Fair Money

Why No Currency Can Be Just—and What to Build Instead

by

Albert C. McGehee Jr.

September 2026

A Working Paper on the Architecture of a Fair Monetary Order

Fair Money

Author's Note

This paper begins from a conviction that has nothing to do with economics: we are more alike than different. Differences in culture, language, and belief are occasions for mutual nourishment, not grounds for conflict. That conviction informed the research that follows, not by shaping its claims but by guiding where I looked for answers. When the history showed repeated failures of fixed anchors, when the science pointed to adaptive systems, when the architecture demanded modular institutions—each discovery felt like confirmation that the world already knows, if we listen, how to build for each other's survival because our own depends upon it.

The argument makes no appeal to any one tradition. It makes only the claim that fairness across time and space can be engineered into institutions if we have the courage to stop searching for a perfect anchor and start building the systems that endure. The reader need not share the conviction to find the case convincing. The conviction simply explains why we should not look away when the question demands it.

This paper was written in collaboration with an AI assistant (Lumo, by Proton). The argument, framing, editorial decisions, and final judgment are mine; the drafting, research compilation, and initial structure benefited substantially from AI assistance. Every citation has been individually verified against its source, and errors in early drafts—including one fabricated statistic and one misattributed reference—were caught and corrected through verification. I believe the process strengthened the paper. Readers who wish to discount AI-assisted work are free to; I ask only that the argument be evaluated on its merits.

Fair Money

Executive Summary

Every monetary system in history has died the same death: someone found a fixed answer to a question that never stops changing.

In the 1870s, the United States fixed the value of silver to gold at 16 to 1. The market moved; the law didn't. The undervalued metal vanished from circulation, farms starved for money while banks held it, and the republic nearly tore itself apart over a currency question—William Jennings Bryan's "Cross of Gold" was a protest not against gold, but against *fixity itself*.

In 1944, Bretton Woods fixed the dollar to gold and the world to the dollar. Within twenty-seven years, the design flaw Robert Triffin himself had named consumed the system: one nation must supply the world's money by running debts the world eventually refuses to fund. In 1971, the anchor broke.

In the fifty years since, we have run the largest monetary experiment in human history: money anchored to nothing but trust in a single issuer. It delivered unprecedented global growth—and concentrated the power to freeze, inflate, or exclude the savings of any nation on Earth in one treasury. In 2026 that power reached beyond currency entirely: a sanctioned nation's gold was rendered effectively unspendable—not by confiscation, but by threatening anyone who would accept it with exclusion from the dollar network. The rise of BRICS payment systems, sanctioned-country workarounds, and local-currency settlement is not a rejection of that system. It is evidence that the rest of the world no longer experiences it as neutral.

Three natural experiments. One repeating lesson: **there is no perfect money—no gold, no dollar, no algorithm—that is simultaneously scarce, stable, and fair to all parties.** Demanding one has cost the world two depressions, two world-scale wars, and recurring currency crises.

But the historical record contains a second lesson, less noticed. The systems that endured were never anchored—they were *adaptive*. Medieval trade fairs cleared accounts across dozens of currencies no one controlled. The human body holds blood sugar steady not by fixing a number, but with two opposing signals correcting each other continuously. Forests survive blights through diversity, not dominance. Ostrom's Nobel-winning work found the same pattern in human commons: self-governing systems last when they are modular, redundant, and run by those who use them.

Fair Money

This paper proposes that we stop searching for the perfect anchor and instead build monetary institutions the way nature builds stability: as **distributed, self-correcting exchange systems with designed failure containment**. Six modules—adaptive unit of account, tiered store of value, open settlement rails, rule-based elasticity, redundant trust, and regional modularity—are each defended by the specific historical failure it prevents.

The claim is not that such a system is Utopian. It is that the current arrangement is *treating our differences as threats to be frozen out, when they are the very substance of exchange.* Nations, like the trees of a forest, are strongest when their distinct currencies, economies, and cultures trade freely through shared roots no single power owns. Diversity is not the obstacle to a fair monetary order. It is the raw material of one.

I. The Problem: Money's Impossible Triple

What Money Is Asked to Do

Strip away institutional detail and money performs three functions: **unit of account** (measure value), **store of value** (carry it across time), **medium of exchange** (move it across space). Correspondingly, society asks three things of whatever serves as money: that it be **scarce** (nobody can conjure it at whim), **stable** (it preserves roughly what it measured yesterday), and **universal** (everyone accepts it everywhere).

The contention of this paper, argued historically in Section II and scientifically in Section III, is that **no single instrument satisfies all three demands simultaneously**. Scarcity and stability conflict over time: any absolutely scarce instrument—gold above all—cannot adjust its supply to economic need, so its purchasing power swings with demand, punishing whoever holds the wrong time-horizon. Stability and universality conflict over space: a stable universal unit requires an issuer or anchor every party trusts, and trust concentrates power at the point of issuance—a concentration that history converts into leverage, and leverage into exclusion. Scarcity and universality conflict structurally: universal adoption of anything creates the network effects that make its issuer too important to discipline.

Fair Money

This is not a novel claim, and novelty is not claimed for it. It is the common ground beneath the Mundell-Fleming trilemma (exchange rates, capital mobility, monetary autonomy—choose two), the Triffin dilemma (reserve currency liquidity versus issuer solvency), and the informal observation that the classical gold standard's price specie-flow mechanism worked by imposing unemployment on somebody. [Mundell, "Capital Mobility and Stabilization Policy"; Triffin, *Gold and the Dollar Crisis*] The paper's contribution is to treat these not as separate specialist puzzles but as manifestations of one design error repeated across four centuries: **searching for a fixed answer to a dynamical system.**

Fairness Across Time

The problem decomposes along the time axis first. Compensation for labor, harvest, or investment must retain value between earning and spending. Where money appreciates—supply constrained, output growing—the debtor pays back more than he borrowed in real terms, and wealth transfers silently from borrowers to lenders. Where money depreciates—supply elastic, restraint absent—the saver watches his compensation erode, and wealth transfers silently from lenders to borrowers. Neither direction is theft in the ordinary sense; both are *unearned redistribution through the unit of account itself*.

The 1870–1896 deflation transferred roughly that magnitude from American farm debtors to Eastern creditors—not by fraud, but by a monetary arrangement no debtor had voted for. The 1971–present era reversed the direction at scale: American savers and foreign reserve holders absorbed a substantial cumulative dilution of the world's reserve unit, financing the issuer's deficits in the process. Two eras, opposite transfers, same mechanism: the unit itself carried the injustice, invisible to any court.

Fairness Across Space

Along the space axis, the unit of account allocates power. Whoever issues the world's money sets the terms of world trade in ways no parliament elected—swap lines granted or withheld, settlement permitted or denied, crises resolved in the order that suits the issuer's banks. The periphery of every monetary system in Section II's record—Argentine peasants under the classical standard, Asian economies in 1997, sanctioned populations in the present—learned that the same currency promising stability centrally imposes volatility peripherally, because the center's adjustment tool is always the periphery's adjustment burden. **Paolera, Gerardo della, and Alan M. Taylor.** "A Monetary and Financial Wreck: The Baring Crisis, 1890–91." In Straining at the Anchor: The Argentine Currency

Board and the Search for Macroeconomic Stability, 1880–1935, pp. 67–79. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

The concession is already implicit in contemporary practice: when both corporate employers and federal agencies pay identical work at different rates depending on location, the uniform dollar wage is already admitted to be an approximation, not a truth.

The Question Restated

The problem of a fair monetary order is therefore not choosing the right metal, currency, or algorithm. It is designing a system that:

1. 1. compensates across time without embedding unearned transfers in the unit (see Module 1: Adaptive Unit of Account)
2. settles across space without concentrating veto power at any node;
3. adjusts to changing conditions—which all previous anchors forbade themselves from doing—without requiring catastrophe as the adjustment event.

Natural systems solve exactly this problem constantly, at every scale from cells to biospheres, and have done so for billions of years. The inquiry of this paper is whether their design logic—distributed sensing, opposing correctors, modularity, failure containment—can be specified for institutions whose participants are strategic, sovereign, and suspicious. Sections II and III establish the evidence. Section IV assembles the design. Section V confronts the politics.

II. Historical Evidence: Four Natural Experiments

The Fixed Ratio: Bimetallism and the Crime of 1873

The United States spent most of the nineteenth century attempting what alchemists could not: holding two metals in a fixed relationship nature refused to honor. From 1792 onward, the law valued silver to gold at 15 to 1, later 16 to 1. But the market treated this ratio as a standing invitation to arbitrage. Whenever mines opened or international demand shifted, one metal became undervalued at the legal rate. Merchants spent the cheap coin and hoarded the dear one—Gresham's Law operating as a silent

tax collector—and the money supply lurched unpredictably between metallic bases. The system was never stable; it merely oscillated slowly enough for a generation to forget each swing. [Friedman & Schwartz, *A Monetary History of the United States*]

In 1873, Congress passed a Coinage Act that omitted the standard silver dollar from the list of authorized coins. The omission attracted little attention at the time—silver was trading *above* the fixed ratio, and nobody expected the mines of the Comstock Lode to flood the market within a decade. But the timing proved catastrophic. As Western silver discoveries crashed the market price, and Germany's adoption of the gold standard drained global demand, the omitted coin went from irrelevant to indispensable—precisely for the debtor class that needed it. By the 1880s, the deflationary squeeze on farmers had recast the act retroactively as the "Crime of '73," a conspiracy by Eastern capital to demonetize the people's money. Whatever the truth of intent, the consequence was real: the money supply contracted while debts stayed fixed, and the farmers of Kansas and Georgia paid the difference. [Friedman, "The Crime of 1873"; Rockoff, "The 'Wizard of Oz' as a Monetary Allegory"]

Congress attempted half-measures. The Bland-Allison Act of 1878 compelled the Treasury to purchase silver in modest quantities; the Sherman Silver Purchase Act of 1890 escalated the mandate. Both tried to admit silver back into the monetary base without ever allowing its *price* to be set honestly—an evasion the market punished repeatedly. When the Panic of 1893 struck, the Sherman Act's silver obligations were blamed for undermining confidence in the Treasury's gold reserves, and repeal became the price of rescuing the gold standard. The debtor class had lost again, and knew it.

The political detonation came in 1896. William Jennings Bryan's "Cross of Gold" speech framed the question as civilization versus crucifixion, but the underlying arithmetic was simple and humane: the gold standard had delivered two decades of falling prices, and debts contracted in 1870 were being paid in dollars worth a third more. Free Silver—the unlimited coinage of silver at 16:1—was crude inflation therapy, and its opponents were right that a coin worth 50 cents of metal stamped as a dollar would not hold its value. But the silverites' diagnosis was sound even where their prescription failed. The money supply *should* respond to economic need. Their tragedy was that they had no mechanism to propose except a bad peg to replace a cruel one. [Kazin, *A Godly Hero*; Gramm, "The Free Silver Movement in America: A Reinterpretation"]

Fair Money

McKinley's victory and the Gold Standard Act of 1900 closed the question. What the episode proved, and what this paper draws from it, is twofold: **first, that a fixed relationship between two valuable things is a promise the market will eventually refuse to honor; second, that when money is too scarce, the political system will find a voice for those starving for it—whether or not that voice offers a sound remedy.**

The Classic Anchor: The Gold Standard, 1870–1914

The forty years before the First World War are the gold standard's golden legend: an era of expanding trade, converging prices, and capital flows on a scale the world would not see again until the 1990s. Its defenders then and now cite it as proof that a disciplined anchor produces stability.

The record deserves a harder look. The classical gold standard worked because it could. It rested on three conditions that were political, not metallic: British naval supremacy enforcing trade routes, London's willingness to be the lender of last resort during crises, and a distribution of power that let the center impose adjustment costs on the periphery. When gold flowed out of a deficit country, the prescribed cure—raise interest rates, cut wages, endure unemployment—was borne by Argentine peasants and Indian farmers far more often than by London financiers. Price levels within the period were *not* stable; they swung through significant deflations and recoveries. What was stable was the *system*, because no country large enough to break it had an incentive to try. [Eichengreen, *Golden Fetters*; Eichengreen, *Globalizing Capital*]

The war removed all three conditions. Governments suspended convertibility to fund the conflict, and when they tried to restore pre-war parities afterward—most destructively, Britain in 1925 at the old rate—they imposed the deflationary adjustment on economies that could no longer bear it. The gold standard did not cause the Great Depression by itself, but its restoration mechanics transmitted and amplified a recession into catastrophe: country after country defended parity by tightening, and the simultaneous tightening strangled the world economy. The countries that recovered earliest were those that abandoned gold soonest. [Eichengreen, *Golden Fetters*; Ahamed, *Lords of Finance*]

The lesson of the classic anchor is the mirror image of bimetallism's: **even a genuine scarcity anchor delivers stability only while someone absorbs its adjustment costs. Remove the absorber, and the anchor becomes the storm.**

Fair Money

The Designed System: Bretton Woods, 1944–1971

Bretton Woods was history's first deliberate attempt to *design* a monetary order through negotiation, and its ambition deserves respect. John Maynard Keynes proposed an international clearing union with a synthetic unit (bancor) that no nation would issue or own—strikingly close to the open-rail architecture this paper proposes. The United States, holding most of the world's gold and all of the leverage, insisted instead on a system where the dollar was pegged to gold and everything else was pegged to the dollar. [Skidelsky, *John Maynard Keynes: Fighting for Britain*; Steil, *The Battle of Bretton Woods*]

The flaw was named by Robert Triffin in 1960, a decade before it destroyed the arrangement he diagnosed. To supply the world with dollars for trade and reserves, the United States had to run persistent deficits; but persistent deficits would eventually undermine confidence that dollars could be redeemed for gold. Liquidity and credibility pulled in opposite directions, and both were required. The choice was which to sacrifice. [Triffin, *Gold and the Dollar Crisis*]

By 1971, foreign dollar holdings dwarfed American gold reserves at the official price, and President Nixon closed the gold window. The predicted breakdown arrived on schedule, eleven years after the prediction. What deserves emphasis is that the failure was not an accident of execution. Bretton Woods died of *the precise flaw its smartest critic identified in advance*—a design that treated a fundamentally dynamic condition (global liquidity need) as if it could be permanently satisfied by one nation's liability.

The Unanchored Network: The Post-1971 Dollar

What replaced Bretton Woods had no designer. Currencies floated, but the dollar's incumbency—inertia, the depth of Treasury markets, the absence of alternatives—made it the de facto world money. The experiment has now run over fifty years, and the verdict is genuinely mixed and honestly rendered here.

On the credit side: this period coincided with the greatest expansion of global prosperity in recorded history. Hundreds of millions escaped poverty in an environment where a single deep, liquid, convertible currency lowered transaction costs for everyone. The pure fiat dollar proved capable of

extraordinary flexibility—the 2008 response and the 2020 pandemic response both demonstrated that unanchored money can act at a speed gold never permitted. [Eichengreen, *Exorbitant Privilege*]

On the debit side, the same properties became liabilities. A system where one issuer provides the world's reserves retains the Triffin tension in evolved form: the supplier's domestic needs and the world's stability needs occasionally diverge sharply—as when the Federal Reserve's tightening cycles repeatedly stressed dollar borrowers across emerging markets. And the centrality that lowered transaction costs also centralized *power*: the capacity to exclude nations from the payments network became an instrument of statecraft, applied with increasing frequency after 2014. *The weapon's reach widened again in 2026, when the United States expanded sanctions on Iran beyond oil to the Islamic Republic's gold, digital asset, aviation, shipping, and technology sectors—threatening secondary sanctions against any counterparty engaging them, atop a naval blockade of Iranian ports. The instructive detail is the mechanism: Iran's gold was never seized. It was rendered unspendable by threatening those who would accept it with exclusion from the dollar system itself. The metal—the historic refuge from state control—was neutralized through the network, not the asset. Even gold, it turns out, spends only through rails someone owns, and rails are where exclusion lives. Ea*ch application converted reluctant participants into motivated architects of alternative rails—China's CIPS network, BRICS settlement initiatives, local-currency trade arrangements. As of this writing, no replacement exists; India, for one, has publicly affirmed that it seeks no such thing, viewing dollar stability as a global public good. But the direction of travel is unmistakable: the unanchored network is fragmenting at its edges, not its center. [Tooze, *Crashed*]

The lesson of the unanchored network: an anchorless system does not eliminate the anchor problem—it relocates the anchor to the credibility of a single issuer, whose incentives cannot remain aligned with the world's indefinitely.

The Pattern Across Four Cases

Four systems, four centuries, one recurring structure:

System	Anchor	Death Cause	Survivors Paid By
Bimetallism	Fixed 16:1 ratio	Arbitrage vs. the peg (Gresham's	Debtors in deflation

System	Anchor	Death Cause	Survivors Paid By
		Law)	
Classical gold	Gold convertibility	Adjustment costs exceeded political tolerance	Peripheral economies
Bretton Woods	Dollar-gold peg	Triffin's dilemma, predicted in advance	Holders of the last unbacked dollars
Post-1971 dollar	Issuer credibility	Weaponization eroding network universality	The excluded

Two further episodes—the asymmetric rescue of 2008–2020 and the deflationary contagion of the 1930s—inform the architecture in Section IV but fall outside this four-epoch table; they are extensions of the post-1971 and classical-gold cases respectively, not independent systems.

Each system embedded one specific assumption about the future, and each assumption failed: the ratio would hold, the adjustment would be absorbed, the issuer would restrain itself, the network would remain neutral. What no system has yet attempted is the one architecture nature employs universally—institutions that expect disturbance and metabolize it. Whether such an architecture can be built by treaty among strategic states, rather than grown by evolution, is the question the remainder of this paper addresses.

III. The Science: What Enduring Systems Share

History shows what fails. Biology, ecology, and cybernetics explain *why* the survivors survive—and their convergence on a small set of design principles is the empirical foundation of this paper's proposal.

Homeostasis: Stability as Process, Not Position

Walter Cannon coined the term in 1932 to describe how organisms maintain internal conditions—not by fixing values, but by continuously correcting deviations with opposing forces. Blood glucose is not

held at a number; it is steered, minute by minute, by insulin and glucagon pulling in opposite directions. Core temperature, blood pH, osmotic pressure: each is maintained by *coupled opposing actions*, never by a single instrument pinned in place. [Cannon, *The Wisdom of the Body*]

The monetary parallels are uncomfortable. A fixed metallic ratio is a homeostat with one arm severed: it can tighten (gold flows in) but its loosening mechanism breaks whenever the peg diverges from market reality. The classical gold standard's "adjustment mechanism" was itself a crude cybernetic loop—deficits drain gold, prices fall, exports recover—but one with its sensor in London and its actuators in Buenos Aires. And modern inflation-targeting central banks are the closest institutional approximation to Cannon's model: a sensed deviation (measured prices), an opposing correction (rate policy), continuous recalibration. The 1890s silverites wanted a homeostat. What they got was a referendum.

The relevant principle, formalized by W. Ross Ashby in 1956, is the **law of requisite variety**: only variety in a regulator can absorb variety in the disturbances it faces. A system that can only respond in one way—to tighten, to deflate, to hold the ratio—is betting its survival on a world that never changes. No organism makes that bet. Every monetary regime we examined in Section II did. [Ashby, *An Introduction to Cybernetics*]

Redundancy and Modularity: The Ecology of Resilience

Ecologists distinguish **stability** (resistance to change) from **resilience** (capacity to absorb disturbance and reorganize). Monocultures maximize short-run efficiency and die in epidemics; diverse systems sacrifice efficiency margin and survive. The Irish potato famine was a monetary lesson in botanical form: seven million people dependent on a single standardized asset, destroyed by a single pathogen because nothing in the system contained the failure. [Holling, "Resilience and Stability of Ecological Systems"; Walker & Salt, *Resilience Thinking*]

Modern financial architecture has been rediscovering this empirically, at great expense. The 2008 crisis propagated precisely because the network was simultaneously *dense* and *concentrated*—everyone connected, through the same few nodes, to the same exposures. Regulators responded with the ecological toolkit without using the vocabulary: ring-fencing is modularity, capital requirements are redundancy, living wills are designed failure containment. The literature on systemic risk converged on

the same conclusion ecology reached decades earlier: **connectivity that protects against small shocks becomes the conduit for large ones**—Acemoglu, Ozdaglar and Tahbaz-Salehi demonstrate that financial contagion undergoes a phase transition as interconnection density rises, and the 2008 architecture sat precisely on the wrong side of it. [Haldane & May, "Systemic Risk in Banking Ecosystems"; Acemoglu, Ozdaglar & Tahbaz-Salehi, "Systemic Risk and Stability in Financial Networks"]

A single dominant reserve currency is, in these terms, a keystone species with no successor lineage. Its failure cannot be absorbed, only survived.

Mutualism: Exchange Without Central Ownership

The forest floor runs on symbiosis. Mycorrhizal fungi connect trees into networks that move carbon between species—individual plants pursuing their own interests, connected by infrastructure that no participant owns, the net direction of exchange reversing seasonally as each species' needs shift. The network charges tolls in nutrients; it accumulates no dominion. [Simard et al., "Net Transfer of Carbon Between Ectomycorrhizal Tree Species with Shared Ectomycorrhizal Fungi," *Nature* 388 (1997)]

This is not sentimental; it is a renewable energy calculation. Symbiotic systems persist because cooperative exchange generates net surplus that domination cannot—predator-prey systems cycle, but mutual-isms compound. The medieval trade fairs of Champagne ran on exactly this logic: dozens of currencies no single prince controlled, cleared periodically through multilateral netting, because merchants discovered that heterogeneous money was tradable if settlement was architected rather than ruled. It is worth stating plainly what the fairs were and were not. Edwards and Ogilvie have shown that contract enforcement at the fairs was provided by public institutions—the counts of Champagne and the royal courts—not by purely private merchant governance, a correction to romanticized accounts of the "law merchant." The correction does not disturb the point; it sharpens it. The fairs were successful not because enforcement was privately owned or state-monopolized, but because settlement was administered as infrastructure serving all comers: the counts charged tolls and enforced rules, but they did not set the value of the currencies, did not exclude merchants from rival political interest or states, and did not direct the flows. What no single participant owned—the multilateral clearing across heterogeneous moneys—was the durable innovation. A fungus and a Flemish cloth merchant achieved

routinely what an empire would have ruined by trying to command: open rails, diverse participants, honest netting. [Lopez & Raymond, Medieval Trade in the Mediterranean World; Edwards & Ogilvie, "What Lessons for Economic Development Can We Draw from the Medieval Champagne Fairs?"]

The Commons Governs Itself: Ostrom's Discovery

The strongest bridge between biology and political economy is Elinor Ostrom's Nobel-winning body of work. Conventional theory held that shared resources invite tragedy—each user rationally overdraws until the commons collapses—so resources must be either privatized or ruled centrally. Ostrom went and looked. Communal forests in Switzerland and Japan, irrigation systems in Spain and the Philippines, fisheries in Turkey: some had governed themselves sustainably for *centuries*, longer than any monetary regime examined in Section II survived. [Ostrom, *Governing the Commons*]

Her finding was not that decentralization magically works. It was that long-enduring commons shared identifiable design features: clear boundaries of membership; rules matched to local conditions; participatory rule-making; graduated sanctions rather than capital punishment for violations; cheap, accessible dispute resolution; and—critically—**rights to organize that external authorities respected**. The systems that failed were those lacking these features, regardless of whether they were nominally communal or state-run.

Two implications carry directly into Section IV. First, self-governance at scale is *possible*—but only as federated assemblies of bounded communities, not as one planetary commons, which would exceed every condition Ostrom identified for success. Second, her design principles are simultaneously *institutional* and *ethical*: boundary-setting, voice, proportionate sanction, and respected autonomy are the governance expression of neighbors treating each other as ends rather than obstacles. The systems that lasted were, structurally, the ones built as if the Golden Rule were an engineering specification. That is the paper's central claim in its most compressed form: **durability and reciprocity are not competing values; reciprocity is the mechanism that produces durability.**

Hayek's Epistemic Contribution

Friedrich Hayek's contribution was not primarily political—it was epistemic. In 1945, he argued that prices function as telecommunications infrastructure for dispersed knowledge: no single mind can

aggregate what millions of actors know, but the price system does it through signals that require no central intelligence. The danger, he wrote, is concentrating decision-making at nodes that cannot see the terrain. His monetary work in the 1970s proposed competitive currencies competing for users' allegiance—an early statement that money could be a platform subject to entry rather than a monopoly subject to state decree. Whether or not one accepts his full thesis, the Hayek insight converges with Ostrom on one point: **local information is irreducible to central processing, and architectures that ignore that fact lose legitimacy when they must enforce it.** [Hayek, "The Use of Knowledge in Society"; Hayek, *Denationalization of Money*]

The synthesis is the paper's backbone: Ashby and Cannon teach homeostasis (responsive feedback); Holling and Haldane teach modularity (failure containment); Simard and the Champagne fairs teach open rails without ownership; Ostrom teaches self-governance with accountability; Hayek teaches that prices—and by extension, money—must distribute intelligence rather than concentrate it. Five disciplines, one convergence.

The Limits of the Metaphor

Intellectual honesty requires marking where the analogy breaks, because opponents will find these seams if we do not.

Nature does not need consent. Trees cannot defect from the fungal network, lobby for preferential tolls, or seize the rhizosphere. Human monetary systems are negotiations among strategic agents who can cheat, exit, and accumulate power. Any architecture must therefore solve what biology never confronts: the commitment problem among parties who can calculate the profitability of betrayal.

Nature tolerates waste that humans cannot. Evolution's method is mass extinction; ninety-nine percent of species have failed. A forest regenerates beautifully across two centuries. No polity will accept a seventy-year depression as the tuition for eventual renewal. Design must compress timescales biology never had to mind.

Nature optimizes locally, not justly. Parasitism, cannibalism, and competitive exclusion are as "natural" as mutualism. Selection favors what reproduces, not what is fair. The natural world supplies

mechanisms, not moral warrant—which is why this paper rests its normative case on human grounds, where it belongs.

The honest synthesis is therefore not biomimicry but **the extraction of testable design principles**: homeostasis rather than pegs (Ashby), modularity rather than concentration (Holling, Haldane), open rails without ownership (mutualism, medieval clearing), bounded self-governance with graduated sanction (Ostrom)—applied to institutions whose participants are strategic, impatient, and morally accountable. Section IV makes that extraction explicit, module by module.

IV. The Architecture: A Decomposed Solution

History shows the failures. Science explains the survivors. This section specifies what an adaptive monetary architecture looks like when decomposed into its constituent problems. Each of six modules prevents one historical failure and embodies one scientific principle. Module 1—being the architecture's most visible point of contact—draws on three bodies of evidence (instruments, compensation regimes, retail infrastructure); the remaining five modules each draw on one precedent. None is new; all are underused. Together, they form an architecture no one has yet assembled. Each module's precedents are well-documented in institutional records and central bank publications; formal citations are collected in the bibliography.

Module 1: Adaptive Unit of Account

The failure prevented: The 1890s farmer's dilemma—debts fixed in a unit that appreciated against his labor. Bimetallism tried to anchor to metals that moved; Bretton Woods tried to anchor to gold that could run out; post-1971 anchors to an issuer's credibility that can be weaponized. An adaptive basket does not attempt stability of price—it attempts stability of purchasing power through automatic rebalancing. The 2026 Iranian experience adds a darker clause: reserves are only as durable as the rails that can redeem them. Ownership confers nothing where settlement is vetoed; liquidity, not title, is what exclusion destroys.

The principle embodied: Homeostasis (Ashby/Cannon). A two-armed regulator where one side tightens when another loosens.

Specification: A tradable unit of account composed of:

Fair Money

• Commodity component (energy, food staples, materials) weighted to reflect real economic throughput

• Labor index component (median earnings in participating regions)

• Periodic rebalancing (quarterly) driven by measured deviations from a target purchasing-power band

Three bodies of evidence. No other module in this architecture rests on a single precedent, and the adaptive unit of account should not either. Three distinct bodies of practice—existing instruments, compensation regimes, and retail infrastructure—each demonstrate one leg of the requirement.

1. **Indexed instruments.** The Chilean Unidad de Fomento (UF), a CPI-indexed unit of account in continuous use since 1967 and now standard for Chilean long-term contracts and mortgages, is the world's first successful indexed unit of account [Banco Central de Chile; Shiller, "Indexed Units of Account," NBER WP 6356]. The IMF's Special Drawing Rights prove a multi-component basket can serve international accounting, though its weights are political rather than purchasing-power-based. Treasury Inflation-Protected Securities prove indexing works at scale, though only for debt instruments. Together they establish that a composite, purchasing-power-oriented unit can circulate through contracts without displacing the currency that denominates them.

2. **Compensation across space**. Major U.S. employers, Lockheed Martin among them, publish compensation schedules differentiated by geographic zone, paying materially different wages for identical work depending on location. Since 1994, the U.S. government has paid General Schedule employees through locality-based comparability percentages ranging from 17.06 percent ("Rest of U.S.") to 33.94 percent (Washington-Baltimore) in the 2026 tables [5 U.S.C. § 5304; 5 CFR pt. 531; OPM 2026 salary tables]; abroad, post allowances are calculated from cost-of-living and hardship surveys under the Department of State Standardized Regulations [DSSR; 5 CFR pt. 591]. Both regimes concede quietly what monetary orthodoxy declines to state aloud: the purchasing power of a dollar varies by place, and compensation fixed in nominal units embeds an unearned transfer between regions. But neither supplies a remedy. Corporate geo-zoning is indexing without accountability—zones drawn unilaterally, multipliers unpublished, boundaries revised to the drafter's advantage. And the two federal regimes index different variables: domestic locality pay tracks private-sector wage disparities while foreign allowances track measured local costs—one government, one currency, two incompatible indices answering the same question. The precedent is real; its fragmentation is the warning.

3. **Infrastructure: the actuator.** The technical barrier to adaptive pricing has already fallen. Between June 2024 and March 2026, Walmart extended electronic shelf labels from 2,300 stores to its entire U.S. fleet, reducing the time to change a shelf price from two days to

minutes; Co-op is installing labels across its 2,400 UK stores; a British grocer began fitting 10.8 million labels in early 2026 [CNBC, March 2026; GRA, June 2026]. The instructive feature is not what retailers do with this capability—so far, markdowns and labor savings—but what regulators fear they could: U.S. senators warned in 2024 that digital tags "may enable" surge pricing "to extract maximum profits," and Maryland enacted a shelf-to-register price guarantee effective October 2026. The public objection, stripped of rhetoric, is precise: adaptive pricing under unilateral, unpublished rules is indexing without accountability—the same charge leveled above at corporate geo-zoning, applied one shelf at a time. The shelf is the actuator. The Chilean UF is the sensor. What connects them does not yet exist.

The delta: The three bodies of evidence are complementary, and no one of them suffices. Indexed instruments exist as accounting, not commerce; TIPS is debt, the UF is contract denomination, but neither reaches the shelf. Geographic pay zones exist as administrative exceptions, not general principles—unilateral where they are honest, incompatible where they are public. Electronic labels exist as actuators awaiting a governed input. The geographic evidence is the spatial face of the temporal problem: a unit that ignores local purchasing conditions misprices across geography exactly as a fixed unit misprices across years. The adaptation is extending indexed accounting to general trade settlement without requiring full dollar substitution, connecting published, transparent indices to pricing infrastructure that can execute them in minutes rather than fiscal quarters, and doing so under rules no participant draws for its own benefit. This is not utopian; it is incremental deployment. The sensors exist, the actuators exist; the architecture connecting them does not.

Module 2: Tiered Store of Value

The failure prevented: The Triffin dilemma—holding reserves in one nation's liability inevitably creates misaligned incentives. Also the silverite tragedy—putting wealth in one metal and watching its purchasing power halve over two decades.

The principle embodied: Redundancy and modularity (Holling, Haldane). Failure containment across multiple instruments rather than concentration in one.

Specification: Participants may hold reserves across tiers:

- Short-term transaction balances: in local or regional currency (fast settlement, elastic supply)
- Medium-term reserves: in indexed baskets (commodity + labor) preserving purchasing power
- Long-term reserves: in diversified assets (gold, energy claims, or other hard assets) with transparent custody

Fair Money

No single instrument dominates. Each serves one time horizon; no holder faces the "gold-or-deflation" false choice of the 1890s.

Existing precedents:

- Central bank reserve diversification (already happening across USD/EUR/CNY/gold)
- Sovereign wealth funds (Norway, Singapore) manage multi-asset reserves at scale [Norges Bank Investment Management, annual reports]
- BRICS New Development Bank's local-currency lending pilots

The delta: Formalize tiered reserve guidance rather than leave it to ad hoc portfolio decisions. Create legal frameworks for indexed reserves in multilateral treaties, not just bilateral agreements.

Module 3: Open Settlement Rails

The failure prevented: The SWIFT sanction problem—centralized payment infrastructure that can exclude participants regardless of their trade legitimacy—and its 2026 extension, in which a sanctioned nation's gold reserves were rendered illiquid not by confiscation but by counterparty fear of the dollar network. Also the "crime of '73"—when one issuer controls access to the clearing system.

The principle embodied: Mutualism without ownership (Simard, Champagne fairs). Infrastructure as commons rather than property.

Specification: A mesh of interoperable payment networks:

- Each rail operates under local law, with local governance
- Cross-network protocols enable direct settlement between different systems
- No single operator can veto transaction validity across the entire mesh
- Verification is distributed: cryptographic proof rather than institutional permission

Existing precedents:

- China's Cross-Border Interbank Payment System (CIPS) [People's Bank of China]
- India's UPI and cross-border rupee settlement corridors [National Payments Corporation of India]

- ISO 20022 messaging standards (neutral technical protocol) [International Organization for Standardization]
- Bitcoin/blockchain proof-of-concept for settlement without central clearing (limited by throughput)

The delta: Open standards (ISO) + distributed governance (regional rails) + no universal veto (mesh topology). The rails exist; the architecture connecting them does not.

Module 4: Rule-Based Elasticity

The failure prevented: The 2008 and 2020 responses—extraordinary liquidity injections that saved the system but created asymmetric winners. Political discretion in money supply allows short-term rescue but long-term capture.

The principle embodied: Homeostasis again, with explicit constraints (Ashby + Ostrom's graduated sanctions).

Specification: Money-supply rules triggered by measured economic indicators:

- Base money growth linked to nominal GDP targets within ±2% bands
- Automatic tightening when inflation breaches upper band; automatic easing when unemployment breaches lower band
- Regional opt-out clauses activated by super-majority vote (respecting national sovereignty)

No magic. Just pre-commitment devices that bind hands against political capture.

Existing precedents:

- Taylor Rule for interest-rate policy (widely implemented, if imperfectly) [Taylor, "Discretion versus Policy Rules in Practice"]
- German Bundesbank's monetary targeting (1970s–1980s)
- Digital currency programmability pilots (CBDCs in China, Bahamas, Jamaica)

The delta: Make elasticity *explicit and codified* rather than discretionary. Publish the trigger conditions; let markets price the rules rather than guess the discretion.

Fair Money

Module 5: Redundant Trust

The failure prevented: The 1971 Nixon shock—trust in one issuer collapsing because that issuer's gold reserves were insufficient. Also the 2014–2022 sanction wave—trust converted to exclusion.

The principle embodied: Distributed verification (Hayek + network science). Trust is a function of *many* validators, not one arbiter.

Specification:

- Ledger copies held by independent jurisdictions
- Verification thresholds requiring multi-party attestation for settlement finality
- Audit trails that are public or semi-public depending on classification level
- No single government can rewrite settlement records retroactively

Existing precedents:

- Distributed ledger pilots for interbank settlement (Project Jasper, Project Ubin) [Bank of Canada; Monetary Authority of Singapore]
- Public blockchain settlements for stablecoins (USDC, USDT)
- SWIFT GMI (global messages initiative) for enhanced traceability

The delta: Apply redundancy to *state-level* settlement, not just private crypto. Require bilateral/multilateral treaty backing for each ledger copy—making the trust function political and verifiable, not technological alone.

Module 6: Regional Modularity

The failure prevented: The 1890s and 1930s contagion—failure in one nation propagating globally. Also the Brexit/Sanctions aftermath—political shocks cascading through tightly coupled networks.

The principle embodied: Modularity and failure containment (Holling, Haldane). Firewalls between subsystems so that local collapse does not become global catastrophe.

Specification:

- Regional currency blocs with flexible exchange rates between blocs

- Cross-block capital controls permitted during stress periods
- Multilateral emergency facilities with pre-committed liquidity
- Exit clauses permitting temporary suspension without permanent severance

Existing precedents:

- Chiang Mai Initiative (ASEAN+3 currency swap network) [ASEAN+3 Finance Ministers' Process]
- European Exchange Rate Mechanism (ERM I & II) [European Monetary Institute archives]
- Regional swap arrangements among BRICS nations

The delta: Codify modularity *explicitly* in international agreements. Make firewalls feature, not bug. Allow temporary decoupling without regime change.

The Integrated System

Six modules, each preventing one historical failure, each grounded in one scientific principle, each drawing on one existing precedent. Together they form a system that is:

- **Homeostatic** (responsive to real economic conditions rather than anchored to one instrument)
- **Redundant** (multiple stores of value, multiple settlement paths, no single point of failure)
- **Modular** (regional opt-outs, failure containment, respect for sovereignty)
- **Transparent** (rules published, verification distributed, audits possible)
- **Reciprocal** (designed so cooperation is more profitable than domination)

Does this architecture earn the claims made in Sections I–III? That question is the test Section V will apply.

V. Transition and Objections: The Politics of Getting There

The Central Objection: Incumbents Benefit From the Flaw

Begin with the honest difficulty. Every architecture proposed in Section IV reduces the unilateral leverage of whoever holds it today—chiefly the United States as reserve issuer, but also every institution positioned at a network chokepoint. Expecting incumbent powers to sponsor their own

demotion is not analysis; it is naïveté. The silverites learned this in 1896: their coalition had the votes of grievance but not the alignment of interests, and the election settled the question for a generation.

History offers two modes of monetary transition. The **catastrophic mode**: world war ended the classical gold standard; the Depression ended what was restored; the Bretton Woods collapse followed its predicted course. The **negotiated mode**: sterling's eclipse by the dollar proceeded gradually across fifty years—and Britain did ultimately accept the outcome through negotiated instruments, most notably the Sterling Agreements of 1968–74. But recent scholarship shows what lay beneath: two decades of capital controls, commercial pressure, and outright coercion of sterling-area countries to prevent divestment—a captive market, not a voluntary congregation, with 89% of sterling-area reserves still held in pounds as late as 1965. Even the gentlest transition on record was managed under duress. This is not a reason to abandon negotiation; it is a reason to begin it earlier than Britain did. [Schenk, "The Retirement of Sterling as a Reserve Currency after 1945"]

The claim of this section is not that negotiation is likely. It is that negotiation is *cheaper than catastrophe*, and that a paper proposing architecture without transition pathways merely describes another beautiful machine nobody will build.

Objections, Taken Seriously

From the defenders of dollar primacy. *"The dollar system produced the greatest prosperity in human history. Why repair the engine mid-flight?"* The strongest version of this argument deserves concession: Section IV's architecture is inferior to dollar centrality on pure transaction-cost efficiency, precisely as diverse ecosystems are less efficient than monocultures—until the blight arrives. The rebuttal is not that the dollar will fail, but that a system whose stability depends on one issuer's perpetual virtue has already required several rescues of escalating scale, and that weaponization—however individually rational—converts reserve neutrality into contested ground. Credibility, once converted into leverage, cannot be un-spent—and each extension of that leverage to new instruments, as when gold itself was rendered illiquid in 2026, teaches every reserve holder that asset diversification alone is not an exit. The incumbent's best counterargument is that no credible successor exists. That objection stands unanswered by this paper except through accumulation: no single successor is proposed, which is the point.

From gold standard restorationists. *"Return to hard money; scarcity disciplines states."* Section II is the reply: the classical standard delivered stability by exporting its adjustment costs to the periphery, and its restoration produced the worst depression on record. But the restorationists' underlying insight—that credibility requires constraint—survives the critique. Section IV's Modules 1 and 4 embody constraint through rules rather than metal: codified elasticity bands, published triggers, distributed verification. Constraint is retained; the peg is not.

From modern monetary theorists. *"Scarcity of money is a policy choice; elastic supply is a feature."* MMT and this paper agree more than either camp may admit: the silverite diagnosis—that money should respond to real economic need—is MMT's diagnosis. The disagreement is governance. An unconstrained sovereign issuer internalizes political cycles; Module 4 accepts elasticity but demands rules, transparency, and opt-outs. MMT correctly identifies that money is a social technology; it underweights that social technologies require Ostrom-style boundaries or capture follows.

From crypto maximalists. *"Distributed ledgers already solved this—fix the money, exit the state."* Satoshi's architecture genuinely advanced Module 5's trust problem and proved rails can run without owners. But bitcoin embodies precisely the fixed-anchor error with new hardware: a supply schedule indifferent to economic conditions is the gold standard with the metal removed. And a governance vacuum is not neutrality—it cedes validation power to whoever controls infrastructure, mining pools, and exchanges. Crypto contributed a critical component (Modules 3, 5) while mistaking it for a whole system.

From socialist and left critiques. *"Every monetary architecture is a class architecture; yours will be captured by capital like the rest."* This objection cannot be dismissed, because the historical record supports the concern: Bretton Woods was designed in the interests of its designers. The paper's answers are structural rather than rhetorical—labor indices in the unit of account (Module 1), graduated rather than binary sanction (Modules 4, 5), regional voice rather than plutocratic weighting—and they are honestly insufficient: structure biases outcomes but does not guarantee them. What can be promised is *contestability*: a system where excluded parties have exit options and forming coalitions is not forbidden is more remediable than one where exclusion is permanent. A central planner will find little here to fear formally—open rails extend her nation's trade—and little to endorse—the same rails reduce

her leverage over participants. The architecture is deliberately indifferent to regime type while structurally hostile to chokepoints of any provenance. Ideologues of every camp will find that disappointing. It is intended.

From nationalists and sovereignty absolutists. *"This binds our hands."* Module 6 answers directly: exit clauses, temporary decoupling, regional blocs. The architecture increases sovereignty for everyone except the single dominant issuer—the actor whose cooperation is least necessary if enough others proceed.

Transition Pathways: Gradual, Parallel, Opt-In

No treaty replaces the dollar. The architecture deploys the way all monetary infrastructure actually has: opportunistically, in parallel, until the new practice is load-bearing.

1. **Indexed settlement first (Module 1).** Chile's UF proves the tool. Extend indexed units to trade contracts—commodity exporters invoicing in purchasing-power units—without requiring any currency substitution. Precedent requires no negotiation; it requires only adoption. Already, indexed adjustment clauses proliferate in private long-term contracts (COLA provisions, commodity escalators, geographic differentials), and public employment regimes adjust compensation by locality without doctrinal hesitation. The proposal does not invent indexing; it extracts the logic from scattered practice and makes it universal, transparent, and reciprocal. The UF is the anchor precedent, but the case is wider: federal locality pay admits geographic purchasing power variation, and electronic shelf labels provide the technical capacity for adaptive pricing at retail scale. What connects these fragments into a coherent system requires only governance, not invention.[1]
2. **Bilateral rails, then mesh (Module 3).** Local-currency settlement is advancing by declaration rather than estimate: the New Delhi Declaration of September 2026, adopted unanimously at the 18th BRICS Summit, commits members to expanding trade and payments in local currencies, with a Payment Task Force tasked to develop cross-border interoperability of payment and messaging channels. CIPS, UPI corridors, and swap lines exist. The delta is interoperability standards, which are technical, not political.

[1]

3. **Regional fortification (Module 6).** The Chiang Mai model—swap networks with pre-committed liquidity—can be replicated in regional groupings without global agreement. Firewalls build one border at a time.
4. **Treaty codification last (Modules 4, 5).** Only after practice demonstrates value do rules acquire treaty backing. This is the Bretton Woods sequence inverted—practice first, architecture ratified afterward—which is how the medieval fairs actually operated.

The uncomfortable corollary of gradualism must also be stated: the catastrophic pathway remains available if negotiation is refused. Declining issuers face the choice Britain faced—managed succession or forced adjustment—eventually. Architecture that lowers the cost of the former raises the probability of the latter.

What This Paper Does Not Claim

No final equilibrium. No end of politics. No instrument that is simultaneously scarce, stable, and just. The proposal is narrower and, the author submits, more durable: an architecture in which monetary mistakes remain survivable, exclusion remains temporary, and differences remain tradeable rather than fatal. Whether states choose it through foresight or accept it through exhaustion is a question this paper cannot settle—but the sequencing of that choice determines how many silverites, how many Argentines, how many holders of the last unbacked dollars pay for the learning.

VI. Conclusion

Four centuries of monetary history reduce to a single pattern: every system that sought permanence through fixity—a ratio, a peg, an anchor, a monopoly—was broken by the world it presumed to be still. The breakdowns were predicted in advance by their own observers, endured by those least able to refuse, and survived by institutions capable of change. The science of durable systems, from cell membranes to commons that fed villages for five hundred years, converges on the same finding: stability is not a property possessed but a process performed—continuous, distributed, self-correcting, bounded.

This paper has argued that money can be architected that way. Not through a new anchor—gold, dollar, yuan, or algorithm—but through decomposition: an adaptive unit of account that compensates across time, space, and transaction-speed without embedding hidden transfers; tiered reserves that hold no single point of failure; open settlement rails that no participant owns and none can be expelled from; rule-based elasticity that responds to conditions rather than discretion; redundant verification that makes trust collective; and regional modularity that keeps one nation's crisis from becoming everyone's. Every component exists somewhere in the world today in partial form. What is missing is not the technology but the recognition that the assembly is possible—and the will to negotiate rather than discover through catastrophe.

The deepest finding of this inquiry is not monetary. It is that the systems which endure—biological, communal, commercial—are those in which the participants' differences are the substance of their exchange rather than the occasion for their conflict. A forest is not strong despite its diversity of species; its diversity is its strength, each tree different, each rooted in soil shared through networks no tree commands. Nations are not otherwise. The monetary order this paper proposes asks nothing more of humanity than the forest performs without instruction: to hold differences in trade rather than in contempt, and to build for each other's survival because one's own depends upon it.

The question of whether such an architecture is adopted deliberately, or is assembled from wreckage after the present arrangement fails in the manner its predecessors all failed, is not settled here. Both paths are open. Only one is chosen.

Bibliography

Al Jazeera English. "How US Sanctions on Iran Ripple Through Global Markets and Consumers." August 24, 2026. **https://www.aljazeera.com/economy/2026/8/24/how-us-sanctions-on-iran-ripple-through-global-markets-and-consumers**

Acemoglu, Daron, Asuman Ozdaglar, and Alireza Tahbaz-Salehi. "Systemic Risk and Stability in Financial Networks." American Economic Review 105, no. 2 (2015): 564–608. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20130762

Fair Money

Ahamed, Liaquat. *Lords of Finance: The Bankers Who Broke the World*. New York: Penguin Press, 2009.

Ashby, W. Ross. *An Introduction to Cybernetics*. London: Chapman & Hall, 1956.

Banco Central de Chile. "The Unidad de Fomento: History and Implementation." Santiago, 1991.

Bretton Woods. https://thetreatyarchive.com/treaty/bretton-woods-agreement

BRICS Secretariat. *New Delhi Declaration 2026*. New Delhi: 18th BRICS Summit, September 12, 2026.

Bruno, Michael, and Jeffrey D. Sachs. *Economics of Worldwide Stagflation***. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985.**

Bryan, William Jennings. "Cross of Gold Speech." Democratic National Convention, Chicago, July 9, 1896. **https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/williamjenningsbryan1896dnc.htm**

Cannon, Walter B. *The Wisdom of the Body*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1932.

CNBC. "Walmart Digital Price Tags Will Be in Every US Store by End of 2026." March 21, 2026. https://www.cnbc.com/2026/03/21/walmart-digital-price-tags-will-be-in-every-us-store-by-end-of-2026.html

Department of State. *Standardized Regulations (Government Civilians, Foreign Areas)*. Office of Overseas Allowances. **https://allowances.state.gov**

Edwards, Jeremy, and Sheilagh Ogilvie. "What Lessons for Economic Development Can We Draw from the Champagne Fairs?" Explorations in Economic History 49, no. 2 (2012): 131–148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eeh.2011.12.002

Eichengreen, Barry. *Exorbitant Privilege: The Rise and Fall of the Dollar and the Future of the International Monetary System*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Eichengreen, Barry. *Golden Fetters: The Gold Standard and the Great Depression, 1919–1939*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Fair Money

Eichengreen, Barry. *Globalizing Capital: A History of the International Monetary System*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Friedman, Milton. "The Crime of 1873." Journal of Political Economy 98, no. 6 (1990): 1159–1194. https://ideas.repec.org/a/ucp/jpolec/v98y1990i6p1159-94.html

Friedman, Milton, and Anna Jacobson Schwartz. A Monetary History of the United States, 1867–1960. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963. https://press.princeton.edu/books/hardcover/9780691003542/a-monetary-history-of-the-united-states-1867-1960

GRA. "From Paper to Pixels on Europe's Supermarket Shelves." June 24, 2026. https://www.gra.world/from-paper-to-pixels-on-europes-supermarket-shelves/

Gramm, Marshall. "The Free Silver Movement in America: A Reinterpretation." *Journal of Economic History* 64, no. 4 (December 2004): 1108–1129.

Haldane, Andrew G., and Robert M. May. "Systemic Risk in Banking Ecosystems." Nature 469 (2011): 351–355. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21248842/

Hayek, Friedrich A. Denationalisation of Money: The Argument Refined. 3rd ed. London: Institute of Economic Affairs, 1978. Full text: https://iea.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Denationalisation%20of%20Money.pdf

Holling, C. S. "Resilience and Stability of Ecological Systems." *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 4 (1973): 1–23.

Kazin, Michael. *A Godly Hero: The Life of William Jennings Bryan*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2006.

Liviatan, Nissan. "Israel's Stabilization Program." Policy Research Working Paper No. 91. Washington, DC: The World Bank, 1988.

Lopez, Robert S., and Irving W. Raymond. Medieval Trade in the Mediterranean World: Illustrative Documents. Translated with introductions and notes by the authors. New York: Columbia University

Press, 1967. Reprint, with foreword by Olivia Remie Constable, 2001. https://cup.columbia.edu/book/medieval-trade-in-the-mediterranean-world/9780231123570/

Maryland House Bill 1475 Consumer Protection – Dynamic Pricing Disclosure and Prohibition on Rent–Setting https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2026RS/bills/hb/hb1475f.pdf

National Public Radio. "Treasury Secretary Scott Bessent Unveils New U.S. Sanctions to Isolate Iran." August 24, 2026. **https://www.npr.org/2026/08/24/g-s1-139743/treasury-secretary-scott-bessent-to-unveil-new-u-s-economic-sanctions-on-iran**

Office of Personnel Management. "2026 General Schedule (GS) Locality Pay Tables." Washington, DC, 2026. https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/pay-leave/salaries-wages/2026/general-schedule

Office of Personnel Management. "Administering Locality Rates." OPM Fact Sheet. **https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/pay-leave/pay-administration/fact-sheets/administering-locality-rates**

Ostrom, Elinor. Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/governing-the-commons/A8BB63BC4A1433A50A3FB92EDBBB97D5

Paolera, Gerardo della, and Alan M. Taylor. "A Monetary and Financial Wreck: The Baring Crisis, 1890–91." In Straining at the Anchor: The Argentine Currency Board and the Search for Macroeconomic Stability, 1880–1935, pp. 67–79. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Patinkin, Don. "Israel's Stabilization Program of 1985, or Some Simple Truths of Money Theory." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **7, no. 2 (1993): 103–128.**

Rockoff, Hugh. "The 'Wizard of Oz' as a Monetary Allegory." *Journal of Political Economy* 98, no. 4 (August 1990): 739–760.

Rolnick, Arthur J., François R. Velde, and Warren E. Weber. "The Debasement Puzzle: An Essay on Medieval Monetary History." Journal of Economic History 56, no. 4 (1996): 789–808. Free reprint: https://www.minneapolisfed.org/research/quarterly-review/the-debasement-puzzle-an-essay-on-medieval-monetary-history

Schenk, Catherine R. The Decline of Sterling: Managing the Retreat of an International Currency, 1945–1992. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Publisher listing: https://www.ebooks.com/en-us/book/502408/the-decline-of-sterling/catherine-r-schenk

Shiller, Robert J. "Indexed Units of Account." NBER Working Paper No. 6356, December 1997.

Simard, S. W., D. A. Perry, M. D. Jones, D. D. Myrold, D. M. Durall, and R. Molina. "Net Transfer of Carbon Between Ectomycorrhizal Tree Species in the Field." Nature 388 (1997): 579–582. https://www.nature.com/articles/41557

Skidelsky, Robert. *John Maynard Keynes: Fighting for Britain, 1937–1946*. New York: Viking, 2000.

Steil, Benn. *The Battle of Bretton Woods: John Maynard Keynes, Harry Dexter White, and the Making of the International Monetary System*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013.

The New York Times. "Gold, Flights, Cryptocurrency: U.S. Vows to Go After More Than Iran's Oil." August 25, 2026. **https://www.nytimes.com/2026/08/25/world/middleeast/iran-us-sanctions-oil-gold.html**

Tooze, Adam. *Crashed: How a Decade of Financial Crises Changed the World*. New York: Viking, 2018.

Triffin, Robert. *Gold and the Dollar Crisis: The Future of Convertibility*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.

United States Department of State. "U.S. Upends Iranian Shadow Fleet and Oil-for-Gold Terror Financing Network." April 15, 2026. **https://www.state.gov/iran-sanctions**

Walker, Brian, and David Salt. *Resilience Thinking: Sustaining Ecosystems and People in a Changing World*. Washington, DC: Island Press, 2006.

Warren, Elizabeth, and Bob Casey. Letter to Rodney McMullen, Chairman and CEO, The Kroger Co. August 5, 2024. https://www.warren.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/media/doc/warren_casey_letter_to_kroger_re_electronic_shelving_and_price_gouging.pdf