

## Subject: Summarising BFI's 40 years

Saturday, 30 Sep, 2023 - 10:09

From **Peter Challen** to Rodney Shakespeare, Simon Mouatt,  
cc Steve Lancashire, Claudius Peter Van Wyk, Janet Reeves, John Courtneidge

Dear Rodney and Simon,

After Rodney's introduction to BFI of the Universal Paradigm, I thought it worth running off the summary of BFI's 40 years in this global arena. I've cut out all the pictures and some unnecessary or diverting asides. So the **attachment** - <https://ccmj.org.uk/wp/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/BFI-summarises-its-40-years.pdf> is down to 5000 words and 10 pages. Well worth a quick glance at its key points and global coverage and its encouragement of collaboration.

Peter

Saturday, 30 Sep 2023, 10:45am,

From **Rodney Shakespeare:** to Peter

Peter, Thank you.

1. The Buckminster Institute is excellent and fully understands new paradigm etc. So (attempted) contact has been made.....
2. **NB.** Good progress is also being made with construction of the Binary Paradigm website..... Thought is also being given as to whether there can be a CCMJ website.

Rodney

Saturday, Sep 30, 2023, 11:34am

**John Courtneidge** to Rodney, Simon, Steve, Peter, Claudius, Janet, Mary, Desmond

There is a CCMJ website: [www.ccmj.org](http://www.ccmj.org)

Diligently maintained by Mary cc'd

Saturday, Sep 30, 11:38am

**John Courtneidge** to Rodney, Simon, Steve, Peter, Claudius, Janet, Mary, Desmond

Why, please, do we continuously look overseas for gurus? We have the answer here: the plan and process for Co-operative Socialism: [www.co-operativesocialism.org](http://www.co-operativesocialism.org)

Videos as in the attachment. Outreach ditto. [Co-Operative+Socialism=vid](#)

Saturday, Sep 30, 11:46am

**Rodney Shakespeare:** to John, Claudius, Desmond, Janet, Mary, Peter, Simon, Steve

Yes, John, there is the existing CCMJ website and it would be sensible to host CCMJ Paradigm there.... Many issues are involved and it would be helpful if you could comment on them. Thanks.

- Is it necessary or desirable? • Who would present it? • Who would do the audio introduction?
- Who would finance it? (The present cost is quite high) • If not done, and hosted, by Cedric Born) how would the computer code get transferred? • No doubt, there are other issues.

Saturday, Sep 30, 12:00pm

**Rodney Shakespeare:** to John, Claudius, Desmond, Janet, Mary, Peter, Simon, Steve

John, You are missing the point – nobody is looking abroad for gurus. Instead, around the world, support for the Universal Paradigm is being identified and invited to help.

1. On behalf of South America and the Global Majority, the Binary Paradigm will be presented by an international grouping based in Bonaire (Dutch Antilles, near Brazil).
  2. A key aspect of the above presentation (which has not yet been done) will then enable invitation to be extended to people in Washington D.C and New York State.
  3. When 1 and 2 above have been done there will be a promising situation for extending invitation to particular people in Indonesia, Bangladesh and Pakistan.
  4. And when 3 has been done there will be another big possibility..... -- but only a possibility
- It's time to think globally. This quotation is from Buckminster Fuller:-

**“In order to change an existing paradigm you do not struggle to try and change the problematic model. You create a new model and make the old one obsolete.”**

Sunday, Oct 1, 10:59am

**Simon Mouatt** to Rodney, John, Claudius, Desmond, Janet, Mary, Peter, Steve

Dear John, nice to hear from you. One possible answer to your suggestion of not considering the UP approach and facilitating DS instead is that by spreading capital ownership gradually, it is more likely to gain traction with the deeply embedded liberal-minded Anglo Saxon lot who prefer ‘life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness’ and who (en masse) genuinely fear the large state which at best is overly bureaucratic and, at worse, is relatively more susceptible to the establishment of autocratic power grabbers. Ironically, it would also move political economy closer to the small state ideal of both Marx and Hayek by providing a more theoretically robust third way than the one suggested by Giddens and New Labour. If we are honest about this UP idea, it offers socialists a way of joining up with others across the political spectrum (yes including neoliberals) in an inclusive societal change that will move humanity forward and offers something for all, thus avoiding the polarised politics of old. This makes it pragmatic.

Sunday, Oct 1, 12:35pm

**Rodney Shakespeare:** to Simon, Claudius, Desmond, Janet, John, Mary Peter, Steve

Dear Simon, Further to your email below, today's most pernicious false assumption is that human labour creates all or most of the wealth (and the UP website adequately explains this).

If you believe in a pernicious false assumption you end up making proposals which are out of touch with physical reality. Rodney

Monday, Oct 2, 6:34am

**John Courtneidge:** to Rodney, Claudius, Desmond, Janet, Mary, Peter, Simon, Steve  
CCMJ hasn't adopted the BFI Paradigm.

Monday, Oct 2, 8:25am

**Simon Mouatt:** to Rodney, Claudius, Desmond, Janet, John, Mary, Peter, Steve

Hello Rodney, to my mind this labour issue still needs more clarification in the UP presentation. The classicals pointed to labour as a measure for all income/wealth for good reason. At a theory level every commodity is broken down to labour.

But the main point you wish to make in the UP is that fortunes are generated for people from property rights to assets not from wages-which is of course true. That's why we need to spread capital ownership through a paradigm.

But many people who are well-versed in labour theory know this. The problem comes in the debates taking place between people who are talking at cross purposes. If you state that labour is not the only entity that creates the value the UP can easily be refuted theoretically and this will undermine support. But if the UP stated labour first creates all value but it's asset owners that cream off the surpluses then this cannot be denied theoretically. This does not change the essence of the UP at all but it would be taken more seriously.

The trouble is that people cannot bring themselves to admit that Marx was right on this. But you do not have to accept his politics to agree with him on this point. There were chinks in his thinking but this point was not one of them. This is why the powers that be have to resort to other tactics to suppress this.

Monday, Oct 2, 9:55am

**Rodney Shakespeare:** to John, Claudius, Desmond, Janet, Mary, Peter, Simon, Steve  
Excellent, John!

We can now make progress capable of going far beyond the confines of this group/thread.

1. Buckminster Fuller is famous for saying -- time and time again -- that you cannot argue with the existing paradigm. Instead, you have to build a new one. And BFI does not have a major new paradigm as such. Rather, it aspires to one.
2. Unless you are concerned with reality in a new, accurate and comprehensive way you are completely unable to:- a) successfully challenge the existing paradigm, b) propose new ideas/policy which have a hope of (eventually) being implemented. So it's Reality (or accurate Paradigm) First and Policy Second.
3. CCMJ has a big problem -- its present paradigm is a version of the prevailing paradigm (see the linear spectrum in section F of [www.universalparadigm.org](http://www.universalparadigm.org))
4. Therefore, in order to clarify exactly what is (or could be) the CCMJ paradigm, please start with the most fundamental thing of all (at least in economics) by answering the question:- Who or what creates the goods and services on which we all depend? Rodney

Monday, Oct 2, 11:05am

**Rodney Shakespeare:** to Simon, Claudius, Desmond, Janet, John, Mary, Peter, Steve  
Hi Simon, Excellent! (As I have just written to John C) we are now making progress going far beyond the confines of this group/thread.

1. Without addressing an outdated understanding of reality (and substituting a new, accurate and dynamic one instead) there is no hope of challenging existing institutions and practices let alone establishing new ones. So it's Reality (or accurate Paradigm) First and Policy Second.
2. (As you are indeed indicating), the most fundamental question of all (at least in economics) is:- Who or what creates the goods and services on which we all depend?
3. The problem is that Labour Theory is completely outdated and stems from Adam Smith (yes, Adam Smith) via Ricardo and Marx. By attributing (all) creation of wealth to labour it is saying there will always be lots and lots of good jobs (while, at the same time, the World Economic Forum is saying that, very soon, the vast majority of people will be 'useless' (their word). (AND, NB. those with power have a tendency to kill useless people.....)
4. The issue as to who or what creates the goods and services is completely muddled by talking about the value (a moral concept). The creation of goods and services is a physical matter. And the physical creation of goods and services is exactly why the World Economic Forum etc. holds all the power and, in future, will hold even more.
5. You are perfectly right to indicate that people have difficulty in accepting this. They have difficulty particularly because they know full well that, without saying jobs do it all, they are (or will be) on the scrap heap
6. Just as everybody used to believe that the sun goes around the earth (they were wrong) so, today, everybody (or most) believe that labour creates all the wealth -- and it ain't true!
7. Those who believe in Labour Theory are completely defeated by today's facts eg half the world lives on under \$5.50/day for everything (they want to work but can't get jobs!) automated factories (I saw the first ones fifty five years ago) oak trees grow from acorns without humans doing anything....
8. And now to the much-needed clarification of the CCMJ paradigm. Unlike the World Economic Forum, CCMJ has a Christian belief in God AND so it upholds the worth of all individuals. That belief is the ultimate justification for ensuring that everybody has adequate income/housing etc and so there is no need (and very unwise) to rely upon a completely false understanding (Labour Theory) as to how goods and services are actually created.

Rodney

Monday, Oct 2, 12:05pm

**John Courtneidge:** to Simon, Rodney, Claudius, Desmond, Janet, Mary, Peter, Steve  
Is BFI intended to replace Capitalism or, like Binary Economics, a modification of Capitalism in which Theft of Economic Assets is retained (the Thieves call that 'Ownership') and, subsequently, Usury. Both Theft and Usury are not Christian Principles. Yes?

Monday, Oct 2, 12:37 pm

**Claudius:** to Rodney, Simon, Desmond, Janet, John, Mary, Peter, Steve

Greetings, I am curious about the stance of the view of the person as being located in a Christian belief of God rather than labour theory.

The Preamble to the UN Declaration of Human Rights was drafted by Jan Smuts - it was based on his belief in the sacredness of human Personality. This they did not get t the time and changed that to person. Personality, as opposed to person (this physical body with a mind), referred to the nature of deepening human 'inwardness' as individual identity, in its evolutionary process, transcended own needs to take on the greater good of fellow humans, life and ultimate 'being'. Poetically he declared: "The universe is individuating as the individual universalises". We are thus instruments of on-going cosmic evolution. His notion of human rights was thus that society should organise itself in such a way that this capacity to the deepest self-realisation could be actualised. These link below refer to this issue.

<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/smuts-defines-sacred-individual-claudius-van-wyk/>

<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/individual-personality-society-holistic-view-claudius-van-wyk/>

[https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/human-rights-responsibility-state-society-claudius-van-wyk/?trk=pulse-article\\_more-articles\\_related-content-card](https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/human-rights-responsibility-state-society-claudius-van-wyk/?trk=pulse-article_more-articles_related-content-card)

Now concerning the notion of a BIG we are looking at an extremely complex issue, sociologically, economically, politically and morally.

In South Africa for example millions of people (47% of the population) survive on meagre social security grants - see: <https://theconversation.com/47-of-south-africans-rely-on-social-grants-study-reveals-how-they-use-them-to-generate-more-income-203691>

Yet the SA government is approaching a fiscal cliff: <https://theconversation.com/47-of-south-africans-rely-on-social-grants-study-reveals-how-they-use-them-to-generate-more-income-203691>

Given the burgeoning role of technology (in south Africa as well) the huge numbers of unemployed are likely to swell even further.

This issue of the balance between social support (i.e. European social market economy) and individual sovereignty - seems to point increasingly to the need for the revival of self-supporting communities.

This article looks at the issue of sovereignty: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/sovereign-individual-state-claudius-van-wyk/>. This initiative looks at re-empowering local agency (relocalising creativity). Kerry and Marc of the SeetheSystems group are presenting at this conference in Bristol - their theme is relocalizing creativity - it all about re empowerment of neighbourhoods in the face of potential systems breakdown.

These friends of the Holos-Earth Project will show how to employ system dynamic mapping to get to grips with finding the areas of potential generative influence. Highly recommended.

Here is the registration link: <https://helmtickets.com/events/8786/cave-drawings-and-campfire-conversations-an-online-and-in-person-event>

Just thinking, Claudius

Monday, Oct 2, 12:42pm

**RodneyShakespeare:** to John, Simon, Claudius, Desmond, Janet, Mary, Peter, Steve  
John,

1. In another email I have said that BFI does not have a major new paradigm (or comprehensive understanding of reality) as such. Rather it aspires to one. Buckminster Fuller spent years saying that you cannot argue with anybody upholding any aspect of the existing paradigm. Instead, you have to create the new paradigm.

2. Also in another email, I have opened up the big subject of asking exactly what is the CCMJ paradigm. Paradigm is about the understanding of reality -- and (correct me if I am wrong) your understanding of the most fundamental thing of all (how goods and services are created) is virtually the same as that of today's capitalism -- you think labour does all, or most of it. Rodney

Monday, Oct 2, 1:44 pm

**Rodney Shakespeare:** to Claudius, Desmond, Janet, John, Mary, Peter, Simon, Steve  
Thank you, Claudius!!

You are ensuring this discussion is addressing the main issues.

1. The Christian Council for Monetary Justice is Christian in concept and purpose. That means belief in God and in the value of all individuals.

One of the great virtues of religious belief is that it goes beyond present society and practices and beliefs and unequivocally, and over the generations, upholds the value of all individuals.

However, you are (very well) setting out the "natural justice" belief in the value of all individuals whereon the crucial question arises as to whether that belief is strong enough to defeat what is actually happening i.e., a world in which:-

-- the vast majority of people will be useless (those are the words of the World Economic Forum) the environment is being destroyed and resources depleted. NB Many people associated with the WEF think a population level around only 7% of the present level is desirable.

So now you know why millions, probably billions, of people are fearful that the Covid-19 vaccines are (or will be) part of a global depopulation programme (with effective vaccines secretly available only to the elite).

2. Therefore I ask: Do you really believe that a "natural justice" position is sufficiently strong to protect future humans e.g., in South Africa? OR Is it not best to have some religious belief which, at least, goes beyond, and outside government and the state?

3. It is good (but also depressing) that you raise the issue of South Africa's 47% living on a meagre grant.

In proposing solutions, (forgive me being blunt) but I think you are not completely taking into account the immense power of the World Economic Forum and the rapidly-strengthening global elite. The power of the elite is increasing because everybody (consciously or not) accepts all the fundamental assumptions of the present prevailing paradigm. A change in paradigm is necessary.  
Rodney S.

Monday, Oct 2, 7:10pm

**Simon Mouatt:** to RODNEY, John, Claudius, Desmond, Janet, Mary, Peter, Steve

Saying that labour creates the wealth is not saying there will always be jobs, Marx thought that capitalists would be increasingly economising on labour which meant the rate of surplus value tends to decrease. It is important to recognise for stronger credibility.

Mon, Oct 2, 8:26pm

**Claudius:** to RODNEY, Desmond, Janet, John, Mary, Peter, Simon, Steve

A few further thoughts:

On 02 Oct 2023, at 14:44pm Rodney wrote: Thank you, Claudius!!

You are ensuring this discussion is addressing the main issues.

1. The Christian Council for Monetary Justice is Christian in concept and purpose. That means belief in God and in the value of all individuals.

One of the great virtues of religious belief is that it goes beyond present society and practices and beliefs and unequivocally, and over the generations, upholds the value of all individuals.

I think you'll find this quote by Jan Smuts says it all - he was deeply concerned at the trajectory of 20th century human affairs. In the Preface to the second edition of 'Holism and Evolution' he wrote: "It must be clear to those who look below the surface of things that far-reaching changes ... are setting in ... the world of to-morrow will be a very different ... a grave duty arises ... for our science and philosophy (it) ... should regard itself as dedicated to service and should make its distinctive contribution towards the upbuilding of a new constructive world-view. We are passing through one of the great transition epochs of history; we are threatened with reaction on the one hand and with disintegration on the other ... the torch of new ideas has to be kindled for our guidance ... it is nothing but a spiritual structure of the dominant ideas expressing themselves in institutions and the subtle atmosphere of culture. If the soul of our civilisation is to be saved we shall have to find new

and fuller expression for the great saving unities—the unity of reality in all its range, the unity of life in all its forms, the unity of ideas throughout human civilisation, and the unity of man's spirit with the mystery of the Cosmos in religious faith and aspiration ...”.

However, you are (very well) setting out the "natural justice" belief in the value of all individuals whereon the crucial question arises as to whether that belief is strong enough to defeat what is actually happening i.e., a world in which:-  
-- the vast majority of people will be useless (those are the words of the World Economic Forum)  
the environment is being destroyed and resources depleted

The mechanistic materialistic worldview measures value according to overt power and material goods. Even creativity tends to be valued in accordance with its capacity to be monetised - hence the extractive economy. The value of consciousness is appropriated into data that can be monetised or converted in power. We conscious creatures bring an entirely new value into existence - we can know, and relate - and that can be converted into empathy, compassion, gratitude and love. That is a higher frequency of value that cannot easily be quantified - but can be experienced. When Smuts spoke about Personality being a manifestation of ‘inwardness’ it is that invisible field of value we create that represents a new dimension of wholeness. Without a spiritual perspective that value is non-existent and we are bound to remain trapped in materialism.

NB Many people associated with the WEF think a population level around only 7% of the present level is desirable. Paul Ehrlich in his ‘Human Time Bomb’ had the same fear of overpopulation. I don’t think this is a question of numbers - I think it is a question of coming back into relationship with nature’s regenerative capacity - and nature is the living expression of cosmic evolution. The Psalmist wrote ‘How Lovely is Thy Dwelling Place...’ that is the human task to make this dwelling place lovely in conscious awareness - and that includes music, art, poetry, dance, literatures, and even cooking. :)

So now you know why millions, probably billions, of people are fearful that the Covid-19 vaccines are (or will be) part of a global depopulation programme (with effective vaccines secretly available only to the elite).

2. Therefore I ask: Do you really believe that a “natural justice” position is sufficiently strong to protect future humans e.g., in South Africa?

South Africa has probably the most advanced constitution in the world with a wonderful Bill of Rights. But many today say that living conditions are now worse than under apartheid rule. The core issue is culture, and what you are by implication pointing at is the powerful role of religion in culture: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/world-economically-trapped-self-betrayal-claudius-van-wyk/>

OR Is it not best to have some religious belief which, at least, goes beyond, and outside government and the state?

3. It is good (but also depressing) that you raise the issue of South Africa’s 47% living on a meagre grant.

The ANC still lives in the illusion that Russian inspired socialism can bring peace and justice to society. They lived in the illusion that ‘wealth was just lying around’ and had been ‘captured’ by the white population. All that was needed was the overthrow of the hated regime. The role of creative entrepreneurship was not in the political equation. The imposition of minimum wages forced farm workers off the land into urban slums. The next step is Zimbabwe style EWC - expropriation without compensation - with disruptive consequences on food production etc. So an evolution of paradigm - absolute - revolution - no: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/lessons-from-russian-revolution-claudius-van-wyk/>

In proposing solutions, (forgive me being blunt) but I think you are not completely taking into account the immense power of the World Economic Forum and the rapidly-strengthening global elite.

I’m only too aware of the power of the elite - further enabled by technology - I’m also aware of alternative approaches to currency - interesting innovative initiatives:

<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/holist-attempts-get-grips-block-chain-claudius-van-wyk/>

The power of the elite is increasing because everybody (consciously or not) accepts all the fundamental assumptions of the present prevailing paradigm. A change in paradigm is necessary.

No doubt about that - here is my vision:

<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/post-brexit-vision-britain-claudius-van-wyk/>

Monday, Oct 2, 8:59pm

**Rodney Shakespeare:** to Simon, Claudius, Desmond, Janet, John, Mary, Peter, Steve  
Hi Simon,

1. There is a contradiction at the core of your response. If you say that labour creates all the wealth (i.e, goods and services) then there will always be lots of good jobs. Yet nobody believes that.

2. What's more, Marx's recognition that capitalists will always economise on labour (i.e., diminish the jobs) is a simple statement that machinery increasingly produces the output more quickly, efficiently and cheaply than humans.

What's more, Marx (e.g., in his description of Nasmyth's steam hammer) really DID understand that machinery was doing more and more of the production.

3. However, at the time, Marx had no practical way by which he could spread ownership of machinery to the mass of the people. So he put forward a moral explanation for the creation of goods and services rather than the accurate physical one.

4. The completely debilitating weakness of the moral explanation is that, in practice, it hands over everything to the World Economic Forum and the global elite -- and you do not want that.

Put another way, the prevailing paradigm (containing the Labour Theory) is forwarding the interests of the elite and not those of the world's majority.

5. Please have a think about an automated factory (I saw the first ones fifty five years ago and have still not recovered from the shock...). There is NO human involvement in an automated factory. The designers and builders of the factory have been paid while the maintenance team (playing blackjack until suddenly needed) is exactly like your doctor who maintains you but who is NOT part of your production.

PS. NB. Buckminster Fuller pointed out that the new paradigm cannot win by argument. The only way forward is to build the new paradigm. (Fuller was really only expressing, and popularising, the insight of Thomas Kuhn, 1962.) In practice that means new thinkers (e.g. Copernicus, Galileo, Darwin, Wegener, McClintock etc) first put forward the new paradigm and then had to wait until others, recognising increasing failure, started to look for something new.

It's time CCMJ works out what is its underlying paradigm and does not, in practice, help to maintain the prevailing outdated and inaccurate one.

Rodney

Monday, Oct 2, 10:17pm

**Rodney Shakespeare:** to Claudius, Desmond, Janet, John, Mary, Peter, Simon, Steve  
Claudius,

Thanks for an extensive and thoughtful reply. However:-

1. The long Smuts passage (rightly) wants spiritual advance and unity of reality, life and ideas, but it says nothing about practical ways of achieving the advance and unity. The passage is certainly aspirational, even inspiring, but aspiration and inspiration are not the same as pragmatic economic political and environmental solution.

2. Then -- forgive the bluntness -- you go even further away from pragmatic solution into a "higher frequency of value which cannot be easily quantified". That is vague and not helpful.

3. Claudius, South Africa has 46% of its population on derisory income and nothing that you propose as solution can happen unless the falsity of (at least) fifty nine assumptions about reality is identified. The false assumptions stop the development of new, positive, pragmatic ideas. Indeed, without addressing those assumptions, your excellent solutions just won't happen -- and then South Africa will be in even bigger trouble than it is today.

4. You say that you don't think that population is a question of numbers but, instead, "a question of coming back into relationship with nature's regenerative capacity." The "coming back into relationship" is indeed very necessary but (apparently) you have no practical way of doing it.

Population, environment and regeneration are dealt with extensively at [www.universalparadigm.org](http://www.universalparadigm.org) and it's high time that you -- as an intellectual and spiritual leader of others -- focussed on practical matters.

5. I am not indicating that religion is part of the problem -- I only pointed out that (in contrast to the World Economic Forum, for example) belief in God is important as a long term way of upholding the value of billions of individuals.

6. Thank you for alerting me to your Vision for Britain. It says "What we need is a fundamental shift in values - and the application of the principle of self-organisation to implement them." The Vision is very aware of impending environmental disaster but seems to offer little or nothing as a solution. "Meaningful experience" etc is not a solution to environmental disaster nor to the miserable living standards of the bulk of the South African population. The Vision seems to be something for the (sufficiently prosperous) middle classes (and there's nothing wrong in that) but it is woefully short on practical solution for others. The aims of your vision are excellent but the vision is short on practical solution.

Rodney

Friday, Oct 6, 10:17pm 10:52 am

**John Courtneidge:** to Rodney, Simon, Claudius, Desmond, Janet, me, Peter, Steve

Many thanks Rodney, The central question is: Does CCMJ support the continuation of Capitalism? Or its replacement?

Two definitions of Capitalism are:

- 1) The use of money to get and accumulate more money (ie Usury),
- 2) The Theft of Economic Resources (Land, Law, Knowledge, Position, People) and the use of these God-given Resources to get and accumulate Money (ie Power) in the form of Rent, Interest, Profits, Unequal-pay for Bullying Work respectively.

PS The Thieves call Theft 'Ownership'. Jesus calls for the replacement of Capitalism by The Kingdom. So do I. Hence the plan and process which I, and supporters, call 'Co-operative Socialism: [www.co-operativesocialism.org](http://www.co-operativesocialism.org) - ie #TrueSocialism

For all, in All, by all,

John

Friday, Oct 6 12:35pm

**Rodney Shakespeare:** to John, Claudius, Desmond, Janet, Mary, Peter, Simon, Steve

John, Thanks for responding. Some questions arise:-

1. Do you propose no private ownership at all? (Please be clear on this).
2. Who would own the productive capital (and to what extent)?
3. Exactly what money system do you propose?
4. Debt-free or interest-free issuance? Or both? To whom? For what purposes? To what extent?
5. Or perhaps no money system at all? (?Maybe some form of gift economy?)
6. Are you aware that opposition to 'usury' (if the opposition is made without specific explanation) in practice and law means that support is being given for interest and compound interest? (In UK law 'usury' means 'excessive interest' and not interest.)

Lastly, there is a way to help others understand exactly what you are saying -- just imagine that you have a magic wand and limitless power ..... -- please describe what the world would look like.

Rodney

*This discussion has veered into a new topic, and continues under a new header:*

**Clarification of the CCMJ paradigm** - see <https://ccmj.org.uk/wp/archives/8203>