving international aid, when this aid could surely, if the donors agree, contribute to the dynamics of LDD diffusion.

If such diffusion were to take place it is not excluded that, given its effects, the balance of power between those opposing innovation and the direct potential beneficiaries of it will tip, even in the more *reluctant* Countries, in favour of the latter.

Since the metamorphosis induced by the LDD diffusion in the latter countries, despite requiring an *enhancement* of the Market to answer a new demand for production spaces and related equipment, certainly does not open the door to any “drift” towards a “Market Only” system and therefore a “Market Society”, it is not to be excluded that such diffusion may also take place in integralist Countries: it will depend on whether, and to what extent, *gender discrimination* constitutes a real problem.

The LDD would represent however for these Countries, if it were to spread in other, similar countries, an opportunity for social evolution and increased prosperity, an opportunity, now non-existent, with no “drift” risk.

Regardless of the differences mentioned above, that surely characterize the two types of Countries with a static system, it is nevertheless clear that such a diverse and populated galaxy would represent an *immense market* for the Executors. This is both due to the widespread poverty that characterizes it, which only the diffusion of Districts can eliminate, and to the fact that self-production, in addition to being a distinctive practice in those people way of life, constitutes an *evolution* of it, certainly welcomed because emblematic of an idea of *progress* that seems to be inborn in man.

### 3. IMPACT OF THE LDD DIFFUSION IN THE SYSTEM

*(to the attention of the Sponsor)*

In the previous section we provided some elements for reflection destined to the potential Executors (Market companies) to help them assess the size of the demand they could induce by *gradually* starting off a field LDD trial as a marketing tool, and then meet such demand in a competitive environment where to operate with an undeniable, lasting competitive edge.

In this section we will talk about the main *consequences* of the dynamics that could set in, so that some Philanthropy entity with a mission compatible with them may consider its interest in “associating” with the Executors (or identify other, alternative, ones) to facilitate and enhance such dynamics through its Sponsorship.

Also in this regard it would be best to handle countries with a “Static Traditional” system separately from those with a “Market Only” system or one heading definitely towards it.

The expected impact of the LDD diffusion on the architecture of the two systems is quite different in the two cases, as are the social and environmental consequences that may stem from any structural change in the economies of these Countries.

#### 3.1. *Countries with a “Market Only” and a “Traditional Degenerative Dynamic” system*

Let’s start in order of importance with these countries, meaning that a profound metamorphosis along the above lines is a *necessary* condition for *the whole* of mankind to hope in a better future, if not a future at all.

If such a metamorphosis, which could extend its positive effects also to Countries with a “Static Traditional” system, should not take place very shortly, no Country will escape the appalling global catastrophe that the Market Only countries are going to cause.

Since the above analysis indicated in the LDD diffusion the starting point of such a metamorphosis and identified its potential great ability

to spread in the Countries in question, at least in theory, we must now examine more closely the broad lines of their economies evolution towards the “Traditional Regenerative Dynamic” system.

We shall see, in particular, that such an evolution is going to happen through “domino effects”, confirming that our analysis had correctly identified the LDD as the *long-sought solution*; the evolution can be considered established when the *very first* results of the field trial which, remember, takes place in an absolutely *gradual* way, will show to be according to expectations, even without the “forcing” (always possible anyway and easily implementable to speed up the dynamics), previously mentioned here as a mere “safeguard resort” to make sure the objective is achieved.

### 3.1.1. *Employment aspects*

#### *Preamble*

Let’s start by pointing out that the issue of employment typically concerns the Heteronomy Paradigm.

Indeed, if the near totality of goods and services were self-produced within the Autonomy Paradigm, i.e. within a hypothetical “All Autonomy” system, there would be no unemployment problem, regardless of the production being distributed among *various modalities*, public and private, of the Paradigm itself. It certainly has not been a problem in the “All State” systems (an extreme type, even among the “All Autonomy” systems, in which the whole production was in the hands of a *single* Paradigm modality, the only one that could afford such a “feat”) and where inactivity was even banned, including any voluntary one.

Here we must deal with the Heteronomy Paradigm because the *Traditional Re-generative Dynamic* system, representing the convergence point of the advocated metamorphosis, involves the symbiosis (synergistic, not parasitic in this case) of economic modalities belonging to *both* Paradigms. As regards employment, we should also consider, although it may seem *trivial*, that its level cannot be considered a macroeconomic

parameter to be controlled, *regardless* of its use, in a logic of “growth, of any kind, for employment”.

Such a consideration, however, finds its place here because that is the stance of orthodox economists, the “Prince’s advisers” who, unwittingly but quite often, urge the Government to use its “visible hand” to allocate resources (an “affront” to the “invisible hand” bordering on the sacrilegious...) nearly always, however, where it should least be done (but there is a reason for everything), for purposes ... of employment.

Still, everybody can see that a system is all the more desirable the more a) it can use all the available human resources b) to produce goods and services that are more useful to society c) in a context of social and environmental sustainability.

Despite that, orthodox economists defend tooth and nail a system that not only fails to deliver point a), being even incompatible with it, but fails abundantly to also meet point b), using much of our human and natural resources in a constant fight of everyone against everyone else and in a great collective war against the environment, thus also failing point c), a system that must be changed urgently and *at all costs*; it would be suicidal not to do it, especially if that involves *no costs*, as in the case of the LDD induced metamorphosis, but just immediate *individual* advantages for anyone taking up this road, with a view to future *collective* advantages.

#### 3.1.1.1. *Specific and general employment*

Given what we just said, and going back to the effects on employment of a metamorphic process aiming to satisfy point a), b) and c) above, it is important to note that, as soon as the *first* field trial results (such as the start of an initial self-production business, let’s say bread self-production, which implies the presence of all non-working members together with a couple of working members), will confirm the LDD diffusion potential, the *Executor*, as other production spaces become gradually available, will have no problem in finding, thanks to the *Sponsor*, within the territory of operation corresponding to a Town or Municipality, the members-workers allowing him to launch in sequence the other activities needed

to complete a pilot LDD “clone”, to use as a marketing tool with a view to spread other “clones” wherever they may be required.

Since the capital that can be allocated to *profitable* investments (as they would be in this case, given the extent and sign of the associated risk) is *unlimited*, this means that, as long as the reserves of “prospective members” (working and non-working ones) available in the right *proportions* in the territory are not exhausted, the *Executor* can continue to create and spread rapidly other LDD “clones”, activating each time (let’s take, for convenience, the approximate numbers mentioned above) about a hundred people or, more precisely, “full time equivalents”.

At first glance such dynamics seem inevitably bound to absorb much of the involuntary inactivity present in the area of intervention within the lead time, relatively short all considered, required to implement the necessary number of “clones”.

If we look more in detail, however, this conclusion appears, to say the least, a little hasty.

Considering that every single initiative undertaken in economics, either public or private, causes direct and indirect effects to varying degrees in the rest of the system (like ripples caused by a stone falling into the water), an evaluation of the employment created in the whole system (*general employment*) requires that employment data characterizing every single initiative (*specific employment*) are corrected by the positive and negative effects induced elsewhere.

It is precisely the *general* employment being generated that allows to assess the real “employment capacity” of a certain type of initiatives (private and public) and is therefore the one that, in their ideal evaluation, allows to assign to each one its real *impact* on employment in the system (our topic).

This issue is of *little* interest to the private *Executor* not hunting for public funds, an endangered species, who is glad to settle for a good *diffusion capacity* of the LDD, regardless of its causes; it is even of *no* interest to the direct beneficiaries of the initiative’s employment aspects, who are only interested in being part of that *specific* employment, but is of sure interest to those addressed by this section, i.e. the representatives of the system’s Institutional Units, usually private non-profit institutions whose

“mission” is in the public interest and who, *associating with the Executor*, or looking for another one of their liking, can contribute to a synergistic pursuit of the respective objectives.

What we said about *specific* and *general* employment applies, obviously, whichever is the economic Paradigm hosting the initiative. Let’s clarify, with a few examples, the difference between the two employment concepts mentioned above.

### 3.1.1.2. *Occupation and innovation*

Starting with an environment familiar to us all, the Market, the experts say that:

a) to each *viable* private initiative corresponds, albeit to a varying degree, the creation of some additional *general* employment in the system, and  
b) the necessary condition for a private initiative to be *viable* is to come from *innovation*, “process” innovation (as it makes a company competitive on the existing *market*) or “product” innovation (as it allows the company to open a *new market*).

In the first case the *general* employment being created is considered equal to *zero* or even *negative*, at least at first (first ripple in the water), but *compensation* effects are postulated that help adjust upwards the employment figure and make it positive (the saving made by buyers due to a better price can, for example, be spent elsewhere, creating new employment in different production sectors).

In the second case, since the demand met by the new offer is also new, *specific* employment is considered, rightly or wrongly, as all *general*.

Apart from the differences in terms of *general* employment deriving from the two types of innovation, much higher in the second case, it appears that without one or the other no initiative can be *viable* and therefore cannot re-munerate its production factors, including labour.

In other words, supposing a bread producer appears on a given market and manages to attract enough customers to make his business viable, since such viability, according to experts, cannot have any other cause but innovation, it must have been ensured by a *new* production technique

(like automation or the use of additives for faster production times) that makes the new offer economically competitive, or by a *new* type of bread, tastier and/or suitable for new uses (both innovations, however, rather unlikely).

Similarly, if the *Executor's* initiative (consisting in the supply of services to *investors* called to provide production facilities and to *families* called to feed the self-production circuit, with a view to spread LDD "clones" wherever required) manages to intercept sufficient demand from *investors* and *families*, making the initiative viable, that will be thanks to the innovation characterizing the self-production circuit which, being new, constitutes a "product" innovation (an intangible product, in this case).

The *specific* employment occurring in the business created by the *Executor* to follow his initiative will be, therefore, all *general* employment.

On the other hand, any *specific* employment created within the LDD through the *ordinary* production of *basic* goods and services shall always lead, according to the adepts of orthodox economics, to null *general* employment.

That is the opinion usually expressed by insiders and various experts, often out of their depth on this issue, about the LDD employment capacity.

Indeed, given the total lack of innovation, a self-production circuit should not even be viable and only public support could possibly prolong its existence.

Yet, self-production circuits just as devoid of innovation exist in the real world, and some of them, such as those set up in family environments, are highly frequent, as well as viable.

It seems therefore that, in spite of some terse statements about the need for innovation for the creation and relative viability of the *general* activity of different initiatives, at least the collective ones at the base of self-production circuits, something is amiss.

### 3.1.1.3. *The relational factor*

Apart from self-production circuits, it seems often more reasonable to

evoke causes *other* than innovation for most *viable* initiatives found on the Market.

Returning to the baker example, it is entirely possible that, despite producing *non innovative* bread using *ordinary techniques*, he manages to attract customers for completely different reasons, including some *empathic* or *relational* ones (well know honesty of the baker, his belonging to a special social group...) that cannot be classified as *innovation* (but rather bound to *tradition* or simply to *social reality*, contexts where, unlike in the *imaginary* economists world, human relationships do *count*).

In short, on the theme of employment, this orthodox academic approach to reality based on innovation as a prerequisite for an initiative to be viable and for the creation of new activities in the system seems rather restrictive.

Indeed, if we look at the real world, it is clear how the role of the relational sphere in economics is today undervalued, one could say “blanked out”, by economists.

And that is no coincidence.

We can place the *relational* factor at the exact opposite of the axiom at the base of the theoretical models so dear to mainstream economists, which says that relationships between economic operators are necessarily conflicting relationships between producers and *third party* consumers, two groups within which there must also be a mutual competition. This factor, likely to lead to *aggregative forms* such as cartels and ethical purchasing groups (intra-corporative agreements) or, worse, *self-organizations* of economic networks (inter-corporative agreements), provides a disturbing element for such models... as well as lack of respect for the “invisible hand”.

We are not very far from the front page of economics manuals in the more “advanced” Countries bearing the words “self-organization is strictly forbidden, any abuse will be published”.

The much celebrated need for innovation, better if technological, in order to create wealth and employment shows therefore its ideological nature and appears to be essentially the tool of an aggressive form of propaganda.

To the point that those who, with regard to “process” innovation



(aiming, at least from a capital/remuneration point of view, to save the most costly and potentially problematic resource), evoke the spectre of “jobless growth” are considered neo-Luddites (an epithet deriving from the phantomatic Ludd who, the tale goes, was so stupid and backward that he destroyed the looms to save jobs). As for “product” innovation (which aims to offer any kind of merchandise to people who do not know how to spend their money, as long as it elicits the desire of potential buyers, regardless of the effects of its production on the environment and of its consumption on human health), those who raise environmental objections are just poor idiots who also upset somebody’s plans.

In short, the belittling of innovation, especially if it comes from technological progress, is considered “sacrilegious” by current experts (scientific progress must not be stopped... except in the economic sciences, where it is rather the regression to the *law of the jungle* that tells us in which direction History is going).

#### 3.1.1.4. *Innovation and economic development*

Besides, our friends at the service of the “Market Only” ideology have to find *reasons* and *mechanisms* to explain the historical trend to expansion of the Market sphere of action in most Countries economies, which has turned it into the high road to be followed without ever looking away.

As regards the *reasons*, the quick answer is that the expansion of the Market is celebrated as a synonym of growth of the economy as a whole, hence increase of *usable* (sic) wealth, and *employment* that allows access to such wealth; consequently, it can only focus the whole society on this objective.

As for identifying the *mechanisms* by which this “beneficial” expansion takes place, the two types of innovation mentioned above lend themselves very well to the role. Indeed, the contribution they give to businesses and their products in terms of ever increasing production efficiency and growing stimulus to consumption can only drive the Market up.

We cannot however hide some serious misgivings, not only on the *motivations* and *mechanisms* supposed to underlie Market development,

but also on such development representing the growth of the whole economy (and, as such, desirable because the level and quality of life depends entirely on it).

With regard to the first aspect, we probably need just to evoke the unbridled lust for power that prevails in a small minority of mankind, a pathological trait that, if channeled, could paradoxically have some social utility but in an economy where finance dominates, in a scientifically and technologically advanced environment and in the presence of *triggering factors* in the system can do a lot of damage.

Of these factors, a major one is certainly represented by the *Limited Liability Public Companies*, an instrument that allows capital to acquire, so to speak, *a life of its own* and thus become the “Devil’s dung”, which just aims to multiply itself even to the detriment of Man and Nature. In their constant and blind pursuit of profit these public companies, by depersonalizing their shareholders, induce a *lynching* on the hands of otherwise meek individuals (the small shareholders) who, thanks to the anonymity granted by the group and led by shrewd and ruthless people (technostructures who only obey their master, the capital), can become bloodthirsty killers. Shame that with public companies, especially *multinationals*, devoid even of a national identity, the unfortunate subject destined to be lynched, without any guilt of its own, should be the ecosystem of the spaceship orbiting the sun where we are all embarked. We can say beforehand that one of the *Traditional Re-generative Dynamic* system great advantages, enough to hope that it will soon come about, consists in creating the *conditions* a) to induce in multinational entities a “genetic mutation” (repeatedly tried through legislation but never succeeded, as expected, and to which we shall return) so that their behavioural excesses can be curbed and b) to gradually reposition their area of action and, more in general, downsize their role in the economic and social sphere.

As for the second aspect, we should consider a) that the so called “wealth” produced and exchanged in the Market is, as previously pointed out, far from being all *usable*, given the numerous *collateral* effects of industrialization (e.g. transport) and competition (e.g. advertising) engrained in the Market, and b) that the growth of such wealth and

relative employment has been, in the historical period of its maximal expression, mainly the result of an *accounting illusion* due to the transfer of economic activities from the informal, non-monetized sphere of a family and proximity type of economy to the formal and monetized sphere of the Market, a passage reflected in the increase of *statistical indicators* (in short, all that glitters is not gold in the Market expansion).

It must be said that, prior to the transfer of activities to the Market, people were not idle but made products, perhaps in less quantity but often of better quality and, more to the point, in a sustainable way.

In conclusion, without going as far as saying that “we were better off when... we were *statistically* worse”, it is quite apparent that the “Market Only” race represents an increasingly dangerous *drift*, which must urgently be reversed with a massive *counter-exodus* to a thrifty and efficient collective self-production, but *not* a public one, on a *local* scale, of many activities essential to life (especially farming products, now in the hands of a globalized Market, but also many services), leaving the Market to do what no one else can do better (the production, with due exceptions, of capital intensive goods and services, starting from instrumental goods). This can take place through a rationalization effort within the Autonomy Paradigm, now possible thanks to the new ICTs (Information and Communication Technologies) progress, which aims to optimize the efficiency of specific small production-consumption circuits, making them sufficiently “attractive” to large segments of the population.

This is the spirit that led to the LDL.

Our thesis is that *only* by spreading LDL “clones” on the territory can we achieve full and permanent activity in the system and, through the numerous domino effects that will be set off, improve *the economy as a whole* and propagate a way of life based on sustainable prosperity, where people can find their dignity in a less and less distressful and binding job, so that mankind can be relieved of material needs to the full advantage of the emotional, intellectual and spiritual sphere.

*That is the only way* to adequately reduce the economic chaos produced by the absence of the “invisible hand”, and thus lower the levels of individual and collective aggressiveness, now growing rapidly, which could take mankind to its own extinction.

3.1.1.5. *Mutual trust and solidarity in the creation of work and wealth*

We now go back to the *relational* sphere, in order to clarify its current role and, above all, figure out its future one; let's examine a few emblematic situations where there is a creation of real, usable wealth and *general* employment (or activity, somehow), and which show no trace of (or need for) innovation.

These situations, either real or imaginary, may *cause some surprise* because they produce a rather unexpected effect according to the "law of economics" that says that "employment is synonymous with innovation", just as levitation, which contradicts the "physical law" of gravity.

That applies to the totally *imaginary* situation of the former hairdresser with tattered shoes and former cobbler with unkempt hair, both forced to inactivity for want of customers and therefore lacking the money, supposedly in the same amount, that would allow them to acquire on the market the service they need, now certainly off their budget.

As they meet and see their mutual need, the two decide to exchange the professional service they need.

Through such a direct exchange (barter) of services, the two inactive people who were dumped by the Market for some reason, not excluding an insufficient modernization of the production process and/or the product they offer, were however able to generate a new *specific* (informal) activity that appears to be entirely *additional* to the system, i.e. all *general*. In fact the production-exchange-consumption circuit activated by them has absolutely no impact on the surrounding context since the two protagonists, in addition to not touching any money, did not change with their initiative their previous expenditure pattern as the exchanged services and products are supposed totally off their budget.

In other words, the two protagonists have arranged things between themselves, unbeknown to the economic system, without causing anyone any bother, and have created in the very system of which they are part, despite their modest role, a new activity or somehow a "spark" of it that testifies to its short-lived existence.

Let's move now to another situation, quite *real* this time, whereby a certain number of service providers (hairdresser, cobbler, plumber,

painter, baby-sitter, musician, linguist...), characterized to some extent by involuntary inactivity, decide to set up a Local Exchange System (LES), a practice that tends to spread in the West for want of anything better and in which each member offers a service to other members at a price expressed in an *internal currency* accepted by all members as payment for their respective services.

We have in this case a sort of “multilateral barter” because, just as a proper barter, it requires an act of *mutual trust* between participants, leading each one of them to “grant credit” to the others by accepting the *internal currency* (expression or title of such credit), counting on the fact that they will be able to spend it to acquire services in the same context, thus completing the production-exchange-consumption circuit, which is the ultimate goal of the collective initiative.

This circuit, created in a “multilateral barter” context, is *additional* with respect to the Market, as it *totally* rests on the LES own currency (we will not consider here any input that might be required to provide the services and should be acquired in a monetized way, since the services offered in a LES context consist essentially in “working” services, as these are the “goods” each participant wants to sell and therefore also the only ones he can buy in this context).

However, as regards its effects on employment, we cannot say, *a priori*, that *all* activity deployed in the LES circuit is additional to the system as in the bilateral barter example.

That depends on the fact that some services, produced and exchanged in the LES (hairdresser, plumber, painter...), unlike in the previous example, are part to some extent of the members families consumption pattern and it is reasonable to assume that, having one of their members joined this informal exchange system, some variation will take place in the spending pattern of the family, as every service acquired in the LES will release part of the family income, which can be spent on other purchases.

This causes the LES circuit, although *additional* to the economy's monetized context, to produce *indirectly* some “turbulence” in it, which leads, in particular, to “emigration” of activities from the production sectors that include services produced and exchanged in the LES, and

to “immigration” into sectors receiving that part of the members families income that is made “free” by purchases made in the LES using the *internal currency* earned by their adhering member.

To calculate the net variation in *general* activity due to the LES creation and resulting from a *private* and *viable* collective initiative (not an individual one, as a Market enterprise would be), we must therefore correct the *specific* activity taking place in it with the employment *balance* corresponding to that migration.

Such balance may be positive or negative, depending on the “labour intensity” level in the sectors affected by the “migrating” phenomenon.

However, even if we should think that the balance is negative (because the activities involved in “emigration”, i.e. those including LES produced services, have presumably “labour intensive” record levels), such balance will probably still be one *order of magnitude* lower than the “migratory flows”, implying the creation of an additional *general* activity relatively near to the *specific* one.

We will not mention here the additional *general* employment associated with the set up of production facilities, since the supply of such services takes place in existing spaces (e.g. the buyer’s home).

And so it is that, also in this second situation, a *new* net (informal) activity can be created in the economic system: anyone who finds it somehow difficult to access the Market and other monetized contexts can enjoy the fruits of the new activity, without any trace of the innovation judged necessary by experts, but thanks to a simple act of *mutual trust* that does not affect (for good or bad) the economic individuality of operators.

We note that, as in the baker’s case, the two barter situations illustrated above also belong to the Heteronomy Paradigm, i.e. a context where *independent* subjects produce for *third parties*, albeit within a small restricted circle as compared to the general context, in *competition* between them (this being clear, however, only in the second barter example, where the producers of a given service may be more than one and in competition between them, as typically happens according to current literature in the Market, which best embodies this Paradigm).

At this point it is worth highlighting a few remarkable aspects that have emerged so far from the Heteronomy Paradigm examples, to stress

their similarities and differences with respect to Autonomy Paradigm situations that we will take into consideration later.

The *first* is given by the fact that in the Heteronomy Paradigm there is space for the creation of *specific* and *general* activity *without* the need for innovation (of “process” or “product”) and in such space, originating from the *relational* dimension typical of human beings, the catalyst principle is represented by *trust* between economic agents.

This can be *unilateral* (like the one, in the baker’s example, that may have induced customers to switch to a notoriously honest producer), but can also be *reciprocal*, as in the two subsequent examples, arising between subjects who form a community, a pair in the *bilateral* barter or a more numerous group in the *multilateral* one, and may, or may not, end up producing an *internal currency*.

That is how these subjects can benefit, in the economic initiative they have undertaken, from the fruits of their reciprocal trust while keeping their economic *individuality*.

The *second* aspect is given by the fact that in the economic circuit arising in this community, where individuality is maintained, the *universal currency* is vigorously ousted, leaving room for *reciprocal trust*; such trust can possibly be expressed in the aforementioned *internal currency*, since it allows to transfer “goods” that individuals already have potentially at their disposal (their professional service) and to acquire immediately other “goods” using the *internal currency* also already at their disposal, without having to make any further exchange “on the side” with a monetary context supposedly *difficult* to access (to get inputs that would be required by more complex products). The ousting, however, of the universal currency will lead, first, to a drastic limitation of the production range, which becomes limited to *services* only and, among them, those needing minimum input from the Market and, secondly, to a need to exchange *informal* services, given the impossibility of transfers in universal currency to the Public Administration, which constitutes a further limitation in terms of *participants types* and prevents, in particular, the participation of professionals (the informal service of professionals would be considered, rightly, as tax evasion), with a consequent potential lowering of the quality of services on offer.



The *third* salient point consists in the fact that, although the LES circuit is totally isolated due to the (nearly) exclusive use of *internal currency* compared to the monetary context, it causes a “turbulence” in it, to the extent that it impacts on the pre-existing expenditure pattern of the members families; this may take the additional *general* activity value *below* the *specific* activity one (given the “labour intensity” level, virtually unsurpassable, characterizing the economic sectors of the LES professional services and the consequent occupational balance, tendentially negative, in a monetized context).

Moving now to the Autonomy Paradigm, we can see how *new* activity in the system can be created also in this context, typically characterized by *solidarity*, without any need for innovation.

It is worth noting that the concept of *solidarity*, even just economically speaking, goes *well beyond* the concept of *mutual trust* between individuals, who remain economically as such (the only bond that can exist in a Heteronomous context, typically *individualistic*), because it implies that people in the community are bound “jointly”, sharing both advantages and disadvantages of the collective initiative. This “going beyond”, which could be seen as a “self-limitation” of individual economic freedom, when it does occur is in fact expression of a desire to be able to enjoy the relatively abundant fruits that may result from this bond.

Let’s start with a first small scale example of domestic self-production by imagining an involuntarily inactive housewife who, to escape boredom, puts to use her artistic talent and begins to decorate her home with paintings and sculptures made by herself, something she would *never* have done by buying similar artistic products on the market, because of her insufficient income.

She starts in this way an (informal) activity that allows her, with a household expenditure identical in volume and (practically) structure, to increase consumption (with the addition of artistic products, in this case) and therefore the family standard of living (at least in her intentions...).

In this example the economy monetary context is not affected (or, at the most, barely touched) and so no correction has to be made to the new *specific* activity, which comes to coincide with the *general* one (the example can compare in this respect with the bilateral barter between a former



hairdresser and a former cobbler).

Let's now make the example of a housewife whose family income is no longer sufficient to meet the increasing needs.

To cope with such a situation she may decide to produce goods, for example farming goods, that require the use of input (raw materials and semi-finished products) to be purchased on the market.

Since the family is a (small) self-producing community, thus belonging to the Autonomy Paradigm governed by solidarity (and not by competitiveness as in the Market, which can at the most give way to *trust* between operators), it will be easy for her to use part of the husband monetary income to purchase such inputs and start her own activity, thus increasing, with the same *volume* of *expenditure* and a different *expenditure structure*, the volume of family *consumption*, which will benefit, jointly, all members of the family.

Such change in *expenditure structure*, however, unlike what we saw in the previous example, involves a "turbulence" in the monetized context of the system and a consequent need, in quantifying *general* activity, to correct the *specific* activity created by the self-production initiative with the occupational balance connected with such "turbulence".

The above examples from an Autonomy context show again the creation of new (informal) activity, *specific* and *general*, *together with* related usable wealth, in a total absence of innovation.

#### 3.1.1.6. *Interim reflections*

The lesson to be learned so far can be summarized in the observation, surprising to some, that in terms of creation of additional (informal) activity within the system, the *trust* between economic agents in the Heteronomy Paradigm and the *solidarity* in the Autonomy Paradigm can do more, indeed much more, than *innovation*, without being incompatible with it and with the advantage of being, once their beneficial effects are discovered, easily reproducible. Too bad that we cannot benefit from this lesson as much as we would like to.

That is firstly due to the fact that the above activity is relegated to *restricted*

contexts (in the Heteronomy examples because of the incompatibility between *universal currency* and *trust* among economic agents, and in the Autonomy home self-production examples because of the small scale and lack of know-how) and, secondly, to the fact that any new additional activity appears, in all examples examined so far, to suffer from one considerable drawback, its *informality*.

In short, we cannot certainly count on such a *limited* and *informal* activity to create an accomplished economic system that allows everyone a participation in production and the fruition of wealth produced in modes that are appropriate to the times.

But, luckily, this is not the end of our considerations on the theme of employment in the absence of innovation.

Turning now to the Autonomy Paradigm, and from small scale examples to a larger size model, we encounter the focal point of our essay, the LDL. It certainly is no surprise that also in this case, and more rightly so compared to the small scale examples, *solidarity* can do much more than *innovation* and always give rise, when it is the base of an economic circuit, to additional activities in the system.

What could, if anything, surprise us in these examples is that a new activity created in such contexts is *monetized* and *formal*, thus giving rise to real *employment* (*self-employment*, in this case).

Indeed, if we exclude the minimum size self-producing Communities constituted by families whose members are certainly bound “jointly” as far as results are concerned, but are also in a relationship of mutual trust, in other Communities who self-produce individual goods and services, starting with *intermediate* Communities such as the one at the base of a LDL, monetization, with its acquisition of products through a price system, appears *indispensable*; if it is true that the circuit’s segment of labour remuneration may be non-monetized, it is also the only one that can be so, and *exclusively* on condition that the “proportion of working members” is sufficiently close to 100% (in which case the cost of labour would not appear in production costs, which constitute the acquisition prices paid by members).

This was the case of the “extreme” communities mentioned before, now almost all disappeared (Kibbutzim of the origins, utopian Phalansteries

and “anarchic” communities...) in which all labour was provided free, including the production of individual goods and services, but it is also the case, although mainly with reference to collective services, of current *intermediate Communities*, such as Clubs, in which most members give in rotation their time, on a *free* basis, to produce collective services such as the maintenance and/or cleaning of premises where the main activities take place.

An example of *big communities*, in particular public Communities, is represented by the defence *collective* system which, when carried out through a compulsory military service (something that happens *necessarily* when the aim is the actual *defence* of the national territory), can be widely demonetized.

In the LDL case, given a Working Members Proportion (WMP) quite far from 100%, the monetization of the whole circuit is, in fact, a necessity. Strictly speaking, the LDL circuit segment of labour remuneration, the only one that needs no official currency, could be managed, to avoid possible abuses in purchases, by using an internal currency, an “internal Euro” taken into account in the production costs at which the products are acquired, a legal tender within the LDL; this option, however, as we shall see, is likely to produce sure drawbacks without bringing any appreciable benefits.

The whole LDL economic circuit is therefore entirely monetized, partly due to *necessity* and partly to *convenience*.

With reference to necessity, we must remember that the LDL was designed to have maximum spreading ability (with a view to maximize its positive social and environmental impact on the system), which implies a) unlimited availability of *production means*, b) the broadest production range compatible with a relatively reduced scale and thus access to *production inputs* from large scale productions typical of the Market and c) a sufficient “attractivity” as regards the labour factor.

The first two requirements can be met in an immediate way *only* by resorting to the monetized context of the economy, hence the need to rely on corresponding monetary incomes, which itself translates in the need for monetization of least part of the economic circuit set up within the LDL.

This seems to imply, given the LDL production type, a need to address the local market as commercial outlet for the corresponding part of production, leaving the remaining part to the self-production circuit (we shall return later to the advisability of its actual monetization).

Such a scenario, implying a LDL “bridging” the two Paradigms or, better, with its feet in two different boats, is just an option, characterized however by a couple of drawbacks.

The *first* is the risk characterizing any commercial outlet intended for the Market, as it introduces an element of uncertainty on the viability of the circuit (although equipped here with a safety element, i.e. the demand from working members families on which to rely); this, in turn, leads to uncertainty on investments for the provision of production spaces, hence a higher price for their utilization leading, in a vicious circle, to increased production costs and the risk of commercial outlets.

The *second* consists in the fact that a LDL devised this way, having downsized the self-production circuit, would also have reduced to the same extent the quality *ascertainability* value, which characterizes a circuit *totally* focused on self-production.

Considering these drawbacks, the preferred option was to introduce in the LDL community base an adequate proportion of *non-working* members with a solvency of their own acquired in a monetized context; as members, they can take advantage of the *ascertainability* of product quality, which thus preserves its value in full.

That is how the *currency* brought in by LDL customers, i.e. the families of *non-working* members (who, by becoming producers, will also change their family’s role from mere consumer to self-producing subject who can rely on the LDL strengths but can also influence and in any case know the quality of acquired products) finds its place in the LDL “gravitational field”.

With regard to that part of the circuit characterized by the *convenience* of monetization, i.e. the one involving labour remunerations, it is clear that if those remunerations were paid in “internal Euros”, legal tender only within their own “clone”, the LDL attractivity mentioned in point c) above would be strongly reduced for the “audience” of potential working members, with a negative consequence on its spreading ability and

therefore its social impact.

The fact remains, however, that it is certainly in the interest of the working members families to make their purchases within the LDL because, at the same price and a quality considered equivalent to what is offered on the local market, they have the advantage of the *ascertainability* of quality, like the families of non-working members, plus the added advantage that with their purchase they support the employment, and thus remuneration, of their member.

It will not therefore be such a big uncertainty factor, in terms of cash flow for the LDL coffers, if remunerations are paid in the official currency, moreover issued by the LDL itself in electronic format, since the net salary mass (previously assumed, roughly, to be about half the value of production as evaluated from costs) will in fact be destined to remain, in large part, in the “gravitational field” of the LDL, working exactly as an *internal currency*.

Any “fragments” that should escape this “field”, something that monetization will allow to give flexibility to the circuit and thus make it more “attractive”, can easily be replaced by relying more on monetized customers through a real time adjustment system (using the LDL management software) of the ceilings applicable to such customers, initially set at a level relatively lower than the “physiological” one, i.e. related to their potential spending capacity.

That is how the LDL can, at the same time, keep *intact* its self-production circuit, remaining thus entirely in the Autonomy Paradigm, and *monetize* the whole of the circuit, maximizing its “attractivity” and therefore its ability to spread and impact the system.

#### 3.1.1.7. *Employment creation in the LDL*

All of the above considerations aim, on the one hand, to confirm that the setting up of a LDL “clone” implies creation of *employment* (and not a simple informal activity) without the need for innovation and, on the other hand, to indicate in the “turbulence” that inevitably takes place in the system following the creation of a “clone”, in particular in its

employment balance, the correction factor that allows to progress, as a first approximation, from *specific* employment to what can be considered *general* employment.

To shed some light on this latter aspect it would be useful to make a parallel with the second example of domestic self-production, since this is also monetized (albeit partially) and in any case at the origin of a “turbulence” in the system that also characterizes, as we shall see, the LDL.

To this end we can see the totality of families of the whole social community as one “big family” where the workforce employed in an external *monetized* context (consisting, given the above assumptions, in the total workforce of non-working members families and half the workforce of working members families) can be compared to the *husband* of the self-producing family in the example, while the workforce of all working members engaged in self-production can be compared to the *wife* of that family.

If we place the “big family” in the first scenario, previously outlined while identifying the LDL “working members proportion”, where 100 working member families were accompanied by just as many families of non-working members, such a “big family” would be characterized by a Work Force Proportion (WFP), i.e. the proportion of the total work force engaged in self-production, equal to 25%.

To make a parallel with the real family in the example, this is equivalent to the wife devoting *half* of her potential working time to the family self-production.

Let’s now compare the ways in which this family and the “big family” at the base of the LDL can implement their respective self-production circuit.

To this end, we must consider that, although they both devote 25% of their total work force to self-production, they differ in the amount of obligatory cash outflow for external acquisition of goods and services needed by the self-production circuit, with respect to total costs.

Indeed, while in the real family the wife operates in *family-owned* equipped spaces and in an informal way, so that cash outflows are limited to acquiring raw materials and semi-finished products, to these cash

outflows for the purchase of goods the LDL must also add those, here for convenience assumed to be equal in value to the ones above, to acquire from *third parties* the use of production spaces and pay for any related charges, due to the fact that production takes place in a *formal* way.

The obligatory cash outflows, that we assumed to be equal in the LDL to the net remunerations, in the family of the example will be equal to *half* the wife (virtual) remuneration (here quantifiable by assuming, for convenience, that her productivity is the same as found in the LDL).

Supposing now that the net monthly remunerations earned in a monetary context by 75% of the “big family” work force and by the husband of the real family are equal to 1,500 Euro per person per month, while those in the self-production circuit are equal to 1,000 Euro per full-time working member and 500 (virtual) Euro for the wife of the real family who works half-time, let’s examine closely the two self-production circuits in operation.

Starting with the family of the example, let’s imagine that the wife, with her half-time work to which we assigned a *virtual* remuneration of 500 Euro, plus *half* of this, i.e. the 250 Euro from her husband income assigned to purchase raw materials for her own production, makes a volume of goods and services that in the LDL are worth 1,000 Euro (since production costs in this context include also rent and charges) and that, acquired on the market, would involve a hypothetical expenditure of 1,250 Euros.

The family, who used to buy on the market at a cost of 1,250 Euro the goods and services that it now self-produces, was then able to devote to other purchases the remaining 250 Euro.

By consuming goods and services that are self-produced at the cost of just 250 Euros, the family now “frees” 1,000 Euro of the family income, which can be spent elsewhere, together with the previous 250 Euros.

The family thus creates a *first* and more *visible* “turbulence” in the monetary context of the Market due, on the one hand, to a reduced expenditure of 1,000 Euro which affects, given the family self-production range, the final segments of the farming product chains and the labour component (an added value) of services to people and things (because raw materials and semi-finished products are acquired by the family at the cost of 250

Euro on the Market) and, on the other hand, to an increased spending of 1,000 Euro in other production sectors.

The family, therefore, *moves* 1,000 Euro of its expenditure on the local market and increases its consumption of goods and services using the 1,000 Euro of expenditure *moved*.

As regards the “big family”, the “turbulence” can be calculated in the same way and adopting the same assumptions, by simply using the figures of this “family” instead of the real one.

So, 100 working members will produce goods and services for a total cost of 200,000 Euro, which on the market are worth 250,000 Euro.

The “big family”, whose total income amounts to 450,000 Euro (150,000 from the working member families and 300,000 from the non-working member families), and who used to purchase on the market at a cost of 250,000 Euro (1,250 Euro for each of the 200 families) goods and services that now it self-produces, could previously devote 200,000 Euro (25,000 from working member families and 175,000 from non-working member ones) to other purchases.

Now, by consuming goods and services that are self-produced in the LDL with an expenditure in the monetary context of just 100,000 Euro (contributed, with their purchases in the LDL, by non-working member families), it “frees” 150,000 Euro (125,000 Euro from working member families and 25,000 Euro from non-working member families) that can be spent elsewhere, together with the previous 200,000 Euro.

The “big family” thus creates a “turbulence” of around 150,000 Euro in the monetary context due, on the one hand, to the decrease in expenditure of 150,000 Euro that affects the final segments in the chains of products of the LDL production range (because the 100,000 Euro of obligatory monetary outflows are still being spent in the initial segments of such chains and with the same type of suppliers) and, on the other hand, to the 150,000 Euro increase in expenditure for goods and services that are not self-produced.

The “big family” therefore *moves* 150,000 Euro of its previous expenditure on the local market and increases its total consumption of goods and services by 150,000 Euro of *moved* expenditure.

We may say that the LDL self-production circuit makes room for itself in



the system by pushing aside the Market, somewhat like a gas bubble that creates a “hole” in Gruyère cheese by *moving* the existing cheese mass without *destroying* it, and so causing the growth of the whole cheese, a growth bound, in *both cases... to stop*.

The twofold difference between the mechanics of cheese growth and the “Gruyère-like” model of economic growth is that in the latter a) unlike what happens in the cheese, the “holes” contain new *quality* mass, self-produced by a number of Communities using their previously inactive human resources and b) the moved “mass”, cleared moreover of the awkward presence of such inactive resources, benefits, as we shall see, of an increase in *quantity* but also of an improvement in *quality* from several points of view.

It would seem arduous now to try and quantify the average employment balance of the “turbulence” in terms of its algebraic sign and, even more so, its absolute value. However, as we can well imagine, such a “turbulence” is somewhat theoretical because, in addition to the assumptions at the base of our scenario, it requires for instance that every available increase in income be spent in full, with no savings (which would help investments anyway and thus have also a positive effect on the system’s employment).

What we can, however, give for granted is that such balance will be one order of magnitude lower than both labour flows, the “outflow” (from product and service chains in the LDL production range) and the “inflow” (into the chains of products where the “big family” income, “freed” and spent, is directed to), since it depends solely on the different degree of labour intensity characterizing the chains of the two product categories. We can therefore infer, *only* with respect to the *first* and more *visible* impact on the system due to the creation of an LDL “clone”, that the *general* employment created, even when lower than the *specific* one in the same “clone”, will not differ so much and, in any case, not excessively so, from the latter.

### 3.1.2. *The Realizer's initiative and full activity*

From the above considerations we can draw a first conclusion, i.e. that the involuntary inactivity present in a given territory will be more reduced the more “attractive” an LDL is to the “audiences” of potential resident members.

Such a conclusion happens to be the opposite of what we gather from the so-called “economic laws” on the relation between employment and innovation, especially tailored by the economists to fit the Market and that do not explain the real world, as we already saw, even in that context. According to these “laws”, the only *general* employment created by the *Realizer's* initiative is internal to the undertaking aimed at spreading the “clones”, and such employment is even equal to the *specific* one, since the *Realizer*, the bringer of “product” innovation, operates on a new market, while in the “clones”, where “essential goods and services are produced in an *ordinary way*”, *general* employment is equal to *zero*, since all *specific* employment (the latter, at least, not to be denied... in addition to being the only one of interest to the *Realizer* and other stakeholders, and to the “audiences” of potential members, in particular working members), is “subtracted”, or rather “stolen”, from the Market, which is thus... “plundered” in equal measure as far as this employment aspect is concerned.

Indeed, according to the economists, the new (informal) *specific* activity of the housewife in the second example is also the result of a *transfer* of labour from the Market to domestic self-production and therefore does not reflect any increase in the *general* activity of the system.

According to them, this is a case of true disappearance of employment from the system, since domestic self-production is not even part of the economy in their “Market Only” vision, but is just *folklore*, where it constitutes a “bad practice” (making bread at home... hurts the economy). Again along this line, it is worth mentioning another cliché, much more damaging than the previous one and not contradicted by economists emphatically enough, according to which *volunteer* work carried out in charity associations, especially those financed by the public sector, “steals” work and creates unemployment, and should therefore be

logically considered a “bad practice” (doing voluntary work... hurts the economy).

It certainly does no honour to the economic sciences that there are economists who subscribe to these clichés and their consequent conclusions. We can only hope that those who believe, in the same spirit, that the *specific* employment associated with LDL “clones” is *subtracted* from the Market (and think that carrying out work activities and acquiring goods and services in such a context... hurts the economy) will mend their ways, and not just because of the above arguments, at least well before the much hoped for diffusion of “clones” and its effects on the rest of the economy make it clear that this system, in which the Market continues to prosper (with less collateral effects), is on course for *full permanent* activity.

To shed some light on this course, we should consider two phases, in chronological order.

The *first*, taking place over a relatively *short* period of time, takes the form of a “pincer” manoeuvre, whereby involuntary inactivity is absorbed, on the one hand, by part of the LDL “clones” and, on the other hand, by *Market* businesses answering different types of demand that arise with the spreading of “clones”. This phase is characterized by some *striking* effects, as it is likely to bring the system to *full activity*, although not structurally. In the *second* phase, slower and less spectacular but not devoid of important social and economic effects, the centre stage is taken by public Communities, mainly at the local level, who are naturally keen to intervene through public administrations to favour, without having to commit public funds, the consolidation of such full activity and make it *permanent*.

### 3.1.2.1. *First phase*

With reference to the impact on employment associated with the diffusion of LDL “clones” we should distinguish the role of the two “pincer’s arms”: one represents a *permanent* component reflecting the *direct* absorption of involuntary inactivity within the “clones”, the other represents a *temporary*

component reflecting the *indirect* effect of the “clones” diffusion dynamics within the businesses that operate on the Market, meant to ease these dynamics and answer other types of demand that may originate from such diffusion.

*Permanent effects on employment*

As for the *permanent* component of the impact on employment, the first question that comes to mind is to what extent the involuntary inactivity in a given territory can be absorbed within the different “clones” during the *first phase* of their diffusion.

Before we answer this question we must consider that the LDL has a built-in “*structural*” *limitation* given by its WFP value, of which a first quantification, to be used as a general term of reference, will be provided by the first field trial.

In other words, even in the not too likely case that the *totality* of families in a given territory were “attracted” to the LDL model ever since its appearance and each aspired to participate, should the opportunity arise, in a Community at the base of a nearby LDL “clone”, the maximum level of inactivity that could be so absorbed in the territory could not exceed the aforementioned WFP value of reference, since very close to it would be positioned the WFP value of *every* “clone”, for the reasons of good operation described above. Besides, in the hypothesis of a WFP value of 50%, domestic production, even when carried out in *all* families, for want of anything better or because “strongly recommended” as in Countries with a Static system, either Tribal or Religious, could hardly accommodate in production activities more than 50% of the work force, as it currently happens with the female half in this case, a “ceiling” that can however be reached through a minimalist consumption pattern (to the benefit of *environmental*, but not *social* sustainability, which leads to the exclusion of democratic forms of governance).

For the time being we can assume, based on the scenarios examined when we were identifying the LDL, that a WFP bound to ensure good operation of the self-production circuit in our model is around 20%, so we will use this as a reference level, again to streamline things and

not generalize too much in the considerations that will follow, to avoid potentially misleading symbolisms.

We can assume, within the limits of our previous hypotheses, that in territories where involuntary inactivity *exceeds* 20% of the total work force full activity cannot be achieved by *direct* absorption within the LDL “clones”, not even if this novel mode of self-production were greeted by people with the greatest enthusiasm.

We should also note that the diffusion of “clones” can take place as long as the Communities behind them will be put together by the Realizer by adopting, for best “clone” operation, the adequate proportions between working members and non-working members.

This means that what really counts for the LDL employment capacity, subject however to the limit of the above WFP of reference, is not only the favour that this economic model may find with people, reflected in the *size* of potential member “audiences”, but also the *proportions* between the “audiences” of potential “working/non-working” members and, more precisely, the proportions between those who, “attracted” by the LDL, are actually present in the *local* databases from which the Realizer draws to make up the Communities that will give rise to the various “clones”.

Even if we assume that the families of our potential working member “audience” are *all* “attracted” by the LDL model, this can hardly be the case for audience b) and c) which, however wide, are made up of fully active families who, unlike those of potential working members, can look also at the local market offer without employment worries and, especially “audience” c), with not many qualms about the environment.

However the situation may present itself in a given territory, the very fact that the Realizer’s local database containing the “prospective” *non-working* members could run out prematurely, i.e. before the local database of working members is emptied, can constitute a *further limitation* of the LDL *direct employment capacity*.

On the other hand, even if the Realizer shows great skill in putting together the Community at the base of a “clone” (taking into account, in particular, the pre-existing family income), drawing sparingly from the scarce resources, he will however have to include in such community, for the “clone” good operation, a sufficient percentage of *non-working*

members, which could turn out to be quite difficult to achieve.

In fact, in the territories where involuntary inactivity is so high as to make appropriate a “clone” WFP of 20%, the highest level considered compatible with good operation, since according to our previous assumptions we would have a WMP (Working Members Proportion) equal to 40%, the considerable proportion of non-working members required, equal to 60%, could pose a serious problem.

Luckily, this is only an apparent problem, deriving from the supposition, made purely for convenience reasons, that the WFP of *all* working member families is equal to 50% and, moreover, concentrated on one of the only two postulated family members.

Now, however, to take our considerations closer to the real world, we will have to *abandon* this supposition and use the 50% value as the *upper limit* of those families WFP.

To a WFP of 20% may therefore correspond some quite different self-producing Communities in terms of WMP, depending on the distribution of the *families* WFP, with 20% being the *average value* of reference in the various families of the Community, the *virtual village* created by the *Realizer*. Of course the manner of this distribution, whatever that may be, will not compromise the *running* of the LDL model, since the most important parameter here is the *average* WFP and indeed, in the end, the spending *capacity* fuelled by incomes from sources external to the LDL, reasonably assumed to be inversely related to the WFP (in the obvious sense that, the less human resources in the Community are devoted to self-production, the greater will be the availability of income from external sources that can be spent in the LDL, thus allying the risks of malfunctioning of the economic circuit).

It follows that the relative importance in the social community of *non-working* members representing families with a WFP equal to 0% is definitely reassessed, to the advantage of the spreading capacity of LDL “clones” on the territory.

We only have to consider, for example, that a Community of 250 families characterized by a WFP of 20% represented, as per our previous assumptions, by 100 working members and 150 non-working members, simply by replacing 50 *full-time* working members with 100 *half-time*

working members could keep the same WFP, and therefore an equivalent spending *capacity* supported by external incomes, with only 100 non-working members and with the increased *propensity* to spend that characterizes the families of working members who, in the new extended definition, are now 150.

We must in other words consider that, in practice, the Realizer will largely resort to part-time work, especially in the various production units that are most suitable for it.

Indeed, we must not forget that some production units can also accommodate a *very partial* type of work, although on a permanent basis (for instance two hours every evening of hairdresser service), and also occasional work (for instance one day a week in the building unit), thus including in the Community families with a spending *capacity* financed by incomes external to the LDL, not much different from that of non-working member families, and usually characterized by a greater spending *propensity*.

That is how, going back to the previous example and trying to keep the same total number of members, by replacing 50 half-time working members with 100 working members on a *reduced part-time* basis (let's say operating for 25% of the usual working time), the WFP could be kept at 20% in a social community composed, to schematize things, of 50 full-time working members, 50 half-time working members, 100 members working for 25% of the time and 50 non-working members, which takes the WMP to 80%, to the advantage of the *propensity* to purchase in the LDL.

Although a certain percentage of *non-working* members (or, as we shall see, *comparable* to them), quantified in the example as 20%, will still be important to ensure the presence of *full-time* working members commensurate with the number of LDL production units and essential for the good working of the "clone", it will however be the *new* "audience" a), much wider than the one previously mentioned because based on a definition of working member extended to *part-time*, who is going, in practice, to be the pillar of the self-producing Community to whom the LDL model must be sufficiently "attractive", a relatively easy task, as we saw previously.

Going back to the subject of how much involuntary inactivity can be absorbed *permanently* within the LDL “clones” in the *first phase* of their diffusion, its quantification can therefore be largely traced back to the quantification of the *new* “audience” a).

In this regard, we should keep in mind that the *first phase* on the road to full permanent activity is the one, immediately after the first pilot trial, when it will become clear to public opinion, once the LDL viability has been *proven on the field* and as soon as the Realizer marketing activity has produced its effects, that something absolutely unprecedented and bringer of new hopes is finally happening, despite the economists whining.

It is therefore plausible that, starting from this generalized acknowledgment, there will be many who, dissatisfied with their current job, would gladly reduce the workload by compensating it with an LDL activity, but also others who, although keeping their current job, would like to devote part of their free time to an activity of particular interest to them, and all of them will go to swell the ranks of the *new* “audience” a). Many of them, fulfilling in terms of spending capacity a similar function to *non-working* members, as they will be able to spend in their “clone” a lot more than they earn there, will certainly be seen by the Realizer as *comparable* to non-working members.

We may be surprised at the “attractiveness” exercised also on young and elderly people by the different LDL production units, these new generation *local Artisan Workshops* where the doors are always open and you can teach and/or learn while working and earning, and that applies equally to the social groups of reference for the various *Sponsors* and to ordinary people.

To contrast this tendency, of little use will be the warnings of the unflinching prophets of doom, hired by those who use the “Market Only” system to give vent to their delusions of omnipotence: they will warn people of the advent of a... “new communism” (as if to say that full permanent activity, so far an exclusive prerogative of “State Only” systems, may well be achieved... but at a high price).

The warning will backfire, however, because it will be clear to people that in this new, dawning system the role of the State, and more in general of



### *The dignity of nations*

the Public Sector, unlike what happens in Communism-inspired systems, will be *minimized* (being confined to the *collective* services falling within its exclusive and natural competence), albeit not so “thinned down” as in “Market Only” systems.

It will be clear to everybody, in other words, that the new system has been designed so that it can adapt its architecture (by modifying the relative weight of the two Paradigms and their modalities) to answer people’s will, expressed mostly in real time through the daily economic actions of each individual, and can therefore present the advantages of other systems without the disadvantages.

In particular, it will be clear that this is not, unlike others born of some kind of “one-track philosophy”, like a “*unique suit* to fit a *new, reputedly ideal man*” everyone is bound to strive for, either the easy way (as in the “Market Only” systems of capitalistic dictatorships disguised as “*representative democracies*”), or the hard way (as in certain Static systems imposed by theocratic dictatorships), but a “*suit to fit everyone*” with a style always in potential evolution that will at any time be the result of a multiplicity of free individual choices.

### *Temporary effects on employment*

Given the *structural limitation*, in terms of direct absorption of involuntary inactivity, represented by the LDL’s WFP of reference, assumed to be 20%, and anticipating the presence in certain territories of other *potential limitations*, associated with the difficulties experienced by the Realizer in putting together the Communities in the most adequate way as regards members type and relative spending *capacity* and *propensity*, in order to ensure a good working of the “clones”, we can take for granted that involuntary inactivity, although present on many territories in a percentage lower than the WFP of reference, can be absorbed by the “clones” only *partially*, which would be bound to occur, incidentally, if it were above the WFP value.

That, however, is far from saying that *full activity* cannot be achieved.

Indeed, this is the first characteristic of the *Traditional Dynamic Regenerative* system that will appear in a relatively short time, and it is precisely

starting from it that the other characteristics of the system will also start to take shape, contributing moreover to turn any full activity that has been achieved into a permanent one, and thus consolidating this fundamental feature of the new system.

It should be noted that with his private initiative the Realizer, by starting a pilot “clone” and almost simultaneously also the diffusion of other “clones” in the territory, is throwing, so to speak, a hail of large stones into a pool of water, each one causing a series of “waves” that will expand in concentric circles, less and less *visible* but with effects that little have to do, in terms of *general* employment, with the waves *visibility*.

Indeed, we saw previously that the “turbulence” due to the transfer of expenditure and relative migrating flows of activity in the self-producing Community, which is also the most visible “wave”, appears basically devoid of this type of effects but is, on the contrary, full of positive fallouts in terms of rearrangement of the system’s architecture, since it shows a Market *movement* from economic activities that are essential to life (e.g. product farming) and better managed at *local* level by economic structures belonging to the intermediate variant of the Autonomy Paradigm (first of all, the LDL), towards activities chosen by the consumers families (e.g. tourism and other leisure activities), where it becomes irreplaceable.

There are however other less visible “waves”, or rather ripples in the water, farther away from where the stones had plunged in, whose effects, including those on the *general* employment here being considered, are far from being negligible.

This is precisely the case of any monetary flow related to the *rent* paid to third parties who own the production spaces hosting the various LDL production units, which constitutes one of the three components of the overall LDL obligatory cash outflow.

Indeed, while the type of recipients of this *flow* is always the same, i.e. real estate investors (usually *private*, but in this case also possibly *public* investors) specialized in production facilities, it is also true that this goes to remunerate investments concerning *new* facilities destined to replace, with regard to activities in the LDL production range, the existing ones. That is how the role of such *stock* of facilities for goods production, constituted by large plants concentrated in industrial areas, is destined,

as a result of the LDL “clones” diffusion dynamics, to a gradual decline to which will correspond a rise of the new generation small production facilities, structured at each “clone” level into a Urban Area and a Rural Area, widely distributed on the territory, that will gradually make up a new and different *stock*.

The small monetary flow represented by the rent is therefore at the base of investments whose expectations are projected, naturally, over a broad time span but which, occurring in the here and now, produce their effects on employment in the present time.

Considering that the diffusion of LDL “clones” can take place, if required, virtually *simultaneously*, the scenario that is likely to materialise can be compared, in terms of new activities, to that of the reconstruction following a *war event* or a *natural calamity*, with a twofold difference: that the construction of the “new” *precedes* and causes the decline of the “old” and that the size of individual plants is *smaller*, since they are intended for a *local* role (unlike what has happened so far, with reconstructions turned into a headlong run towards industrial gigantism and internationalization).

As we can well understand, the spread of the LDD “clones” on the territory involves, like all the great reconstructions, a whole series of positive consequence in terms of new economic dynamics that set up on the Market, initially referring to the sectors which are directly interested and subsequently extending to the whole economy.

In any case, it's well known that the employment, or the business, can increase after each shock (as it would happen in nature, by kicking a big swarm), either a big one (as long as within the resilience threshold of the system) or a small one, thus inclusive of the ones that have been caused by practicable private initiative, whatever the matter of their production (butter or... cannons, as long as they are sold, either spontaneously or through an adequate “marketing”).

This means that if on the one hand the increase of the activity calculated based on the growth of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) cannot certainly be blindly assimilated to an increase of the social welfare, it's also true, on the other hand, that the shock caused by the productive structures of the Districts spreading over the territory helps the system to reach, in an original way, the full activity.

For a comprehensive description, looking at the other side of the coin in employment terms, it seems that a reduction in production and employment can only be caused by the Public Administration, the public-law body that exerts the governance and that the great public Community carrying out the self-production of collective services refers to.

This actually seems to be the only economic condition able to “dampen” the productive tendency of a Country in a sharp way, wrongly legislating (for hidden purposes or for “talent”) and/or by degrees, through bad administration (justice, taxation or whatever) as well as through a creeping increase of bureaucracy.

This happens, in particular, when the self-production of such collective services with a significant impact on the whole system is realized in a “spurious” way and not through direct democracy.

However, it should be noticed that, fortunately, any dynamics with the nature and dimension of the one concerning the widespread diffusion of the Districts throughout the territory also affect the Public Administrations and, above all, the public Communities referring to them, which, following the diffusion of the Districts, can see first-hand the positive effects of self-production.

And this is of vital importance for the transformation of the Public Administration in function of a real and complete convergence of a given system towards the Traditional Regenerative Dynamic one, in which the self-production of collective services (both legislative and administrative), even if not properly realized through complete forms of direct democracy, will have at least to be socially monitored.

In conclusion, considering that following great shocks, comparable to the post-conflict reconstructions, the sufficiently resilient economic systems tend *motu proprio*, and whatever the pre-existing employment situation, to rapidly enter into full activity, there is no doubt that, in the specific case, the full activity will be soon achieved, as only the occupational gap possibly left by the indirect absorption of the accidental inactivity of the LDD “clones” will have to be filled up through indirect effects.

3.1.2.2. *Second phase*

Without prejudice to the achievement of the full activity through the mentioned “double-pincer manoeuvre”, it must be considered that, after the said bonfire of development attributable to the “clamp” represented by the Market (the environmental impact of which, due essentially to the increase of activity in the building sector, is partially counterbalanced by the simultaneous re-localization of a large mass of activities, particularly in food farming, due to the entry into activity of the “clones”), it is reasonable to expect that a similar fiery dynamic slows down in correspondence with the reduction, until its quasi-extinction, of the demand for productive areas set aside for the “clones” and, consequently, that the involuntary inactivity peeps out anew.

Along with the gradually reappearance of a new involuntary inactivity (a limited phenomenon since the system, which has however achieved its full activity, will settle on relatively high activity levels) it is nevertheless reasonable to imagine that the Public Administrations, to which public Communities most likely characterized by a new and more incisive social commitment refer, will be ready, especially at a local level, to encourage their absorption in many different ways, which are within their reach, especially in the favourable balance conditions accompanying a situation nearing the full activity.

So in the eventuality of a reappearance of an involuntarily inactivity it is acceptable to assume (and, after the supposed metamorphosis with “revolutionary” tones but with lasting effects, it would be unreasonable not to do so) that an immediate solidarity mechanism will begin between two subjects belonging to the Autonomy Paradigm, i.e. the Public Communities and the Intermediate Communities, given that both benefit from this synergistic relationship.

Among the possible intervention modalities, a privileged attention will be reserved therefore to those that mainly facilitate the advent of the Traditional Regenerative Dynamic system, the system that best performs the role of Autonomy by placing it in complementarity with that of Heteronomy, mainly embodied by the Market, bringing the most benefit to the community.

The intention therefore is not, after assisting to the diffusion of the LDD model, to propose to the ones who should still need an employment income the participation to socially useful works, an instrument which no one resorting to it could be proud of and that is, above all, humiliating for those obliged to “benefit” from it.

More specifically, among the intervention modalities which the public Communities could implement there will be those aimed at encouraging the absorption of the involuntary inactivity, as far as this will be reflected in an increase of the databases related to the candidate working members, through existing or new LDD “clones”.

In particular, they will be able to help even more the plausible spontaneous tendency to resort to “clones” in territories where this tendency may not have the necessary autonomy because of insufficient cash receipts (scarce presence of non-working or comparable members in support of new working members), by putting part of their current spending to the service of this target.

In other words, re-orienting (with any possible modality) a given part of the current public spending (office cleaning, maintenance, public green areas...) from Heteronomy subjects (including those operating outside the competitive environment, since they are designed for the employment of subjects belonging to the weakest groups in the labour market) to a LDD “clone”, the Public Administrations would obtain, with no cost, a much higher impact on the employment due to the multiplier effect of the LDD model (a remuneration received by a worker in a Heteronomy “social enterprise” offering services to the Public Administration and spent in the “multinational companies’ supermarket”, can be more functional to the general employment if it becomes the remuneration of a working member of a LDD “clone” and is tendentially spent in this context).

This would imply to equip the tardy “clones”, that is, born (through working members only) or extended (with the addition of working members only) in the second phase, with a commercial outlet involving no risks, the function of which consists in integrating the cash receipts (spending of the members' families financed by incomes of origin other than the “clone”) to the extent necessary to ensure the obligatory cash

outflow of these “clones”.

The tardy “clones” are therefore “anomalous” because, other than expected in the standard model, they are provided with an exogenous commercial outlet, which, as previously mentioned, cannot be anything but public (a private exogenous demand makes no sense, as the person having a basic income at his disposal and buying goods and services in a “clone” will do it more conveniently as user member).

The possible birth, in limited number, of new tardy “clones”, which will take place if and to the extent that the extended “clones” should not succeed in absorbing the residual inactivity, will correspond, in particular, to a demand for productive structures proportional to this number: this will originate a new limited employment increase on the Market within an oscillatory dynamic, which is expected to gradually fade away until its disappearance, once that the involuntarily inactivity will be totally extinguished.

At that point the Districts will dot the territories of the Countries where the system will certainly have entered the metamorphosis process and, representing the guarantee of a citizenship work and of the related income, they will be the evidence of a higher level of Autonomy, and of a consequently social and environmental sustainability, achieved by the Countries characterized by a full activity, which will then be permanent.

### *3.1.3. Structural effects on the Pillars of the system*

Following the formulation of the two economic Paradigms and the consequent identification of their modalities, the architectures of the different economic systems can each be represented, as mentioned, through a double entry table, in which we agree to place these modalities in the rows and the various typologies of goods and services in the columns; in the boxes are shown the contributions to the “national production” will be shown, a quantity “similar” to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) but calculated differently, corresponding to the architecture of the considered system.

If, for illustrative purposes only and using hypothetical data, as it is common with the graphic representation of abstract supply and demand curves, we build a table whose boxes show the hypothetical data attributable on average to the most industrialized Countries at issue

here, and between brackets those, hypothetical as much, related to the Traditional Regenerative Dynamic system, then it will be easy to evaluate the impact, certainly with reference to its algebraic signs but also drawing a general indication about its absolute value, of the LDD diffusion in the various Pillars of the system.

Let us consider, for example, the following table showing the structural data of a hypothetical industrialized Country representative of this category and, between brackets, those which should follow up the diffusion of the LDD in such Country.

	Basic G&S	Other G&S	Public Utility Services	Intermediate G&S	Community Services	Total
Market	400 (50)	100 (100)	0 (-)	150 (100)	- (-)	700 (250)
Philanthropy	15 (-)	- (-)	5 (15)	- (-)	- (-)	20 (15)
Families	30 (5)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	30 (5)
Intermediate Comm.	- (390)	- (-)	- (-)	- (50)	- (-)	- (440)
Big Priv. Comm.	- (-)	- (-)	- (90)	- (-)	- (-)	- (90)
Big Pub. Comm.	- (-)	- (-)	50 (-)	- (-)	200 (200)	250 (200)
Total	445 (445)	100 (100)	105 (105)	150 (150)	200 (200)	1000 (1000)

Considering the row of the Total, it can be observed that they have been maintained constant.

That means the diffusion of the LDD modifies not so much the structure of the “national production” in terms of goods and services typology but the role of the different economic modalities used in producing them. Indeed, by analysing the column related to the Totals corresponding to these modalities, the more macroscopic expected variations concern the reduction of the relative importance of the Market (which also includes in this representation the “small-scale markets” represented by



Local Exchange Systems) and the increase of that of the self-producing intermediate Communities.

These variations take mainly place with reference to basic Goods&Services or, more precisely, to those that are essential for a “dignified” life in a given society.

They reflect the expected counter-exodus of the corresponding economic activities from the Heteronomy to the Autonomy Paradigm, the subsequent re-localization of which is a necessary condition to the environmental sustainability at least.

The table also shows a reduction of the domestic self-production, which is often practised in the industrialized Countries on need basis by involuntarily inactive person, to the benefit of that related to the intermediate self-producing Communities (LDD).

Philanthropy is subjected to a limited decrease in its total weight but shows a more sensible variation in its contents, passing from the production of basic goods and services (popular canteens) to public utility services (vocational training).

We remember, however, that this table shows relative data, that is data based on the same total “national production”, which in the new system could however even be higher than in the previous one, and most likely it will be so, without this involving any environmental contraindications, since, as expected, such increases in wealth, often produced with a higher manpower impact, are essentially of qualitative nature.

The variation of the “national production” may therefore be regarded as indicator of the *national wellness* evolution, contrary to the GDP, which represents a simple *activity* indicator, the variation of which represents the much-desired and acclaimed “growth” (often “bad-growth”, when not “bad-degrowth”).

### 3.1.4. *Functional effects on the Pillars of the system*

#### 3.1.4.1. *Public Administration*

If it is true that the diffusion dynamic of the LDD “clones” has an

immediate impact on the Market, since the birth of the first “clones”, both in terms of volume and, *especially*, in terms of activity context (less bread and more films), the new of employment and income perspectives could - why not - have an immediate impact, not so much in volume but in *functional* terms, on the *Public Administration*.

This could happen since the very first phase of *direct* absorption of the involuntary inactivity due to the diffusion of the LDD “clones”, in which it is reasonably possible that many representatives of the public administration could be interested in switching to a part-time work or in prematurely terminating their service, attracted by the wide and various job opportunities offered by this new economic modality.

On the other hand, the part of workplaces freed, which will result convenient to replace, will not lack applicants interested in them, given the foreseeable emergence of a new desire of appropriation of the res publica, beginning with the control on the *implementation* of the rules, encouraged by the visibility of the positive effects of the Autonomy embodied by the LDD.

This would result in a *functional* transformation of the Public Administration, having therefore a qualitative impact on the self-production of collective services, deriving from an increase in the number of working members following a wider use to the *part-time* work: together, thanks to the new arrivals, they will probably pay more attention on the efficiency and quality of the service offered to the reference community.

This spontaneous dynamic may be also encouraged through a structural reform aiming at the maximum extension of the access to the public function through a wider use of the *part-time* work introducing gradually, for example, 10-year full-time contracts or 20-year half-time ones, until their generalisation, but also making an extensive use of temporary work. All this is made possible, even in a relatively short term, by providing financial incentives or, at least, not penalising early retirement, thanks to the real perspective of the *permanent full activity* in the system, which allows using the remaining time for other opportunities offered in different spheres, including that, always possible, of a proximity LDD “clone”.

With regard to the social appropriation of the public affairs, it is worth noting that in many Countries a compulsory form of public service, for

example simultaneously with the school cycle, could also get a foothold and in any case be enhanced where it already exists - a public service rendered even in different fields than the defence one (e.g. activities related to fauna and forest or to preservation of the artistic heritage), and variously remunerated, including a just symbolic remuneration, possible in the Autonomy Paradigm in the condition of a QSL equal to 100%, as in this case.

This procedure of appropriation of the *res publica* through a widespread social participation to the *implementation* of the rules allows a behaviour of the public function more decisively oriented towards the public good and, particularly, reduces considerably not only the corruption opportunities but also the hurdles that the “bureaucracy” often poses to the proper daily functioning of the administration, thus gradually giving to the system the expected peculiarities of the *Traditional Dynamic Regenerative* one, which represent the point of convergence of the desired metamorphosis.

But even the will of the people to participate actively in the *formulation* of the rules through various forms of *direct democracy* will be soon manifested. This means, in other words, that the pedagogical value of the LDD will have produced its effects and that the people, having appreciated the results of the self-production Autonomy in the *proper sense* embodied by it and, at the same time, the groundlessness/tendentiousness of certain concepts purported by mainstream economists, such as the minimum unemployment threshold that should not be exceeded, as it is a “desirable unemployment” level (desirable by whom?), will be tempted to self-produce, in *proper sense* or in similar ways, the *collective* services as well, appropriating even more resolutely the *res publica*, that is something to which it is entitled as a *right* and *duty*, if the aim corresponds with the achievement of *dignity* both on the *individual* and on the *collective* level.

The “representative” democracy translates, as previously mentioned, a “spurious” self-production of the *legislative* services (a very specific typology among the collective services), since the individual, in his role of consumer, delegates the productive activity to which it is entitled as a right and duty to a given “working member”, who offers himself to represent him, considering the “part” of community in which he is called

to place himself.

This means that this “spurious” self-production reflects a concept of society intended as a collective subject divided into “parts”, in conflict with one another, and represented (parasitized) by Political Parties (party of the workers, masters, housewives, pensioners, ecologists...).

Also in the Autonomy Paradigm, in particular in the public self-producing Communities, there is place for an *information asymmetry* which in this context could lead, e.g. through corruption, to a distortion of the law rule issued by the public Community in order to reward, for example, the Heteronomy producers privileging their own personal interest even at the expenses of collective interest.

Anyhow, the principal rules receiving attention will be those which mainly support - and that is easy to prove - the advent of the *Traditional Regenerative Dynamic* system interpreting at best the role of the Autonomy as it places it in *complementarity* with that of the Heteronomy, mainly embodied by the Market, thus bringing benefit to the community... as a whole.

Even if this is not the place to list these rules, it is however worthy to mention at least one of them, which is constituted by a substantial reduction of the taxes applied to the profit of enterprises, if not their complete elimination through the transition to indirect taxation, which realises a necessary condition, as we shall see in details later, underpinning the *functional* transformation of the pillar represented by the Market, which will stay essential even in the architecture of the future system.

#### 3.1.4.2. Market

The Countries where the full permanent activity will be achieved in the way we have seen above will have taken the first *necessary* step towards the *Traditional Regenerative Dynamic* system.

After that, the journey will continue starting from this employment situation that, thanks to the positive *functional* transformations it produces in the main pillars of the system, as we have just seen in the case of the Public Administration, or allows, as in the case of the Market.

Regarding the Market producers, especially those operating in the sectors doomed to remain outside of the Autonomy Paradigm and that are even the object of an increase in demand, it is reasonable to assume that the general lack of available jobs may entail their tendency to increase the attractivity of work conditions.

Undoubtedly, an increase in remunerations may represent a viable solution, especially in the *service* sectors, where a greater recourse to automation is not very effective.

But it is also reasonable to assume that the *participatory* system could make a comeback, and actually it is very likely that it will gradually replace the *wage* system, becoming the norm, since it seems that the various conditions required to make this happen could be gathered together.

This in turn would contribute, as we will see, to bring the economic dynamics of Heteronomy - the *Yang* component of the system - closer to those predicted by the *Civil Economy*, in which the cold economic calculation and the consequent spirit of competition among “atomized” subjects gives place to a more human collaborative relation within the economic agents of the offering in view of a legitimate self-interest but of the *common good* as well (e.g. through a better care for human and environmental health)... a little help to the “invisible hand”, which, in our time, seems to be rather “demagnetized”.

It must be said that the participatory system develops, substantially, on two levels: the *first* implies only an assumption of the entrepreneurial risk by the workers, and the consequent distribution, in different ways, of the economic result, whether positive or negative, while the *second* sees in addition a participation of the workers, this too variously modulated, to the strategic company decisions.

Starting from the first level, i.e. from the first *necessary* step common to all the participatory variants that can take shape according to the intentions of the parties, when other specific conditions allow it, we notice that it has been proposed in several occasions and with different motivations in the twentieth century.

At the beginning the aim was to soften the conflict between Capital and Work which the collectivist drift (“All-State”) could insert itself in and exert leverage on - which has however happened in a good part of

the land area of the globe - while subsequently, once this risk had been avoided, the aim (the achievement of which was “mathematically” (*sic*) shown), was to bring the system to the “full employment” condition, thus supporting the opposite drift of the system (“All-Market”) and ensuring its future success through an acquired social sustainability.

Let’s point out immediately that in this book the participative system, unlike in the past, is not *proposed* as a *medium* aiming to achieve a result, but is treated as a plausible *effect* of the development of a new important “pillar” of the system (Intermediate self-producing Communities) on an existing and equally important “pillar” (Market).

Hence, the participative system is treated here as a “domino effect”, an important one, of the LDD diffusion, which is liable, in particular, to modify the “genetics” and the subsequent “*behaviour*”, of a part of its offering agents, especially in terms of an increased *social and environmental responsibility*.

Having said that, it is worth noticing that all past proposals based, for their realisation, on an active role of the *Public Community*, which was called to award through fiscal measures the enterprises that would have taken the *first step*, proceeding towards other possible and more complete forms of participation.

Clearly the bad habit to appeal to *politics* in any circumstances, included the “lightly” appeal, since it implies no risk for the proposers, has always hovered over humanity.

As is well known, none of the mentioned proposals have ever come to light. And the so called “incentives to productivity”, in the form of modest cash “bonus” given to the employees in case of success of the company, are not included among them despite a vague similarity.

And this not only because the “great way” represented by *politics* is difficult to haunt for those who intend to change the status-quo, which has always been the result of a specific power balance, and even for those who pretend to... “rush to the aid” of the strong.

But also, quite simply, because the conditions necessary to make this happen, which we shall review below, have never existed.

The ones who suggested participation, although limited to a first level, was actually asking for no less than... the moon, without realizing it.

The matter is quite different, in this respect, in case the system is already in full activity and this has been reached in the way previously described, that is by haunting the “middle road” represented by the diffusion of the *intermediate* self-producing Communities, and *only* in this way. Actually, starting on the side of the *workers*, the condition which must necessarily be fulfilled for realising the *first step* towards the system can be summarised as follows:

- a) a household income *complementary* to the participation income, sufficiently high and, above all, *certain*;
- b) the presence, among the workers, of a business culture that may turn into a sufficient risk propensity.

These conditions, clearly, are fulfilled in a system that has reached full activity through the widespread dissemination of the LDD model on the territory, since on the one hand, a *complementary* income can be adequate and, above all, certain, only if it comes from self-production (this last statement is *almost* tautological) and, on the other, an entrepreneurial culture can be acquired at best acting as a producer (as every LDD member, and, in particular, as the working member, who, if a favourable occasion should arise, could act as a participation worker in a Market company). As concerns the companies, their inclination to resort to the participative system, even if limited to the its first level, and indeed with reference to such level, can arise only if *tax evasion* is totally absent.

As a matter of fact, the connection of the workers’ remunerations to the economic result of the company involves an absolute *transparency* of the accounts, which is a scarcely acceptable option for the employers, quite evidently in cases of a criminal nature but also in many cases in which thanks to a modest tax evasion the survival of the company is guaranteed in normal times and, especially, in possible critical situations.

In the mentioned, frequent, circumstances the adoption of a transparency policy is equivalent, for the employers, to raise a snake in their bosom, to open the doors to every form of blackmail.

Such a generalised “evasion-propensity” phenomenon is, quite evidently, closely and directly correlated to the level of tax rates and it appears rather widely acquired that a simplified, moderate-level tax system, such as those applied in many Countries not by chance, is liable to reduce the evasion to the point of increasing the total tax revenue.

For this reason, those who refuse to admit the incapacity of the Rulers inevitably think that the introduction of high direct tax rates in some Countries is part of a strategy encouraging tax evasion, aimed at generalising illegality and making society prone to accept even corruption, thus letting it thrive among the rulers themselves, that is, among the working members of the public Communities that are charged with the *spurious* self-production of legislative services, including taxation (between dishonesty and incapacity we are spoilt for choice, for which reason – let's stress that once again - some form of direct Democracy is highly desirable).

In the context of an economy that has reached the permanent full activity hand where the state coffers are no longer dried up by public expenditures caused by the strong presence of involuntary inactivity, both in a direct (social welfare and various other forms of assistance) and an indirect way (measures facing the consequent social unease in its multiple forms), an *easy* and above all *simple* direct taxation system is the right solution (this system could be also take shape through the systematic acquisition, by the Tax Authority, of a given companies' share).

But it is also reasonable to assume that in a system, even though unequal, in which equal opportunities are in fact assured and *everyone* can live with *dignity* thanks of his own work, the public expenditure could be entirely, or nearly entirely, financed through *indirect* taxation, obviously organised in such a way as to facilitate the social equality and the environmental protection, therefore *zeroing*, as a first step, the corporate profit tax.

So it is possible that, in case of general lack of available manpower, and under certain conditions, both on the side of the workers and of the companies, favouring the start up of the participative system, this latter would get a foothold spontaneously, at least with reference to the *first* level.

And it is also reasonable to think that, once the participative dynamic has been launched it would gradually extend, for convenience, to the *second* level, thus modifying to some extent, the very "genetics" of the companies that adopt it.

Actually, the presence, in the governance bodies of a company, of workers with a household income including a component from work carried out in a LDD, where attention to human and environmental health is a priority,



is liable for sure to have a positive impact, by transmitting such ethic, on the behaviour on the company itself.

If then also the context in which the companies are brought to work substantially changes (the return of many activities from the Market to the Autonomy Paradigm, and in particular towards the self-producing intermediate Communities, pushes companies towards the production of instrumental goods, where the demand is unlikely to be inflated in an artificial way through marketing, and towards innovative *niches* in other productive sectors, where the demand is, by nature, limited and selective), their behaviour could change further in more favourable terms for the environment and society.

It must be kept in mind that companies working in the financial sector, in the new economic context, may be doubly affected by the *participative* system, both with respect to their employees and to the companies to which they would bring capital, rewarding themselves with a part of the economic result.

The ethic of *sustainability* (an idea which, moreover, is to be considered as minimalist, as a “last resort”) may, in this way, (and *only* in this way in Countries previously with an “Market Only” system or well underway towards it) enter the Market (on the producers’ side), making of it a precious and unique pillar of the new system - after, of course, its inherent exuberance having been correctly brought under control and this economic modality having been confined to the action spheres where it is unequalled and irreplaceable.

Actually, if this is not kept under control by using *strength* - not so much that of the public Community, a strength existing on paper but not in reality (the “great way” of *politics* is only practicable for strengthening the Market but not for limiting its exuberance in terms of *space of action* - and that is better) - but rather the invincible one, with “pneumatic” effect, of the intermediate self-producing Communities (which I previously compared to the strength of gas bubbles creating the “holes” in the Gruyère and similar cheeses by moving the existing paste aside), it will tend to swallow up the entire economy as a “black hole”, leaving only the *frame* of the Public Administration to make a fine show.

One might also think that a Market substantially excluded from many

economic activities and in which the employees, but also the credit institutions and, maybe, even the tax authority gradually gain shares (always assuming that indirect taxation is preferable), would lose its attraction to the eyes of many entrepreneurs, intended as “coordinators of production factors” targeting the reduction of production costs and the increase of the sales of the manufactured goods.

But should the entrepreneurs intend to pursue their aims at the expenses of the employees, environment and communities, this is not so worrisome. Actually, with the diffusion of the LDD the age of the wild Market that, without counterweights, tends to degenerate becoming an extremely violent context leaving “scorched earth” all around, should come to an end.

Comparing it to a *jungle*, where the *law of the strongest* is in force but the sustainability is taken for granted, would be a *euphemism* because the strongest animal kills until the limit of fullness dictated by Nature, while the strongest and pathologically power-hungry man, the Mammon’s servant who is never sated of the “devil’s excrement”, sitting on top of a company operating in a Market lacking adequate counterweights, *seems* to also escape natural laws.

Therefore the LDD diffusion and the metamorphosis of the systems originating from it, which could give life to an *ethic* Market managed by men of goodwill wishing to put their talent to the test in their own and the community’s interest, are welcome.

### 3.1.5. *Effects on the household incomes*

The first macroscopic direct impact of the diffusion of Districts on the household incomes consists in a general increase of the lower incomes, particularly of those which were so low because of a persistent presence of involuntary inactivity.

This certainly contributes to a *social justice* which is not however the result of assistance policies consisting in public cash benefits of various forms (they are often necessary, but also burdened with inconveniences), but of the application, through the diffusion of the Districts, of a principle that

has until now remained in the sphere of good intentions, represented by the *equal opportunities*, offered to everybody, to contribute to the production and fruition of the national wealth.

In a Traditional Regenerative Dynamic system, in which no one is left to his own, the high household incomes, generally subject to tax, can surely persist, including the large passive private incomes, which however could gradually be skimmed over time if a hereditary legislation oriented in this sense is put in place. However, it cannot be ignored that if direct taxation, that is a forced subtraction of legally acquired wealth, has been conceived for practical rather than ethical reasons (money is taken where it is found), it nevertheless causes quite a lot of problems.

Therefore it is possible that, in a new and radically changed context in terms of household incomes, an *indirect* taxation could take place, i.e. a taxation not aggressive towards a lawfully gained wealth, which can be taxed when it is used, obviously making sure that its contribution to supporting the cost of collective services would grow with the non-essential character of the collective goods and services that are offered and *freely* acquired.

Today the transition from direct to indirect taxation is challenged by the producing sectors related to non-essential goods and services, which are likely to be more taxed precisely due to their non-essential character, and the excuse for this is the reduction of their market and the consequent decrease of employment, a problem which is overcome in the new situation.

Indeed the environmental sustainability can be achieved when, in addition to the relocation of many productive activities, a reduction in the production of non-essential goods is also achieved, above all of those with a large environmental impact in their production and/or in their usage.

But in addition to the mentioned effect on the income *level*, starting from the lowest, the permanent full-activity state achieved in this way, that is in an economic context where the free initiative is preserved and encouraged, is no doubt likely to also modify another important feature of such income, represented by its *structure*, i.e. its *source*, and this with reference to each family, including the single-person one.

The possibility, offered to everybody, to export one's own resources - work and talent - to fields more suitable to the personality, aspirations and determination of everyone, is a fundamental component of life quality, often more important than the income *level*, obviously over an acceptable threshold.

In the new system, the work, which in the "All-Market" systems is regarded as a cost by the producers and a necessary sacrifice by the workers, can acquire, if exerted in a suitable activity, a different and important role, becoming a real vehicle of personal *perfection*.

### 3.2. "Traditional Static" System Countries

If in the industrialised countries the urgency of an increased role of the Autonomy Paradigm in the architecture of their economic system is mainly motivated, at least for now, by an environmental *emergency* on a worldwide scale, in Countries with a Traditional Static system, especially those of the "Tribal" typology, in which this architecture is a simple legacy of the past and not a result of a clear vision characterised by a proper order, as in the "Religious" typology, the equally immediate urgency of a metamorphosis in the architecture of their economic system is essentially motivated by internal issues, such as poverty and the numerous plagues related to it.

A gradual economic and social development, to which this metamorphosis can strongly contribute, will allow also the *least developed* countries to avoid the current problems originated from an insane relationship with the industrialised and *wrongly developed* Countries, which will be briefly mentioned later on.

#### 3.2.1. *Get out of poverty*

Nowadays, despite the achieved level of scientific and technical development, still exist, next to a minority of people projected despite themselves towards an ephemeral and wasteful opulence, large masses

of human living in absolute poverty, a part of which die even of starvation; this simple observation is the indisputable proof that the economic disorder, the poisoned fruit of a systematic vision which the economists consider “without alternatives”, and propagate as such, has already reached the bottom long time ago.

Now, instead of “digging up”, focusing the public opinion on economic “innovations” that move in the same direction of the “Market Only” drift (let us consider, for example, the microcredit and the Local Exchange Systems but also the certifications of the “socially responsible” companies), risking to create dangerous illusions, it is rather necessary to bring on the global scene, which is today made possible by the new Information and Telecommunication Technology (ICT), a new economic modality of the *obscured* Autonomy Paradigm, represented by the intermediate *self-producing Communities* (a concept the economists consider as *heretic*), through the diffusion of a *new* variant, the Local Development District (LDD), the only one that is able to cause a significant and redeeming metamorphosis both in the industrialised Countries and, once adapted to the local colour, in the poorest Countries in the world.

The LDD diffusion on the territory is susceptible to structurally change the architecture of the economic system, as represented – in a purely descriptive way - in the following table.

It should be noted that while in the industrialised Countries with a “Market Only” system the diffusion of the Districts represents a *change of course*, that is, a *return* of certain activities from the Heteronomy Paradigm to the Autonomy Paradigm, in Countries with a Traditional Static system this diffusion is realized through a transfer of activities from one modality to another, a more productive one, of the same Autonomy Paradigm, thus representing a *requalification* of the Paradigm itself.

The most macroscopic effect of the LDD diffusion in Countries with a Traditional Static system actually involves, as represented in the table below, a *migration* into this new context of great part of the economic activities that in systems of this typology take place essentially in the domestic self-production field.

	Basic G&S	Other G&S	Public Utility Services	Intermediate G&S	Community Services	Total
Market	50 (50)	50 (100)	0 (-)	50 (100)	- (-)	150 (250)
Philanthropy	20 (-)	- (-)	5 (15)	- (-)	- (-)	25 (15)
Families	375 (5)	50 (-)	- (-)	100 (-)	- (-)	525 (5)
Intermediate Communities	- (390)	- (-)	- (-)	- (50)	- (-)	- (440)
Big Private Communities	- (-)	- (-)	- (90)	- (-)	- (-)	- (90)
Big Public Communities	- (-)	- (-)	100 (-)	- (-)	200 (200)	300 (200)
Total	445 (445)	100 (100)	105 (105)	150 (150)	200 (200)	1000 (1000)

A second effect is constituted by a *remodulation* of these activities with an *extension of the range* of those related to the production of final consumer goods and services and a *decrease* of those, essentially agricultural, related to the production inputs.

Some of these intermediate consumer goods, as for example the flour currently self-produced in families using mortars, could be surely produced with greater advantage by adequately equipped LDD units (usig small mills, for example).

However, the production of many other products, as for example cereals, could also go over the LDD, passing from the domestic self-production directly to the self-production carried out by *second level* intermediate self-producing Communities depending on geographically contiguous groups of LDD “clones”.

The recourse to this last typology of self-producing Communities allows to achieve a double aim: on the one hand, an increased productivity due to the use of more efficient and expensive tools which the largest production scale allows to acquire, and, on the other hand, the reduction

of the cash outflow that follows the purchase on the market of these inputs, by encouraging the *viability* of the LDD at their basis.

With reference to this second aspect, it should be said that in these Countries, given the slightness of the Market and the subsequent scarce *monetization* of the economies, a great number of members will be constituted by working members, many of them working part-time, and therefore, being able to rely only barely on the purchases of the already solvent non-working members, the production should be absorbed almost integrally by the families of the first group, spending more than collected by the working member; this could represent a difficult restriction for the less well-off families and therefore it will be convenient to limit this restriction.

Consequently, it is advisable, for this reason, too, that in this type of Countries the LDD diffusion be achieved systematically, by “bunches” of LDD “clones”, that is through the simultaneously launch of a small number of them, let’s say three or four, located contiguously.

It is also advisable, always for the same reason, that the productive spaces, owned by third parties, are chosen or realised in a *minimalist* way with a view to reduce as far as possible the rent for their use and thus the global volume of the obligatory cash outflow of the LDD, *a part* of which is to be covered by a surplus of the purchases of the working members’ families over the net distributed wage bill, and the remainder by the purchases of the non-working members’ families.

Although the advice to use minimalist equipped spaces, the fact remains that the necessity to have these spaces available translates into a new demand of proved solvency, to which the agents of the local market offer will be able to reply if supported by a credit which could, in part, promote the development (real and sustainable in this case).

In this way, the LDD diffusion in these Countries could, on the one hand, requalify the Autonomy Paradigm, replacing the (hardly profitable) domestic self-production with the self-production of the intermediate Communities and on the other hand, simultaneously start a *Market development* dynamic. A Market, moreover, already substantially conforming - at least as concerns the type of activity (capital goods and intermediate consumer goods, the production of which is basically highly capital-

intensive) - to that expected by the *Traditional Regenerative Dynamic* system, as it is already *confined* to these activities by a domestic self-production that draws its strength from the absolute lack of alternatives.

Thus, the diffusion of the LDD in Countries with a Traditional Static system translates into an increase of the quality of life, deriving from a greater productivity of the system as a whole, in addition to a progressive evolution towards the *full activity*, which, being monetized, reflects itself into a growth - measured by an increase in volume of the “national production” - characterised by a controlled environmental impact, and in any case sustainable thanks to the new model of development that produced it.

### 3.2.2. *Acquisition of democracy and dignity*

In these Countries the *pedagogical* effect of the self-production practice carried out in a technologically relatively developed environment can also support the privatisation, within the Autonomy Paradigm, of many individual *general utility* services that are often in the public hand in this type of Countries.

The management of these services could therefore, in the end, be transferred from the Big *Public* Communities, generally referring to the Public Administration, the role of which could thus be limited to the self-production of collective services, to the Big *Private* Communities, referring to the User Cooperatives, much to the advantage of a greater efficiency, deriving from a better control by the user-members, but also from the reduction of the corruption phenomena that nestle in these services, being particularly high in Countries with a “Traditional Static Tribal” system.

The exercise of an *active citizenship* can, in the end, also lead to a higher control in the management of collective services, realised through some forms of direct democracy, an appropriation of the *res publica* that is a sign of citizen dignity.



### 3.2.3. *Achievement of the demographic balance*

The greater increase in population observed in Countries with a *Traditional Static Tribal* system may be due, on the one hand, to its function as a counterbalance of the high child mortality, today partially hindered by a greater availability of suitable medications and, on the other hand, to the function of progeny as an invalidity and old-age insurance “policy” for parents, in a context without other alternative forms of security and/or welfare.

As both causes could be gradually replaced by the desired launch of a balanced economic and social development dynamic, the demography of these Countries is likely to find its balance, too, thus contributing to the establishment of a much needed virtuous circle.

### 3.2.4. *Freedom from neocolonialism*

The increased welfare achieved by following the way proposed here, that is, by increasing the role of the Autonomy Paradigm, and in particular its modalities represented by intermediate Communities and Big Private Communities, being probably also related to an increase of civic awareness, could reduce some serious plagues currently affecting these Countries.

Many of these plagues come from an insane relation among Countries with a “differently unbalanced” economic architecture - the ones, those with an “excessive Market”, sick from *poor development*, and the others, those with an “excessive Domestic production”, sick from *underdevelopment*.

This relation can be defined as neo-colonialism, in the sense that the former Countries, highly industrialized, use the latter on the one hand as a “dispenser” for raw materials, that are employed in a huge production of goods, largely unnecessary but curiously, at the same time, necessary to the functioning of a system that “consumes in order to produce”, and on the other hand as a “dustbin” for waste deriving from such an insensate and devastating “inverted” circuit of “consumption-production”.

If the *second* use is the result of a joint-venture between a limited number

of criminals from neo-colonial Countries and corrupt public officers from neo-colonies, the *first*, on the contrary, has assumed the aura of a wide-ranging development aid policy, still supported by the mainstream economists, although by now it is widely proved that development (which would however be, in any case, a wrong development) does not take place, as largely predictable.

A dynamic aiming at reaching *self-sufficiency*, first of all related to food, of the neo-colonies, starting from a *requalification* of the Autonomy Paradigm, which is the first step towards a sustainable economic and social development lying at the basis of an acquired dignity of suffering persons and nations, must be urgently put into place.

This dynamic, which can be activated through a bond among non-profit Philanthropy subjects and Market companies, represents the only way to avoid the theft of raw materials that leaves on the ground only wreckage, both social and environmental, and to ensure that it is substituted, if anything, by a healthier exchange among Countries characterised by a more similar economic architecture and by a substantial balance in power relationships.

### 3.2.5. *The start of return migration*

Another plague is assuming today biblical proportions, that is the migration phenomenon, generally originating in Countries devastated by wars (many of which are also attributable, ultimately, to the race for resources... that are never enough) and directed towards the industrialised Countries, which, given the scale of the phenomenon, are unable to cope with it appropriately.

Moreover, in the Countries towards which the human flow is moving, the crisis, or better the structural decline of a "Globalised Market Only" system, the instability of which is clear to everyone except the economists, makes the work opportunities insufficient even for the native population; this means immigrants could be exploited, or, if they are lucky, only receive a poor assistance.

The start in the industrialised Countries of the desired District diffusion

dynamic, which suggests since its very beginning the possibility of a permanent full activity and a secure work income for all those who desire it, would have the effect, on the one hand, to reduce the inevitable tensions produced, in the present conditions, by the migration phenomenon in the host countries and, on the other hand, to reduce the pathological voraciousness of the industrialised Countries in terms of resources and thus to slow down the invasiveness of some of them towards the migrants' Countries, thus creating the *necessary* conditions for many migrants to return to their Countries of origin.

If then the Districts' diffusion should gradually take place also in such Countries, so poor and, moreover, devastated by conflicts, a precise *line of development* could emerge within them for the first time in history, and this would associate them to the industrialised Countries that, starting from an opposite unbalance, could tend towards a similar system of convergence.

This line, based on concrete results, could create the objective conditions for a gradual counter-migration, which a great part of the migrant population certainly aspires to, being made finally *possible*, as well as *desirable*, by the hope of many of them to contribute to their own economic and social growth, as well as to that of their Countries, in a climate of hopefully lasting peace.

In this way, the present hateful situation, which sees a minority of Countries running faster to the detriment of many others, wrongly chasing them towards an abyss which both the ones and the others are destined to fall into.

And this, let us say it once again, can be attributed to mainstream economists, who, although they are not the cause of the ongoing drama, have supported in a cowardly and opportunistic way the delusions of grandeur of a few psychopaths, thus obfuscating the field of analysis concerning the entire architecture of the economic systems, and impeding the emergence of suitable solutions.

When faced with the imminent danger, a multitude of scholars in other subjects and of other personalities from every continent have had the great merit of directly taking on the task, made difficult by the TINA (There Is No Alternative) economists, to make mankind aware of the

seriousness of the ongoing destructive dynamic, even attempting to offer some solutions.

However, despite their honesty and goodwill, they have not managed to get to the *root of evil*, providing any possible solutions, as they had no economic analysis instrument that could drill the smokescreen deliberately created by the former to obscure the field of research.

We trust that this short essay, which could be considered as the result of the mentioned awareness-raising process, will motivate non-profit organisations and Market companies to start the necessary “reverse gear”, by now deadly urgent, that will allow mankind to leave behind the present horror and move towards a new Age of Dignity.

## C. CIVISM

### *Ethics for a destiny*

#### 1. A “REALISTIC” UTOPIA

Civism is a *model of society* based on the *Traditional Dynamic Regenerative* economic system, a novel system so far, with an architecture that allows to achieve the objectives most shared by all people, leading to social and environmental sustainability.

At the present time Civism still belongs, as the economic system on which it is based, to the world of ideas, inhabited by utopias.

But even in that world it represents an anomalous subject.

Civism cannot be defined as a utopia because the *Traditional Dynamic Regenerative* system, on which it can flourish and bear fruits while following the values that prevail in different societies, comes with a precise and *viable* praxis according to which anyone can contribute, with his own *daily* economic actions, to turn it into reality.

The *viability* of such praxis lies in the fact that those who follow it can help achieve the fundamental twofold objective of social and environmental sustainability not so much through personal *sacrifice*, but while pursuing their own *interest*.

This praxis emerges thanks to a refounded Economic Science which led to the realization that the architectures of all economic systems established so far, none of which satisfactory enough that people will want to deliberately imitate it, are devoid of a fundamental “pillar” constituted by an economic mode of the Autonomy Paradigm, in particular the one concerning *intermediate* self-producing Communities.

The analysis that followed has proven that an architecture compatible with such sustainability objectives can come into being with the development of this economic mode thanks to the diffusion of one of its specific *variants* (the Local Development District) with a *potential* degree of “attractiveness” for those wanting to be part of it to export work and talents and/or import goods and services, that will allow it to occupy in

the system the place it is entitled to, driving other economic modes to do the same.

The repeated reproaches made to economists are motivated not so much by the fact that they did not identify such *variant*, which however has not proved itself in terms of performance yet, but by the much more serious fact that they did not unfold the whole range of possible economic modes through the definition of the two fundamental economic Paradigms and their different applications, each characterized by a specific *behavior*, but bearing traces of the “genetics” proper of their own Paradigm.

The unfolding of this range of possibilities represents a necessary condition, though not sufficient in itself, for the progress of our economic organization and would be useful in examining initiatives that may occasionally arise also from individual intuitions and “illuminations”, so as to help the various parties involved to evaluate potentials and consequences of the expected behaviours to be inferred from such examination.

## 2. PRAXIS AND ETHICS

Having said that, we can well understand that the hoped-for metamorphosis of

the current systems can happen if the *praxis*, i.e. the participation in collective self-production, pervaded by a type of *ethics* centred on *betterment* (in the economic but also social and environmental fields), expressing an aspiration to get away from *chaos* and aim for *order*, intrinsically dynamic nonetheless, and its *beauty*, will have sufficient following with people.

Of course, since it is an economic praxis, the assessment of the interest of *individuals* in following it can easily be carried out by anybody.

This could lead to conclude at first that, once its practical implementation will have quantified the advantages, its success will be guaranteed.

However, things are not as predictable as they may seem.

### 3. THE KEY ROLE OF SPONSORS

Indeed, such a success can only come about if there will be entities from the Philanthropy world (social, religious, environmental Movements...), adequate in numbers and influence who, having judged the economic praxis in question and the *ethics* of *betterment* at its base to be *in line* with their own “vision of the world”, will take on the role of Sponsors in the dynamics of its diffusion.

This “passe-partout” praxis could give rise to a host of economic instruments (*guidelines, behavioural precepts, doctrines, intuitions*), emanating from the “visions of the world” or the missions of many Movements, none of which had succeeded, in its current form, to produce a system capable to guarantee a sufficient level of *sustainable* and diffused prosperity in a context of individual freedom or, at least, to contrast our rush to the abyss.

It should also be noted that any Movement, by embracing a praxis that follows a *rational* research conducted within a refounded Economic Science and also faithfully conveys the Movement’s own “economic doctrine”, would be relieved of the burden of seeking fancy economic solutions of great and decisive weight, the only ones that can establish themselves today, but could devote itself to the noblest aspects of its *mission* and obtain, on top of that, greater attention from a society that, freed from the pressing individual and collective material issues that are now distracting and stressing it, would certainly be more keen on a jump in the quality of daily life, granting new lymph to the Movement itself.

### 4. THE “UNIVERSAL CIVIST REPUBLIC”

When that happens, we will have a large and growing number of people who, although answering the invitation of Sponsors who are bearers of different social or religious messages, will follow one *economic* praxis animated by the common positive *ethics* of *betterment*. If we were to use an allegory, these people may be seen as the fruits of a wide variety of plants, noble but delicate, *all* grafted onto one recently identified *root stock*, wild

and robust, that by protecting them from the perils of a biological and climatic nature will grant them new vigour and greater productivity.

All these people, whatever their country of residence, could be considered the citizens of an *ideal* “Universal Civist Republic” (UCR), non-territorial, destined to expand patchily in many Countries and gradually turning their economic system to a direction that favours society and the environment.

A Republic in which material wealth will be less and less a status symbol and where we could have the establishment of an *aristocracy of values* with a function of moral guidance for its citizens, based on the principle of *social utility*; such a recognition would be granted by the community to individuals who gave concrete proof of having achieved exemplary levels of *betterment*.

The UCR could also acquire a legal entity status under private law as, let's say, a secular Association to be structured in different ways, with a view to exercise pressure, speaking with one official voice, on Public Administrations at various administrative levels in the territories of several Countries a) to favour the diffusion dynamics of local activities and b) to pave the way for the “domino effect” caused by such dynamics, so as to make the architecture of these economic systems evolve towards a convergence system and the corresponding social systems towards Civism, in a version *most in line* with the values prevailing in different territories. Of course, if such pressure should not produce the desired results despite the dynamics being well under way, it will only be a short step before the above legal entity becomes a political Movement that may even candidate itself to the Government of public Communities at different territory levels, aiming to influence more directly the management of the aforementioned dynamics.

It is of course desirable for such “Universal Civist Republic” to quickly show a diffusion (courtesy of the globalized “Market Only” virulence) widespread enough to reverse the rush to the abyss in the main areas of the world, at least in those where the civist praxis Sponsors are more present and where they could strengthen their presence by promoting the praxis, thus bringing their message to a wider audience.

This message will certainly be about the dignity of people and nations,



respect for the environment and peace, in the mutual respect of sovereign peoples, because these are the values of the “ Universal Civist Republic”, to which the praxis adopted by the Sponsors will contribute to give shape.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The introduction to this essay started by highlighting a rather *curious* phenomenon, in the sense that it challenges all logic, i.e. the huge discrepancy between the current high level of development of all Sciences, a development that is still ongoing, as logic would have it, at an exponential rate, and the absolute stillness of the Economic Sciences, when it is not, according to the input of numerous popular insiders, a regression to its nineteenth century origins, at the time when the invisible hand was “discovered”, so to speak.

Then, throughout the essay, we did our best to prove that such an anomalous situation is not the result of a strange effect of chance but represents the deliberately sought result of the “Masters of the world” mentioned in the preceding pages, who have a vested interest in blanking out any development of our economic organization that may question the *status-quo* on which their (ephemeral) power rests.

Let’s hope we succeeded in unveiling the mystery.

Now, at the end of our essay, we would like to highlight a second remarkable aspect, in other words the total break from the widespread belief (produced by the predominant relativistic faith, mother of all chaos) that the “messages” at the base of different ideologies and even religions cannot be distinguished into “good” or “bad”, based on ethics and the related practices that derive from their faithful interpretation.

Having said that, it is very likely, from the first spreading of the civist *praxis*, that the latter will split *potential* Sponsors into those who will actually take on such role and those who will not.

Among these, there will surely be those who, being indeed advocates of economic systems imposed in a dictatorial way by a “one-track philosophy”, either materialistic or religious, will oppose it, accusing it of being *heretical*.

However, as soon as the practical implementation will confirm the theoretical expectations, these latter organizations are bound, for the first time in history and certainly to the eyes of all those who answered the call of the Sponsors and are now part of the Universal Civist Republic, but also to the eyes of many who are under these organizations influence, to appear *objectively* as on the “Bad Guys” side.

At that point the praxis will act as a sieve, separating the wheat from the chaff.

It will be then be clear that such a hostile behaviour towards a praxis welcomed by so many people and sponsored by many other organizations who keep conveying successfully their message denotes not so much a will to keep their followers on the right path, in line with the inscrutable “truths” they are the sole repositories of, but rather a determination to hold on to the power they enjoy, even if that means depriving their people of the freedom to decide their own destiny or, in other words, depriving them of their dignity!

Fair winds to Civism!

## INDICE

### THE DIGNITY OF NATIONS

#### *Introduction*

#### **A. THEORETICAL ASPECTS**

##### 1. A NEW SCIENTIFIC APPROACH TO ECONOMY

#### *Preamble*

##### 1.1. *The basic economic paradigms*

##### 1.2. *Consequences of the definition of the two Paradigms*

##### 1.2.1. *Classification aspects*

##### 1.2.1.1. *Classification criteria*

##### 1.2.1.2. *Behavioral aspects*

##### 1.2.1.3. *Exhaustiveness*

##### 1.2.1.4. *The research of new ways*

##### 1.3. *Economic behavior and socio-environmental impact*

##### 1.3.1. *The economic Paradigms and the evolution of the systems*

##### 2. THE PARADIGMS AND THEIR ECONOMIC MODALITIES

##### 2.1. *The Heteronomy Paradigm*

##### 2.1.1. *The Market*

##### 2.1.2. *Philanthropy*

##### 2.1.3. *Local Exchange Systems*

##### 2.2. *The Autonomy Paradigm*

##### 2.2.1. *The Large Communities*

##### 2.2.1.1. *Public Communities*

##### 2.2.1.2. *Private Communities*

##### 2.2.2. *Intermediate Communities*

2.2.3. *Small Communities*

3. CATEGORIZATION OF THE ECONOMIC ARCHITECTURES

3.1. *“Market only”*

3.2. *“State only”*

3.3. *Traditional*

3.3.1. *Traditional Static System*

3.3.1.1. *Traditional Static Tribal System*

3.3.1.2. *Traditional Static Religious System*

3.3.2. *Traditional Dynamic System*

3.3.2.1. *Traditional Degenerative Dynamic System*

3.3.2.2. *Traditional Re-generative Dynamic System*

4. INTERMEDIATE CONSIDERATIONS

5. A NEW RESEARCH AREA

5.1. *Procedure for the identification of the subject*

5.1.1. *The concept of attractivity*

5.2. *The path*

6. COMMENTS ON THE “ROUGH MANUFACTURING”

7. BRIEF PRESENTATION OF THE LDD

8. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

**B. APPLICATIVE ASPECTS**

1. THE REALIZER

1.1. *Nature of the Realizer*

1.1.1. *Role and nature of the Sponsor*

## *The dignity of nations*

- 1.1.2. *Role and nature of the Executor*
- 1.2. *The initial Realizer*
  - 1.2.1. *One “fly in the ointment” we do not want to omit*
- 1.3. *Other functions of Realizers*
  
2. LDD DIFFUSION ABILITY IN THE SYSTEM
  - 2.1. *Countries with “Market Only” and “Traditional degenerative dynamic” system*
    - 2.1.1. *Families characterized by involuntary inactivity*
    - 2.1.2. *Families in full activity who are also environmentally aware*
    - 2.1.3. *Families in full activity and with low environmental awareness*
    - 2.1.4. *Another world is possible*
  - 2.2. *Countries with a “Traditional Static” system*
  
3. IMPACT OF THE LDD DIFFUSION IN THE SYSTEM
  - 3.1. *Countries with a “Market Only” and a “Traditional Degenerative Dynamic” system*
    - 3.1.1. *Employment aspects*
      - 3.1.1.1. *Specific and general employment*
      - 3.1.1.2. *Occupation and innovation*
      - 3.1.1.3. *The relational factor*
      - 3.1.1.4. *Innovation and economic development*
      - 3.1.1.5. *Mutual trust and solidarity in the creation of work and wealth*
      - 3.1.1.6. *Interim reflections*
      - 3.1.1.7. *Employment creation in the LDL*
    - 3.1.2. *The Realizer’s initiative and full activity*
      - 3.1.2.1. *First phase*
      - 3.1.2.2. *Second phase*
    - 3.1.3. *Structural effects on the Pillars of the system*
    - 3.1.4. *Functional effects on the Pillars of the system*
      - 3.1.4.1. *Public Administration*
      - 3.1.4.2. *Market*
    - 3.1.5. *Effects on the household incomes*

- 3.2.     *“Traditional Static” System Countries*
- 3.2.1.    *Get out of poverty*
- 3.2.2.    *Acquisition of democracy and dignity*
- 3.2.3.    *Achievement of the demographic balance*
- 3.2.4.    *Freedom from neocolonialism*
- 3.2.5.    *The start of return migration*

## **C. CIVISM**

- 1.        A “REALISTIC” UTOPIA
- 2.        PRAXIS AND ETHICS
- 3.        THE KEY ROLE OF SPONSORS
- 4.        THE “UNIVERSAL CIVIST REPUBLIC”
- 5.        CONCLUSION