Twitter Thread by Fabiana Cecin ■ ■

Fabiana Cecin ■ ■
@fabianacecin

OK let me try math again.

GoodStaking: you invest X, like you would in a savings account. After many years it produces Y interest, of which Y/2 go to the reserve over time, and Y/2 becomes G$ that you own.

No, that's wrong. Jesus.

The entire Y goes into the reserve, and that generates a Z amount of G$.

Z/2 goes to people as UBI.

Z/2 goes to you.

OK, so I wasn't that far off.

If I donate a large amount of money to the reserve, what I am doing is emulating a large Y. I'm taking a ton of money that I *have* (so it would be a "principal" today, a X) and pretending it's like a Y of someone else that will do GoodStaking.

The money that I have is a small X. It will generate a small Y. Instead, I want to take my small X and pretend it's a large Y, which would originate from a large X. That I don't have. Because I'm poor.

So if I want to make the largest possible impact into the UBI reserve, to make a splash, and help it be noticed, I can take the small amount of money I have, the X I have, and pretend it's a Y of staking, and time warp it to the present and use the X to buy G$ from the reserve.

What GoodStaking does is a purchase of G$ over time from the interest of your e.g. USD investment which donates *half* *the G$* from that purchase. What is donated is both an amount of G$, and the risk associated with the difference between the G$ and the e.g. USD currencies.

When you buy from the reserve, you get ALL of the G$, so the only thing you are truly donating is the difference of risk between holding G$ and e.g. USD. When you buy G$ from the reserve directly you donate risk, but not "50% of your

interest" (i.e. your purchase with some money)

When you invest in GoodStaking, you are risking very little. In fact, you're doing what rich people do, which is invest, which is what causes financial independence, which is a way to get out of e.g. being a wage slave. By investing, you're doing the right financial thing.

GoodStaking IS an investment. Meaning you're earning money from money, directly. You earn that interest money as G$, which is money, albeit money that has a different risk profile than the e.g. USD.

As you're risking very little, and you can move your invested principal to something else at any time, then it makes sense that you also donate half of your interest, in G$, to the UBI claimers. So you're directly funding the world's UBI by keeping your money in GoodStaking.

It's really really clever.

You're buying into the G$ economy with your interest. That means that you're basically taking the mechanism of interest and making it ** ethical. **

The interest you earn is economically meaningless if it does not help everyone else!

The interest you earn is in G$. If G$ succeeds and it lifts people out of poverty, your interest succeeds. If G$ does not succeed and does not lift people out of poverty, then your interest is nothing. It couples finance with social good!

The thing where 50% of the G$ you earn with the interest goes for the UBI is just a way for people to go, yes, sure, also take half of my interest and distribute as UBI, why not.

Not only you're taking your 5% / year interest and making it ethical, you're reducing it to 2.5% ...

... and distributing the other 2.5% as a direct UBI, direct redistribution, which is made in the *form* of the G$ currency, but whose dollar value is indeed the "dollar" value of the time the G$ currency was acquired and thus is an UBI donation in dollar value.

The current GoodDollar system has a *dollar* daily income due to the amount in the GoodStaking that it already has. The UBI dollar value is insignificant because the number of claimers of the G$ *currency* is an actual *hit*, which dilutes that dollar value into nothingness.

Because the system literally just started, like, 3 months ago.

If there was 1 claimer they would be earning like $1,000 a day or something like that.

Or $100, I'm not sure what's the staking income in dollar value right now.

If I ever invest in life, it will be in GoodStaking.

Done with the bank shit. If doesn't produce G$ as interest -- a democratic currency -- then it is invalid.

Now, why doesn't the GoodReserve sell only 50% of the purchased amount in G$, and allocate the other 50% to the UBI? It could have been built to do that. Then it would be the same as the GoodStaking, would it not, all things being equal?

Let's say you have some other "defi" (financial investment) elsewhere. I invest X. I get Y in "dollar" interest. Then I manually send that Y into the GoodReserve, and get Z G$.

If the reserve sent me back just Z/2 G$ instead of G$, it would be the exact same as the GoodStaking.

In fact, the GoodStaking could be the same as the GoodReserve. You get Z G$. You get the entire interest of the defi as G$, and you contribute only risk.

Then, you could complement that with a way for people to volunteer G$ into the UBI pool.

Why not do that? The reason is that it makes the system worse. Because we should all want to fund the UBI. We want to give G$ to everyone. I think 50% of the G$ interest income going directly to the UBI is exactly how it should work. If I invested that's what I'd want.

Why would I want that? Because it makes my contribution more contributey. More UBI is more good and it's doing it automatically while I sleep. That's exactly what everyone wants.

Now if the GoodReserve purchase kept 50% of the G$ in the cDAI (i.e. USD) to G$ conversion, that would be weird.

The GoodReserve is a low-level mechanism. The GoodStaking is a high-level mechanism built on top of the GoodReserve.

The GoodReserve is a way for people to donate risk. GoodStaking limits how much risk you can donate at once, because interest from a principal is a tiny number so you contribute a tiny amount compared to your principal in the present. Like, right now.

And let's be clear. The GoodDollar system is something that defeats the whole financial trap. It is mathematically designed for success. The more people purchase risk from the reserve directly or indirectly, the less risk everyone has. The risk goes to zero over time.

The risk goes to zero because a democratic monetary system reduces conflict in the world, which is the main cause of actual real objective risk in the world.

UBI is financial security for all because it is security of every kind. It's a real economy defeating the poverty economy

All purchases into the GoodDollar system strengthen the system. You cannot damage the system by buying into it. It's impossible.

It does not matter how you contribute. All interactions reinforce the system.

GoodDollar is a Hyperobject

Actually, the less you think about it and just believe and jump in, in any capacity, the better

All we need is UX/UI for participation. No way people are dealing with this ethereum wallet shit. No fucking way

No amount of storytelling is going to make normal people torture themselves with crypto

Money is custodial. People don't manage "safe combination security" for gold bars at home. That's nuts

Crypto UX is an absolute non starter

GoodDollar is for normal people.

Coinbase is already a stretch for people

This is for the stakers and traders. The claimer end is solved.

The trader / investor / philanthropist end is the end that I want to focus on because the GD wallet is already superb.

The GoodReserve is a way to get traders interested. The GoodStaking is a way to get investors interested. The wallet is a way to get currency users and recipients interested.

Since all energy contributes because it's a hyperobject, just pick one to develop.

It is impossible to harm the project by trading it

That is why getting rich people on board would be easier: because there's very few of them, and that's like a handful of high value Ethereum transactions that we can just manually assist. Instead of having to explain Ethereum to a million people.

The success signal of a billion dollars committed to the GoodReserve would be unequivocally good for this project.

We could do a giant kickstarter for the GoodReserve. The kickstarter operators collect in fiat, and then convert into a GoodReserve donation, and the G$ is either destroyed or entirely distributed as UBI.

You could also do a giant kickstarter for a giant GoodStaking-committed pile, if that pile could be controlled by the GoodDAO. I.e. the GoodDAO would control "public stakes", public investments.

The difference is that this giant Good-Stake would contribute to the reserve slowly instead of instantly, and that people would not be able to sell G$ to collect this principal.

How important is that? I'm not sure.

If I had two billion dollars, I'd commit one to a giant GoodStaking stake, and one to the GoodReserve, just to see what happens.

It's both. It doesn't matter which one and in which order.

We need lots of use, lots of staking, and lots of reserve.

More of anything is better in any order. This has to be clear. This has to be the story.

This has to be crystal clear.

A dynamic system is experimented with. It is studied. We will learn things, and in the process of learning, only good things will happen, and no bad things will happen.

The GoodDollar system has no bad states.

Everything is "Good for GoodDollar." That's how you win.

We need energy to go into the system. Any energy you have available to put into the system is valid.

Getting people to install and use the wallet and value G$ into economic interactions is one way.

If we do just that -- just install wallet and use -- the system will succeed. If a billion people are "playing" with G$, then it instantly is no longer play. In fact, that's cheating. That's going straight to the solution, which is mass cultural acceptance. It's the end goal.

The reserve/staking stuff is the hard part because it involves the accumulation of capital, which is a social game that is designed to be difficult, competitive. Which is the thing that we are trying to get rid of with the building of a global democratic economy.

So, ironically, the solved part, which is the wallet UX, if we do just that, we cheat and solve the whole thing. That alone will cause people to invest in the G$ reserves and to buy G$ with investment interest.

On the other hand, reserve and staking activism also help the stories of adoption of the wallet. So why not invest in a mechanism that helps? If you have several intervention points, why not farm all of them to the optimal point?

*optimal level

(as in the "diminishing returns" thing)

Also, reserve and staking activism is very hard to decode and explain, which is why it's interesting. Explaining the GoodDollar wallet and use of the G$ currency as a currency is boring because it's perfect and obvious.

Lots of people are going to do that. I don't need to do that.

The GoodReserve, for example, exists and can be used. If it was not meant to be used then it would not exist. If increased reserves and the swapping of USD by G$ at will was a bad thing, then it would not be allowed. Which means it must be a good thing.

And if you cannot see the ability to buy 20 million G$ with a few thousand bucks as insane fun, then I just have to question your sanity. It's as simple as that. It's just mad fun.

Buying millions of G$ from the reserve is just insane fun. Now I can imagine that I have "millions" to distribute to people. It's just a charity power trip. Maybe it's crazy, but it is helping the system by definition, and it makes me happy for that.

It is not possible for me to accidentally damage this system. All my interactions *with the system* are ethical and good by design. I can only be unethical (or dumb) if I tell you that you're going to get rich with this system. Which is something that's not possible to know.