

(31) “The citizens’ / owners’ rights” framework

Content

Category 1: Core	4
1. Citizens (the owners of their country) must be treated as owners by their employees (even elected or appointed).	4
2. The citizens’ (Owners’) right to non-violent free speech.	6
3. Free, public, easy and complete access to all laws, decrees, rules, regulations.....	7
Category 2: Existence	10
4. General protection of life of the citizens (= Owners) against immediate threats.	10
5. Protection of life, freedom, freedom of movement of the citizens (= Owners) from country, state, authorities, etc. 12	
6. The citizens’ (Owners’) long term right to basic needs.	13
Category 3: Citizenship	16
7. The citizens’ (Owners’) right to keep the citizenship.	16
8. The citizens’ (Owners’) right to regular statistics on the volume of immigration and new citizenships.	17
9. The citizens’ (Owners’) right to limit the voting rights of fresh citizens.	18
10. Conditions for new citizenships and for visa must be authorized by the citizens.	19
Category 4: Authorization	21
11. Any change in the constitution must be authorized by the citizens (Owners) in advance by public voting. 21	
12. Elected or delegated employees, parties, management may implement only the in advance authorized program (before the election or delegation) by public voting..... 22	
13. Minimum level of quality to be reached in public voting.	24
Category 5: Accountability	27
14. Employment in high leadership positions (even elected) in state-related organizations is time limited.... 27	
15. Minimum press-conference obligation of employees in high management.	28
Category 6: Transparency.....	30
16. Required minimum transparency of any owned organization..... 30	
17. Regular statistics on the economy and demography..... 31	
18. Special KPIs to describe the effect of taxing of income. 32	
19. The right to deny hidden ownership in the country. 33	
20. The citizens’ (Owners’) right to remind to honest representation of any non-business organization in the country. 34	
Category 7: Environment/nature	37
21. Regular statistics on waste, recycling, air, soil, and water quality. 37	
22. Regular statistics about area provided for flora and fauna..... 38	
23. Regular reporting on local global warming relevant data..... 39	

24.	Environmental tax on goods, materials based on the transportation distance.	40
Category 8: Economics/business.....		42
25.	Minimum requirement against activities with mass destruction potential.	42
26.	Restrictions on monopoly.....	42
27.	Trade with other countries, tariffs.....	44
28.	Right to require the country to represent the citizen in cross-border insurance matters (including war-related cases) when the loss occurred on national territory and the responsible party is foreign.	45
29.	The individual citizen's (owner's) right to private bankruptcy.....	47
30.	The right to tax AI-related revenue (tax income to be evenly distributed among the citizens).....	48
Category 9: Other state/country related		50
31.	Minimum requirements for the employees in any law enforcement or private security organizations.....	50
32.	Regular statistics on level of readiness for potential emergency scenarios.....	51
33.	A citizen may not be imprisoned or taken into custody if there was no criminal force and is no danger of criminal activity.....	53
34.	The right of the citizens (Owners) against mass surveillance.	54
35.	The right against mass surveillance technology in goods and services.....	55
36.	Owners' special rights against management in the case of state of emergency or war.	56
37.	To call the form of state by his or her opinion.....	58
38.	About in advance authorization by the citizens in case of annexation, separation.	59
39.	Demand appropriate compensation for employees in state-related high positions.	61

This document provides a detailed description of each right (around 1-1.5).

For each right there are the following sections:

- **Short description:** a short description
- **Further explanations or details to the right:** detailed explanation and functionality
- **Why this Right Exists:** why this right exists
- **Relationship:** in which organization to single owner (in most of the cases a citizen) relationships is it applicable
- **Violation:** who and how can violate this right
- **Legitimate requests of the owners:** legitimate requests of any owner regarding this right
- **Who can assert this right, and how?:** there is a separate document “How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” for detailed description to reduce redundancy in this document

As “The citizens’/owners’ rights framework” as a solution focuses on the protection of ownership rights at the individual level (single owner – in a relation with a country the citizen), the individual owner requests him- or herself a veto right in many of the rights. For each right it described if the owner has a veto right. In the categories 6-9 there are some rights where the owner rather asks (like 6.20, 7.21., 7.22., 7.23., 7.24., 8.27., 8.30., 9.39.).

Violation is generally is a violation of a right (with a veto right) or any type of sabotaging of the request procedure (e.g. not processing or hindering the request). Owners generally request to stop the violation of their right, but they also can request some consequences for the violators. E.g. a big punishment for a violator could be a dismissal from his or her position with or without severance.

13 out of 39 rights have more technical descriptions with examples. To keep the detailed description here relatively short they are described in the document The citizens’/owners’ rights framework attachments”. Those rights have the appropriate hint in their section “Further explanations or details to the right:” section, e.g. “See in the document: “The citizens’/owners’ rights framework attachments”.

Category 1: Core

1. Citizens (the owners of their country) must be treated as owners by their employees (even elected or appointed).

Short description:

The citizens are the owners of any state-related organization and have to be treated by their employees (even elected or appointed) as owners on all levels (from the highest to the lowest position).

Any non-violent owner (e.g. company <-> owner relationship) has to be treated with respect by all the employees of the organization. Any owners' right is always superior compared any state-related employee's (even elected or police) or state-related organization's sensibility about non-violent critics or opinion.

Further explanations or details to the right:

No owner may be suppressed, threatened, investigated or punished in any way for non-violent questioning activities of (co-owned) organizations or its employees, vocalizing critics in any form or just requiring documents from those organizations.

Co-owned organizations e.g.: country, state, authorities, military, community, all state-related organizations (also parliament, congress, senate).

Employees: employees of those organizations and also elected persons.

Examples for suppression/threat/punishment:

- jail, abuse, detainment
- threatening with: weapon, force, loss of job, loss of citizenship, take away his/her children, restriction of rights, put in psychiatry, place under guardianship.

Any 3rd party organization that processes outsourced activities of state-related organization have the same obligation.

Why this Right Exists:

An employee or the organization may not disclose he/she from his/her ownership. In a company it is also not possible that employees deny some of the owners' ownership. Any non-violent owner (e.g. company <-> owner relationship) has to be treated with respect by all the employees of the organization.

The formulation of critics or of different views are part of any kind of ownership right.

Any owners' right to be treated as an owner is always superior compared any state-related employee's (even elected or police) or state-related organization's sensibility about non-violent critics or opinion.

Relationship:

citizen <-> state-related organizations, country, state, authorities, military, community, all state-related organizations (also parliament, congress, senate)

Violation:

by not complying with the right

Examples: force/detainment used in demonstrations against non-violent individual owners (=citizens).

Non-violent opinions or activity of owners(=citizens) is punished/tracked by any authorities (police, army, intelligence, outsourced, etc..) or tracked in any way.

Critics of any owner is punished/ridiculed in any way.

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- Stop the violation (=provide service in the defined volume and quality)
- In case the violators are employed/elected in state-related organization immediate dismissal without.
- Employment ban for all the violators from state-related organization for 10 years (even elected).
- in case there is a request for personal consequences there are always at least 3 persons who face consequences: the processor and his/her direct boss and head of the department
- eventually financial compensation where all the violators burden

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

An owner may assert only for himself or herself and for his or her children.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

2. The citizens' (Owners') right to non-violent free speech.

Short description:

The citizens(=owners) have the right to express their opinion or criticism non-violently verbal or in written form (digitally or on paper). Alone or as a group inside or outside (=demonstration).

Any state-related employee (even elected) or state-related organization (at every level) have to live with non-violent criticism. Non-violent critics or opinions of any owner may not be suppressed, threatened, investigated, put under surveillance or punished in any way.

Further explanations or details to the right:

Co-owned organizations e.g.: country, state, authorities, military, community, all state-related organizations (also parliament, congress, senate).

Employees: employees of those organizations (also elected or appointed persons).

Examples for suppression/threat/punishment:

- jail, abuse, detainment
- threatening with: weapon, force, loss of job, loss of citizenship, take away his/her children, restriction of rights, put in psychiatry, place under guardianship.

Any 3rd party organization that processes outsourced activities of state-related organization have the same obligation.

Why this Right Exists:

The formulation of critics or of different views are part of any kind of ownership right.

The owners' non-violent free speech right is always far superior compared to state-related employee's (even elected, police) or state-related organization's sensibility about critics or opinion.

Relationship:

citizen <-> state-related organizations, country, state, authorities, military, community, all state-related organizations (also parliament, congress, senate)

Violation:

by not complying with the right

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- Stop the violation (=provide service in the defined volume and quality)

- In case the violators are employed/elected in state-related organization immediate dismissal without.
- Employment ban for all the violators from state-related organization for 10 years (even elected).
- In case the violators are subcontractors (e.g. should help the police) termination of the contract for the subcontractor and employment ban (even freelancing or 3rd party) for all the individual violators and for the subcontractor.
- eventually financial compensation where all the violators burden

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

An owner may assert only for himself or herself and for his or her children.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

3. Free, public, easy and complete access to all laws, decrees, rules, regulations.

Short description:

Any citizen (or even companies) can only follow rules (law etc.) if he/she has access to and can read it, otherwise no compliance with laws can be expected.

All the current and planned laws/decrees/rules/regulations/etc. have to be highly accessible for the owners in digital and in paper form for free, unrestricted, downloadable, processable, without registration otherwise any owner (=citizen, in case of community resident) may simply deny it (new/change coming into effort and/or the application).

Further explanation of the right:

New/changed/deleted laws/decrees/rules/regulations/etc. accessible before coming into effort. In normal case (no state of emergency) 90 days in advance. In case of state of emergency 7 days in advance.

What accessible means (refresh every week):

- free, easy access via internet, central, without registration, searchable, all the text are easy to download, well structured, downloadable all at once, easy and free to process by anyone, in common file document formats (not scanned), restrictions in an unchangeable format, data time travel has to be possible, from inside and outside of the country with no

- in printed form in every town where there are more than 1000 inhabitants (all the current laws, decrees, rules and regulations)
- planned new/changed/deleted laws/decrees/rules/regulations have to published the same way separately (in normal case 90 days in advance)
- after 1 month from the 1st request all the current laws, decrees, regulations available
- after 6 months from the 1st request additionally the last 5 years' changes (new/modified/deleted)
- after 12 months from the 1st request additionally the last 25 years' changes (new/modified/deleted)

Any change within the timeframe (normally 90 days) postpones from which date they may come into effort and also the date of coming into effort has to be determined again.

Any type of law/decree/rules/regulations/etc. has to be published public with impact/risk/financial analysis, budgeting and with quality assurance (including compliance with the constitution).

Why this Right Exists:

Any citizen (or even companies) can only follow rules (law etc.) if he/she has access to and can read it, otherwise no compliance with laws can be expected.

For business it is very difficult and expensive to keep al laws and local rules/regulations. A central free database can help for business entities to comply faster and cheaper.

Relationship:

citizen <-> state-related organizations, country, state, authorities, military, community, community owned organizations, all state-related organizations (also parliament, congress, senate)

Violation:

by not complying with the right

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- provide the service in the defined volume and quality and with deadlines
- In case the violators are employed/elected in state-related organization immediate dismissal without severance
- Employment ban for all the violators from state-related organization for 10 years (even elected).

- in case there is a request for personal consequences there are always at least 3 persons who face consequences: the processor and his/her direct boss and head of the department
- eventually financial compensation where all the violators burden

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

An owner may assert only for himself or herself and for his or her children.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

Category 2: Existence

If these points are violated many citizens' / owners' life/freedom is directly and almost immediately in danger. (e.g. in a Nazi state)

In case of those violations the individual owner can deny the activity by veto. By veto because the majority (or elected) have no right to danger or threaten his/her existence (life, freedom, health, etc.).

4. General protection of life of the citizens (= Owners) against immediate threats.

Short description:

Any single owner has the right for the protection of his life by the country/state/community. The ultimate goal for a country as an organization is to protect his owner's.

It should avoid but be prepared for disasters that can kill the owners within days.

Any owner may request from those organizations for the following services:

- to be prepared for locally possible natural and industrial disasters
- depot of medication/ vaccine/water/food/shelter for disaster cases
- try to avoid a war, but be prepared for a war, do not start a war on foreign soil
- try to avoid a pandemic, but be prepared for a pandemic
- have a functioning disaster management and police
- have a functioning network of ambulance and emergency hospitals

Further explanations or details to the right:

No further explanation.

Why this Right Exists:

The ultimate goal for a country as an organization is to protect his owner's life as far as possible.

A state or a community can also partly cover those protections, e.g.: ambulance, hospital, police, waterwork, to be prepared for different local scenarios, disaster management.

All of the specified protections/services/actions save directly or indirectly potentially the life of many owners e.g.:

- a tornado or extreme weather can kill many owners within minutes
- an industrial accident can kill also many owners within minutes

- a war on foreign soil has also some or many casualties within 24 hours (owners=citizens in the military)
- without properly functioning ambulances and emergency hospitals many victims (=owner) of accidents can die within minutes or hours daily

Relationship:

- citizen <-> country/state/community

Violation:

on purpose or by negligence. In case the organization on purpose puts the life of many owners at risk is a heavy violation.

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- The appropriate organization should offer the required services and should have the specified processes
- The appropriate organization should avoid unwished activities (start of a war)
- Immediate dismissal with severance in case of ignorance for all employees (even elected) involved (all the decision makers in the process) in the violation and 5 years employment ban from all state-related organization (even elected).
- Immediate dismissal without severance in case of on purpose for all employees (even elected) involved (all the decision makers in the process) in the violation and lifetime employment ban from all state-related organization (even elected).
- any kind of sabotage (e.g. just slowing down or not processing in time) of the request has the same consequences
- eventually financial compensation where all the violators burden

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

5. Protection of life, freedom, freedom of movement of the citizens (= Owners) from country, state, authorities, etc.

Short description:

Any single owner has the right to deny immediately when state or state-related organizations or their employees (even elected) threatens its life / health / free movement /assets or puts in danger on purpose or by ignorance, directly or indirectly -even if there is a law/decree/etc. that would authorize him/her on paper (e.g. by law).

Further explanations or details to the right:

No further explanation.

Why this Right Exists?:

It is unacceptable that any employee (even elected) if an organization harms or threatens an owner (=citizen or resident if community) unreasonably based on fabricated evidences or just because someone belongs to some minority or has unwished political, religious or other views. Even if there is a law/decree/etc. that would authorize him/her on paper.

Examples for some minorities or individuals: race (see genocide in Nazi Germany), belonging an ethnical group (see genocide in Nazi Germany), religion, language, sexual orientation, profession, political views, practicing free speech, demonstration, strike.

The owners' lives/free movement/family/core assets for survival must be protected by the co-owned organizations. No law/decree/constitution can authorize the organizations (e.g. authorities or "elected people" or "the majority") to threaten/harm any owner.

Relationship:

citizen <-> country/state/county/town/authorities/military/intelligence

Violation:

directly or indirectly

direct examples (even outsourced): murder, execution, detaining, jailing, kidnapping, putting someone in a camp, torturing, free movement, fostering the owner's children, put the owner into a psychiatry as a sanction or simply threatening.

indirect examples: censorship or silencing over catastrophic events that happened or are about to happen (e.g. industrial accidents, natural disasters, military accidents, pandemic)

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- Stop the violation.

- Employment ban for all the violators from state-related organization for 20 years (even elected).
- In case the violators are employed/elected in state-related organization immediate dismissal without compensation.
- all the violators from decision maker to processor get dismissal and employment ban (it is not an excuse that was the order, see military and authorities in Nazi Germany)
- any kind of sabotage (e.g. just slowing down or not processing in time) of the request has the same consequences
- eventually financial compensation where all the violators burden

in case there is a request for personal consequences there are always at least 2 persons who face consequences: the processor and his/her direct boss

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

An owner may assert only for himself or herself and for his or her children.

An owner may make a request in the name of other persons (but only if they are kidnapped, missing, in jail, dead, psychiatry or permanently unconscious). This is an exception only at this right (to make a request in the name of others).

one owner is enough to force the right

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

6. The citizens' (Owners') long term right to basic needs.

Short description:

Any single owner (=citizen) has the right to basic needs.

The main meaning of a country that it keeps its owner alive. On daily basis: shelter, water, food, emergency medical service, protection of life (e.g. police), basic education for minors.

On weekly basis: basic medical service, energy (some electricity, to heat), digital/telephone/postal communication, information (TV, radio, newspaper).

From another point of view the country should provide any citizen with at least the same quality and volume of basic needs that refugees, immigrants or prisoners receive.

Further explanations or details to the right:

In case the citizen has no wealth and money even for free. (e.g. victims of hurricanes/earthquakes/floods/fires/industrial accidents/etc. but also victims of war)

Normally those have to be provided locally.

After 6 months the country has the possibility to offer that service not locally but within the country. In those cases, the country has to care about the transport (or transport costs) and the citizen has the right to get the service not further than 200 miles (except war) from his permanent address. (e.g. invalid persons, long term unemployed even homeless with citizenship)

Why this Right Exists:

the main meaning of a country that it keeps its owner alive.

From another point of view the country should provide any citizen with at least the same quality and number of basic needs that refugees, immigrants, prisoners etc. get.

Relationship:

citizen <-> country

Violation:

by not providing the described service in the appropriate volume, quality and time. (e.g. every day less than 1 gallon of water and/or the provided water is not drinking water) and by not processing any request

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- Stop the violation (=provide service in the defined volume and quality)
- In case the violators are employed/elected in state-related organization immediate dismissal with compensation.
- Employment ban for all the violators from state-related organization for 4 years (even elected).
- in case there is a request for personal consequences there are always at least 3 persons who face consequences: the processor and his/her direct boss and head of the department

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

An owner may assert only for himself or herself and for his or her children.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

Category 3: Citizenship

7. The citizens' (Owners') right to keep the citizenship.

Short description:

Any single owner has the right to deny a withdrawal of its citizenship by its country if he/she is citizen has only one citizenship or has the citizenship since birth (before the age of 1). Otherwise only a citizen may abandon their citizenship of his own will, without any pressure otherwise illegal, and the citizenship is still valid.

Further explanations or details to the right:

In other cases, a withdrawal may take in effect only after 1 year. Already citizens cannot be forced to give up other citizenships.

Why this Right Exists:

an employee or the organization may not disclose he/she from his/her ownership. In a company it is also not possible that employees deny some of the owner's ownership.

Relationship:

citizen <-> country

Violation:

by not complying the right

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- Stop the violation (=provide service in the defined volume and quality)
- In case the violators are employed/elected in state-related organization immediate dismissal with compensation.
- Employment ban for all the violators from state-related organization for 10 years (even elected).
- in case there is a request for personal consequences there are always at least 3 persons who face all the required consequences: the processor and his/her direct boss and head of the department
- eventually financial compensation for the citizen where all the violators burden (at least 10 times of the average salary in the country, to be paid within 6 months)

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

An owner may assert only for himself or herself and for his or her children.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

8. The citizens' (Owners') right to regular statistics on the volume of immigration and new citizenships.

Short description:

Any single owner has the right to require periodically free statistics and data about immigration, refugees, new citizenship, permanent or temporary foreign workers, with geodata that went through an independent quality control.

Further explanations or details to the right:

All data and statistics have to be anonymized but has to be grouped by foreign citizenship, former or multi citizenship (new citizens), sex, age group, and duration and visa duration (workers from foreign countries) and with geodata (at least ZIP code). For illegal immigrant groups also the entry point (at least ZIP code) and current address geodata (at least ZIP code).

The access to the specified data, statistics has to be to the has to be free, easy to query, easy to download historical, unchangeable format.

Data, statistics and has to contain historical data (at least 8 years) and has to be published monthly and the data can be maximum 30 days old.

Data quality has to be officially confirmed by two independent consulting organizations. (to avoid any fraud).

Why this Right Exists:

that owners (citizens) can easily keep track what is happening, in case of unwished processes they can articulate criticism and address issues.

Relationship:

citizen <-> country/state/community

Violation:

by not publishing data and statistics in the specified frequency, quality, detail, history or without the required data quality assurance.

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- Stop the violation (=provide service in the specified way)

- by recurring (2 times) In case the violators are employed/elected in state-related organization immediate dismissal with compensation.
- Employment ban for all the violators from state-related organization for 10 years (even elected).
- in case there is a request for personal consequences there are always at least 3 persons who face all the required consequences: the processor and his/her direct boss and head of the department

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

9. The citizens' (Owners') right to limit the voting rights of fresh citizens.

Short description:

Any single owner has the right to require that new citizens (became citizen after age year 1) are restricted from voting for 10 years - even with multiple citizenship.

This limitation can be required also for “new” citizens who have already voted. They cannot vote again until there was a continuous 10-year ban from voting. Any single owner can require that ban/limitation for all the “new” citizens currently in the future and from the past.

Further explanation of the right:

Monthly statistics and data with geodata (at least ZIP code) have to be published by the responsible office. These statistics must be free, easily query able, historical, and in an unchangeable format by former (or parallel) citizenship, age group, sex, geodata, citizenship since, expected expiration of the ban.

Any owner may require a quality assurance by 2 independent organization before publishing the data and also the application of the ban on a yearly basis for the last 12 months. Quality assurance is to happen within 1 month after the end of calendar year.

They are also not electable and may not appointed in state-related organization 10 years long.

Why this Right Exists:

Any citizen born in a country also cannot vote usually until the age of 18 and usually cannot be represented in voting by its parents, therefore a 10-year ban is very generous.

Another point of view to avoid situation where a country “adds” a significant number of new citizens to maintain its power even against the will of the original citizens (historical example for ad hoc increase of new citizens: annexation of Austria by Nazi Germany)

Relationship:

citizen <-> country

Violation:

in case the request is not processed or the right is violated

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- apply the specified voting ban/limitation countrywide
- quality assurance as specified
- In case the violators are employed/elected in state-related organization immediate dismissal with compensation.
- Employment ban for all the violators from state-related organization for 10 years (even elected).
- in case there is a request for personal consequences there are always at least 3 persons who face all the required consequences: the processor and his/her direct boss and head of the department

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

10. Conditions for new citizenships and for visa must be authorized by the citizens.

Short description:

Any single owner has the right to require authorization of all citizenship and visa conditions by public voting (=decision of the owners) in advance.

Further explanations or details to the right:

Also, any single owner can require that any future modification can be made valid by a public voting (=decision of the owners).

If the current rules and laws are not authorized by public no new citizenships and no visas can be given.

Why this Right Exists:

The owners have to have control about the terms and conditions of any kind of new citizenship and visas (e.g. working). In history it has already happened that a country has given new citizenships and e.g. working visas although the majority of the owners(citizen) has not supported it.

Relationship:

citizen <-> country

Violation:

in case the request is not processed and the right is violated

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- apply the specified voting ban/limitation countrywide
- quality assurance as specified
- In case the violators are employed/elected in state-related organization immediate dismissal with compensation.
- Employment ban for all the violators from state-related organization for 10 years (even elected).
- in case there is a request for personal consequences there are always at least 3 persons who face all the required consequences: the processor and his/her direct boss and head of the department

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

Category 4: Authorization

11. Any change in the constitution must be authorized by the citizens (Owners) in advance by public voting.

Short description:

Any change of the constitution (even a completely new constitution) has to be authorized in advance by the owners (citizens) via public voting, otherwise any owner may deny it (veto).

It is not feasible that owners can authorize every law, but at least the constitution has to be under their control. As constitution is the cornerstone of any law, it should be stable and any change should be authorized by the owner well in advance.

“Constitution is the cornerstone” means that it is the highest law, any law/decree/etc. that does not comply with it is invalid.

Further explanations or details to the right:

Any prepared changed has to be made public in an unchangeable format 270 days in advance, otherwise any owner may deny it (veto). Any change within the deadline means a new process (again 270 days).

Other requirements for the validation:

- Public voting about the change is valid only after the 270 days have expired.
- at least 50% of the owner have to vote for change (not 50% of the attended, but 50% of all the owners)

If not all the requirements are fulfilled any owner may deny it (veto).

Why this Right Exists:

it is not feasible that owners can authorize every law, but at least the constitution has to be under their control. As any constitution is the cornerstone of any law, it should be stable and matter of public(owners) discussion.

On the other hand, it has to be avoided that the current political power changes the constitution by its will without the permission of the majority of the owners. A “blank cheque” (no control) can be otherwise a big threat to the owners, e.g. overnight change the form of state, nationalization of specific assets is allowed, ethnical groups lose their basic rights (e.g. Nazi Germany).

Extra public voting has extra costs, but it is much cheaper for the owners to have extra public voting as not (e.g. Nazi Germany has led to World War 2).

Relationship:

citizen <-> country

Violation:

by not complying with the right

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- provide the service in the defined volume and quality and with deadlines
- In case the violators are employed/elected in state-related organization immediate dismissal without severance
- Employment ban for all the violators from state-related organization for 25 years (even elected) and ban from any political position lifelong (cannot be elected or chosen)
- in case there is a request for personal consequences there are always at least the following employees face consequences: president, head of any ministry, head of parliament/congress/senate and their deputies
- eventually financial compensation where all the violators burden

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

12. Elected or delegated employees, parties, management may implement only the in advance authorized program (before the election or delegation) by public voting.

Short description:

Any single owner (=citizen) has the right to deny actions/programs/investment by elected persons or organizations (e.g. party) that were not part of the official public election program or the cost of a new project/investment exceeded over 50%.

Without the authorization or the official public election program (in written unchangeable format, before the elections) only maintaining current processes with the current laws is possible (=zero program). A zero program allows for every citizen(owner) the immediate denial of past or new laws, programs or decrees.

Further explanations or details to the right:

Actions/programs outside of election program are not authorized by the owners therefore they are not legal. In case there was no official dedicated program for the next legislature (or there were multiple) in an unchangeable format or it was not publicly known or available then it means there is no authorization for any change in the next legislature. Any owner has the right to deny those actions and programs.

In case a government plans to change something or start or stop programs it has write down the program, store and publish in an unchangeable format at least 100 days before election or public voting about it. Any change within 100 days is not possible the only other option is to revoke the whole election program (that means no changes allowed in the next legislature).

The budget of any authorized new action or program or investment has to be reported for the owner quarterly to all owners. To be published together with every relevant contract/agreement (in full detail) and invoice. In case of an overrun (25%) any owner has the right to demand to stop the specific action or program or investment. Data quality has to be confirmed by 2 independent organizations.

It is applicable only persons or management currently in power, while through an election their program got the majority vote.

Unauthorized (by the owners) steps can be treated as a state of emergency with its consequences for the involved elected persons.

Why this Right Exists:

To deny unauthorized action or program or investments and excess spending. Elected persons or management (e.g. party) get their mandate to get things done written down in the election program nothing more.

Extra public voting (authorization of change of program) has extra costs, but it is much cheaper for the owners to have extra public voting as not (e.g. Nazi Germany has led to World War 2).

Relationship:

citizen <-> state-related organizations, country, state, authorities, community owned organizations also applicable for private organizations

Violation:

not processing the request properly

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- End immediately unauthorized new action or program or investments
- End immediately unauthorized stop of previously authorized actions, programs, processes, service or investments
- End immediately unauthorized new action or program or investments in case budget overrun
- provide reporting in the specified frequency, quality and content with the specified quality assurance
- request personal consequences in case of ignorance and/or not processing:
 - immediate dismissal with financial compensation for the head of the elected management:
 - in case one person, then the person (e.g. mayor or president)
 - in case of a party at least the person in the highest position in the state-relevant organization (in case of political parties probably a member in the government)
 - eventually financial compensation for the owners where all the violators burden

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

13. Minimum level of quality to be reached in public voting.

Short description:

Any owner can deny the result of any public voting if there is no QA that guarantees the quality of voting and counting process.

A nationwide (if the organization is a country), independently supervised, stratified risk-limiting audit (risk limit $\alpha = 0.01$) with three fully independent auditors per voting circle, using public random sampling of 20% of the most contested 10% of circles and 3% of the rest, to verify results within ± 2 percentage points and escalate to full recount if discrepancies exceed this threshold.

Further explanation of the right:

See in the document: "The citizens'/owners' rights framework attachments"

Why this Right Exists:

in history voting fraud has happened many times, e.g. some voters could not vote, some voters voted many times, voting manipulation (e.g. influence or threat), manipulation in handling (e.g. adding artificial votes), manipulation in counting, manipulation in recording and publishing (e.g. Nazi Germany).

The individuals participating in a voting are doing a service for the owners. It is not acceptable that on purpose or by negligence the will of the owners gets influenced or hijacked. Only a proper QA process in that every owner has a full insight can help to minimize those risks.

A proper QA process and fulfilling the requirement has extra costs, but also almost every product and service goes through sometimes expensive QA processes so why save money at the core? It is much cheaper for the owners to have a proper QA process as not (e.g. Nazi Germany has led to World War 2).

Relationship:

citizen <-> country, community

Violation:

by not complying with the right, in case of a request not complying

Legitimate request of any owner:

- in case QA not fulfilled deny the result and require a repeat of the voting
- In case sabotage on purpose the violators are employed/elected in state-related organization should be dismissed immediately without severance and employment from state-related organization for 25 years (even elected) and ban from any political position lifelong (cannot be elected or chosen)
- In case mistake by negligence are employed/elected in state-related organization should be dismissed immediately with severance and employment from state-related organization for 5 years (even elected) and ban from any political position 5 years long (cannot be elected or chosen)
- Employment ban for all the violators from state-related organization for 25 years (even elected) and ban from any political position lifelong (cannot be elected or chosen)

- in case there is a request for personal consequences all the participant face consequences, but at least 2 persons (violator and his boss)
- as always one owner's veto is enough

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

Category 5: Accountability

14. Employment in high leadership positions (even elected) in state-related organizations is time limited.

Short description:

Any single owner has the right end the employment of individual employee in high leadership position with immunity status after a given time limit. After the time limit is hit there must be at least 4 continuous years without any kind of immunity to be eligible for such kind of positions. The higher the position the shorter the time limit (e.g. 10 years).

Further explanations or details to the right:

No further explanation.

Why this Right Exists:

For accountability reasons after a time period there must be a time period where individuals in leadership position have no immunity and can be held accountable. It has to make possible that no one can hide behind immunity for many decades.

It is not a crime to hit those limits, therefore there is a financial compensation for the employed/elected/delegated individuals.

It is a risk-minimizing tool because as history shows the probability of corruption and/or dictatorship rises the longer an individual employee (even elected or delegated) is employed in leadership positions (see Nazi Germany). Corruption and/or dictatorships harm the ownership rights and/or economically (in worst case his/her life).

Examples of high leadership positions (in case combined with immunity): president, part of head or deputy of the government, head of a ministry, head of parliament/congress/senate.

Relationship:

citizen <-> state-related organizations, country, state, authorities, military, community, all state-related organizations (e.g. parliament, congress, senate) and authorities

Violation:

not processing the request procedure

The person against whom the claim is made ignores the request. (any further activity is illegal)

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- End the employment (even elected) and any immunity immediately

- but with financial compensation (salary until the end of the contract/election period a maximum of 5 years)
- after immunity ended now or before have 4-year continuous immunity free status of the individual to have the possibility to be held accountable (not even diplomatic status from the country or from other countries)
- in that 4-year period no state-related employment (even elected) is possible
- by the following exact criteria:
 - the individual had immunity 20 years long
 - had the individual at last a 4-year immunity free status the counting of the years gets a reset otherwise they will be added (e.g. 4 years immunity, then only 2 years without immunity, then 4 years with immunity, counts as of now as 8 years immunity)
 - the following positions (in case combined with immunity) count by a factor of 1.5 in years: president, head of a ministry, head of parliament/congress/senate
 - e.g. a president after 10 years needs a 4-year sabbatical (in that he/she has no immunity)

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

In one assertion only one employed/elected person can be named.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

15. Minimum press-conference obligation of employees in high management.

Short description:

Employees (even elected) have the obligation to periodically hold personally a live public status report for the owners, combined afterwards with a public Q&A with the press.

Further explanations or details to the right:

See in the document: “The citizens’/owners’ rights framework attachments”

Why this Right Exists:

Every public company has to hold a general assembly at least yearly (including status report and Q&A) for the shareholders. For a shareholder there is a part of his/her wealth at stake.

But the specified organization not just manage public wealth (partly belonging to every owner) but much more is at stake: security, safety, taxing, environment, education, etc. . The owners' daily life is influenced by the activities by those organizations, therefore much more control is needed.

On the other hand, in history e.g. many politicians avoided or tried to avoid any kind of status meeting or gave an opportunity to the press to ask. Any new outlet can channel question of millions that makes a communication between owner and management e.g. Q&A much more effective. Many politicians try to avoid any contact to critical news outlets. For all these reasons the minimum obligation and the content -described above- has to be defined where the owners have the chance to get frequently necessary updates.

CEOs of monopolies belong to this circle. In case of a monopoly the owners as customers do not really have a chance to choose a rival product or service (extreme case 100% monopoly). In history monopolies have many times misused their power, were unreasonably expensive or just delivered bad service or product. In many cases they are maintaining some restricted resource (e.g. by a concession) or provide a service that can be reasonably provided as a (local) monopoly (e.g. waterworks). For the owners is favorable not have monopolies at all, but as long there are any, they have the obligations by hitting the defined criteria.

Violation:

by not complying with the right, sabotaging the request procedure

Relationship:

citizen <-> state-related, community-related organizations, monopolies

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- demand to comply with a the right for a specific organization
- in case in the specific organization the specified employee does not comply as defined, request the dismissal of the head of the organization with severance

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

Category 6: Transparency

16. Required minimum transparency of any owned organization.

Short description:

The right to get detailed, complete information about all types of projects, contracts, orders, obligations, subsidiaries, donations, lends, credits, projects, payments, compensation, outsourcing of activities or assets, investments, founding, size (internal, external employees), incomes (tax, fine, rental, from application, subsidiaries, donations), costs and spending or giveaways of any state-related or community organizations.

Further explanations or details to the right:

See in the document: "The citizens'/owners' rights framework attachments"

Why this Right Exists:

To offer the owner transparency over their organization, public wealth to be able to detect fraud or by the owners unauthorized spendings / donations / payments / obligations / etc. .

Relationship:

citizen <-> every state-related (also national bank) or community-related organizations.

Potential corruption is much more expensive as the cost of the obligation.

Violation:

by not complying with the right, sabotaging the request procedure

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- setup a system and start to fill with current data within 1 year from the first assertion of the right by any owner (after further 3 years provide all relevant data and documents)
- in the meantime (if no system available) provide all new and historical data in the system for in the request specified data and documents within 90 days for free with the same quality attributes digitally
- anyone in state-related organization sabotaging or slowing down the process have to be dismissed immediately without severance and get 25 years of employment ban from state-related organizations

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

17. Regular statistics on the economy and demography.

Short description:

to require a free accessible and usable interactive dashboard with specified statistics and for country/state/county/community that enables free download of statistics and post processing. E.g. population, economics, public wealth, debts, taxation, employment, unemployment, etc.

Further explanations or details to the right:

See in the document: “The citizens’/owners’ rights framework attachments”

Why this Right Exists:

with those statistics provided in a freely accessible and easy to use dashboard(s) the owners can monitor key statistics of the owned organization.

They can easily e.g.:

- understand how many taxes were collected and how they have been spent
- identify unfavorable change in public assets, debts, loans and wealth
- misusage of tax (not for the purpose)
- identify ineffective tax collection (e.g. the organization and the cost of the collection is too expensive)
- identify unfavorable taxation (if the poor pays higher taxes proportionally than the rich)
- identify too high or too low taxes
 - o over- or underfinanced taxes
- identify social problems (e.g. homeless people, children in state care)
- identify potential corruption:
 - o giveaways in great volume nullifies public wealth
 - o donations can mean trying to take influence

Relationship:

citizen <-> country/state/national bank/police/county/community

Violation:

by sabotaging the request procedure

Legitimate requests of the owners:

provide the statistics in the described quality and volume as specified

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

18. Special KPIs to describe the effect of taxing of income.

Short description:

One special measure to understand the effect of taxing on the income of the owners. The measure describes at least how many hours has to work an employee to be able to order himself/herself for one.

Further explanations or details to the right:

See in the document: „The citizens'/owners' rights framework attachments”

Why this Right Exists:

This coefficient helps owners and also companies to easily interpret the employment-based taxation (even a relatively a high personal income tax can be favorable if the other taxes are low and vice versa)

- understand of tax ratio in the owner's country
 - o tax ratio in consume (it can be that the end price a customer pays contains over 60% tax)
 - o tax ratio of income
 - o coefficient between taxing services and income tax (how many hours has to work someone that he/she can pay 1 hour of service by himself/herself)

For companies it also helpful in business decisions (e.g. where to create a new factory).

Relationship:

citizen <-> county/state/country

Violation:

by sabotaging the request procedure or not fulfilling it

Legitimate requests of the owners:

require the application of the right

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

19. The right to deny hidden ownership in the country.

Short description:

Every citizen (=owner) may deny for state-related or community-related organization any business activity (even donation) with companies/organizations that have at least one unknown/hidden owner.

Further explanations or details to the right:

The owners(=citizens) have to right to let immediately terminate every running business or financial relevant activities (investment/founding/contract/payment/etc.) with those types of organizations or companies.

Furthermore, any owner may demand to make every document public related with those organizations for every citizen accessible, without fee and registration within 14 days (contracts, details, drafts, payments, orders, agreements, etc., in full detail).

No employee (even elected) in state-related or community-related organizations may have any hidden ownership.

Why this Right Exists:

Potential corruption is much more expensive for the owners as the cost of the extra regulation.

Relationship:

citizen <-> every state-related (also national bank) or community-related organizations

Violation:

by not complying with the right, sabotaging the request procedure

Legitimate request of any owner:

- deny and stop for state-related or community-related organization any business activity (even donation) with companies/organizations that have at least one unknown/hidden owner
- deny hidden ownership in the country, make immediately all hidden ownership in the country public

- employee (even elected) in state-related or community-related organizations may not have any hidden ownership (no matter in which country), in case there are any make them all immediately public
- anyone in state-related organization sabotaging or slowing down the process have to be dismissed immediately without severance and get 25 years of employment ban from state-related organizations

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

20. The citizens’ (Owners’) right to remind to honest representation of any non-business organization in the country.

Short description:

Any owner may publicly remind non-business organizations or their leaders to stop using use one or more adjectives in their name or promotional material if they do not comply with the characteristics described by those adjectives to a significant extent or many cases they contradict with it.

This is a special case of in the framework, because normally the framework is focusing only on the owned organizations and on the employees of the owners in those organizations. This right exists because of historical reason. It happened many times in history that movements, political parties or even religions do not comply with their values and misused them.

Commenting any organization within a country belongs to general free speech of all owners.

Further explanations or details to the right:

Those non-business organizations can be state-related, political parties, community-related, NGOs, religions, churches.

In case this remind is non-violent by an owner, the owner may not be investigated, put on trial, put under surveillance, threatened, harmed, ridiculed or punished any way.

But for fabricated evidences can the requesting owner held accountable.

The owner cannot force the termination of the practice (no violation), but is a violation to repress any owner to practice its right.

Why this Right Exists:

This is a special case of in the framework, because normally the framework is focusing only on the owned organizations and on the employees of the owners in those organizations (exception: a task/service/resource is outsourced to a 3rd party).

This right exists because of historical reason. It happened many times in history that movements, political parties or even religions do not comply with their values. E.g. Hitler held himself for a Christian although he had zero compliance with content of the New Testament. But commenting any organization within a country belongs to general free speech.

As all the named type of organizations are more or less participant in the political area (willingly or unwillingly), it is important to remind those organizations or their leaders if they do not comply. In worst case those organizations can “hijack” under a “false flag” the votes of the owners and if that has happened is history those owners have realized it only years later. E.g. Hitlers Nazi party has “hijacked” the religious Christians votes, although Hitler and his party judged by their activity had zero compliance with the New Testament therefore with Christianity (a wolf in sheep's clothing).

Any owner may publicly non-violently remind/call out such divergencies, but has no right to force any change.

This right should enable the owners to lower that risk.

Relationship:

citizen <-> non-business organizations, be state-related organizations, political parties, community-related organizations, NGOs, religions, churches

Violation:

- sabotaging the request procedure
- as a consequence of a non-violent and not fabricated request the owner is investigated, is detained, is put on trial, is put under surveillance, gets threatened, is harmed, is ridiculed or punished any way

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- remind/call out the organization or its employee for not complying with their (advertised) values with providing evidence
- in case any owner reminds a state-related or community-related organization or employee (even elected) and his right is violated (see below) the single owner may

request the immediate termination of the employees who have participated in that process

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

Category 7: Environment/nature

21. Regular statistics on waste, recycling, air, soil, and water quality.

Short description:

Get public regular free reporting with 3rd party quality assurance about air quality, water quality, waste management, recycling, soil.

Further explanations or details to the right:

Get a daily report about:

- air quality e.g.: proportion of gases, pollution, toxic/radioactive particles, microplastics
- water quality (rivers, lakes, water management, beach) e.g.: waste type and content, toxic/radioactive particles, organisms, microplastics

Get a quarterly reporting about:

- amount of waste or garbage: produced, existent, stored, processed, unprocessed, recycled in detail (at community / town / city / county / state / country level)
 - o including:
 - waste water management
 - garbage
 - hazardous waste
 - nuclear
 - all major incidents from the last 3 years and their aftermath (impact, severeness, damage, fines, suspensions, compensations, etc.)
 - o for all of them type, source, location (e.g. garbage/litter also landed/dumped in rivers/seas/oceans)

Historical data has to be also offered (at least 25 years).

To eliminate possible data manipulation QA has to be setup and a yearly independent audit is necessary. Both QA and audit results have to be made public within 2 working days.

Data should be queryable in different granularity: community, county, state, country.

Why this Right Exists:

Everyday citizens are usually not informed by authorities from all aspects of waste management. The owners need continuous monitoring/and information about the status of the processes and also about incidents. It is important to raise the transparency as it impacts directly their everyday life or it can impact in some years.

In history it has happened many times that industrial incidents were without consequences (after they have disappeared from the headlines).

Raised awareness and monitoring can raise the quality, lower the output and use more environmentally friendly products/solutions. As this right makes those indicators measurable effect of changes is easy to judge.

Relationship:

citizen <-> country/state/county/city/town/community

Violation:

by sabotaging the request procedure or not fulfilling it

Legitimate requests of the owners:

require the application of the right

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

22. Regular statistics about area provided for flora and fauna.

Short description:

Demand and force a yearly report about:

- forested area in the country/state/county/community
- water covered area (lake/river) in the country/state/ county/community

Further explanations or details to the right:

See in the document: „The citizens’/owners’ rights framework attachments”

Why this Right Exists:

Humanity caused a mass extinction of flora and fauna in the last thousands of years. Almost every flat area is used where conditions are acceptable for business, living, or agriculture, causing massive deforestation. At the same time, wild animals were extinct and lived in much smaller areas than before.

It would be more than fair that at least 50% of the surface should be provided for nature in every country, where entry for people is not allowed, and flora and fauna are not bothered.

It is not fair that one race (*homo sapiens*) requires all the surface and resources for himself against the billions of other races on Earth.

In case of a reasonable tax is collected it:

- rewards efficient usage of surface
- helps to have greener surface

Relationship:

citizen <-> country/state/county/community

Violation:

by sabotaging the request procedure or not fulfilling it

Legitimate requests of the owners:

require the application of the right

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

23. Regular reporting on local global warming relevant data.

Short description:

To get daily global warming related data with historical data by region

Further explanations or details to the right:

See in the document: „The citizens'/owners' rights framework attachments”

Why this Right Exists:

Providing the data raises awareness among the citizens. Raised awareness helps the owners to take some actions or avoid some actions. (E.g. use less UV absorbing surfaces on buildings or have more parks/lakes/parks or plant more trees to have more shades).

It is important to provide the raw data to avoid any kind of manipulation in the interpretation.

Relationship:

citizen <-> country

Violation:

by sabotaging the request procedure or not fulfilling it

Legitimate requests of the owners:

require the application of the right

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

24. Environmental tax on goods, materials based on the transportation distance.**Short description:**

The right to request an environmental tax on goods and materials that have been transported. This tax rewards less transportation, that is positive for the environment.

Further explanations or details to the right:

category 1: within the state (and the same economic region, e.g. NAFTA, EU): 0 %

foreign country and the nearest distance between the borders is:

- category 2: below 500 miles: 0 %
- category above 500 miles: 1-5 %
- category above 2000 miles: 1-5 %
- category above 6000 miles: 1-5 %

Why this Right Exists:

this tax rewards less transportation, that is positive for the environment and helps to fight global warming.

Ideally the distance between the production site and the place of sale could be determined exactly also within the country. That would enable to refine the categories. E.g. a category distance below 50 miles would encourage local production (e.g. agricultural products). At the current state of technology e.g. a chain could give discounts for products/goods/services based on the distance to save money for himself (less transportation costs), save money for the customers (discount), cause less traffic (shorter distance), cause less pollution (shorter distance) and support local businesses.

Relationship:

citizen <-> country

Violation:

by sabotaging the request procedure

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- apply the defined taxes
- request that the country changes the laws to comply with the right

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

Category 8: Economics/business

25. Minimum requirement against activities with mass destruction potential.

Short description:

Demand the state/country to issue an obligation to for any business (private or state-owned) or organization (even military) activity/service that has the potential that it can cause the death of over 100 individuals in a single accident or of over 1000 individuals within a month.

It is possible, that in those cases the organizations will not be able or willing to pay. To assure rapid payment to the victims or their descendants a proper insurance is obligatory.

Further explanations or details to the right:

See in the document: „The citizens'/owners' rights framework attachments”

Why this Right Exists:

Technology, experience and knowledge make possible to build remarkable solutions.

Relationship:

citizen <-> country

Violation:

by sabotaging the request procedure

Legitimate requests of the owners:

require the application of the right

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

26. Restrictions on monopoly.

Short description:

Demand special rules, activities and regulations in case of monopolies or to stop monopoly.

Management of common resources is a matter of owner even the management / exploitation / distribution is in the hand of a monopoly therefore any single owner has a veto right. Generally, monopolies have misused their position in history many times therefore a strong control and monitoring is essential

Further explanations or details to the right:

See in the document: „The citizens'/owners' rights framework attachments”

Why this Right Exists:

management of common resources is a matter of owner even the management/exploitation/distribution is in the hand of a monopoly therefore any single owner has a veto right.

Generally, monopolies have misused their position in history many times therefore a strong control and monitoring is essential. Misusage of monopoly in category 1. and 2. has to do with the everyday life of the owners therefore it is essential that even a single owner has veto right.

With new technologies emerging it is normal that the technology and therefore the market share is concentrated in one or two hands. As time goes by many new technologies become part of the everyday life. Innovations have to be respected but should not be used against the citizens.

Banking: even the collapse of bank/financial service between 10-20% has a massive impact, the risk can be minimized by the size.

Relationship:

citizen <-> country

Violation:

by sabotaging the request procedure

Legitimate requests of the owners:

require the application of the right

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

27. Trade with other countries, tariffs.

Short description:

Ask to apply a tariff on a trading partner, or if applied limit its size. The owner can ask for tariffs but cannot force tariffs. The owner can force the limitation of the tariffs and the duration (see below).

Further explanations or details to the right:

See in the document: "The citizens'/owners' rights framework attachments"

Why this Right Exists:

These tariffs' intention is to make trade possible in difficult even in very difficult times.

This rights rewards:

- peace
- good relationships between countries
- avoidance of dangerous technologies (e.g. nuclear) that in case of malfunction can have international impact
- environmental-friendly industry
- and the protection of intellectual and non-intellectual properties and assets and very basic human rights

Different values and systems are easy to judge but almost every country / nation had a bloody part in their history.

The owners'(citizens') own country probably had at least one phase in the last centuries that is probably darker as the issues the with the trading partner country.

These tariffs (taxes) help:

- to find a way to keep trading alive with a quick solution
- to avoid a trading ban
- to annoy the trading partners with different issues the trading companies in most cases cannot even influence

Relationship:

citizen <-> country

Violation:

by sabotaging the request procedure

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- name the country, the industry, the reason to apply specified tariffs
- name the country, the industry, applied tariff to limit specified tariffs

- name the country, the industry, applied tariff to keep the minimum duration

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

28. Right to require the country to represent the citizen in cross-border insurance matters (including war-related cases) when the loss occurred on national territory and the responsible party is foreign.

Short description:

Demand from the owner's country to represent its interest in case a foreign (outside of the country) organization has caused damage for the citizen. E.g. has damaged the owners' wealth (e.g. property), caused the damage of his health (or loss of life), caused psychological damage, torture, restrict freedom (e.g. unnecessary detainment, torture or imprisonment), extra spending by industrial, by military actions.

Those cases should be treated as insurance cases, where the representant country may keep a maximum of 10% of the payout to cover its costs.

Further explanation of the right:

The owner may require from the country to handle his case as an insurance case and step up internationally to represent his/her interest and collect and transfer him/her an appropriate compensation within 1 year.

Typical case: the owner has suffered some loss in his country by an event caused by any kind of organization from a different country.

Unusual case: the owner has been kidnapped (or got detained) by the 3rd party organization and possible further harm in his/her country or in abroad.

Why this Right Exists: Every owner has to be able to protect its right and for the needless suffer get at least an appropriate compensation. Those cases are insurance cases but as most of the insurance companies do not handle these cases the country has represent those insurance cases and has to collect the single owner's compensation and transfer directly to him/her.

In history in such cases the two countries usually agreed eventually there was some compensation but the individual owner in most cases was not compensated or not to full extent. This right brings the protection of the owners in those insurance cases to a whole new level.

There is a damage or loss but no insurance company to collect the compensation therefore the country(state) has to step in and internationally collect the compensation.

Relationship:

citizen <-> country

Violation:

by not complying with the right, sabotaging the request procedure

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- after documenting the damage, loss, etc. demand (always) financial compensation within 10 years:
 - to be collected and transferred to the owner within 2 years from making the request
 - for loss of life per person: a lifetime compensation (30 years of average salary currently in the owners' country, to be paid to the nearest family)
 - for loss of wealth/property: 100% of value
 - for other cases (health, psychological issues, kidnapping): rule of thumb at least so many years as it needs to process the damage or loss, minimum 1 years and maximum 30 years (lifetime compensation) of average salary currently in the owner's country (e.g. a major disability won't heal ever in that case the lifetime compensation, regardless how old the victim was)
- anyone in state-related organization sabotaging or slowing down the process have to be dismissed immediately without severance

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

Normally an owner may assert for only for himself, in this case also for his/her children. In case of loss of life for the nearest family member (e.g. wife for the husband or child for a parent).

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

29. The individual citizen's (owner's) right to private bankruptcy.

Short description:

The right to file private bankruptcy. Force the country to design and pass the laws within 1 year (in case not yet possible). In case an Ltd. company (synthetical juridical person) is insolvent they can file bankruptcy, as well as a country, a single owner has to have that right as well with comparable conditions.

Further explanations or details to the right:

No further explanation.

Why this Right Exists:

See in the short description.

Relationship:

citizen <-> country

Violation:

by sabotaging the request procedure

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- in case no private bankruptcy possible in his/her country demand from the country to design and pass the laws and make private bankruptcy possible within 1 year from the date of the request
 - in case not fulfilling the request personal consequences to possibly ask for:
 - immediate dismissal without severance and 4-year employment ban from state-related organization (even getting elected) for: president, members of the cabinet (e.g. all the ministers, head and deputy of the cabinet)
- file for him-/herself a private bankruptcy

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

One owner is enough to force the country/state to design and pass missing law for private bankruptcy.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

30. The right to tax AI-related revenue (tax income to be evenly distributed among the citizens).

Short description:

Since the industrial revolution there is a permanent evolution where machines help the employees but also substitutes them. Many professions died out in those centuries and nowadays it became a normality that many employees have to regularly upskill themselves and often reskill themselves. Those who are not able to upskill or reskill themselves are a potential victim of long-term unemployment.

Until now with upskill and reskill the majority of the workforce could balance out the parity between machines and human labor. With AI there is a danger that suddenly in complete industry sectors AI solutions can replace the humans. As it is possible that a 5-year TCO of an AI solution is less than a year salary of the concurrent human workforce and it can work 50-100% of the time (2 to 4 times more than humans) and probably with a much higher efficiency, the danger of sudden mass unemployment rises with the time.

To be able to keep some balance the citizens need the right to tax at least AI solutions as AI solutions can be a far superior workforce as humans.

The eventually collected tax (at least 90 % of it) on AI solutions has to be evenly distributed among all citizens.

Further explanations or details to the right:

No further explanation.

Why this Right Exists:

See in the short description.

Relationship:

citizen <-> country

Violation:

by sabotaging the request procedure

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- ask and force for the special tax
- evenly distribution of collected tax
- full transparency and regular statistics

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

Category 9: Other state/country related

31. Minimum requirements for the employees in any law enforcement or private security organizations.

Short description:

Deny any employees/members of army/police/intelligence/any special forces/peace-keeping/ security if they do not fulfill some minimum requirements. Some examples:

- no major criminal record/history ever allowed
- citizen of the country and residential address in the country
- identification (face uncovered, provide badge number, full name, department)
- photo and video recording of those employees is allowed for citizens

Security companies and every security related activity also need fulfill the same criteria sets.

Further explanations or details to the right:

- no name changes in the last 10 years
- citizen of the country and residential address in the country continuously for the last 18 years

Why this Right Exists:

Every owner has to be able to identify violators from organizations that may use some force. To be able to do that identification and evidence collections has to be possible. Any owner can also expect at least that no one with a criminal history and no foreign forces may use force against citizens.

Relationship:

citizen <-> country/state/authorities and community/companies/organizations who employ on some form security forces

Violation:

by not complying with the right, sabotaging the request procedure

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- new and current employees (even freelancing, subcontracting) have to fulfill the criteria. The ones who do not fulfill the criteria cannot practice further in this sector
- in case employed by state/authorities/community they are dismissal+ severance
- anyone in state-related organization sabotaging or slowing down the process have to be dismissed immediately without severance

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

32. Regular statistics on level of readiness for potential emergency scenarios.

Short description:

Get yearly informed about the emergency plan (including capacity, resources, personal, reaction-time, capability, information) for possible emergency cases town/county/state/country level e.g.:

- nature based: wildfire, flood, earthquake, drought, heat wave, blizzard, hurricane, tornado or pandemic (human, animal)
- industrial or military accidents: accidents: chemical, biological, nuclear, mining, fire, explosion, poisoning, infrastructural or transportation accidents
- shortages: water, food, electricity shortage, medical, shelter

other: homelessness, war, terrorist attacks, immigration

Further explanations or details to the right:

e.g.:

- nature based:
 - massive wildfire, flood, earthquake, massive drought, long heat wave, massive snowfall, blizzard, massive cold, hurricane, tornado
 - pandemic: human, animal
- industrial/military:
 - industrial accidents: chemical, biological, nuclear
 - nuclear military accident
 - fire, explosion
 - mining accidents
- other:
 - transportation accidents (shipping, rail, air, road)

- infrastructural accidents (bridge, dam, tunnel)
- shortages: water, food, electricity shortage, medical
- shelter shortage or homelessness
- war
- immigration
- terrorist attack
- poisoning (food, water)

QA and yearly independent audit are necessary.

Why this Right Exists:

for the described each emergency case one need an emergency plan that can be used within an hour and all the described capacities/capabilities/personal/resources are immediately available. The owners can make sure the owned organizations are prepared if there is strict, public and transparent monitoring.

From the controlling point of view, it motivates e.g. to do less risky industrial activity, build safer infrastructure with higher quality, be prepared for drought and water shortage or war the public in time to avoid some disasters.

Relationship:

citizen <-> town/city/county/state/country

Violation:

by sabotaging the request procedure

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- require the application of the right
- by sabotaging the right immediately dismiss every involved state employee involved in the process, without severance, optionally ask for financial compensation to be paid by the violators

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

33. A citizen may not be imprisoned or taken into custody if there was no criminal force and is no danger of criminal activity.

Short description:

A citizen(=owner) may not rule to imprisonment (or similar) if there was no criminal activity, there is no danger for criminal activity. E.g. not paying financial obligations (e.g. fines) is not a criminal activity.

For example, if a company (synthetical juridical person) or a country goes bankrupt nobody will be imprisoned although in both cases the impact is many times higher.

Further explanations or details to the right:

No further explanation.

Why this Right Exists:

In history it happened many times that a citizen was ruled to imprisonment (or similar) although there was no criminal activity and with the imprisonment (or similar) no future criminal activity has been hindered.

E.g.:

- not able to pay an obligation (fine, etc.): not being able to pay is not a crime. There are several tools and service to collect overdue obligations (examples for crime: theft, scam, robbery)
- being homeless is not a crime

For example, if an Ltd. company (synthetical juridical person) is insolvent or is not willing to pay nobody will be imprisoned or if a country goes bankrupt nobody will be imprisoned although in both cases the impact is probably many magnitudes higher.

Relationship:

citizen <-> country

Violation:

by sabotaging the request procedure

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- deny imprisonment (or similar) if there was no criminal activity, there is no danger for criminal activity
- demand that the country changes the laws to comply with the right

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

An owner may assert only for himself or herself and for his or her children.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

34. The right of the citizens (Owners) against mass surveillance.

Short description:

Data (also photo, audio, and video) of citizens(=owners) that are not suspected of committing crimes can be only stored according to GDPR for citizens for a limited time, not even aggregation of data is allowed or profiling in any way the owner (=citizen).

Further explanations or details to the right:

Transparency is a must. No third-party participation in the whole process is allowed. Outsourcing to a company/foreign country/organization is not allowed.

Only citizens of the country (at least 18 years old individuals, that were born in the country) may participate in surveillance activities or can have any kind of access or visibility to any kind of data.

If the citizen has not committed with a crime and the data is still stored after 90 day the individual owner has to be reported when, where, what type of his data has been captured (email, camera, car, etc.) since when and the data owners.

Mass surveillance without suspicion of committed crime of the citizen can be denied by the owner. Outsourcing mass surveillance of citizens or get/change/buy mass surveillance data processes involving the citizens data is can be denied by the single owner.

Why this Right Exists:

No organization is allowed to spy any owner without suspicion of committed crime. (Imagine a company is spying on its owner, the shareholders. That is big NO-NO.)

Relationship:

citizen <-> country/state/authorities, community

Violation:

not processing properly the request, or by not complying with the right

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- comply GDPR

- comply right (e.g. delete data after 90 days, no aggregation, no profiling if there is no hard evidence of suspicion of committing a crime)
- in case compliance was not given inform the individual owner what type of data has been stored and who are the data owners he/she can dress and request the removal with evidences
- no outsourcing if surveillance (no 3rd party, no foreign countries or organizations in abroad) and no buying/change/getting of surveillance data about own owners
- demand personal consequences by violation:
 - dismissal with financial compensation
 - employment ban at state-related organization for 4 years and immunity free status to be able to held accountable
 - always at least 2 persons (processor, direct boss) in case it could not be identified with 30 days those 2 persons than the head of data owner organization, in case no data owner could be identified in the 30 days, then the head of inner affairs (ministry)

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

35. The right against mass surveillance technology in goods and services.

Short description:

Mandatory labelling of every electronic and software solution used directly or indirectly by the citizens with certification categories for possible surveillance and for possible manipulation. No organization is allowed to spy any owner without officially documented suspicion of committed crime.

Further explanations or details to the right:

See in the document: „The citizens’/owners’ rights framework attachments”

Why this Right Exists:

No organization is allowed to spy any owner without suspicion of committed crime.
(Imagine a company is spying on its owner, the shareholders. That is big NO-NO.)

Relationship:

citizen <-> country/state/authorities, community

Violation:

not processing properly the request, or by not complying with the right

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- comply GDPR
- comply right (e.g. delete data after 90 days, no aggregation, no profiling if there is no hard evidence of suspicion of committing a crime)
- in case compliance was not given inform the individual owner what type of data has been stored and who are the data owners he/she can dress and request the removal with evidences
- no outsourcing if surveillance (no 3rd party, no foreign countries or organizations in abroad) and no buying/change/getting of surveillance data about own owners
- demand personal consequences by violation:
 - dismissal with financial compensation
 - employment ban at state-related organization for 4 years and immunity free status to be able to held accountable
 - always at least 2 persons (processor, direct boss) in case it could not be identified with 30 days those 2 persons than the head of data owner organization, in case no data owner could be identified in the 30 days, then the head of inner affairs (ministry)

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

36. Owners' special rights against management in the case of state of emergency or war.

Short description:

Historically, the ruling power has in many occasions has misused crisis (order by decree) to widen its influence and power eventually even extend the length of the crisis.

In many crises situation it was clear afterwards that poor management, ignorance or manipulation has led to the crisis that cloaked in a state of emergency or it was a set up to be able to declare state of emergency.

Any owner has the right to demand the dismissal all the main leaders in involved organizations. Depending on the type and duration of the state of emergency immediately (self-inflicted) or delayed (e.g. industrial disaster).

Further explanation of the right:

Any owner has the right to demand the dismissal of individuals in state-related management (employees or elected persons) to prevent for the owner potentially unfavorable scenarios by the criteria below.

Employees (even elected) in high management with immunity status in case they have hit a limit in years serving during ruling by decree and/or state of emergency (now or in the past, continuously or in parts) can be dismissed with financial compensation by any citizen unless they were free of immunity for at least 4 years long continuously (for accountability reasons).

The limits by positions (any other positions that are protected by immunity) even combined:

- 2 years (730 days): president, head of government, head of parliament/congress/senate
- 3 years (1095 days): member of government
- 4 years (1460 days): any other positions (e.g. member of parliament/congress/senate)

Why this Right Exists:

Those rights are necessary as in many cases, only history could tell afterwards if the management (group of power like the president, forces, government, mayor, etc.) has forced on purpose the crisis (faked or caused crisis or just let it happen).

Historically, the ruling power has in many occasions has misused crisis (order by decree) to widen its influence and power eventually even extend the length of the crisis.

In many crises situation afterwards it was obvious that poor management, ignorance or bad preparation has led to the crisis that cloaked in a state of emergency.

In many cases the state of emergency is not avoidable (e.g. hurricane, volcanic eruption, earthquake, tsunami, etc.). Therefore, this right is not a punishment but a risk minimizing

tool for the owners. The owners need those rights to be able to avoid as many state of emergencies as possible. On the other hand, it is a motivation for management to prepare to be to deflect crisis situations and/or to minimize the length of a crisis situation.

Relationship:

citizen <-> country/state/authorities, community

Violation:

not processing properly the request, by not complying with the right

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- naming the employee (even elected) to dismiss immediately with financial compensation
- employment ban the employee (even elected) in state-related organizations for 4 years and also immunity free status for years (to be able hold accountable)

Who can assert this right?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

37. To call the form of state by his or her opinion.

Short description:

To call the form of state in any form (democracy, dictatorship, fascist state, or a Nazi state) what it is based on the list below without any negative consequences or restrictions for the owner.

It is always the owner who assesses the owned organization and employee not the other way around. Any employee (even elected) who threatens or dangers the owner because of his/her opinion is to be dismissed immediately in any type of organization.

Further explanations or details to the right:

Detailed list of criteria in the document: “5 The frameworks relation to constitution, laws, decrees and contracts”.

See further in the document: “The citizens’/owners’ rights framework attachments”

Why this Right Exists:

it is always the owner who assesses the owned organization and employee not the other way around. Any employee (even elected) who threatens or dangers the owner because of his/her opinion is to be dismissed immediately in any type of organization.

Relationship:

citizen <-> state/country

Violation:

by sabotaging the request procedure

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- require the application of the right
- by sabotaging the right immediately dismiss every involved state employee involved in the process, without severance, optionally ask for financial compensation to be paid by the violators

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

38. About in advance authorization by the citizens in case of annexation, separation.

Short description:

Preparation and process of any separation and annexation and are can only take effect after a public voting has authorized it in advance (in any case at least a year ago).

Further explanations or details to the right:

See in the document: „The citizens’/owners’ rights framework attachments”

Why this Right Exists:

Every owner has the right to maintain the power of his/her decision (annexation).

Extra public voting has extra costs, but it is much cheaper for the owners to have extra public voting as not (e.g. Nazi Germany’s annexations have led to World War 2).

The dismissal of employees is high management positions is very important. It is not a punishment (they get severance), but a risk minimizing-tool for the owners. In history many times annexation was afterwards unfavorable for the owners. (Imagine this right back in 1938 as Nazi Germany has annexed Austria. Hitler and his people could have dismissed

immediately by a single owner in German and that could have saved the world from WW2). The employees in high management position bring just a little sacrifice (they are dismissed with severance) compared to the big win for all owners to avoid a lot of risk.

Relationship:

citizen <-> country/state/territory

Violation:

by not complying with the right, sabotaging the request procedure

Legitimate requests of the owners:

- stop annexation or separation in case does not comply with the rules above
- start separation following the rules above
- new elections after an annexation (2 parties: 1 country +1 country/state/territory) or separation (one party: the country/state/territory that separated himself)
- personal consequences legal and authorized annexation/separation:
 - immediate dismissal with severance for the highest management (president, member of government e.g. ministers or head of government, head of parliament/congress/senate)
 - employment ban from state-related organizations (even elected) for all the employed/elected/appointed individuals part of the process
- personal consequences illegal and/or unauthorized annexation/separation:
 - immediate dismissal without severance for all the employed/elected/appointed individuals part of the process
 - employment ban from state-related organizations (even elected) for all the employed/elected/appointed individuals part of the process
- anyone in state-related organization sabotaging or slowing down the process have to be dismissed immediately without severance and get 25 years of employment ban from state-related organizations

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

One owner is enough to assert the right.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document

39. Demand appropriate compensation for employees in state-related high positions.

Short description:

Preparation and process of any separation and annexation and are can only take effect after a public voting has authorized it in advance (in any case at least a year ago).

Further explanations or details to the right:

See in the document: "The citizens'/owners' rights framework attachments"

Why this Right Exists:

Appropriate salary helps to employ high quality employees (even elected) and at the same is effective against corruption.

Those employees (even elected) have to make huge financial decisions that raises the probability of corruption. E.g. well-paid state employees were/are one important cornerstone of Singapore's successful fight against corruption.

On the other hand, there have to be a maximum limit.

Relationship:

citizen <-> state-related or community-related organizations

Violation:

by not complying with the right, sabotaging the request procedure

Legitimate requests of the owners:

apply the specified salary ranges

Who can assert this right, and how?:

Only individual citizens (acting in their own capacity, not as a group or movement) may assert.

for further details, see the „How to Try to Enforce Your Rights and Make a Complaint” document