The Longest-Running Error in Human History

A story in twelve scenes, for anyone who has ever wondered why the world works the way it does — and whether it has to

A note before you begin: this story is true. The characters are fictional. The mechanism that connects them is not. Every footnote in this document points to a formal proof — a mathematical derivation that anyone can follow and that no one has yet refuted. The proofs have been publicly available since 2009. They have not been incorporated into any standard curriculum in economics, finance, or law. You are about to find out why.

Scene 1

The Kitchen

6:47 am. Lisbon.

Maria has been a nurse for twenty-two years. She is not bad with money. She does not gamble. She has never missed a payment.

She is standing at her kitchen table looking at a number on a piece of paper. The number is what she owes on her apartment. She bought the apartment when the number was smaller. She has been paying every month for eleven years. The number is now larger than the day she started.

She finishes her coffee. She will spend the day keeping people alive. The number will get larger while she does.

She assumes she is missing something. That somewhere there is an explanation that would make sense of it — something about how economies work, something she didn't study, something the experts understand. She is a nurse, not an economist. She defers to the framework she cannot see.

She is not missing anything. The experts do not have the explanation she is looking for. The explanation has been suppressed not by conspiracy but by something more durable: a question

that the framework never asks of itself.

The question is: *what is a unit of money, exactly?*

Not what it buys. Not what governments say it is. Not what markets assign to it. What *is* it — what are the necessary and sufficient conditions for something to count as one unit?

Ask that question of any central bank. Ask it of any economics faculty. You will receive an answer that defines money in terms of itself. The unit is worth what people will give for it. What will people give for it? Whatever they believe it is worth. The definition is circular. It has no external anchor.

This is not an opinion. A definition that refers only to itself is formally invalid by the same standard that makes "a metre is whatever a metre is" an invalid definition of length. A metre is valid because it is anchored to the distance light travels in 1/299,792,458 of a second — a phenomenon that exists independently of anyone's belief about it.

Maria's mortgage is denominated in a unit that has no equivalent anchor. Every payment she makes, every number on every piece of paper, every calculation her bank has ever performed — all of it is built on a unit that cannot tell her what it fundamentally is.[1]

She goes to work. Somewhere else in the world, a child is about to ask the question Maria stopped asking twenty years ago.

Proof 1

[1] The existence proof: a valid concept requires an intensional definition — necessary and sufficient conditions determinable independently of the thing being defined. The monetary unit fails this requirement. This is proved in Chapter 1 of the MSTA Policy Document using the standard of formal logic. It is the same standard that makes mathematical recursion valid when it has a base case and invalid when it does not. The monetary unit has no base case.

Scene 2

The Ruler

7:15 am. A school in São Paulo.

A girl named Elena is eight years old. She is measuring a piece of paper with a ruler.

Her father, who walked her to school this morning, told her at breakfast that they cannot afford the school trip this year. She did not ask why. She is eight. She noticed that he looked away when he said it.

In class, she finishes her measurement and puts the ruler down. She picks it up again. She looks at it.

She raises her hand.

"If the ruler got a little bit longer every time I measured something," she says, "then the things I measured would seem to be getting shorter even if they stayed the same. And I wouldn't be able to tell, because I'd only have the ruler."

The teacher smiles. "That's very creative, Elena."

Elena looks at the ruler. She does not think she is being creative. She thinks she has noticed something.

She has. What she has noticed is the precise mechanism by which a monetary unit with independent commodity value corrupts every measurement it makes — not by changing the objects it measures, but by changing itself. The ruler gets longer. Goods and wages appear to fall in real terms not because they are actually less, but because the unit measuring them is accumulating value of its own and dragging the ratio.

Elena will not study economics. She will become an engineer. She will spend her career measuring things with instruments that are externally anchored and independently verifiable. She will trust her measurements. She will never quite understand why economic measurements feel different — why they always seem to be telling her something slightly wrong about the world.

The feeling is correct. The measurements are contaminated at the unit level.

In Lisbon, Maria is taking a patient's blood pressure with a calibrated instrument. She trusts the reading. She does not know that her mortgage is measured with an instrument that would make her stethoscope useless if applied to the same standard.[2]

Proof 2

[2] The measurement invalidity proof: a valid measure must satisfy independence from the objects it measures, passivity (output cannot exceed input), countable additivity, decidability, and non-negativity. These are the Lebesgue measure conditions. The monetary unit fails independence and passivity simultaneously. This is formally equivalent to using a thermometer whose reading changes based on the temperature of the thermometer itself. The proof is in Chapter 5 of the MSTA Policy Document, using the Radon-Nikodym theorem.

Scene 3

The Physicist

9:00 am. Geneva.

Dr. Yuki Tanaka works at a metrology institute. Her job is to ensure that measurements are valid — that when a scientist anywhere in the world measures a kilogram, they are measuring the same thing as every other scientist measuring a kilogram.

She is preparing a lecture on the history of measurement standards. She reaches the section on the monetary unit.

She stops.

She has been asked to add a section on currency to a broader course on measurement standards. She has spent two weeks looking for the monetary unit's external anchor — the independently observable phenomenon to which the unit is tied, the way the metre is tied to the speed of light, the way the second is tied to the resonance frequency of caesium-133.

She cannot find one.

She calls a colleague at an economics faculty. She explains what she is looking for. He laughs, not unkindly. "That's not how currency works," he says. "Currency isn't a physical measurement. It's a social instrument."

"But it's used to measure value," she says. "Contracts are denominated in it. Prices are expressed in it. People make decisions based on it. If it's not anchored, then all of those measurements are..."

She trails off. She knows what she wants to say but she is not an economist and she does not want to overreach.

What she wants to say is: *all of those measurements are invalid by the standards of every other measurement discipline on Earth.*

She is correct.[3]

She will not include the section in her lecture. She will tell the course coordinator that the monetary unit is outside her area of expertise. She will go back to measuring things that can be measured. She will not think about the conversation again.

In São Paulo, Elena is putting her ruler away. In Lisbon, Maria is reading a patient's chart. Neither of them knows about Dr. Tanaka. None of them knows about James.

Proof 3

[3] The metrology failure: every unit in the International System of Units has an external, independently observable anchor. The monetary unit is the only unit in regular use in human civilisation that does not. When a measurement standard is not anchored, every measurement made with it is formally indeterminate — it can be consistent with itself while being disconnected from the reality it claims to measure. This is not a philosophical observation. It is a technical requirement of measurement science. The proof is in Chapter 4 of the MSTA Policy Document.

Scene 4

The Economist Who Cannot See the Cause

9:23 am. Nairobi.

James has two postgraduate degrees in economics. He has spent fifteen years advising governments on monetary policy. He is the smartest person in most rooms he enters.

He is preparing a briefing on food inflation. Maize prices have risen thirty-one percent in eight months. He will recommend a combination of interest rate adjustment and targeted subsidy. He has given this briefing, in different forms, in different countries, for fifteen years. The numbers change. The recommendations do not. The results do not either.

What James does not know — what his training has never equipped him to ask — is whether the framework he is working inside is capable of seeing the cause of the problem he is diagnosing.

It is not.

The framework treats the monetary unit as given. It examines what happens between monetary units — prices, rates, flows — but it never examines what the unit is. This is like a physician who studies the interaction of drugs without ever examining whether the instrument measuring the doses is calibrated. The prescriptions will be internally consistent. They will not reliably produce the intended outcomes.

The price of maize in Nairobi is partly a function of a monetary instrument priced in dollars that carries an independent commodity value — a value that compounds across every transaction in the supply chain between an American farm and a Kenyan market stall. This compounding is not a market event. It is not a supply shock. It is the monetary unit's own cost, transmitted through every price that references the dollar as a benchmark.

James's briefing does not include this. It cannot. The framework has no category for a cost that originates at the level of the unit's definition. The unit is assumed valid. If the unit is invalid, the framework is measuring with a broken thermometer and every reading is contaminated.

The briefing will be accurate within the framework. The framework does not include what is causing the problem.

He will present to the minister at eleven. The recommendations will be implemented. The prices will continue to rise.

As James edits his slides, in a building across the city a junior researcher is looking at a paper she found through an unusual search. The paper uses control engineering mathematics to analyse monetary systems. She finds it compelling. She sends it to James with a note: *"Have you seen this? It might be relevant."* He will not read it. He is busy. He has a briefing to deliver.■

Proof 4

■ *The decidability failure: a claim is formally decidable only if there exist determinate truth conditions by which any instance can be adjudicated true or false. Under a circular definition of the monetary unit, monetary valuations are undecidable — there is no external standard by which to determine whether any given price correctly represents real value. This is the Gödel-Tarski condition applied to monetary claims. A framework built on undecidable units cannot produce determinate diagnoses of the phenomena it measures. The proof is in Chapter 3 of the MSTA Policy Document.*

Scene 5

The Room Where the Tools Don't Reach

10:30 am. An undisclosed location.

Twelve people are sitting around a table. They have between them perhaps three hundred years of combined experience in monetary policy. Several have led central banks. Several have won the profession's highest awards. All of them are looking at the same problem.

The problem is that their tools are not working.

They have raised rates. Inflation persisted. They have lowered rates. Growth did not follow. They have deployed quantitative easing at scales that would have seemed impossible twenty years ago. They have introduced forward guidance, yield curve management, macro-prudential frameworks. Each intervention produces effects. The effects are not the predicted ones. The system finds new channels.

They are not incompetent. They are not corrupt. They are applying the best available tools of the most sophisticated monetary policy frameworks ever developed, with genuine commitment to the outcomes they are seeking.

The tools do not reach the problem. This is not because the tools are weak. It is because the problem exists at a level the tools were not designed to reach — the definitional level, where the unit itself is constituted. Every tool in the room operates on quantities and rates of a given unit. None of them can operate on the definition of the unit, because the framework assumes the unit is valid before any tool is applied.

Correcting a definitional error requires operating at the level of definition. Monetary policy operates at the level of rate and supply. The gap between these levels is not a matter of political will or technical sophistication. It is structural. No amount of the right tool can substitute for the right level.

One of the people in the room knows this. She has known it for three years. She has a paper on her desk — the same paper James's junior researcher sent him this morning, found through a different route. She read it. She found no error in it. She has shown it to two colleagues she trusts. They found no error either.

She has not circulated it. She does not know what circulating it would mean — for the institution, for the framework, for the careers of everyone in the room. She tells herself she needs more time to think about it. She has been telling herself this for three years.■

In Nairobi, James is finishing his slides. In Lisbon, Maria is on her lunch break, looking at her phone, checking her bank balance. The number is slightly larger than it was this morning.

Proof 5

■ *The policy impossibility proof: conventional monetary policy operates at the level of rates and supply. The definitional error exists at the level of the unit itself. No intervention at the level of rates or supply can correct something that exists at the level of definition. This is a structural proof, not a criticism of central bank competence. A physician adjusting doses cannot correct a miscalibrated measuring instrument by changing the prescription. The proof is in Chapter 21 of the MSTA Policy Document.*

Scene 6

The Factory and the Bond Market

11:05 am. Lyon.

Pierre employs fourteen people. He makes precision components for medical equipment. His work is good. His clients pay reliably. He has never missed a payroll.

He is on the phone with his bank. The loan he took to buy new machinery — machinery that has already paid for itself twice over in productivity — has been reclassified. The interest rate is adjusting. His monthly payment will increase by four hundred euros.

Four hundred euros is the salary margin on one employee.

The rate adjustment is connected to something that happened last week in a bond market in a country Pierre has never visited. A government in that country made a statement about its fiscal policy. Traders adjusted their positions. A benchmark rate moved. Pierre's loan, which is referenced to that benchmark, now costs four hundred euros more per month.

Pierre has never met anyone involved in any of those decisions. None of them have ever heard of him. The connection between their actions and his payroll is real, precise, and invisible.

It is also not a natural feature of economies. It is a specific consequence of a specific mechanism: when financial services are priced as a percentage of transacted value rather than as a flat charge for the actual cost of the service, every interest rate in the world becomes connected to every other through a web of benchmark references that transmit the monetary unit's own compounding cost across every border, every sector, every supply chain.

Change the pricing to a flat charge grounded in the actual cost of the recording service — which is what the passive unit definition requires — and the bond market in another country loses its power over Pierre's payroll. The connection is severed. Not by regulation, not by international

agreement, but by the correction of the definition that created the connection.

Pierre does not lay anyone off this month. He tells his team the business is fine. He goes home and lies awake.

In Nairobi, the price of maize is still thirty-one percent higher than it was eight months ago. There is a drought forming in the east of the continent.■

Proof 6

■ *The international transmission proof: the monetary compounding mechanism does not stop at national borders. Any currency with B>0 used as a pricing benchmark transmits its compounding cost through every supply chain that references it. The price of food in Nairobi is partly a function of the compounding mechanism in the dollar. This is not a market phenomenon. It is a structural consequence of how the unit is defined. The proof is in Chapter 13 of the MSTA Policy Document, including a formal demonstration of exchange rate equivalence under passive currencies.*

Scene 7

The Cost of Keeping People Alive

2:30 pm. The Horn of Africa.

The drought is real. The crop failure is real. The hunger is real.

A logistics coordinator named Kwame is managing the arrival of emergency food shipments. He has been doing this work for nine years. He is experienced, organised, effective. He is also perpetually frustrated by a number he has never been able to explain to anyone above him.

The number is the gap between what the food costs at the source and what it costs by the time it reaches a person who needs it. The gap is not accounted for by transport, storage, handling, or administration. He has looked at every line item. The gap is larger than all of those combined.

The gap is the monetary unit's cost, layered through every transaction in the supply chain. The shipment is financed with a credit facility denominated in dollars. The credit carries interest — a percentage of the outstanding balance. The government receiving the shipment has a loan from an international institution to fund emergency response — interest on the loan, compounding. The currency conversion from dollars to local currency occurs at an exchange rate that reflects the dollar's independent commodity value — a further transmission. Each layer adds a percentage. Each percentage compounds with the others.

By the time the food arrives, the monetary cost of the transaction is substantially larger than the physical cost of the food. The difference does not feed anyone. It is extracted by the compounding mechanism, distributed across the financial institutions that provided each layer of intermediation.

Kwame will file a report this quarter noting the gap. The report will be read by people who will nod and say the supply chain needs efficiency improvements. No efficiency improvement can close a gap generated at the level of the unit's definition.

The emergency will be managed. It will recur. It will recur again.

As Kwame closes his laptop, in Lyon Pierre is staring at his bank's letter. In Nairobi James is presenting his recommendations to the minister. In Geneva Dr. Tanaka is delivering her lecture. In a courtroom in Frankfurt, a contract lawyer named Heinrich is about to discover something that will make him unable to sleep.■

Proof 7

■ *The BIBO instability proof: a Bounded Input, Bounded Output stable system produces bounded outputs from bounded inputs. The formula C■ = W(1+r)■ produces an unbounded output (compounding nominal obligations) from a bounded input (real productive capacity W). This is not a model or a prediction — it is an arithmetic identity. Any system operating under this formula must eventually produce a gap between nominal obligations and real productive capacity that cannot be closed by productive activity alone. The proof is Theorem 1 in Chapter 8 of the MSTA Policy Document.*

Scene 8

The Lawyer Who Looked Too Closely

3:15 pm. Frankfurt.

Heinrich has been a contract lawyer for thirty-one years. He is meticulous, precise, and thorough. He has reviewed thousands of financial contracts. He has never found one he could not understand.

He is reviewing a case in which a client disputes the terms of a loan denominated in a currency whose value fluctuated severely during the contract period. The client's argument is that the contract was not honoured in its original intent because the unit of denomination changed substantially in value. The bank's argument is that the unit is whatever the market says it is.

Heinrich pulls the thread. If the unit is whatever the market says it is, then the contract does not have a determinate object at the time of signing — because what the unit will be worth in the future is by definition unknowable. A contract without a determinate object is void. Not voidable — void. From the beginning.

He finds the legal principle without difficulty: *quae ab initio non valent ex post facto convalescere non possunt* — that which is void from the beginning cannot be validated by subsequent events.

He sits with this for a long time.

He pulls another thread. If one financial contract denominated in a unit without a valid definition is void from the beginning, then the principle applies to every financial contract denominated in any currency without a valid definition. Which is all of them. Which means — he stops.

He walks to his window. He looks at the street below. People are moving through their day. Contracts are being signed. Mortgages are being serviced. Debt is being issued. Every one of those transactions is denominated in a unit that, by the standard of the legal principle he has just applied, has no determinate object.

He does not know what to do with this. It is too large. He is a contract lawyer, not a monetary theorist. He does not have the language for what he has found.

He files the case. He finds a narrower argument that resolves his client's dispute without touching the larger question. He does not mention his discovery to anyone.

He goes home. He pours a drink. He thinks about Maria in Lisbon, though he has never heard of her — he thinks about everyone servicing a mortgage denominated in a unit that cannot tell you what it is. He thinks about whether they agreed to what they agreed to.

He concludes that they did not know what they agreed to, because the unit they agreed to transact in has never been defined. Whether that constitutes agreement, in the formal legal sense, he cannot determine. He is not sure anyone can.■

Proof 8

■ *The legal invalidity proof: a contract requires a determinate object — the parties must be able to know what they are agreeing to. A contract denominated in a unit without a valid definition lacks a determinate object. Under the principle quae ab initio non valent ex post facto convalescere non possunt, such a contract is void from the beginning. This applies to every financial contract denominated in any currency currently in use. The proof is in Chapter 20 of the MSTA Policy Document. It is the most consequential proof in the document and the one most consistently avoided.*

Scene 9

The Engineer and the Idea That Cannot Be Built

4:00 pm. Copenhagen.

Erik is a sustainability engineer. He has spent eight years developing a technology that captures methane from agricultural waste and converts it to energy. The technology works. At a flat-cost financing rate, the system pays for itself in six years.

He cannot raise the capital to scale it.

Every investor he speaks to applies a discount rate to the future returns. The discount rate reflects the compounding cost of capital — the percentage return required to justify deploying money now rather than later. At the current cost of capital, the system's six-year payback period

is too long. The returns are real, but they arrive too slowly relative to the compounding benchmark.

The technology that would work in physical terms cannot be built in financial terms. Not because it is not viable. Because the compounding mechanism makes long-horizon investments structurally non-competitive with short-horizon extraction.

This is the functional analysis proof made visible: the same real productive activity — the same methane captured, the same energy generated — produces different financial valuations depending on how it is financed and over what horizon. The value of the activity is path-dependent in financial terms even though it is path-independent in physical terms.

A valid monetary unit would preserve path-independence. The real value of the activity would be the same regardless of the financing structure. Under a passive unit, the flat cost of the recording service does not compound across time horizons. A six-year investment and a six-month investment are evaluated on the same basis: what real value do they produce?

Under the current unit, the six-year investment will always struggle against the six-month extraction. The technology that could work cannot be built. Not this year. Not next year. Not while the compounding mechanism remains uncorrected.

In Frankfurt, Heinrich is pouring his drink. In Lyon, Pierre is lying awake. In Nairobi, James's recommendations have been accepted. In the Horn of Africa, Kwame has filed his report.■

Proof 9

■ *The path-dependence proof: the value of a joint productive activity, expressed as a Lebesgue integral over individual contributions, is path-independent — it depends on what was produced, not on how the production was financed. A valid monetary unit preserves this path-independence. The current unit violates it: the same real activity produces different nominal valuations depending on the financing structure and time horizon. This makes long-horizon investments structurally non-competitive with short-horizon extraction, independent of their real productive value. The proof is in Chapter 7 of the MSTA Policy Document.*

Scene 10

The War That Was Rational

6:00 pm. An undisclosed location.

A general is reviewing an analysis prepared by his staff. The analysis concerns the economic conditions in a neighbouring region — debt levels, resource availability, the projected trajectory of nominal obligations relative to real productive capacity.

The analysis concludes that within a certain number of years, the neighbouring government will face a choice between two forms of default: default on its financial obligations, or default on its obligations to its population. In either case, the political stability of the region will deteriorate

sharply.

The general does not think of this as a monetary analysis. He thinks of it as a strategic assessment. But the mechanism underlying the assessment is the same mechanism Maria faces in her kitchen, the same mechanism Pierre faces on the phone with his bank, the same mechanism Kwame faces in his supply chain. Nominal obligations compounding faster than real productive capacity can service them. The formula applying at national scale.

When nominal obligations exceed what real production can service, and no other resolution mechanism is available, organised competition for real resources becomes rational. Not moral — rational. The general is not a moral philosopher. He is a strategic planner. He plans for what is rational.

He does not know that the mechanism he is planning around could be switched off. That a correction at the level of a monetary definition would remove the gap between nominal obligations and real productive capacity that is driving his assessment. He has not been told this because the people who know it — the woman in the central bank room, Heinrich the contract lawyer, the junior researcher in Nairobi — have not yet found a way to make it audible above the noise of the framework.

He approves the analysis. He recommends increasing preparedness.

In Lisbon, Maria is making dinner. She has had a long shift. She is tired. She is not thinking about the general, about Kwame, about Heinrich or Erik. She is thinking about the number on the piece of paper. She is thinking about whether she will ever be free of it.

She will not, under the current system. The formula guarantees it.[1]■

Proof 10

[1]■ The war rationality proof: when nominal financial obligations compound faster than real productive capacity can service them, and no other resolution mechanism is available, organised competition for real resources becomes a structurally rational response. This is not a moral claim about human nature. It is a derived consequence of applying C■ = W(1+r)■ at the scale of national economies over time. The proof is in Chapter 21a, Section 5 of the MSTA Policy Document.

Scene 11

The Advocate Who Is Right About the Wrong Thing

7:30 pm. Washington D.C.

Professor Chen has spent twenty years developing and promoting Modern Monetary Theory. She genuinely believes it offers a way out. She is right about some things and not right about others, and the distinction matters precisely.

She is right that a sovereign government issuing its own currency cannot be forced into nominal insolvency. It can always create more units. She is right that this means nominal scarcity of the monetary unit is a choice, not a physical constraint. She is right that this creates space for governments to fund productive employment and public goods that markets underserve.

She is not right that any of this resolves the monetary problem. And here is the precise reason why.

MMT does not change the unit definition. It takes the existing unit — B greater than zero, undefined in the formal sense, carrying independent commodity value, generating C■ = W(1+r)■ at the private level — and proposes changes to who issues it and in what quantity. The units enter the economy as spending. They exit as taxation. The government does not borrow in the conventional sense.

But once those units are in private circulation, they carry the same B greater than zero that every other unit carries. Private banks still lend them at interest. Financial services still charge percentage fees. The secondary compounding mechanism runs at full power across every private transaction. Professor Chen's reform removes the government's own debt-interest problem. It does not remove the mechanism that generates Maria's problem, Pierre's problem, Kwame's problem, the general's problem.

Worse: issuing more units into a B greater than zero system expands the base W on which C■ = W(1+r)■ operates. More units, same compounding rate, larger nominal obligations in aggregate. The formula grows faster.

Professor Chen is standing at the switch. She can see that the light is off. She is proposing to install a second power source without fixing the switch. The light will still not turn on.

She has heard of the MSTA framework. She has not engaged with it. She is busy. She has a lecture to give.[11]

[11] The MMT instability proof: MMT operates with B>0 units and is therefore necessarily BIBO unstable by Theorem 1, regardless of the issuance arrangement. Sovereign issuance does not cure B>0 because B>0 is a property of the unit definition, not of the issuing institution. Furthermore, increasing the quantity of B>0 units in circulation expands the compounding base W without correcting the compounding mechanism. The formal critique is in Appendix C, Objection O-12 of the MSTA Policy Document.

Scene 12

The Same Kitchen. One Year Later.

6:47 am. Lisbon. Twelve months have passed.

Maria is standing at her kitchen table. She is looking at a number on a piece of paper. The number is smaller than it was a year ago.

Not because she received a windfall. Not because interest rates happened to fall. Not because of a government subsidy or a debt restructuring or a legal challenge. Because something changed at the level of the definition of the unit her mortgage is denominated in.

The change happened quietly. It did not require a revolution. It did not require the dismantling of any institution. It required a correction to a definition — a correction that had been formally proved necessary and formally proved sufficient for over fifteen years before anyone with the authority to implement it did so.

The new unit carries no independent commodity value. It is a passive record of value given and value owed — nothing more, nothing less. The cost of the recording service is charged as a flat amount grounded in the actual cost of the service. Not as a percentage of the balance outstanding. Not as a function of a benchmark set in a bond market in a country she has never visited.

The clock no longer runs while she sleeps.

What she owes reflects only what she borrowed, plus the flat cost of the service, minus what she has paid. The number goes down every month. Predictably. By an amount she can calculate in advance and trust.

She makes her coffee. She thinks about going to work. She does not think about the number, because the number is no longer doing anything she has not authorised it to do.

Across the city, a factory is being funded. The investor applied a flat service cost to the financing rather than a compounding percentage benchmark. The project's six-year payback period is now evaluated on the same basis as a six-month project: what does it produce? Erik's technology is being built.

In Nairobi, food prices have stabilised. The compounding cost of the dollar's commodity value is no longer being transmitted through the maize supply chain, because the unit denominating that chain no longer carries commodity value. James's next briefing contains a line he has never written before: *the mechanism driving the transmission has been corrected at the source.*

Kwame's gap has closed. Not entirely — transport, storage, handling, administration remain. But the monetary extraction layer is gone. More food reaches more people with the same resources.

Heinrich is sleeping.

The general's analysis needs to be revised. The trajectory he was planning around has changed. The gap between nominal obligations and real productive capacity is narrowing rather than widening. His staff prepare a new assessment. The word "preparedness" appears less often.

Elena, now nine, is doing her homework. She picks up her ruler. It measures what it measures. It does not get longer when she uses it. She puts it down. She gets on with her work.

Professor Chen has read the MSTA document. She has found no error in the proof. She is rewriting her lecture notes. It is taking longer than she expected. The framework she is revising is the work of twenty years.

In the central bank building, the woman who has had the paper on her desk for three years has forwarded it to the full committee. She does not know yet what will come of it. She knows she can no longer justify the delay.[12]

Proof 12

[12] The Stable Currency Unit Theorem (Gauvin and Domínguez, 2011): if every transaction is Passive BIBO stable and all units created are necessarily products of such stable transactions, then all such units will necessarily maintain a bounded ratio with all system inputs and therefore the units will be stable by definition. Stability is the default state of any monetary recording system in the absence of B>0. The instability we observe is not the natural condition of monetary systems. It is introduced by a single definitional error and it is the only thing standing between the current world and a stable one. The correction is available. The switch exists. The question is whether the people with the authority to flip it will do so before the consequences of not doing so become irreversible. The formal specification of the corrected system is in Chapter 18 of the MSTA Policy Document V15. The policy requirements for implementation are in Chapter 22.

A Note on What You Have Just Read

This story connects twelve people who have never met. They live on four continents. They work in six different fields. None of them knows about the others. All of them are living inside the consequences of the same cause.

The cause is a single number — B — in the definition of the monetary unit. When B is greater than zero, the unit carries independent commodity value. That value must be priced. The pricing takes the form of a percentage of what is transacted. The percentage compounds. The compounding produces everything described in the twelve scenes above.

When B equals zero — when the unit is a passive record of value transacted, charged at the flat cost of the recording service — none of the compounding mechanism exists. The switch is not a metaphor. It is a variable in a definition.

The formal proofs are in the MSTA Policy Document V15. They have been publicly available since 2009. They have been reviewed by mathematicians and engineers and found to contain no logical error. They have not been incorporated into any standard curriculum.

If you have found an error in any of the twelve proofs referenced in this document, the MSTA coordination team wants to know. If you have not found an error, you already know what follows.

Money Systems Transparency Alliance · moneytransparency.com · policysubmission@moneytransparency.com