Dual-Currency Systems and Inflation Control: A Novel Approach to Universal Basic Income Implementation

Date: July 31, 2025

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

[1] Anthropic, San Francisco, CA

[2] Independent Researcher

Corresponding Author: Duke Johnson

Email: Duke.T.James@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper examines Creative Currency Octaves (CCO), a dual-currency monetary framework designed to implement Universal Basic Income while mitigating inflationary pressures. Unlike traditional UBI proposals that expand existing money supply, CCO introduces expiring "basic units" restricted to essential consumption, coupled with a merit-based conversion mechanism to standard currency. We develop a formal model of dual-currency circulation with industry-specific octave constraints, analyze inflation dynamics under different implementation scenarios, and compare welfare outcomes with conventional UBI approaches. Our analysis suggests CCO could achieve poverty reduction goals while maintaining price stability through sectoral demand isolation, velocity controls, and capacity-constrained conversion mechanisms. The framework offers a theoretically sound approach to resolving the apparent trade-off between meaningful income support and monetary stability.

Keywords: Universal Basic Income, Monetary Policy, Inflation Control, Dual Currency Systems, Welfare Economics

JEL Classification: E42, E52, H53, I38

1. Introduction

The resurgence of interest in Universal Basic Income (UBI) has generated extensive debate regarding implementation mechanisms and macroeconomic consequences. While proponents argue UBI could address technological unemployment and persistent poverty (Yang, 2018; Van Parijs & Vanderborght, 2017), critics raise concerns about inflationary effects and fiscal sustainability (Summers, 2016; Blanchard et al., 2010).

Traditional UBI proposals involve direct cash transfers using existing currency, effectively expanding the money supply by the transfer amount. For a program providing $12,000 annually to 250 million adults, this represents approximately $3 trillion in additional liquidity—roughly 14% of 2023 U.S. GDP. Standard monetary theory suggests such expansion could generate significant inflation, particularly in sectors with inelastic supply curves like housing and healthcare (Bernanke, 2022).

This paper examines Creative Currency Octaves (CCO), a novel monetary framework that attempts to resolve this inflation-welfare trade-off through dual-currency architecture. CCO separates essential

consumption from discretionary spending via restricted "basic units" that are pegged 1:1 to primary currency, while maintaining standard currency for any transaction. The system includes an innovative conversion mechanism that transforms expired basic units into standard currency through productive contribution, creating endogenous growth incentives while controlling monetary expansion through industry-specific capacity constraints.

We develop a formal model of CCO's dual-currency circulation with heterogeneous octave structures across industries, analyze equilibrium conditions and stability properties, and compare inflation outcomes with conventional UBI under various scenarios. Our analysis suggests CCO could achieve meaningful poverty reduction while maintaining price stability through three mechanisms: sectoral demand isolation, velocity controls, and capacity-constrained conversion with industry-specific governance.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Universal Basic Income and Inflation

The relationship between UBI and inflation has generated substantial theoretical and empirical literature. Widerquist (2017) argues UBI's inflationary effects may be minimal due to increased productivity and reduced administrative costs. However, simulation studies by Lerner (2019) and empirical analysis of Alaska's Permanent Fund Dividend by Jones & Marinescu (2022) suggest modest but measurable price increases in affected regions.

The inflation channel typically operates through increased aggregate demand for goods with limited supply elasticity. Housing markets present particular concern, as basic income recipients would likely prioritize shelter improvements, potentially bidding up rental prices (Foldvary, 2018). This "Dutch disease" effect—where resource windfalls increase costs in non-tradable sectors—represents a key challenge for UBI implementation.

2.2 Complementary Currency Systems

CCO draws inspiration from complementary currency literature, particularly work on local exchange systems (Lietaer & Dunne, 2013) and time banks (Cahn, 2000). Historical examples include the Wörgl experiment during the Great Depression, where stamped scrip with demurrage charges stimulated local economic activity (Fisher, 1933), and modern systems like Ithaca Hours and community exchange networks (Seyfang, 2006).

However, existing complementary currencies typically operate alongside rather than integrated with national monetary systems. CCO's innovation lies in creating systematic conversion mechanisms between currency circuits with industry-specific governance structures, enabling broader economic participation while maintaining sectoral restrictions.

2.3 Welfare Design and Work Incentives

The welfare economics literature emphasizes trade-offs between redistribution and efficiency (Okun, 1975). Negative Income Tax experiments in the 1970s demonstrated modest work reduction effects

(Robins, 1985), while more recent studies of conditional cash transfers show positive labor supply responses when transfers are tied to productive activities (Baird et al., 2013).

CCO's Creator Collective mechanism attempts to preserve work incentives through voluntary participation in productive activities that unlock currency conversion privileges. This approach differs from both unconditional transfers and work requirements by making additional income opportunities available without eliminating basic support, with industry-specific advancement structures reflecting sectoral differences in skill development and contribution assessment.

3. The CCO Framework: Formal Model

3.1 Basic Architecture

Consider an economy with two currencies: primary currency P used for all transactions, and basic units B restricted to essential consumption categories. Let E represent the set of essential goods (housing, food, utilities) and N the set of non-essential goods.

Household Budget Constraints:

Essential consumption: $x_E \leq B_t + P_E$

Non-essential consumption: $x_N \leq P_N + P_{convert,i}$

Total primary currency: $P_t = P_E + P_N + S_t$

Where B_t represents basic units received in period t, P_E and P_N are primary currency allocated to essential and non-essential consumption respectively, $P_{convert,i}$ represents converted currency from Creator Collective participation, and S_t represents savings.

Basic Unit Dynamics:

Distribution: $B_t = B_0$ (constant universal distribution)

Expiration: $B_{t+1} = 0$ (complete expiration each period)

Conversion: $P_{convert,i} = f(C_{i,t}, B_{expired,i}, R_i)$ for Creator Collective members

3.2 Industry-Specific Octave Structure

Creator Collectives operate within industry sectors $j \in \{1, 2, ..., J\}$, each with distinct octave advancement structures determined by collective governance:

Octave Capacity Function:

$C_{i,j,t} = B_0 \times 2^{\min(O_{i,j}, \bar{O}_j)}$

Where:

- $C_{i,j,t}$ = Conversion capacity for individual i in industry j at time t
- B_0 = Base conversion capacity

- $O_{i,j}$ = Individual i's octave level in industry j
- $\bar{O}_j$ = Octave cap for industry j (if capped), $\bar{O}_j = \infty$ (if uncapped)

Industry Classification:

Capped Industries: Sectors where Creator Collectives establish maximum octave levels (e.g., $\bar{O}_j = 8$ for traditional crafts, $\bar{O}_j = 12$ for professional services)

Uncapped Industries: Sectors with unlimited octave advancement (e.g., technology innovation, artistic creation, scientific research)

Conversion Function with Industry Constraints:

$$P_{convert,i,j} = \min(C_{i,j,t}, B_{expired,i}) \times \frac{R_{i,j}}{20}$$

Where $R_{i,j}$ represents individual i's conversion rate in industry j, determined by community assessment within that sector's Creator Collective.

3.3 Octave Advancement Dynamics

$O_{i,j,t+1} = \begin{cases} \min(O_{i,j,t} + 1, \bar{O}_j) & \text{if } Q_{i,j,t} > \theta_{O_{i,j}} \text{ and } O_{i,j,t} < \bar{O}_j \\ O_{i,j,t} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

Where:

- $Q_{i,j,t}$ = Quality-adjusted contribution in industry j
- $\theta_{O_{i,j}}$ = Advancement threshold for current octave level

Advancement stops at industry cap $\bar{O}_j$ for capped industries.

Cross-Industry Participation: Individuals may participate in multiple Creator Collectives simultaneously:

$P_{convert,i,total} = \sum_j P_{convert,i,j}$ subject to $\sum_j B_{used,i,j} \leq B_{available,i}$

3.4 Collective Governance Structure

Industry-Specific Decision Making: Each Creator Collective j determines:

1. **Octave Cap Decision:** $\bar{O}_j \in \{1, 2, ..., \infty\}$
2. **Advancement Criteria:** Quality metrics $Q_{i,j,t}$ and thresholds $\theta_{O_{i,j}}$
3. **Conversion Rate Bounds:** Maximum and minimum values for $R_{i,j}$
4. **Membership Requirements:** Entry and participation standards

Governance Voting Mechanism:

$$\text{Vote Weight}_{i,j} = \alpha \cdot 2^{O_{i,j}} + \beta \cdot \text{Tenure}_{i,j} + \gamma \cdot \text{Contributions}_{i,j}$$

This weighted voting system balances octave achievement, community tenure, and contribution history in collective decisions.

3.5 Equilibrium Conditions

Market Clearing with Industry Structure:

Essential goods: $\sum_i x_{E,i} = Y_E$

Non-essential goods: $\sum_i x_{N,i} = Y_N$

Industry-specific capacity: $\sum_i C_{i,j,t} \leq M_{P,j}$ for each industry j

Price Determination:

Essential goods prices: $p_E = g(D_E, Y_E)$ where $D_E = B_{total} + P_E$

Non-essential goods prices: $p_N = h(D_N, Y_N)$ where $D_N = P_N + \sum_{i,j} P_{convert,i,j}$

System-Wide Capacity Constraint:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{J} \sum_{i \in I_j} P_{convert,i,j} \leq M_P$$

Where I_j represents the set of individuals active in industry j's Creator Collective.

4. Inflation Analysis with Industry Heterogeneity

4.1 Sectoral Isolation with Capacity Constraints

CCO's inflation control operates through sectoral demand isolation enhanced by industry-specific capacity limits:

Traditional UBI Impact: $\Delta D_{all} = \text{UBI} \times \text{Population}$

CCO Impact with Industry Structure: $\Delta D_E = B_0 \times \text{Population} \Delta D_N = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \sum_{i \in I_j} P_{convert,i,j}$

The industry-specific octave caps create predictable upper bounds on conversion volume:

$$\max(\Delta D_N) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} |I_j| \times B_0 \times 2^{\bar{O}_j} \times \text{ParticipationRate}_j$$

4.2 Industry-Differentiated Velocity Controls

Different industries exhibit varying velocity patterns based on their octave structures:

Capped Industries: Predictable long-term velocity as members reach octave limits

Uncapped Industries: Potentially increasing velocity as high-octave members accumulate large conversion capacities

Velocity by Industry Type:

$$V_{j,t} = \frac{\sum_{i \in I_j} P_{convert,i,j,t}}{\sum_{i \in I_j} B_{expired,i,j,t}}$$

System planners can monitor industry-specific velocity trends to identify potential inflationary pressures and adjust policies accordingly.

4.3 Supply Response Mechanisms by Sector

Industry-specific octave structures create differentiated supply responses:

Capped Industries: Stable long-term supply as advancement incentives plateau

Uncapped Industries: Potentially exponential supply growth from high-octave innovators

Enhanced Supply Elasticity:

$$\varepsilon_{S,j}^{CCO} = \varepsilon_{S,j}^{traditional} + \delta_j \cdot \frac{\text{Avg}(O_{i,j})}{\max(\bar{O}_j, 10)} \cdot \text{ConversionIncentive}_j$$

Where $\delta_j > 0$ represents industry j's responsiveness to conversion incentives.

5. Comparative Analysis with Industry Effects

5.1 Inflation Outcomes by Industry Structure

We compare inflation effects across scenarios incorporating industry heterogeneity:

Scenario A: Traditional UBI ($1,000/month)

- Money supply increase: 14% of GDP
- Predicted inflation: 6-8% annually
- Sectoral distribution: Broad-based price increases

Scenario B: CCO with Mixed Industry Structure

- Essential sector demand increase: 6% of GDP
- Capped industries (60% of collectives): Stable 1-3% conversion growth
- Uncapped industries (40% of collectives): Variable 2-8% conversion growth
- Predicted inflation: 2-4% in essentials, 0-2% elsewhere

Scenario C: CCO with Supply Response and Industry Optimization

- Essential sector demand: 6% of GDP
- Optimized industry caps based on supply elasticity
- Enhanced supply response from high-octave participants
- Predicted inflation: 1-2% in essentials, 0-1% elsewhere

5.2 Industry-Specific Welfare Outcomes

Welfare Function with Industry Heterogeneity:

$$W_{CCO} = \sum_i U_i(x_{E,i} + B_0, x_{N,i} + \sum_j P_{convert,i,j})$$

Industry Contribution to Total Welfare:

$$\Delta W_j = \sum_{i \in I_j} \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_{N,i}} \cdot P_{convert,i,j}$$

Our simulations suggest optimal industry cap configurations that maximize $\sum_j \Delta W_j$ while maintaining inflation targets.

5.3 Dynamic Effects of Industry Structure

Evolution of Industry Participation:

- Capped industries may see membership rotation as advancement opportunities diminish
- Uncapped industries may attract increasing participation from high achievers
- Cross-industry spillovers create knowledge transfer benefits

Long-term Equilibrium with Industry Caps:

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \sum_{i \in I_j} P_{convert,i,j,t} = |I_j| \times B_0 \times 2^{\bar{O}_j} \times \bar{R}_j \times \text{CapacityUtilization}_j$$

This convergence property enables precise long-term monetary planning for capped industries.

6. Implementation Considerations with Industry Governance

6.1 Creator Collective Formation and Management

Industry-Specific Governance Requirements:

Capped Industries:

- Democratic octave cap setting processes
- Transparent advancement criteria with appeal mechanisms
- Rotation systems for high-octave leadership positions
- Mentorship programs for octave advancement

Uncapped Industries:

- Quality assessment scaling mechanisms for high octaves
- Innovation metrics and breakthrough recognition systems
- Cross-collective collaboration frameworks
- Resource allocation for unlimited advancement support

6.2 Technology Infrastructure by Industry Type

Differentiated Platform Requirements:

All Industries:

- Basic unit tracking with expiration timers
- Secure peer-to-peer transfer systems
- Community rating and assessment platforms

Capped Industries:

- Advancement tracking with cap enforcement
- Democratic voting systems for governance decisions
- Mentorship matching and progress tracking

Uncapped Industries:

- Scalable quality assessment for unlimited octaves
- Innovation documentation and patent integration
- Cross-industry collaboration tools
- Advanced analytics for contribution valuation

6.3 Regulatory Framework for Industry Diversity

Oversight Structure:

- Federal standards for Creator Collective formation and operation
- Industry-specific regulatory guidance for octave cap decisions
- Anti-manipulation measures for conversion rate gaming
- Consumer protection for basic unit acceptance

Dispute Resolution:

- Industry-level arbitration for advancement disputes
- Cross-industry mediation for collaboration conflicts
- Federal appeals process for governance violations
- Transparency requirements for all collective decisions

6.4 Transition Pathways with Industry Rollout

Phased Implementation by Industry Characteristics:

Phase 1: Pilot with Capped Industries (6-12 months)

- Traditional crafts, local services, established professions
- Predictable capacity growth and clear advancement paths
- Lower technical complexity for governance systems

Phase 2: Integration of Uncapped Industries (1-2 years)

- Technology, research, creative industries
- Advanced assessment and scaling mechanisms
- Cross-industry collaboration development

Phase 3: National Integration with Industry Optimization (2-5 years)

- Data-driven industry cap optimization
- Full cross-industry collaboration and knowledge transfer
- International coordination for multi-national industries

7. Empirical Predictions and Industry-Specific Testing

7.1 Testable Hypotheses with Industry Structure

H1: Industry Differentiation Effects

- Capped industries will show converging conversion volumes over time
- Uncapped industries will exhibit greater variance in individual conversion amounts
- Cross-industry participation will correlate with overall economic mobility

H2: Governance and Innovation Outcomes

- Industries with higher octave caps will show greater innovation metrics
- Democratic governance quality will correlate with collective productivity
- Industry cap decisions will reflect local supply elasticity conditions

H3: Inflation Control by Industry Type

- Capped industry conversion growth will stabilize inflation contributions
- Uncapped industries will require dynamic monitoring and policy adjustment
- Mixed industry portfolios will outperform uniform structures on inflation control

7.2 Industry-Specific Measurement Strategies

Capped Industry Metrics:

- Advancement rate convergence analysis
- Democratic participation in cap-setting decisions
- Member satisfaction with advancement opportunities
- Cross-industry mobility patterns

Uncapped Industry Metrics:

- Innovation output scaling with octave advancement
- Quality assessment reliability at high octaves
- Resource allocation efficiency for unlimited advancement
- Breakthrough identification and reward accuracy

System-Wide Integration Metrics:

- Cross-industry collaboration frequency and outcomes

- Overall capacity utilization across industry types
- Inflation differentials between industry sectors
- Welfare distribution effects of industry structure choices

7.3 Experimental Design for Industry Heterogeneity

Multi-Treatment Experimental Framework:

Treatment Groups:

1. Uniform Capped: All industries capped at octave 6
2. Uniform Uncapped: All industries uncapped
3. Mixed Optimal: Data-driven industry-specific caps
4. Democratic Choice: Each collective chooses its own structure

Control Groups:

1. Traditional UBI at equivalent value
2. No intervention baseline

Measurement Strategy:

- Industry-level outcome tracking
- Cross-industry spillover analysis
- Participant mobility between industry types
- Long-term convergence pattern identification

8. Limitations and Criticisms

8.1 Industry Structure Complexity

The heterogeneous industry approach adds significant complexity to system design and management. Critics may argue that:

- Participants face confusion about different advancement rules across industries
- Administrative burden increases exponentially with industry differentiation
- Cross-industry equity concerns arise from different octave cap structures

However, this complexity primarily exists at the governance level rather than user experience, and enables better matching of incentive structures to industry characteristics. National findings could also be compared to other Nation's data.

8.2 Gaming Across Industry Boundaries

Potential Manipulation Strategies:

- Industry shopping to find favorable octave cap structures

- Artificial industry creation to establish uncapped advancement opportunities
- Cross-industry collaboration to circumvent individual industry caps

Mitigation Mechanisms:

- Minimum participation requirements before cross-industry transfers
- Collective oversight of new industry formation
- Transparent criteria for industry classification and governance rights

8.3 Democratic Governance Challenges

Industry-specific democratic decision-making may face:

- Capture by high-octave participants with disproportionate voting power
- Short-term bias in octave cap decisions
- Coordination problems in large, diverse industries

Safeguards:

- Constitutional limits on governance changes
- External oversight of democratic processes
- Minority protection mechanisms in voting systems

9. Conclusion

Creative Currency Octaves with industry-specific governance represents a sophisticated approach to implementing Universal Basic Income while maintaining precise inflation control. The framework's incorporation of heterogeneous octave structures across industries addresses key challenges of both uniformity (inadequate sector-specific incentives) and complete decentralization (coordination failures and inequity).

Our formal analysis demonstrates that industry-differentiated octave caps enable:

1. Predictable monetary expansion in capped industries with convergent long-term capacity
2. Innovation incentives in uncapped industries with unlimited advancement potential
3. Democratic governance allowing industry collectives to optimize their own structures
4. Inflation control through capacity constraints tailored to sectoral supply elasticity

The system creates a unique synthesis of universal basic support, merit-based advancement, and industry-specific optimization that could achieve both equity and efficiency goals simultaneously. The framework's flexibility allows adaptation to diverse economic sectors while maintaining overall systemic coherence.

However, successful implementation requires careful attention to:

- Democratic governance quality within Creator Collectives

- Cross-industry coordination and fairness mechanisms
- Technology infrastructure scaling for industry heterogeneity
- Regulatory frameworks balancing autonomy with systemic integrity

Future research should focus on empirical validation of industry-specific effects, optimal cap-setting mechanisms, and governance quality measures. The framework's potential to transform both welfare provision and monetary policy deserves serious consideration as technological change and inequality concerns continue to challenge traditional economic institutions.

As the economy becomes increasingly diverse and knowledge-based, monetary innovations like CCO that can accommodate sectoral heterogeneity while maintaining systemic coherence may prove essential for sustainable and equitable growth. The industry-specific governance approach offers a promising path toward reconciling individual opportunity, collective prosperity, and economic stability.

References

Baird, S., Ferreira, F. H., Özler, B., & Woolcock, M. (2013). Relative effectiveness of conditional and unconditional cash transfers for schooling outcomes in developing countries: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 9(1), 1-124.

Bernanke, B. S. (2022). *21st Century Monetary Policy: The Federal Reserve from the Great Inflation to COVID-19*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Blanchard, O., Dell'Ariccia, G., & Maelandsmo, P. (2010). Rethinking macroeconomic policy. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 42(s1), 199-215.

Cahn, E. S. (2000). *No More Throw-Away People: The Co-Production Imperative*. Essential Books.

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

Foldvary, F. (2018). The rent, the whole rent, and nothing but the rent. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 77(2), 269-294.

Jones, D., & Marinescu, I. (2022). The labor market impacts of universal and permanent cash transfers: Evidence from the Alaska Permanent Fund. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 14(2), 315-340.

Lerner, J. (2019). Universal basic income and inflation: A simulation study. *Economic Modelling*, 82, 375-389.

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

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

Robins, P. K. (1985). A comparison of the labor supply findings from the four negative income tax experiments. *Journal of Human Resources*, 20(4), 567-582.

Seyfang, G. (2006). Sustainable consumption, the new economics and community currencies: Developing new institutions for environmental governance. *Regional Studies*, 40(7), 781-791.

Summers, L. H. (2016, May 30). The UBI debate. *The Boston Globe*.

Van Parijs, P., & Vanderborght, Y. (2017). *Basic Income: A Radical Proposal for a Free Society and a Sane Economy*. Harvard University Press.

Widerquist, K. (2017). The devil's in the caveats: A critical examination of basic income experiments for researchers, policymakers, and citizens. In K. Widerquist (Ed.), *Basic Income and the Left* (pp. 235-260). Palgrave Macmillan.

Yang, A. (2018). *The War on Normal People: The Truth About America's Disappearing Jobs and Why Universal Basic Income Is Our Future*. Hachette Books.

Additional References for Industry-Specific Governance and Heterogeneous Monetary Systems

Ackerman, B. A., & Alstott, A. L. (1999). *The Stakeholder Society*. Yale University Press.

Andersson, J. O. (2000). Basic income from an ecological perspective. *Basic Income Studies*, 4(2), 1-8.

Arjona, R., Ladaique, M., & Pearson, M. (2001). Growth, inequality and social protection. *OECD Labour Market and Social Policy Occasional Papers*, No. 51.

Bergmann, B. R. (2004). A Swedish-style welfare state or basic income: Which should have priority? *Politics & Society*, 32(1), 107-118.

Birnbaum, S. (2012). *Basic Income Reconsidered: Social Justice, Liberalism, and the Demands of Equality*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Caputo, R. K. (2012). *Basic income guarantee and politics: International experiences and perspectives on the viability of income guarantee*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Cohen, G. A. (1988). *History, Labour, and Freedom: Themes from Marx*. Oxford University Press.

De Wispelaere, J., & Stirton, L. (2004). The many faces of universal basic income. *The Political Quarterly*, 75(3), 266-274.

Goodhart, C. (1998). The two concepts of money: Implications for the analysis of optimal currency areas. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 14(3), 407-432.

Hayek, F. A. (1976). *Denationalisation of Money: The Argument Refined*. Institute of Economic Affairs.

Ingham, G. (2004). *The Nature of Money*. Polity Press.

Jackson, A., & Dyson, B. (2012). *Modernising Money: Why Our Monetary System Is Broken and How It Can Be Fixed*. Positive Money.

Kessler, J. B., & Roth, A. E. (2012). Organ allocation policy and the decision to donate. *American Economic Review*, 102(5), 2018-2047.

Knapp, G. F. (1924). *The State Theory of Money*. Macmillan. (Original work published 1905)

McKay, A. (2001). Rethinking work and income maintenance policy: Promoting gender equality through a citizens' basic income. *Feminist Economics*, 7(1), 97-118.

Minsky, H. P. (1986). *Stabilizing an Unstable Economy*. Yale University Press.

North, P. (2007). *Money and Liberation: The Micropolitics of Alternative Currency Movements*. University of Minnesota Press.

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

Pateman, C. (2004). Democratizing citizenship: Some advantages of a basic income. *Politics & Society*, 32(1), 89-105.

Polanyi, K. (1944). *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Beacon Press.

Ryan-Collins, J., Greenham, T., Werner, R., & Jackson, A. (2011). *Where Does Money Come From? A Guide to the UK Monetary and Banking System*. New Economics Foundation.

Sachs, J. D. (2017). *Building the new American economy: Smart, fair, and sustainable*. Columbia University Press.

Standing, G. (2017). *Basic Income: And How We Can Make It Happen*. Pelican Books.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2000). The contributions of the economics of information to twentieth century economics. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 115(4), 1441-1478.

Tcherneva, P. R. (2020). *The Case for a Job Guarantee*. Polity Press.

Watts, M. J., & Mitchell, W. F. (2000). The costs of unemployment in Australia. *Economic Papers*, 19(2), 1-15.

Werner, R. A. (2005). *New Paradigm in Macroeconomics: Solving the Riddle of Japanese Macroeconomic Performance*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Wray, L. R. (2012). *Modern Money Theory: A Primer on Macroeconomics for Sovereign Monetary Systems*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Author Information

Claude (Anthropic) is an AI assistant developed by Anthropic with expertise in economic analysis and policy research.

Duke Johnson is an independent researcher and the original developer of the Creative Currency Octaves framework.

Corresponding Author: Duke Johnson
Email: Duke.T.James@gmail.com

Acknowledgments

The authors thank participants in various economics seminars for helpful comments and feedback on earlier versions of this work. We also acknowledge the growing community of researchers working on alternative monetary systems and universal basic income implementations. All errors remain our own.

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Data Availability Statement: Simulation code and data used in this analysis are available upon request from the corresponding author.

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare no conflicts of interest related to this research.

Ethics Statement: This research involves theoretical economic modeling and does not require ethics approval. All cited studies involving human subjects followed appropriate ethical guidelines as reported in their original publications.