

Kptl Truth 10<sup>2...14</sup>

v2

## Kptl Truth 10<sup>2...14</sup>

*Capital Truth* — to make it more comprehensible - is an electronic currency generated by a computer program. The program is for servers, it is in PHP format and is licenced freely to GNU. It can be accessed free of charge or can be downloaded by clicking [here](#).

It is a local electronic currency which the program distributes based on the following value hypothesis: individuals with better evaluations from third parties based on a questionnaire of human axiological values and everyday behavioural attitudes will have more money.

Those individuals who receive more mutually agreed transfers from other participants and payments for goods and services in the real world will also have more money.

Individuals who deal in this currency live in close proximity and know each other personally, or at least coexist in close proximity, so as to be able to evaluate each others behaviour and values based on everyday experiences.

This IT program requires an administrator, who initially needs to determine three parameters:

—Name the currency, in singular and plural. From hence forth it shall be referred to as "point" or simply coin.

—Size of the Treasury, the total number of points with which the program will work. The program offers thirteen possible quantities

	$10^2 = 100$
	$10^3 = 1,000$
	$10^4 = 10,000$
	$10^5 = 100,000$
	$10^6 = 1,000,000$
	$10^7 = 10,000,000$
INITIAL	$10^8 = 100,000,000$
OR	$10^9 = 1,000,000,000$
TOTAL	$10^{10} = 10,000,000,000$
TREASURY	$10^{11} = 100,000,000,000$
thirteen options	$10^{12} = 1,000,000,000,000$
	$10^{13} = 10,000,000,000,000$
	$10^{14} = 100,000,000,000,000$

of total points in the treasury, from which to select, based on the number of expected participants. Since KT is implemented in established populations it is not difficult to estimate the number of users which there might be, and select one of the options. The recommended quantity with which to work is around 10,000 points per person. From this moment the quantity selected, of the thirteen options, will be referred to as Total Treasury (TT).

—Select between five and fifty value questions of axiological or behavioural significance, the same for all users throughout the experiment. These will be selected by each individual for others to respond to. Each of these value questions has several terms - the proposal - written in the first person - and its third party valuation - the same but written in the third person. There are some examples of possible questions at the end of this document.

The program will add the following text alongside the selected questions proposed

*Yes, that is correct / No / No I do not want to be assessed on this*

And

*No / Yes / Double*

alongside the tick-boxes for third party responses, which will be filled in using the mouse, and which for the convenience of the registered user also records the previous evaluation.

The administrator is also responsible for authorising the participation of individuals who request admission or removal from the program. When an individual exits the program their points are returned to the central Treasury.

## THE PROCESS FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF POINTS

—1. Start and entry // Registration form.

On initial entry into the program, the user must complete the registration form which is then authorised by the administrator. Thereafter they will access the program with their username and password. On the registration form they will state their real name: other participants will refer to them by this, no other personal details are made publicly available.

—2. Personal evaluations.

Here each participant can see the number of points which other users have given them, see the names of the rest of the participants and click to see their value statements. Additionally, they can access the introductions of newly admitted participants, their own money, the sum total of the other participants' points and the amount left in the Treasury. These amounts add up to the initial TT size.

They can also see the quantities they have received from transfers for payments of goods and services.

—3. Protocol for personal evaluations.

There are verification boxes alongside the text. Users are limited to completing and sending their

results to the twenty question questionnaire. In each case they must select one of the three options.

—4. Submitting assessments of values or third party behaviour.

Users respond as to whether the participant has or has not met the axiological values - based on whether they have seen it in everyday life, in their encounters with that person. Their assessment is exclusive - only one tickbox can be selected, neither two nor three options can be selected - and all assessments must be completed. The questions which the user classified as "Do not want to be assessed on this" simply do not appear and are not validated. Users must successively enter into each of the participants' respective pages to validate their assessments.

In addition to these three tickboxes there is also a special box: it makes it possible to transfer coins to the participant which is being evaluated for payment of a good or service which has previously been agreed in the real world.

The points which have not been used, "bet" or validated are simply maintained on the server, in the Treasury.

The program receives the evaluations throughout the day. At a designated time in the day, for example, during the night, access is denied to the program and what can be referred to as the points engine is started up.

Below is a step by step explanation of the process carried out by the points engine. These series of steps have been adapted to make the process comprehension and are not an exact literal succession of steps or representation of the lines of code which are executed by the program, but they do serve to explain the process:

STEP 1—The most recent results are entered into the program

2—The "door is closed" at this moment to all further evaluations which may be received. It remains closed until Step 8.

3—A "role call" is carried out to ascertain who has submitted data throughout the day and who has not: those who have not sent their data on that day are penalised by leaving them with the same points which they had on their previous submission. In addition the rest of the participants are allocated the same points which they were given on the previous occasion.

4—All the points are removed. Each participants' points counter is set to zero.

5—All the questionnaires are checked and cross-checked.

The number of cross-checks carried out is:

$$Q \times (Q-1)$$

..where Q is the number of participants. The "minus one" is applied so that nobody can self-scorejuy.

...if there are 3 participants, six cross-checks  
 ...if there are 20 participants, 380 cross-checks

And the following criteria table is applied:

—For valuation X corresponding to any of the variables in my questionnaire, when assessed by other participants, I achieve....

	Tickbox 1 for value X (Yes, I believe I comply with this)	Tickbox 2 for value X (No, I believe I do not satisfy this)	Tickbox 3 for value X (No, I do not want to be evaluated on this)
Third party response 1: NO	0 points for me	0	0 = Not possible to evaluate, this tickbox did not appear
Third party response 2: yes	1	0	0 (id.)
Third party response 3: double yes	2	1	0 (id.)

By means of these criteria, the program allocates points to each participant. These are collated with the coins paid and received:

	<i>Transfer operations</i>
Are added +	All the transfers received, from the very first to the ones received today: All the transfers data is entered into the database
Are subtracted —	All the transfers received, from the very first to the ones received today: All the transfers data is entered into the database

For this process, the order in which the participants is dealt with is irrelevant: There is no advantage or disadvantage of being the first or the last.

6— The result of the subtractions of points can never lead to someone having negative points. If after step 5 a participant has 0 points, whatever the quantity which should subsequently be deducted for their transfers to others, will be set to zero, never a negative number.

7—The program checks that through the distribution of points it has not exceeded the amount in the Treasury, TT.

In the event that this has occurred, the algorithm is simple: Since the program cannot exceed the TT amount at the time when the system should allocate the point TT+1 to a participant, a % reduction, rounded to the nearest whole number, is applied to all participants .

8— The program publishes the "notice board of points" which remains unchanged throughout the following day. The following information is visible on each participant´s homepage:

$$\begin{array}{r} \checkmark \text{ Their money} \\ \checkmark \text{ The sum of the money owned by all other participants} \\ \checkmark \text{ The amount remaining in the Treasury} \\ + \hline = \text{ Treasury Total} \end{array}$$

Step 9 The final step — The program becomes able to receive questionnaire data and to instantly carry out transfers. This situation is maintained until the following night.

It is important to reiterate that this sequence is not exactly the same as that which occurs in the lines of code which are executed by the program but it does serve to explain the process in an understandable way: It is a translation of the process carried out by the PHP machine in a way which is comprehensible to the layman.

#### OTHER LOGIC RULES OF THE PROGRAM

—The identity of users is well protected so that you cannot value yourself or transfer money to yourself.

—When you evaluate someone, despite being generous and repeating that with many people, you are not giving them your own coins. The following day the amount will be deducted from the TT.

—You are aware of your own points, but not of other people´s, unless you ask them directly by means of another channel. Only the administrator has access to this information, and he trusts that there are no errors and the program ensures the total money coincides with the TT total.

—You do not select who evaluates you, you cannot even make suggestions via the application. Everyones personal evaluation criteria is visible to all participants, unless a participant has selected "I do not want to be valued on this criteria". If so, only their name will appear: others will be able to transfer money to you but not value you.

—Neither can you access the valuations received at an individual level: you only receive the aggregated total. If you are curious to know how someone valued you, you must ask them directly in the real world.

—A negative evaluation or punishment check-box does not exist. The closest thing to doing this

would be to retrospectively withdraw a positive evaluation given on a previous day.

—If you do not rate yourself on a criteria and do not want to be evaluated on it, nobody will evaluate you. When you finally start rating yourself you may be surprised to discover that others double your valuation using the double points option.

—You can transfer money to another participant. The maximum amount that is transferable is the quantity in your possession, no more. This quantity is added to the points of the recipient and deducted from those of the donor with immediate effect.

As such, one achieves more points if they carry out more truths of a high axiological value and which are evaluated by others, because they know and deal with him personally in everyday life. One also earns more money if they manage to receive more transfers for goods and services delivered in everyday life.

The *demurrage fee* of certain social currencies here is not relevant. The demurrage is a strategy to prevent hoarding of currency by someone. This accumulation can be axiologically good or bad: it corresponds to other users judge and withdraw ratings, or not make transfers.

### THREE UNIQUE CASE-STUDIES OF THE APPLICATION

First case-study: KT with a minimum treasury of 100 coins. Only three registered participants, J\*\*, U\*\* and S\*\*. They have valued each other well and very similarly. They have not transferred any coins to each other. In recent days they have obtained up to 33 points each. The treasury has the one remaining point. On Monday, U\*\* improves his valuation of S\*\* so that on Tuesday they have 33 and 34 coins respectively, The Treasury has no coins. On Wednesday J\*\* also improves his evaluation of S\*\*, as U\*\* had previously done.

Resolution: On Thursday, S\*\* will not receive his 35th coin, however much he deserves it. The application will "shave" a whole percentage point with no decimals, from everyone. The result will be: 32 U\*\*, 32 J\*\* 34 S\*\* and two remaining coins in the TT.

Second case-study, a variation on the previous situation: KT with a minimum total of 100 coins. R\*\*, S\*\* and T\*\* have 33 coins each, as in the previous case-study, and one coin in the TT. In this case T\*\* has achieved coins, not through the evaluations received from R\*\* or S\*\* but from selling goods and services. R\*\* and S\*\* achieved their coins solely from mutual valuations. T\*\* does not want to value or be valued by others. (A few days earlier, R\*\* and S\*\* had 16 and 17 coins each, also obtained through mutual valuations, but they used them to pay T\*\*).

On Monday morning T\*\* agrees to be valued. That afternoon, R\*\* and S\*\* value him with 1 point each. On Tuesday, T\*\* should have 35 coins but the program cannot operate with 101 coins in circulation,  $33+33+35=101$ .

As with the previous situation they will have the following coins: 32 R\*\*, 32 S\*\* 34 T\*\* and two coins remaining in TT. Whether the coins have been obtained from an axiological or behavioural valuation or from a payment for goods or services is irrelevant to the program when "shaving" everyone's points. I believe this is neither fair nor ethical` for a coin achieved from a third party

valuation to have the same value as one achieved as a payment. This could be queried or deliberated on, but has deliberately not been taken into account for this application.

Third case-study: KT with a minimum Total Treasury of one hundred coins. Only two participants, A\*\* y Z\*\*. For their mutual valuations, they each have 50 coins. The treasury no longer has any coins. On Monday morning, A\*\* helps Z\*\* resolve a catastrophe at Z\*\* 's house, and as payment asks for 50 coins. Z\*\* accepts the price and they carry out their first transfer.

That afternoon A\*\* has 100 coins and the TT has 0.

On Tuesday A\*\* changes his opinion of Z\*\* considering him now a bad person and withdraws many of his valuations of Z\*\*.

This is the most complex situation that could face the application, called "valuation debt" and occurs as a result of the following three events: a participant receives coins for their favourable valuations, he spends all of them by doing transfers but subsequently those valuations are withdrawn.

Solution: On Wednesday Z\*\* does not have a negative account balance. The application can never give participants negative points or leave them in the red, although it will take negative third party valuations into account. The distribution of coins remains the same as the day before, on Tuesday: A\*\* 100, Z\*\* 0 , and TT 0

Z\*\* will achieve his first coin ...

— When A\*\* transfers a coin to him. In this case he should perhaps spend it by making a transfer immediately, since if he waits until the overnight update of points he will lose the coin and it will be transferred to TT due to his "debt" from his negative third party valuations.

—Or when A\*\* reinstates his prior valuations which would return everyone to the situation which existed on Wednesday, and provides an additional valuation.

Francisco Ortega

kapitaltruth@gmail.com

August 2011



Kptl Truth 10 000 / Isla Cincuenta by [Francisco Ortega Martínez](#) is licensed under a [Creative Commons Reconocimiento-NoComercial-CompartirIgual 3.0 Unported License](#).  
Based on a work at [personales.ya.com](#).



## APPENDIX, proposed valuations to be incorporated in the program

These are written only as responses. The administrator should duplicate them: each of these suggestions are an individuals proposal which is written in the first person, but the third party response should be written in the third person. These are merely examples: others should be created.

### ADOLESCENTS / PLACES OF STUDY (5)

- I arrive at my place of study regularly and on time.
- I treat my classmates with respect: those who are closest to me as well as those who are less so.
- I share my things and the knowledge I have.
- I encourage others to get on well, or at least better than they currently do.
- I make an effort to learn, to teach and to understand.

### EVERYDAY MACHINERY (5)

- I check and drive vehicles skillfully, responsibly and within the limits of the law.
- I drive vehicles with respect and with consideration for other vehicles, pedestrians and the environment.
- I endeavour not to pollute nor destroy the environment.
- I am energy efficient with the machinery I use.
- I make efficient use of water and air.

### BASIC LIFESTYLE PRINCIPLES (13)

- I believe I enjoy life.
- I help others to enjoy life. I want those around me to enjoy physical and mental wellbeing.
- I greet people attentively and courteously.
- I listen attentively to the people I come across and without rushing them.
- I am aware of and interpret peoples body language.
- I tell witty and good humoured jokes and make idle chitchat.
- I take care of my appearance.
- Socially I have and try to maintain, a clean and neat appearance.
- I dress appropriately.
- I look after my local environment .
- I am informed about preventative healthcare.
- I look after the animals and plants which I live with.
- I take care of my health and sleep patterns, avoiding unhealthy habits.

### COMMUNITY (13)

- I remember important community events.
- I enjoy and collaborate in community celebrations and festivities.
- I show an interest in the family history and ancestors of those close to me and I share information about myself.
- I put forward, share and negotiate future plans with my peers.
- I offer to help those who are needy, infirm and disabled around me.
- I offer the most relevant goods and services to the people I deal with in everyday life.
- I am able to keep a secret briefly if it has a wider benefit.
- I ensure everything is in working order and aesthetically pleasing in my living environment.
- I plan for and educate my descendants well.
- I look after the elderly.

- I respect other peoples passions, opinions and beliefs provided they are not detrimental or dubious.
- I prepare myself for and respond to social events - if necessary I try to rectify them assertively and harmoniously.
- I am able to drive well and refrain from behaviour which may be seriously detrimental to others.

#### COMMON WORK ISSUES (5)

- I arrive on time to my place of work and stay for as long as is necessary.
- I dedicate significant effort, both physical and mental, to my work.
- At work, I make optimal use of the efforts, materials and human resources available.
- At work, I collate all relevant information in order to optimise purchases and sales.
- I am interested in my work being assessed and I put a fair value on this.

#### METAVALUES regarding the correct use of the program itself (3)

- I collaborate with the administrator towards the correct operation of this computer application, which I understand and operate well.
- I pay the agreed value for transfers and on time.
- I treat those people and environments which are not part of this program well.