

The Light Side of the Mooney¹... Money

— from Redistribution to Distribution

Andrea Surbone

*I've seen things you people wouldn't believe.
The environment on fire off of human greed. I
watched the social divide spread so far out
that it becomes a U-shaped turn [...]²*

The free interpretation of Roy's famous monologue in Blade Runner is useful for introducing *Philopony*³ - getting out of the money paradigm, the essay with which I take part in the book "Work and the value of robots - Artificial intelligence and non-occupation".⁴

Philopony, a Succinct Definition

Before starting, a few words about *Philopony*; industriousness in Plato's language and lexicon; is given in the text not only as a talent for doing but parting from stress on effort, on fatigue—πόνος (pain), coming to the concept of commitment, to get involved, both personally and as part of the community...

the laws of economics are artificial laws not to be confused for any reason with the laws of nature... Being able to adopt the ideas of the artificiality of the economy is a first step which is all an inner and intellectual event yet necessary to achieve emancipation.

¹ A literary game of words by the author referring to the title by Pink Floyd "The dark side of the moon".

² Free interpretation of Roy's famous monologue in the movie Blade Runner, by Ridley Scott, 1982. Here the original monologue: *I've seen things you people wouldn't believe. Attack ships on fire off the shoulder of Orion. I watched C-beams glitter in the dark near the Tannhäuser Gate. All those moments will be lost in time, like tears in rain. Time to die.*

³ In the original Italian version is Filoponia

⁴ Andrea Surbone, *Dunia Astrologo*, Pietro Terna: Il lavoro e il valore all'epoca dei robot — Intelligenza artificiale e non-occupazione — Meltemi, Milan 2019 www.meltemieditore.it

Roy's Monologue

Returning to Roy's monologue, there are three free interpretations:

- ❖ *that you people wouldn't believe*, to signify the fideism⁵ with which the current capitalist and financial paradigm is now perceived; fideism that borders on obtuseness at the very moment when every alternative is branded as unnatural and every rebellion as an "act against nature";
- ❖ *The environment on fire off of human greed instead of Attack ships on fire off the shoulder of Orion*, to emphasise the planetary and environmental effects of fideism;
- ❖ *The social divide spreads so far out that it becomes a U-turn instead of C-beams glittering in the dark near the Tannhäuser Gate*, to emphasise the social and economic effects of fideism.

Fideism and Financialisation

Fideism is (perhaps) the greatest success of the financialisation of capitalism⁶: considering - and having almost everyone accepting this consideration - the current corporate structures as "natural" and incontrovertible, despite not being the case.

The economy, the whole economy and whatever ideal it may be based on, is uniquely a human creation; a creation around which, in its millennial development, the *δισσοὶ λόγοι*⁷ have been wasted: and despite the natural fideism that I contest, even today on single technical measures we can find as many enthusiastic acceptances as refutations. In short, the laws of economics are artificial laws not to be confused for any reason with the laws of nature. In fact, it would be better to define them as coerced laws, to further emphasise that they are a product of human thought and to counter the mantra of capitalism as much as possible, which, through a variety of artifices, makes them appear, indeed, as a natural thing, governed by the laws of nature.

Environmental sustainability and natural resources, which are now increasingly scarce, are the essential elements of any proposal.

Being able to adopt the ideas of the artificiality of the economy is a first step which is all an inner and intellectual event yet necessary to achieve emancipation.

Three Aspects in One Proposal

Environmental sustainability and natural resources, which are now increasingly scarce, are the essential elements of any proposal. Although the hypotheses about the future of the world do not always take this into account, intellectual honesty should push us to explicitly declare how we will do it; because something will happen—it is already happening—and, consequently, humanity must adopt some actions. It is not enough to use as an excuse that we are going through a natural climatic cycle. This does not explain in fact about the anthropogenic acceleration of these cycles, nor about the increasingly reduced relationship between resources and the world population; and does not explain how the proposal in question will deal with these issues, which displays the intellectual cowardice of those who bring such an incomplete proposal to the debate in the near future.

⁵ The doctrine that knowledge depends on faith or revelation

⁶ The financialisation of capitalism means the transition from the creation of profit through the production of goods and services to the creation of profit through financial returns.

⁷ For the sophists of ancient Greece, the rhetorical exercise of giving opposite interpretations, both with the same "weight". By *δισσοὶ λόγοι* we mean, therefore, a debate that presents opposite theories, both valid—but often specious, something that often takes place in the economic debate.

*Assessing the three aspects—social, economic, and environmental—
together leads to the urgency of a new world view... a new
paradigm that gives full satisfaction to the human being but
respecting the terrestrial globe and all its “components”...*

Social inequality is also an essential element which, however, pertains to the superstructural characteristics of society, characteristics built by all of us over the millennia. In contrast, the environment relates to the natural sphere, however driven by the effects of the anthropocene. This does not imply that it is deemed of secondary importance, far from it. However, this similarity with the laws of nature occurs precisely because it is stated that the "natural" contrast of the social divide is the social elevator, available to each inhabitant of the globe. Economic fideism makes all of this seem truly within the reach of anyone, when it is just another scam. Thus, addressing the social and economic issues is as much a priority as the environmental issue; not only because inequality has reached "hairpin" levels but also because the plundering of resources shares its matrix with the plundering of human beings, and only tackling this combined matrix can lead to a real solution; real in the sense of overall, all-encompassing, global. In fact, it must address every single aspect. Otherwise, the problem will not be solved.

Assessing the three aspects—social, economic and environmental—together leads to the urgency of a new world view, a new paradigm that can interpret it in the most democratic sense possible. A new paradigm that gives full satisfaction to the human being but respecting the terrestrial globe and all its “components”: mineral, vegetable and animal. It means looking for a way, alternative to the current financial / capitalist one, that saves our contemporaneity and respects the constraint of the scarcity of resources and the degradation of the environment but also improves the human condition—in consideration of the unacceptable disparities still present. I am not referring to the gap between wages in companies but to the billions of people living in poverty and which no proposal worthy of this name can leave behind. Science has even allowed us to overcome natural laws—think of the exploration of space by being able to subdue the law of gravity. Why not contemplate yourself the problem of overcoming, or completely changing, the corporate paradigm which is all of our own creation, to finally get out of the aberration of money of our times?

Such a task is almost impossible, unless abandoning the current paradigm to replace it with a new one, redesigned on conditions unthinkable at the time when the current paradigm was invented—the anthropocentric acceleration of climate cycles and the relationship between resources and the world population. A task that *Philopony* attempts to answer.

In Pursuit of a New and Truly Sustainable Paradigm

Implementing corrective measures on the existing capitalist paradigm, pursuing in this way a change of paradigm, takes a long time, particularly putting them in place. This temporal dynamic is described in the new chapter of *Philopony* - from redistribution to distribution - reported at the end of the essay. Working on corrective measure not only entails endless discussions on them but, in favour of opponents of the new system, gains also the tendency of shifting the attention from the essence of the proposal to the technicalities, thus creating a smoke screen that prevents a clear vision of the new society. A choice of strategic opportunity therefore leads me to imagine a utopia, sewn on the existing paradigm but not to correct it but to directly change it: a new society outside of the current capitalist / financial system and of its reforms and technicalities. To dream is lawful if the dream is possible and above all if it can become a reality. Furthermore, the technology we have today allows us to realise dreams and utopias, hitherto unattainable due to the lack of this technological pillar. To make an analogy: in the same way that music technology has facilitated the birth of progressive rock, anthropology technology can allow the birth of better societies.

There is no doubt that the current society—and I refer to western society, in which I live and which I know—has reached valid levels of well-being, at least for those who belong to classes not yet devastated by exploitation first and then by the crisis. It is at this level of well-being that a new paradigm must try to aim, while awarding the environment with the

utmost respect. It is very true, indeed, that the current world has a wicked and poorly planned consumption of resources. Thus it is likely that placing limitations for sustainability on the market in the present and in the future may prove to be the way to go, in the belief that it is easier to impose rules, restrictions and constraints on the market than on human beings. This is the path that *Philopony* attempts to pursue.

So should we throw away the current economic approach? Perhaps we should just expose and eliminate its negative aspects; which are the two-fold looting—environmental and human exploitation—mentioned above. Solving those aspects will open the door to a new paradigm that will keep its present positive aspects.

The result of decades of observations on the world of work and the economy—the basis of the current paradigm—from within, *Philopony* presents itself as an instruction manual, aimed at building a model that can work and that can also be created immediately. Since it is a utopia, its horizon is global, however its local experimentation is possible here and now. There are seven considerations that we need to reflect upon:

- ❖ The first consideration is more psychological than economic: today's human being finds its personal identity in the job performed waning because of the loss of work and the ruthless insecurity of the jobs that remain. Leaving the human being not only poor and precarious but also stripped of its identity, lost and unimportant—and thus favouring the acceptance of the concentration of wealth that a proud and free human being would counter. We must structure the new paradigm in such a way as to allow human beings to find their own identity in themselves, whatever that is, and no longer in the task performed. If today it is customary to ask a newly known person “what kind of job do you do?”, in the new society the question will be “who are you?”. The new paradigm will have to be an essential paradigm.
- ❖ The second consideration concerns the economic aspect of the first: with the constant decrease in work, economic precariousness rises and poverty increases. Above all, the economic inequality gap reaches unacceptable levels and shows no sign of stopping. We must structure the new paradigm in such a way as to allow human beings the certainty of economic tranquillity, one of the necessary foundations, so that their identity can also unfold in fields other than the economic one. The new paradigm must be an essential and humanistic paradigm.
- ❖ The third consideration concerns the environment. It is redundant to repeat analyses and appeals: the anthropogenic effects on depleting resources and pollution are rapidly speeding up, and the world is running fast towards changes that will make it uninhabitable for many animal species, including the human species. The new paradigm must be an essential, humanistic and sustainable paradigm.
- ❖ The fourth consideration is about the market. In *Philopony* the market is amorphous; it detects a relationship that pertains to the economic sphere. Even a gift, when the commitment is reciprocal, becomes an economic relationship. Because the market is amorphous, it is the characteristics and dynamics by which these relationships take place that denote their quality, whether negative or positive. The new paradigm must be an essential, humanistic, sustainable and egalitarian paradigm.
- ❖ The fifth consideration concerns research. Technological development has endowed mankind with a millennial path to free itself from the burden of existence. A road that, despite being also very unequal and far from being completed, makes research the greatest ally possible to address the immense problems that we have created; first the anthropogenic effect on the environment. If we free research from monetary pressures, we will find solutions that we cannot ponder today because they are detrimental to the profit making structures on which today's economic power rests. The new paradigm must be an essential, humanistic, sustainable, egalitarian and technological paradigm.

- ❖ The sixth consideration concerns rebellion, considered as a distinctive trait of the human animal. A characteristic that allows humans to deviate from the group's traditions to envision and then travel different paths. A trait of humanity that leads to breaking free from the yokes not only by creating a new group but identical in its internal dynamics (i.e. conservation) but also new groups governed by different, unheard of relationships (i.e. innovation); a rebellion against any kind of yoke: political, economic, environmental and so on. And that we must respect as a seed of innovation, but also fear, having also the capacity to become a lever for conservation; especially in the presence of the aforementioned fideism, which could engulf and exploit such rebellion. The new paradigm must be an essential, humanistic, sustainable, egalitarian, technological and participatory paradigm.
- ❖ The seventh consideration is the motivation to stand out and to divide, by decision, or personal trait, between those who choose to bear the weight of responsibilities, especially the social ones but also the more personal ones, and those who do not wish to take responsibility for the community. However, without such distinction being burdened by heavy judgments of merit, nor allowing it to flow into hierarchies, which are customarily oppressive. The new paradigm must be the essential, humanistic, sustainable, egalitarian, technological, participatory and libertarian paradigm.

Philopony, Framing the Path to the New Paradigm

Finally, we discuss the instruction manual: *Philopony*, whose reading refers to the "how", preferring with this essay to frame *Philopony* by outlining its urgency, analysis, reasons.

Regarding the urgency, it is unnecessary to add anything else: the double plundering—environmental and human—requires us to confront this shame with the utmost determination and lucidity; also—and, perhaps, above all—using the tool of utopia. Anyone who denies such urgency, or dilly-dallies, can only be blind; or worse, a colluder, a conspirator against the impending crisis.

We thus arrive to the analysis. Because *Philopony* saves private property, somehow saves the bourgeois class, saves doing business, saves even private ownership of the means of production, it may have the problem of looking like a bad compromise.

However, in essence, *Philopony* maintains innovative elements conducive to the proposition of the new paradigm:

- ❖ Comprehensive, accomplished and free schooling, with the achievement of a degree for all (in response to the first consideration);
- ❖ Income to provide emancipation, to guarantee everyone economic peace of mind (in response to the second consideration);
- ❖ Sustainability penalty, to prevent the looting of resources and to limit waste and pollution as much as possible (in response to the third consideration);
- ❖ Exit from the paradigm of money, as we know it today, to reach a market that is the sum of relationships and no longer overpowering (in response to the fourth consideration);
- ❖ Scientific research aimed at progress rather than profit (in response to the fifth consideration);
- ❖ A participatory way to reach the *Philoponic* society, as an alternative to the bloody revolutionary phase (in response to the sixth consideration);

- ❖ A division into the remuneration of the work, which sees the hourly value at the base of the quantitative part equal for anyone and everywhere, and the qualitative part assessed only on personal commitment, thus eliminating the distinction in "merit" classes and producing a clear distinction, a true antithesis, between meritocracy and *Philopony* (in response to the seventh consideration).

But also including the popular participation and control through participatory democracy of the *Temporary Juries Drawn by Lottery*; or the new virtual currency to replace today's money; or full employment.

In contrast, current society is already overwhelmed by the transition from capitalism to financialism. And while

Correcting financialism is not the solution... We need to go to the root... We need the essential, humanistic, sustainable, egalitarian, technological, participatory and libertarian paradigm. Or at least imagine it, ponder about it, commit to make it happen.

capitalism was still based on the aspiration to stand out through its capacities, financialism is disconnected even from meritocracy, exposing only the crude brutality of the law of the economically mightiest. Whereas meritocracy, with societal rankings as its main ingredient, sometimes takes into account some real skills, finance needs only a large amount of money and access to the algorithm. Thus

producing a transition that deprives us of our human nature to become aseptic people and that brings with it the estrangement from the concept of responsibility. No longer it is the entrepreneur who "makes money"; today it is the system that makes money: A system that bases its power on fideism, the one with which this essay opens.

Correcting financialism is not the solution. It is just a palliative. We need to go much deeper, to the root in each of us. We need the essential, humanistic, sustainable, egalitarian, technological, participatory and libertarian paradigm. Or at least imagine it, ponder about it, commit to make it happen.

And *Philopony* declares from its very subtitle to be the main way to reach the new paradigm: to get out of the paradigm of money.

Leaving the Paradigm of Money

This does not mean abandoning money intended as a unit of measurement and as a reliable mediator in economic transactions; far from it. Supported by today's technology, it suffices to limit this new money to the two peculiarities just mentioned: to be a unit of measurement and to be a reliable mediator, that is a bearer of intrinsic trust recognised by all the actors of the economic transaction, even and above all if they do not know each other personally. Today, on the contrary, money is itself a commodity and traded in a market intoxicated by financialism; and it is in this context that *Philopony* intervenes, subtracting from the money the inherent characteristic of goods. *Philopony* could be titled *Jenga*, in reference to the game of skill in which by removing a brick the tower remains standing. It is necessary, therefore, to subtract this diabolical brick.⁸

If all this lays the foundations of a new economic paradigm—with regard to resources and the respect that we owe both to ourselves and to the generations to come and, above all, to the splendid common home that we all inhabit, the terrestrial globe, as well as taking off from the market its most precious commodity, money—the market must be ascribed within the insurmountable boundaries of sustainability.

In *Philopony* we talk about *tachyproduction*, understood as a pernicious mix of overproduction and relentless restocking of products, which along with endless waste, pollution, soil and energy consumption, forms the basis of the environmental catastrophe towards that we are pushing on the world.

⁸ Quote from the *Epilogue* chapter in *Philopony*.

Now, placing the market within the insurmountable boundaries of sustainability by taking away from money some of its characteristics, brings with it, in addition to "consciousness" through teaching, also an automatic educational action: the habit of operating in a certain way naturally creates education to operate in such a way.

I am convinced, in fact, that education is one of the fundamental factors of human growth, and I am convinced that it is easier to impose rules, restrictions and constraints on the market and money—both human creations—rather than on the human being, the bearer of innate characteristics. If, in fact, we can tackle the superstructural ones (i.e. man-made) precisely for being our creations, innate ones are much more difficult to deal with, and doing so often brings with them coercion—and the consequent rebellion.

It is, nonetheless, a new paradigm; not the correction of the current paradigm.

Incentives to Leave the Paradigm of Money

All this leads us, finally, to the motivations. They are of strategic opportunism: to present something that contains the elements necessary for a real paradigm, but that wear a familiar and not a strange construct, and thus easily acceptable, even desirable.

- **The welfare of every rank of society.** Who would not prefer, in fact, total, complete and free schooling, economic tranquillity, participatory democracy, full employment, complete and free welfare benefits, freedom to do business and no taxation to reward us for respecting the environment? All instances desired by anyone: by those who would see their current condition improve, and by those who could imagine a threat in this paradigm, but that upon closer inspection they see the threat fading in the face of freedom in doing business and the absence of taxation.

In other words, *Philopony*—please regard this essay as to the "how" this can materialise—leans towards a participatory transition, built on the desires and aspirations of the people. From my twenty years of activity in the agricultural field, in fact, I bring the concept of grafting on the stump with its roots: the new essential, humanistic, sustainable, egalitarian, technological, participatory and libertarian paradigm grafted on what already exists and we thoroughly know.

It is, nonetheless, a new paradigm; not the correction of the current paradigm; again with a motivation for strategic opportunism.

- **Saving our home.** Cassandra⁹ has never been, nor will she be, attractive, charming, engaging. She plays an essential role on information. This is indeed true. However, fear engenders rejection instead of attraction. And Cassandra today is denouncing—and I use deliberately denouncing instead of portending: that by now the ecological disaster we must forewarn no longer. One can, and must, already observe it fully underway—the end of the world—under the blows of the anthropocene exacerbated. It is the delusion of omnipotence, the arrogance and insolence that financialism brings. To oppose fideism, Cassandra's denunciation has not yet produced real results at the level of society. It has produced them among some individuals and some communities, but not at the level of global society. The human being is proving once again naïve; and once again under the fantasy of the goddess *Speranza* (Hope), to whom we helplessly entrust ourselves. And even if we wake up from our lethargy, proposing restrictions directly to the people risks generating a rebellion.

⁹ A prophet of disaster, especially one who is disregarded.

From Redistribution to Distribution

Philopony proposes a new paradigm based on distribution, in contrast with the current debate focused on redistribution. This is about the distribution of real egalitarian opportunities for anyone and throughout the life of each of us, whilst redistribution is based to a great degree on income equalisation. Furthermore, whereas *Philopony* accomplishes comprehensive and free welfare, redistribution entrusts to politics and the State with allocating the resources gathered, whether they are abundant or scarce. It entails having to establish priorities, with the consequent social conflict, whereas *Philopony* reaches a complete and free well-being. But not only that, for to redistribute you must first discover the wealth to redistribute, which often hides in tax havens or under figureheads or is concealed fraudulently.

In short, as legitimate and fair as it is, redistributing means taking something away from someone: how can we think this action is easier, less bloody, simpler than the *Philoponic* society which operates with upstream distribution? Here is the motivation: a new paradigm to materialise through a participatory way. (At the end of these pages, I quote from *Philopony's* update the new chapter *Distribution or redistribution*):

Today we base our society on money, the commodity underlying all commodities. Without it, one is relegated to the margins of the system: everything revolves around money and everything needs money.

Today our society entrusts that work will supply people with money. Those who do not receive it through work—and retirement, the reverberation of work once it has stopped—are supported in various ways: by the social status, by the charity of people and so on—and often by the family. It relegates people—or peoples, when charity takes place as international cooperation—to a state of subordination, of both psychological and material domination. Depending on the job you do—be it a lawful or an illegal job, the pattern remains the same—you are thus supplied with money; and "your place in society". In fact, especially in the contemporary one, the combination of work, money and social position has monopolised our instinct inherent in humankind to distinguish ourselves, leading people to identify themselves almost totally in line with their job role.

The question, in reality, is fully pertinent. Imbalances, social gap, subjugation, precariousness, exploitation, inequality make the question current and in urgent need to be addressed today. But what will happen to the society of the future, when automation will become fully fledged and capable of satisfying every need? Society will have to come up with a new method of providing people with money—and otherwise solving the identity issue.

This new method is actually—for the time being and for the current dominant thought—an old method: redistribution. We can describe it like this: social conditions are very unequal from inception—wealth, culture, social environment of origin, people of origin, region of origin, gender, social group of affiliation, other associations and so on. These differences are created from childbirth. These are differences that, despite social mobility—which most times is more placebo than reality—are extremely diverging, creating the inequality of the social divide. The social intervention, therefore, has the aim of partially redistributing the wealth created. And the economic debate focuses on corrections—mostly taxation—on the effects of curbing or relaunching these corrections, then on correcting correctives, then on correcting the corrections to correctives... in an infinite succession of debates and economic interventions; the aim of which is to determine how much—a little, or maybe even a little more, up to the perfect equalisation—to take from the rich to give to the poor.

While I agree with redistribution in social and political terms, the crude description above operates and works within the money paradigm, assuming that it remains there. A paradigm corrected by redistribution, and even more so when the creation of value will come mainly—or only—from artificial and synthetic intelligences. A redistribution that takes place, therefore, in a social and ideological clash. *Philopony*, because of the objectives, assumptions, constraints, characteristics and tools outlined so far, proposes a very different society in which redistribution is unnecessary. In

today's economy, which has fallen into the paradigm of money, this is impossible. In the *Philoponic* economy, the non-indispensability of redistribution is, indeed, a consequence.

By accepting, in fact, the motivation to stand out also in the fields of wealth and private property, *Philopony* pushes the problem of the economic inequality upstream: with the distribution of equal access to resources for everyone at the start. Full schooling, no economic hassle for one's existence, the elimination of monetary impediments to doing business, and to any personal achievement. And leaving the human being in complete and absolute discretion to go about his life.

From this base, common to anyone, everyone can build their own path. Those who have the incentive to get involved can do so in the economic sphere as well, while those who do not have this aspiration will express themselves in other ways. This realisation, however, will take place in a differently evolved human assembly, in which economic realisation will be only one of the many ways to reach one's "place in society". And everyone will be protected and supported by full economic tranquillity and by full and continuous acculturation: the basic tools for building oneself. But not only that, protection is also psychological: knowing that the material part of what is built is not eroded by redistribution, the motto from the previous chapters of *Philopony* will be realised, the transition from "a have concealed to a be revealed".¹⁰

While reiterating with firm conviction that—in the current paradigm—redistribution is not only necessary but also fair, being today's society immersed in the money paradigm, we affirm that—in the new *Philoponic* paradigm—this transition from a redistribution society—in which a part of what you create is taken away from you—to a distribution society—where the starting conditions are equalised—leads to a society where conflict diminishes, in particular socio-economic relations, and makes redistribution moot. And it leads the whole of humanity towards the full affirmation of each individual and within the context it has chosen. It leads us to a society that sees the distinction of individuals but in full social equality: equal but different, all of us.

In reality, although the chasm is fading, the stratification of the world into classes now has immense weight: north and south, bourgeoisie and proletariat, illiterate and cultured, just to mention three macro distinctions. But we know full well that such categorisations are infinite and present in the minds of all of us. To feel "superior" it is enough to belong to even any minimally differentiated category, and with the aggravating circumstance of the prejudice for which the "different", the "other" is most often considered inferior, sometimes higher but almost never the same. Being able to change this paradigm—that of categories and their "value"—to understand, comprehend and make ours the equality between people, all people all over the world, will be the most difficult step. Because it takes place—it will have to take place—in our most intimate and deep-rooted beliefs.

However, once we have completed this path, the change may rest on solid foundations difficult to break down. It will take time, at least three or four generations to reach this end. Only the goal of achieving complete schooling will require at least one generation, and full education is a fundamental step, both to give each one the cognitive tools and to have a pillar on which to rely and build our intimate awareness of equality. Afterwards, acceptance and awareness will be a consequence that will come with time and that will cement the true paradigm transition.

I conclude these pages of propositions with a proclamation: we can say that as an alternative to the current society of redistribution, the *Philoponic* society is ultimately the society of distribution.

¹⁰ "a have concealed to a be revealed" is the motto quoted from two previous chapters of *Philopony*: "Persons" and "Distribution or Redistribution".

Useful links:

- [The Jus Semper Global Alliance](#)
- [John Bellamy Foster: The Long Ecological Revolution](#)
- [John Bellamy Foster: The Anthropocene Crisis](#)
- [Álvaro J. de Regil: True Sustainability and Degrowth in the Citizens Imaginary](#)
- [Víctor M. Toledo: What are we saying when we talk about sustainability?](#)
- [Alejandro Teitelbaum: The Progressively Accelerated Degradation of the Environment](#)

❖ **About Jus Semper:** The Jus Semper Global Alliance aims to contribute to achieving a sustainable ethos of social justice in the world, where all communities live in truly democratic environments that provide full enjoyment of human rights and sustainable living standards in accordance with human dignity. To accomplish this, it contributes to the liberalisation of the democratic institutions of society that have been captured by the owners of the market. With that purpose, it is devoted to research and analysis to provoke the awareness and critical thinking to generate ideas for a transformative vision to materialise the truly democratic and sustainable paradigm of People and Planet and NOT of the market.

❖ **About the author:** Andrea Surbone, writer, publisher, ex-winegrower and visionary; author of *Philopony* - get 'em out of money in the book *Il lavoro e il valore al tempo dei robot - Intelligenza artificiale e non-occupazione*, by D. Astrologo, A. Surbone, P. Terna, Meltemi, Milano 2019 – www.meltemieditore.it/. He has written fiction with Dusts and since November 2007 writes *have a nice week*, a small column of glances at the world, sent every Monday by email. Publisher of the magazine *Nuvole* (for paper issues from 16 to 23) and still a member of the Editorial Board (www.nuvole.it). Spokesperson of a proposal for political economy (www.propostaneokeynesiana.it). Promoter of a political proposal (www.surbone.it/per). Andrea is a graduate from the SAA School of Management in Turin.

❖ **Quote this paper as:** Andrea Surbone, “The Light Side of the Mooney... Money – from Redistribution to Distribution” – The Jus Semper Global Alliance, February 2020.

❖ The responsibility for opinions expressed in this work rests only with the author(s), and its publication does not necessarily constitute an endorsement by The Jus Semper Global Alliance.



Under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

© 2020. The Jus Semper Global Alliance
Portal on the net: <https://www.jussemper.org/>
e-mail: informa@jussemper.org