

# THE B=0 BRIEF

*Why your costs rise faster than your income — and what the mathematics shows*

You have already seen Layer 1 — The Ruler. You know that  $A = A + B$  is only true if  $B = 0$ , and that every interest-bearing system sets  $B > 0$ . This brief shows you the derivation behind that arithmetic and what it means for your financial life.

## 1. THE CATEGORY ERROR

Every measuring instrument belongs to one domain: it measures something outside itself. A metre measures length. A kilogram measures mass. The instrument is never the thing being measured.

Money claims to measure value. But money is simultaneously the thing whose value is being measured. This means the unit and the measured quantity are drawn from the same domain.

Formally: let  $M$  be the set of monetary quantities and  $C$  be the set of commodities measured. A valid measure requires  $M \cap C = \emptyset$  (empty intersection). The current monetary system sets  $M \cap C \neq \emptyset$ . This is not an economic opinion. It is a set-theoretic statement about the structure of the unit.

**Valid measure:  $M \cap C = \emptyset$       Current money:  $M \cap C \neq \emptyset$**

## 2. THE METROLOGY ARGUMENT

The metre is defined independently of what it measures. It does not change value when used to measure a larger room rather than a smaller one. It cannot earn interest on the length of what it measures.

The kilogram is anchored to a physical invariant. It cannot accumulate mass from being used repeatedly. Its definition is non-circular: it does not define mass in terms of mass.

Ask: what is the monetary unit anchored to? What physical or logical invariant defines one dollar or one euro independently of what it can buy? The conventional answer — that it is worth what people will accept for it — defines it in terms of itself. That is a circular definition. A circular definition is not a definition. It cannot anchor a measurement.

V16 REF

Metrology argument: Chapter 5. Non-circular definition requirement: Chapter 2.  
Set-theoretic derivation: Chapter 3.

## 3. THEOREM 1 — THE INSTABILITY PROOF

If  $B > 0$  (any positive interest rate on any monetary balance), then the monetary quantity  $C_n$  after  $n$  periods is:

$$C_n = W(1 + r)^n$$

As  $n$  increases,  $C_n$  grows without bound. This is the mathematical definition of an unbounded — unstable — system. In control engineering this is called BIBO (Bounded Input Bounded Output) instability: a bounded input (a fixed loan principal) produces an unbounded output (the total obligation over time).

A measuring instrument that grows without bound is not measuring anything. It is accumulating. The instability is not a side effect of the monetary system — it is structurally embedded in the definition of money as  $B > 0$ .

V16 REF

Theorem 1 full derivation: Chapter 6. BIBO stability proof: Chapter 8. Control engineering formulation: Chapter 9.

#### 4. WHAT THIS MEANS IN YOUR FINANCIAL LIFE

The mortgage you pay over 25 years returns two to three times the original principal. The credit card balance that seemed manageable doubles in five years at 15% interest. The pension fund that should grow with the economy instead races to keep up with a unit that itself changes.

These are not misfortunes or mismanagement. They are the mathematical consequence of  $B > 0$  compounding in a system whose unit is structurally unstable. The Theorem 1 formula predicts them exactly.

#### THE PROCEDURAL DEMAND

Send this in writing to your bank, central bank, or relevant authority:

*“Please provide, in writing, a standard non-circular formal definition of the monetary unit and its symbol that satisfies the necessary and sufficient conditions for a valid unit of measure, as applied in any other metrological standard. If no such definition exists, please confirm this in writing.”*

**Log your demand and its response: [moneytransparency.com/demand-registry](https://moneytransparency.com/demand-registry)**

*Reproduction expressly granted. No permission required. Forward freely.*  
MSTA · [moneytransparency.com](https://moneytransparency.com) · [bibocurrency.com](https://bibocurrency.com) · Marc Gauvin · 2026

# THE B=0 BRIEF

*Why your production costs structurally outpace your revenue — and what the proof shows*

You run a business. You observe that input costs rise faster than you can raise prices. That working capital loans compound faster than turnover grows. That profit margins compress even in years of growth. This brief explains why — not as economics, but as mathematics.

## 1. THE CATEGORY ERROR

Every measuring instrument belongs to one domain: it measures something outside itself. A metre measures length. A kilogram measures mass. The instrument is never the thing being measured.

Money claims to measure value. But money is simultaneously the thing whose value is being measured. This means the unit and the measured quantity are drawn from the same domain.

Formally: let  $M$  be the set of monetary quantities and  $C$  be the set of commodities measured. A valid measure requires  $M \cap C = \emptyset$  (empty intersection). The current monetary system sets  $M \cap C \neq \emptyset$ . This is not an economic opinion. It is a set-theoretic statement about the structure of the unit.

**Valid measure:  $M \cap C = \emptyset$      Current money:  $M \cap C \neq \emptyset$**

## 2. THE METROLOGY ARGUMENT

The metre is defined independently of what it measures. It does not change value when used to measure a larger room rather than a smaller one. It cannot earn interest on the length of what it measures.

The kilogram is anchored to a physical invariant. It cannot accumulate mass from being used repeatedly. Its definition is non-circular: it does not define mass in terms of mass.

Ask: what is the monetary unit anchored to? What physical or logical invariant defines one dollar or one euro independently of what it can buy? The conventional answer — that it is worth what people will accept for it — defines it in terms of itself. That is a circular definition. A circular definition is not a definition. It cannot anchor a measurement.

V16 REF

Metrology argument: Chapter 5. Non-circular definition requirement: Chapter 2.  
Set-theoretic derivation: Chapter 3.

## 3. THEOREM 1 — THE INSTABILITY PROOF

If  $B > 0$  (any positive interest rate on any monetary balance), then the monetary quantity  $C_n$  after  $n$  periods is:

$$C_n = W(1 + r)^n$$

As  $n$  increases,  $C_n$  grows without bound. This is the mathematical definition of an unbounded — unstable — system. In control engineering this is called BIBO (Bounded Input Bounded Output) instability: a bounded input (a fixed loan principal) produces an unbounded output (the total obligation over time).

A measuring instrument that grows without bound is not measuring anything. It is accumulating. The instability is not a side effect of the monetary system — it is structurally embedded in the definition of money as  $B > 0$ .

V16 REF

Theorem 1 full derivation: Chapter 6. BIBO stability proof: Chapter 8. Control engineering formulation: Chapter 9.

#### 4. THE MOZART'S TOWN VALUE CHAIN

V16 Chapter 6 traces a complete value chain from raw material to final consumer good in a hypothetical economy. At each production stage, monetary balances compound under Theorem 1. The result: the total monetary obligation generated by the value chain always exceeds the monetary value of the goods produced. The gap is not recoverable through efficiency. It is structurally embedded in  $B > 0$ .

This is the mechanism behind cost-price squeeze for SMEs. You are not failing to be efficient enough. You are operating in a system whose unit is structurally biased against production and toward accumulation of monetary balances.

#### THE PROCEDURAL DEMAND

Send this in writing to your bank, central bank, or relevant authority:

*“Please provide, in writing, a standard non-circular formal definition of the monetary unit and its symbol that satisfies the necessary and sufficient conditions for a valid unit of measure, as applied in any other metrological standard. If no such definition exists, please confirm this in writing.”*

**Log your demand and its response: [moneytransparency.com/demand-registry](https://moneytransparency.com/demand-registry)**

# THE B=0 BRIEF

*The fungibility failure derivation and its legal consequences*

Financial contracts derive their validity from the premise that the unit of denomination is a valid measure of value. If that premise fails at the definitional level, the question of validity arises prior to any question of performance, breach, or remedy. This brief presents the formal derivation.

## 1. THE CATEGORY ERROR

Every measuring instrument belongs to one domain: it measures something outside itself. A metre measures length. A kilogram measures mass. The instrument is never the thing being measured.

Money claims to measure value. But money is simultaneously the thing whose value is being measured. This means the unit and the measured quantity are drawn from the same domain.

Formally: let  $M$  be the set of monetary quantities and  $C$  be the set of commodities measured. A valid measure requires  $M \cap C = \emptyset$  (empty intersection). The current monetary system sets  $M \cap C \neq \emptyset$ . This is not an economic opinion. It is a set-theoretic statement about the structure of the unit.

**Valid measure:  $M \cap C = \emptyset$       Current money:  $M \cap C \neq \emptyset$**

## 2. THE METROLOGY ARGUMENT

The metre is defined independently of what it measures. It does not change value when used to measure a larger room rather than a smaller one. It cannot earn interest on the length of what it measures.

The kilogram is anchored to a physical invariant. It cannot accumulate mass from being used repeatedly. Its definition is non-circular: it does not define mass in terms of mass.

Ask: what is the monetary unit anchored to? What physical or logical invariant defines one dollar or one euro independently of what it can buy? The conventional answer — that it is worth what people will accept for it — defines it in terms of itself. That is a circular definition. A circular definition is not a definition. It cannot anchor a measurement.

V16 REF

Metrology argument: Chapter 5. Non-circular definition requirement: Chapter 2.  
Set-theoretic derivation: Chapter 3.

## 3. THEOREM 1 — THE INSTABILITY PROOF

If  $B > 0$  (any positive interest rate on any monetary balance), then the monetary quantity  $C_n$  after  $n$  periods is:

$$C_n = W(1 + r)^n$$

As  $n$  increases,  $C_n$  grows without bound. This is the mathematical definition of an unbounded — unstable — system. In control engineering this is called BIBO (Bounded Input Bounded Output) instability: a bounded input (a fixed loan principal) produces an unbounded output (the total obligation over time).

A measuring instrument that grows without bound is not measuring anything. It is accumulating. The instability is not a side effect of the monetary system — it is structurally embedded in the definition of money as  $B > 0$ .

V16 REF

Theorem 1 full derivation: Chapter 6. BIBO stability proof: Chapter 8. Control engineering formulation: Chapter 9.

#### 4. THE FUNGIBILITY FAILURE AND QVAE AB INITIO NON VALENT

Legal fungibility requires that units of the same denomination be interchangeable without loss of value. This requires that the unit be stable — i.e. that  $B = 0$  across the period of the contract. Theorem 1 demonstrates that under  $B > 0$ , no two monetary units at different points in time represent the same value. The fungibility condition fails from the moment  $B > 0$  is introduced into the definition.

The maxim *quae ab initio non valent, ex post facto convallescere non possunt* — that which is void from the beginning cannot be made valid by subsequent events — applies where the defect is definitional rather than performative. V16 Chapter 20 presents the five-step fungibility derivation as the basis for a legal brief.

V16 REF

Fungibility derivation: Chapter 20. Quae ab initio: Chapter 21a. Procedural demand instrument: Chapter 20, Section 5.

#### THE PROCEDURAL DEMAND

Send this in writing to your bank, central bank, or relevant authority:

*“Please provide, in writing, a standard non-circular formal definition of the monetary unit and its symbol that satisfies the necessary and sufficient conditions for a valid unit of measure, as applied in any other metrological standard. If no such definition exists, please confirm this in writing.”*

**Log your demand and its response: [moneytransparency.com/demand-registry](https://moneytransparency.com/demand-registry)**

# THE B=0 BRIEF

*BIBO instability, metrological failure, and measure-theoretic non-compliance*

The argument is a result in measurement science and control engineering with monetary implications. It requires no prior knowledge of economics. The following is the condensed formal statement. Full derivations are in V16.

## 1. THE CATEGORY ERROR

Every measuring instrument belongs to one domain: it measures something outside itself. A metre measures length. A kilogram measures mass. The instrument is never the thing being measured.

Money claims to measure value. But money is simultaneously the thing whose value is being measured. This means the unit and the measured quantity are drawn from the same domain.

Formally: let  $M$  be the set of monetary quantities and  $C$  be the set of commodities measured. A valid measure requires  $M \cap C = \emptyset$  (empty intersection). The current monetary system sets  $M \cap C \neq \emptyset$ . This is not an economic opinion. It is a set-theoretic statement about the structure of the unit.

**Valid measure:  $M \cap C = \emptyset$       Current money:  $M \cap C \neq \emptyset$**

## 2. THE METROLOGY ARGUMENT

The metre is defined independently of what it measures. It does not change value when used to measure a larger room rather than a smaller one. It cannot earn interest on the length of what it measures.

The kilogram is anchored to a physical invariant. It cannot accumulate mass from being used repeatedly. Its definition is non-circular: it does not define mass in terms of mass.

Ask: what is the monetary unit anchored to? What physical or logical invariant defines one dollar or one euro independently of what it can buy? The conventional answer — that it is worth what people will accept for it — defines it in terms of itself. That is a circular definition. A circular definition is not a definition. It cannot anchor a measurement.

V16 REF

Metrology argument: Chapter 5. Non-circular definition requirement: Chapter 2.  
Set-theoretic derivation: Chapter 3.

## 3. THEOREM 1 — THE INSTABILITY PROOF

If  $B > 0$  (any positive interest rate on any monetary balance), then the monetary quantity  $C_n$  after  $n$  periods is:

$$C_n = W(1 + r)^n$$

As  $n$  increases,  $C_n$  grows without bound. This is the mathematical definition of an unbounded — unstable — system. In control engineering this is called BIBO (Bounded Input Bounded Output) instability: a bounded input (a fixed loan principal) produces an unbounded output (the total obligation over time).

A measuring instrument that grows without bound is not measuring anything. It is accumulating. The instability is not a side effect of the monetary system — it is structurally embedded in the definition of money as  $B > 0$ .

V16 REF

Theorem 1 full derivation: Chapter 6. BIBO stability proof: Chapter 8. Control engineering formulation: Chapter 9.

#### 4. LEBESGUE MEASURE COMPLIANCE

A valid measure in the Lebesgue sense requires: (i) a well-defined sigma-algebra over the measured space; (ii) countable additivity; (iii) a null set condition. The monetary unit fails (i) because  $M \cap C \neq \emptyset$  means the measure and the measured space are not disjoint — the sigma-algebra is not well-defined over an independent domain.

The Radon-Nikodym theorem requires absolute continuity of the measure with respect to a reference measure. A unit defined circularly has no independent reference measure. Absolute continuity cannot be established.

The BIBO instability result ( $C_n = W(1+r)^n$ ,  $r > 0$ ) demonstrates that the system is not BIBO stable under any bounded input. This is a falsifiable engineering claim. It has not been refuted in any technical forum.

V16 REF

Lebesgue compliance: Chapter 7. Radon-Nikodym: Chapter 7, Section 3. BIBO full proof: Chapter 8. Decidability: Chapter 11.

#### THE PROCEDURAL DEMAND

Send this in writing to your bank, central bank, or relevant authority:

*“Please provide, in writing, a standard non-circular formal definition of the monetary unit and its symbol that satisfies the necessary and sufficient conditions for a valid unit of measure, as applied in any other metrological standard. If no such definition exists, please confirm this in writing.”*

Log your demand and its response: [moneytransparency.com/demand-registry](https://moneytransparency.com/demand-registry)