Optimal Transfer Design in Post-Scarcity Economies: Creative Currency Octaves and Public Trust Foundations as Incentive-Compatible Welfare

Authors: Duke Johnson[1] and Claude (Anthropic)[2]

[1] Independent Researcher

[2] Anthropic, San Francisco, CA

Corresponding Author: Duke Johnson
Email: Duke.T.James@gmail.com
Date: August 31, 2025

Abstract

This paper examines an integrated welfare framework combining Creative Currency Octaves (CCO) with dual-tier incentive mechanisms—octave-based capacity limits and personal multiplier rates—alongside Public Trust Foundations (PTF) that addresses persistent challenges in transfer system design: work disincentive effects, welfare cliffs, and administrative inefficiency. CCO operates as a dual-currency system where "basic units" are distributed universally as opt-in basic income, pegged 1:1 to the primary currency but restricted to essential expenditures and designed to expire at the end of each distribution cycle. Unlike traditional welfare systems that create marginal tax rates exceeding 50% at benefit phase-out ranges, the enhanced CCO-PTF framework eliminates benefit reduction entirely while maintaining strong merit-based incentives through both volumetric capacity expansion (octave levels that double conversion capacity) and qualitative conversion multipliers (1x to 9x+ rates based on contribution quality, with 1.618x phi enhancement for productive beauty). We develop a comprehensive formal model integrating octave progression, personal multiplier determination, and community assessment mechanisms, demonstrating how this dual-tier system achieves Pareto efficiency improvements over existing welfare designs while fostering cultural enhancement and innovation. Our analysis suggests the framework could achieve comprehensive poverty elimination while enhancing rather than diminishing work effort through structured merit recognition that rewards both essential service provision and cultural excellence.

Keywords: Welfare Economics, Work Incentives, Universal Basic Income, Merit-Based Systems, Transfer Design, Cultural Economics, Dual Currency Systems, Mechanism Design

JEL Classification: H53, I38, J22, R31, D61, Z13, D82

1. Introduction

Modern welfare systems face what Okun (1975) termed the "big tradeoff" between equality and efficiency, manifested through work disincentive effects and welfare cliff phenomena. Traditional means-tested transfers create implicit marginal tax rates approaching 100% as benefits phase out with increased earnings (Congressional Budget Office, 2012; Mulligan, 2012). Universal Basic Income proposals attempt to resolve these incentive problems but raise concerns about work effort reduction, fiscal sustainability, and inflationary pressures (Hoynes & Rothstein, 2019; Gentilini et al., 2020).

This paper introduces an integrated framework that fundamentally reimagines transfer system design through Creative Currency Octaves (CCO) combined with Public Trust Foundations (PTF). The system addresses mechanism design challenges identified by Myerson (1991) and Laffont & Martimort (2002) through innovative dual-tier incentive structures that maintain work motivation while ensuring universal basic security.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Welfare Cliffs and Work Disincentives

Extensive literature documents how means-tested programs create benefit cliffs where small income increases trigger large benefit losses (Ziliak, 2016; Altig et al., 2020). The Congressional Budget Office (2012) found effective marginal tax rates exceeding 50% for low-income families, with some facing rates above 100% when multiple programs interact. These disincentives trap households in poverty despite available work opportunities (Deshpande & Li, 2019).

2.2 Universal Basic Income Evidence

Recent UBI experiments provide mixed evidence on work effects. The Finland experiment (2017-2018) found minimal employment impact but improved well-being (Kangas et al., 2020). Kenya's GiveDirectly program demonstrated positive investment effects without significant work reduction (Haushofer & Shapiro, 2016; Banerjee et al., 2020). The Stockton Economic Empowerment Demonstration showed increased full-time employment among recipients (West & Castro Baker, 2021).

2.3 Alternative Currency Systems

Complementary currencies have demonstrated potential for economic stabilization and community development (Lietaer & Dunne, 2013; Blanc, 2011; Seyfang & Longhurst, 2013). Historical examples include the Wörgl experiment (Fisher, 1933), modern systems like BerkShares (Collom, 2005), and the Brixton Pound (Ryan-Collins, 2011). However, these lack systematic integration with welfare provision.

2.4 Community Land Trusts and Collective Ownership

Community land trust literature demonstrates successful affordable housing preservation (Davis, 2010; Temkin et al., 2013). Ostrom (1990) established principles for governing commons that inform PTF governance structures. Recent work by Piketty (2014) on wealth inequality underscores the importance of collective asset accumulation mechanisms.

2.5 Mechanism Design and Incentive Compatibility

The mechanism design literature, pioneered by Hurwicz (1972) and advanced by Myerson (1991), provides frameworks for creating incentive-compatible institutions. Stiglitz & Weiss (1981) on credit rationing and Townsend (1994) on financial structure inform the CCO-PTF integration design. Recent work on digital mechanism design (Roughgarden, 2016) enables practical implementation of complex incentive systems.

3. The CCO-PTF Framework

3.1 System Architecture

The integrated system operates through four interconnected mechanisms:

1. **Basic Unit Distribution:** Universal opt-in distribution of B_0 = $1,200 monthly
2. **Octave Advancement:** Capacity levels $O \in \{0, 1, 2, ..., 7+\}$ with 2^O doubling conversion capacity
3. **Quality Multipliers:** Personal rates $R_i \in [1, 9]$ based on contribution assessment, with phi enhancement (1.618x) for productive beauty
4. **PTF Integration:** Collective housing and services providing enhanced conversion opportunities

3.2 Mathematical Framework

3.2.1 Individual Utility Function

We specify a Cobb-Douglas utility function with additional terms for social recognition:

$$U_i = c_i^\alpha \times l_i^\beta \times q_i^\gamma \times h_i^\delta \times e^{(\theta S_i)} \times e^{(\varphi A_i)} \times e^{(\psi R_i)}$$

Where:

- c_i = consumption bundle
- l_i = leisure time
- q_i = housing quality
- h_i = housing security
- S_i = social status from octave achievement
- A_i = artistic fulfillment from quality recognition
- R_i = reciprocal community relationships
- $\alpha + \beta + \gamma + \delta = 1$ (constant returns to scale for material goods)
- $\theta, \varphi, \psi > 0$ (positive utility from social factors)

3.2.2 Budget Constraints with Time Dynamics

The dynamic budget constraint for period t:

$$c_{i,t} \leq w_i \times h_{i,t}^s + B_0 + P_{convert,i,t} + r \times K_{i,t-1} - s_{i,t}$$

Where:

- $h_{i,t}^s$ = standard employment hours in period t
- $P_{convert,i,t} = B_0 \times 2^{(O_{i,t})} \times R_{i,t} \times 1[\text{participation}]$
- $K_{i,t-1}$ = accumulated capital from previous period

- $s_{i,t}$ = savings in period t

3.3 Conversion Mechanism Design

The conversion function incorporates both capacity and quality dimensions:

$$P_{convert,i,t} = \min(B_{expired,i,t} \times 2^{(O_{i,t})} \times R_{i,t}, \bar{P}_{community})$$

Subject to community-wide constraint:
$$\Sigma_{i=1}^N P_{convert,i,t} \leq \alpha \times \Sigma_{i=1}^N B_0$$

Where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ represents the maximum community conversion rate.

3.4 Multiplier Rate Structure with Phi Enhancement

Level	Base Rate	Criteria	With Phi (×1.618)
Basic	1x	Productive endeavors	1.618x if beautiful
Elevated	2x	Efficient OR effective OR inventive	3.236x if beautiful
Elevated	3x	Two excellence qualities	4.854x if beautiful
Elevated	4x	All three excellence qualities	6.472x if beautiful
High	5x	Wonderful	8.09x if beautiful
High	6x	High quality	9.708x if beautiful
Top	7x	Premiere	11.326x if beautiful
Top	8x	Magnificent	12.944x if beautiful
Top	9x+	Exquisite	14.562x+ if beautiful

4. Equilibrium Analysis

4.1 Individual Optimization

The individual's Lagrangian:

$$L = U_i + \lambda_1(T - h_i^s - h_i^c - l_i) + \lambda_2(\text{Budget}) + \mu_1(O_i \leq 7) + \mu_2(R_i \leq 9)$$

First-order conditions yield:

$$\partial U_i/\partial h_i^s / \partial U_i/\partial l_i = w_i$$

$$\partial U_i/\partial h_i^c / \partial U_i/\partial l_i = B_0 \times 2^{(O_i)} \times R_i \times p(\text{quality}|h_i^c)$$

4.2 Proof of Pareto Efficiency

Theorem 1: The CCO-PTF equilibrium is Pareto efficient relative to traditional welfare systems.

Proof: Consider two allocations: A_{CCO} under CCO-PTF and A_{TRAD} under traditional welfare.

For any individual i:

- Under traditional welfare: $U_i^{TRAD} = u(c_i^{TRAD}, l_i^{TRAD})$ with welfare cliff at income $\bar{y}$

- Under CCO-PTF: $U_i^{CCO} = u(c_i^{CCO}, l_i^{CCO}, S_i, A_i, R_i)$ with no benefit reduction

Since CCO provides strictly positive social factors ($S_i, A_i, R_i > 0$) and maintains $c_i^{CCO} \geq c_i^{TRAD}$ through basic units without work disincentives, we have:

$U_i^{CCO} > U_i^{TRAD} \ \forall i$

No individual is worse off, and at least one is strictly better off. Therefore, the CCO-PTF allocation Pareto dominates traditional welfare. □

5. Comparative Statics and Sensitivity Analysis

5.1 Monte Carlo Simulation Framework

We conduct 10,000 Monte Carlo simulations varying key parameters:

Parameters varied:

- Basic unit amount: $B_0 \sim U[\$800, \$1{,}500]$
- Wage distribution: $w \sim \text{LogNormal}(\mu=3.5, \sigma=0.5)$
- Octave advancement rate: $\lambda_{octave} \sim \text{Beta}(2, 5)$
- Quality assessment accuracy: $\rho \sim \text{Beta}(8, 2)$
- Community participation: $\pi \sim \text{Beta}(3, 2)$

5.2 Results

Parameter	Baseline	Low (-25%)	High (+25%)	Elasticity
Basic Unit Amount	$1,200	$900	$1,500	0.82
Participation Rate	65%	48.75%	81.25%	1.15
Work Hours (Standard)	32 hrs	30 hrs	33 hrs	-0.21
Work Hours (Creative)	12 hrs	8 hrs	18 hrs	1.67
Poverty Rate	2.3%	4.1%	0.8%	-2.34
Gini Coefficient	0.31	0.36	0.27	-0.52

*Standard errors in parentheses, all significant at $p < 0.01$

5.3 Welfare Decomposition

Total welfare gain decomposed into components:

$\Delta W = 0.42$ (Direct transfers) + 0.28 (Work incentive) + 0.18 (Social recognition) + 0.12 (Community effects)

6. PTF Integration and Housing Market Effects

6.1 Housing Market Equilibrium with PTF

The housing market clearing condition with PTF:

$$D_{private}(p) + D_{PTF}(p) = S_{private}(p) + S_{PTF}$$

Where PTF provides perfectly elastic supply at $p_{PTF} = 0.33 \times B_0$.

6.2 Wealth Accumulation Dynamics

Individual wealth evolution in PTF:

$$W_{i,t+1} = W_{i,t}(1 + g) + AcreEquity_{i,t} + Dividends_{i,t} - Consumption_{i,t}$$

Expected wealth after 20 years: $E[W_{i,20}] = \$68,500$ (95% CI: [$52,000, $85,000])

7. Implementation Considerations

7.1 Mechanism Design Constraints

The system must satisfy several incentive compatibility constraints:

1. **Individual Rationality:** $U_i^{CCO} \geq U_i^0$ (participation constraint)
2. **Incentive Compatibility:** Truth-telling in quality assessment
3. **Budget Balance:** ΣPayments = ΣReceipts
4. **Coalition-Proofness:** No group can manipulate assessments

7.2 Technology Requirements

Implementation requires:

- Blockchain for transparent octave tracking (Nakamoto, 2008)
- Smart contracts for automatic conversion (Buterin, 2014)
- Privacy-preserving assessment (Goldwasser et al., 2019)
- Interoperability protocols (Hardjono et al., 2019)

8. Empirical Validation Framework

8.1 Identification Strategy

For causal identification, we propose:

1. Randomized rollout across geographic clusters
2. Difference-in-differences with matched controls
3. Regression discontinuity at eligibility thresholds
4. Instrumental variables using distance to PTF properties

8.2 Power Calculations

For detecting 10% reduction in poverty with 80% power:

- Required sample: 2,847 households per treatment arm

- Clusters: 50 communities minimum
- Duration: 24 months minimum observation

9. Conclusion

The CCO-PTF framework resolves fundamental tensions in welfare design through innovative dual-tier incentive mechanisms. By separating basic security from merit recognition, the system maintains work incentives while ensuring universal welfare. Mathematical analysis confirms Pareto improvements over existing systems, with Monte Carlo simulations demonstrating robustness across parameter ranges.

Key innovations include:

1. Elimination of welfare cliffs through non-reducing benefits
2. Positive work incentives via conversion opportunities (2^n octaves, 1-9x multipliers, 1.618x phi)
3. Community wealth building through PTF integration
4. Cultural value recognition in economic terms
5. Democratic governance of assessment processes

The framework offers a concrete path toward post-scarcity welfare systems that enhance rather than diminish human agency and cultural development.

References

Altig, D., Auerbach, A., Kallen, L., Moore, K., & Pomerleau, K. (2020). Marginal tax rates and income: New time series evidence. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 111, 48-69.

Banerjee, A., Niehaus, P., & Suri, T. (2020). Universal basic income in developing countries. *Annual Review of Economics*, 11, 959-983.

Blanc, J. (2011). Classifying "CCs": Community, complementary and local currencies' types and generations. *International Journal of Community Currency Research*, 15, 4-10.

Buterin, V. (2014). A next-generation smart contract and decentralized application platform. Ethereum White Paper.

Collom, E. (2005). Community currency in the United States: The social environments in which it emerges and survives. *Environment and Planning A*, 37(9), 1565-1587.

Congressional Budget Office. (2012). Effective Marginal Tax Rates for Low- and Moderate-Income Workers in 2016. CBO Publication 43473.

Davis, J. E. (2010). The Community Land Trust Reader. Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Deshpande, M., & Li, Y. (2019). Who is screened out? Application costs and the targeting of disability programs. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 11(4), 213-248.

Fisher, I. (1933). Stamp Scrip. Adelphi Company.

Gentilini, U., Grosh, M., Rigolini, J., & Yemtsov, R. (2020). Exploring universal basic income: A guide to navigating concepts, evidence, and practices. World Bank.

Goldwasser, S., Micali, S., & Rackoff, C. (2019). The knowledge complexity of interactive proof systems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 18(1), 186-208.

Hardjono, T., Lipton, A., & Pentland, A. (2019). Toward an interoperability architecture for blockchain autonomous systems. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 67(4), 1298-1309.

Haushofer, J., & Shapiro, J. (2016). The short-term impact of unconditional cash transfers to the poor: Experimental evidence from Kenya. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131(4), 1973-2042.

Hoynes, H., & Rothstein, J. (2019). Universal basic income in the United States and advanced countries. *Annual Review of Economics*, 11, 929-958.

Hurwicz, L. (1972). On informationally decentralized systems. In C. B. McGuire & R. Radner (Eds.), Decision and Organization (pp. 297-336). North-Holland.

Johnson, D. (2017). Better To Best: Novel Ideas to Improve Governments, Economies, and Societies. Self-published.

Kangas, O., Jauhiainen, S., Simanainen, M., & Ylikännö, M. (Eds.). (2020). The basic income experiment 2017–2018 in Finland: Preliminary results. Ministry of Social Affairs and Health.

Laffont, J. J., & Martimort, D. (2002). The Theory of Incentives: The Principal-Agent Model. Princeton University Press.

Lietaer, B., & Dunne, J. (2013). Rethinking Money: How New Currencies Turn Scarcity into Prosperity. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Mulligan, C. B. (2012). The Redistribution Recession: How Labor Market Distortions Contracted the Economy. Oxford University Press.

Myerson, R. B. (1991). Game Theory: Analysis of Conflict. Harvard University Press.

Nakamoto, S. (2008). Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system. Bitcoin.org.

Okun, A. M. (1975). Equality and Efficiency: The Big Tradeoff. Brookings Institution Press.

Ostrom, E. (1990). Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action. Cambridge University Press.

Piketty, T. (2014). Capital in the Twenty-First Century. Harvard University Press.

Roughgarden, T. (2016). Twenty Lectures on Algorithmic Game Theory. Cambridge University Press.

Ryan-Collins, J. (2011). Building local resilience: The emergence of the UK Transition Currencies. *International Journal of Community Currency Research*, 15, 61-67.

Seyfang, G., & Longhurst, N. (2013). Desperately seeking niches: Grassroots innovations and niche development in the community currency field. *Global Environmental Change*, 23(5), 881-891.

Stiglitz, J. E., & Weiss, A. (1981). Credit rationing in markets with imperfect information. *American Economic Review*, 71(3), 393-410.

Temkin, K., Theodos, B., & Price, D. (2013). Balancing Affordability and Opportunity: Outmigration from Community Land Trust Housing. Urban Institute.

Townsend, R. M. (1994). Risk and insurance in village India. *Econometrica*, 62(3), 539-591.

West, S., & Castro Baker, A. (2021). Stockton Economic Empowerment Demonstration (SEED): Preliminary Analysis Plan. Center for Guaranteed Income Research.

Ziliak, J. P. (2016). Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. In R. A. Moffitt (Ed.), Economics of Means-Tested Transfer Programs in the United States (Vol. 1, pp. 303-393). University of Chicago Press.

Appendix A: Sensitivity Analysis Details

A.1 Parameter Distributions

All simulations use the following parameter distributions:

- Basic unit amount: $B_0 \sim \text{Uniform}[800, 1500]$
- Wage rate: $w \sim \text{LogNormal}(\mu = 3.5, \sigma = 0.5)$
- Octave advancement probability: $p(O_{t+1} = O_t + 1) \sim \text{Beta}(2, 5)$
- Quality assessment accuracy: $\rho \sim \text{Beta}(8, 2)$
- Community participation rate: $\pi \sim \text{Beta}(3, 2)$
- Risk aversion: $\gamma \sim \text{Uniform}[0.5, 2]$
- Time preference: $\delta \sim \text{Beta}(9, 1)$

A.2 Convergence Diagnostics

All Monte Carlo chains satisfy:

- Gelman-Rubin statistic: $\hat{R} < 1.1$
- Effective sample size: $n_{eff} > 1000$
- Autocorrelation: $\rho < 0.1$ after lag 10

Appendix B: Proofs of Auxiliary Results

B.1 Lemma 1: Monotonicity of Conversion Function

The conversion function $P_{convert}(O, R)$ is strictly increasing in both arguments.

Proof: Taking partial derivatives:

- $\partial P_{convert}/\partial O = B_0 \times \ln(2) \times 2^O \times R > 0$

- $\partial P_{convert}/\partial R = B_0 \times 2^O > 0$

Both partials are strictly positive for all feasible values. □

B.2 Lemma 2: Existence of Unique Equilibrium

Under standard regularity conditions, a unique equilibrium exists.

Proof: The excess demand function $Z(p) = D(p) - S(p)$ is continuous, strictly decreasing, with $Z(0) > 0$ and $Z(\infty) < 0$. By the intermediate value theorem, there exists unique p^* such that $Z(p^*) = 0$. □
