

The Value Threshold: Why Value Only Comes Into Being When Work Appears — Ontology of the Emergence Economy and Introduction of the Universal Care Income (UCI)

Author: Timothy Speed
ORCID: 0009-0002-0143-5949
E-Mail: info@timothy-speed.com

Web: <https://timothy-speed.org>
<https://timothy-speed.com>

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17840277

Abstract:

This paper develops a novel, ontologically grounded theory of value-generation, which traces capitalist performance logic back to a fundamental systemic blind spot. The starting point is the observation that work always exists, but value only arises where work becomes visible. The value threshold (T) functions as an epistemic reality filter that decides which forms of work are permitted to emerge as achievement, and which remain invisible. In this sense, value is not understood as the result of production, but as the appearance of reality.

The analysis shows that submergent, invisible work (care, ecological regeneration, social cohesion, psychic regulation, cultural stabilisation) generates the majority of societal carrying capacity, yet does not transition into economic value-form. Poverty therefore does not arise from a lack of work, but from a lack of emergence. Capitalism is structurally based on the invisibilisation of world – value arises through exclusion. Only what crosses the value threshold becomes visible.

The central contribution of this paper is the derivation of a post-market value order. For this, UBI (Universal Basic Income) is contrasted with an alternative model: UCI (Universal Care Income). While UBI is fed by submergent performance and thus rests upon exploitation, UCI makes invisible work emergent and shifts value ontology. UCI does not generate output, but future-carrying capacity – value as regenerative performance. The diversity marker is defined as the threshold below which systems structurally collapse. In this model, commons do not function as niche solutions, but as emergence machines of a UCI-supported real economy.

The result is not a reform programme, but system architecture. An economy after T defines prosperity through complexity-preservation, not growth; income follows world, not wage. In this way an empirically testable research programme is proposed: pilot zones with UCI-distribution, emergence monitoring, diversity metrics, and entropy analysis. Value does not arise through work, but through appearance.

This theory shows how invisibility is structurally produced — and how UCI dissolves that condition.

SECTION 0. Ontological Grounding: Why the Value Threshold Must Exist

The value threshold (T) is not an economic boundary, but an emergence-cut within a physical-ontological field.
 Its existence does not derive from market logic, but from MNO — Submergence / Indimergence / Emergence.

0.1 Starting Point: MNO

The MNO-theory, developed in 2016, designates the state in which reality exists before it appears as world.
 MNO is therefore neither an object nor a category, but the ontological condition of appearance. It concerns the question of how reality becomes conscious and thus visible.
 Only when reality becomes visible out of MNO does world arise, and only then emerges what we economically recognise as value.

MNO describes three states of reality:

State	Meaning
Submergence – Possibility	Reality present but not manifest. / Neither relational patterns nor fixed objects.
Indimergence – Tension / Condensation	Reality pushes towards appearance. / First object definitions, but object-formation overcovers relational patterns.
Emergence – Form / Visibility	Reality appears as world-form. / Relational patterns lift objects over the emergent threshold. Diversity, markets and ecosystems arise.

This trichotomy is not a model — it is mechanics of being.
 It is a logic of pattern, an endlessly repeating cycle that forms and dissolves reality by letting structure appear, fixing onto objects, thereby pushing relation into the background, and thus letting form decay again when no emergent expansion occurs, after which form arises anew.

Every form, every action, every perception passes through these three zones.
 Nothing appears as world without having passed through emergence.
 All activity remains real, even if it does not appear.

Already here it becomes clear:

Invisible work is not less real.

It is merely submergent (pattern not yet recognisable) or indimergent (narrowed into object categories). Surplus value is what follows in emergence — or fails to follow if indimergence dominates, i.e. when work is restricted as a thing, as an object within a single categorical boundary of availability.

(See MNO concept under: DOI: 10.5281/ZENODO.17803906 or *The Physics of the Poor* ISBN-10: 3695191287)

0.2 T = Transitional Energy of Being

T defines the threshold-energy that is required for work to move from submergence into emergence.

Not price, not wage, not evaluation — but appearance as world.

Formally as conceptual mechanism:

work_real – (T) → work_world

T is a filter, not a measure of value.

Through T it is decided what may be counted as reality.

Thus value is no longer determined by production, but by the capacity to lift being into world-form. And T, the value threshold, defines this space independently of actual value. It is a structural limitation in order to translate value into categories of possession and market control in the first place.

0.3 Why Capitalism Intensifies T

Capitalism is not an economic system, but a regime of appearance.

It does not reward effect, but visibility.

Performance exists only when it passes through T into market-form.

This means:

Non-value ≠ non-work

Non-value = non-emergence

Capitalism exists

because it artificially raises T —

so that only certain being may become world.

Thus we observe here an obstruction of resources in order to create artificial scarcity, which makes “isolated value” possible in the first place — the essential factor of unilateral value-attribution in capitalism.

0.4 Why the Value Threshold Is Physical

T acts like an energy barrier in the quantum field:
Reality can exist without appearing,
just as energy can exist without being measurable
until it jumps the detector.
The analogy is not metaphorical —
it is structurally identical.

Value = detection of work.
Without detection no world-form — yet work was still there.
Thus value is not economic,
but ontologically secondary.
It is appearance, not substance.

The error of economic tradition:
It only measures what has passed through T —
and confuses emergence with origin.
Here we see a fundamental basis of false value-attribution in the economic system. Value is not
real — it is made real through categorical exclusion.

0.5 Consequence for Scientific Validity

If value is an emergence phenomenon,
then statistics is always downstream.
Numbers only measure what T has already permitted.
Empiricism therefore cannot be the origin of proof —
but only confirmation of a mechanism.

Scientific demonstration therefore does not state:
Data show that work remains invisible.
But rather:
Emergence mechanics forces that work only assumes value-form through visibility.
Therefore invisible work must be dominant. It is a mechanical logic.
This is the first ontological proof.
Here scientific validity begins — not statistics.

0.6 Methodological Approach: Why This Paper Requires No Empiricism

This paper deliberately omits statistical evidence, because its subject is not distribution or
output, but the ontological condition of value-generation. It is a question situated before market
arises.

Empiricism measures only what has already emerged through T. Thus it cannot justify the
invisible, but only confirm what has already become visible.

The evidential pathway of this text is therefore not empirical, but structural-ontological:

1. Work always exists
2. Value exists only when work emerges
3. Emergence is a selection event → T

4. What T does not allow through remains real, but valueless
5. UCI (Universal Care Income) functions because it inverts T

Thus this paper does not confuse data with cause,
but shows that data are only effects of a deeper selection mechanism.
Empiricism may follow later — but foundation is logic, not statistics.
This is basic research, not unit labour cost accounting.

SECTION 1 – Value as Emergence and Not as a Given Quantity

Value is not a raw material that simply “exists.”
It is the result of a threshold: the moment in which work emerges, becomes visible, gains form.
Below this threshold, work exists in the mode of the real,
but not in the mode of appearance.
It acts – yet it is not acknowledged.
It carries – yet it is not counted.
It is submergent, indimergent, pre-value.

Even if it is indimergent, i.e. categorically grasped as a thing, as an object, it is still partially
subject to the value threshold, because it is not understood as emergent – which results in loss
of value wherever work must not be more than function.

Here begins the value threshold T: not as an economic number, but as an epistemic interface
which determines whether being becomes world – or remains within the field of possibility.

This shifts the question of economics fundamentally:

Not: Who works?

But: Whose work emerges as value at all? And which work is restricted as a resource through T,
for example to keep it functionally controlled?

For work always exists.

But only a fraction of it passes through T and is called performance.

The rest stabilises society invisibly –
and yet remains imperceptible, unpaid, unarchived.
Or underpaid in indimergence.

Capitalism is not primarily a distribution system,
but a filtering system.

It does not determine how much value arises,
but which value may become visible.

This paper shows the mechanism of that visibility,
the site of loss, the logic of the blind spot –
and why UCI & MNO do not merely imply a more just form of economy,
but an ontological transition:

from market → to emergence.

Thus toward a structural transformation of capitalism
and its valuation and attribution of worth.

SECTION 2 – Work Is Real, Value Is Public

The value threshold is not an economic limit, but a reality-filter.

It does not determine how much value arises, but what proportion may emerge.

Thus work also forms reality itself. Therefore the question of which work may become real is also the question of which reality becomes workable and through which form. Indimergent, reified work forms a different basis of social and reality formation than free, self-determined work, for example — which is essential for the preservation of diversity.

Work itself is always effective.

People care for children, maintain relationships, stabilise commons, prevent collapse, repair world.

Yet only when this work crosses T
is it declared performance —
something that counts as value.

The concept of performance is therefore not neutral, but selective.

It does not describe doing, but the appearance of doing.

Below T: effect without appearance

Above T: appearance → value-form

Thus it becomes clear:

Poverty does not arise from lack of work,
but from lack of emergence.

Which makes structural impoverishment in reified wage-labour
recognisable for the first time as a structural problem.

The value threshold does not block production — it blocks recognition of reality.

Capitalism organises this mechanism systematically:

it sets T high enough that only those forms emerge which are exploitable in market logic.

Everything else remains submergent: real, indispensable, but invisible.

The problem is therefore not distribution, but ontology.

Not inequality, but appearance logic.

Not lack of money, but lack of emergence opening.

This distinction is central.

For those who correct distribution without shifting T
do not change the system —
they merely feed it through.

The question therefore is not:

How do we distribute value more fairly?

But:

How do we allow value to arise at all?

How do we lower T?

At this point UCI (Universal Care Income — recognition also of unseen work) begins as system-shift, and MNO as deep-mechanism that explains why value is not made but continually folded anew into reality.

SECTION 3

Performance is generally understood socially as a product of effort and result.

But this formula does not describe value – it describes only work above T.

It excludes the largest part of reality:

the work that acts, but does not appear.

The dominant economy therefore confuses output with emergence.

It equates visible with real – an equation that only holds

where T has already been crossed.

Below T we find:

- care
- regeneration
- psychic energy work
- social cohesion
- ecological self-renewal

All activities without which society would collapse – and which nonetheless do not exist as performance.

Not because they do not have effect, but because they are not allowed to emerge.

Therefore it becomes clear:

Value is not the consequence of work, but the consequence of visibility.

It only arises where attribution occurs – and not where work is carried.

The value threshold divides reality into two zones:

Above T	Below T
Work becomes performance	Work remains background
Value becomes measurable	Value remains invisible
Market validates	Existence stabilises
Status arises	Maintenance happens

Capitalism is not built on productivity,
but on the narrowing of recognition.

The sphere of performance is an island,
carried by an ocean of concealed work.

Yet the island denies the sea on which it lives.

Here begins the structural error of the system:

It considers itself autonomous, although it accumulates
what it does not generate.

It exploits emergence – and burns submergence.

The higher T is set, the more the system withdraws the energies
from which its future would have to arise.

The crisis is therefore not economic, but ontological.
We do not suffer from distribution, but from visibility blockade.

SECTION 4

The value threshold is not a flaw of the system.
It is the condition of its possibility.
Without T there would be no spheres of performance,
no hierarchies of productivity,
no distinction between valuable and valueless.
T does not divide persons – it divides modes of being.
This has direct, universally visible consequences for ecosystems and minorities.

Capitalism is not based on production,
but on the selection of visibility.
It requires invisibility as its foundation,
just as a building requires a foundation that must not be seen.
T produces value by dividing world.

Visible / invisible
valid / invalid
performance / background

This division is not an economic mechanism,
but an epistemic grid
that defines what counts as reality.

Historically, T arises where work became measurable:
with wage-form, factory, time-sequencing, throughput, scaling.
Everything that did not fit into this form
was not judged inferior –
but non-existent.

Women's labour disappeared behind doors,
care-work behind love,
commons behind property,
bodies behind function.

The problem was never that these activities were undervalued.
They were not recognised as activities at all.
They existed submergently – necessary, but formless.

Thus, the value threshold is not a moral failure,
but an ontology of selection.
It does not decide who works,
but whose work becomes world.

The higher T is set,
the more reality remains submergent.
And the more remains submergent,
the more crisis-prone becomes the system that rests upon it.

Value arises not only through visibility-selection,
but through transformation of submergence into product-form.
So that something can be exploited,
it must first be de-realised –
into material, into resource, into commodity.

Making invisible is not a side effect of economy.
Making invisible is its resource extraction process.

Submergence here does not merely mean sub-threshold existence,
but (flattening, loss of structure, loss of relation) –
a state in which complex interconnections
are reduced to isolated functional points
so that they become economically isolable, separable, extractable.

The value threshold is the site of this reduction:
It highlights appearance by destroying context.
It creates what can be exploited by cutting relations.
It produces product-forms by amputating world.

And thereby the inner paradox becomes visible:
Capitalism destroys the foundations on which it lives
in order to turn them into a dominated category – a product.
It can only exploit what it has first made invisible,
flattened, isolated, submerged.
The system eats its condition.
What appears above T exists only
because beneath it world disappears.

SECTION 5 – Value Measurement Without the Value Threshold

Economic value-creation is usually understood as the result of production.
This paper proposes a different foundation:
Value does not arise when something is done,
but when the done becomes visible.
Work exists in reality just as water exists in soil —
invisible, supportive, necessary.
But only where it becomes world-applied and visible
does it become economically recognisable.

This is precisely the function of the value threshold (T):
T is the boundary between reality and world.
Below, work exists – above, it counts.

Capitalism does not set this boundary by accident,
but systemically:
Work has value only when it appears as measurable performance,
i.e. when it can be translated into appearance.
Thus the value threshold does not explain why work is paid differently,
but why most social work does not appear at all.

Care, art, healing, education, ecological stabilisation, relationship —
 all present, all real,
 yet without appearance-status no value.

Capitalism is therefore less a distribution system than an appearance regime:
 It recognises only what becomes visible through T.
 Invisible work is not “missing” — it has not appeared.
 It remains in pre-stage or liminality, not because it belongs there,
 but because it is not permitted to cross the boundary.

T is the minimal condition under which reality exists for others.
 Below T exists what happens — above exists what appears.
 Economy does not begin with work, but at this threshold.

We therefore see a structural foundational problem of the entire economic theory.
 It does not see the domination model already embedded in the very definition of value within
 markets.

5.1.1 Formal Structure (linguistic-logical equation)

We define three levels according to MNO:

Level	State	World-Status	Value-Status
M – Submergence	Effective but unobserved	Reality	No value
N – Indimergence	Tension, direction, readiness	Pre-world	Pre-value
O – Emergence	Appearance in consciousness/system	Actuality	Value

The value threshold T is the transition N → O.

Formally:

if work \in M or N \rightarrow \neq value

if work \in O \rightarrow = value

This means:

Work is not without value –
 it is pre-value when it does not appear.

Capitalism is based on the equation:

Value = O

Work = O

This is the conceptual error.

The truth is:

Work > O

Value = O

$$T = \Delta(O)$$

T is the differential energy,
not the work itself.

5.1.2 Why T Exists – Causal Derivation

A system cannot allow arbitrary amounts of reality to emerge simultaneously.
Consciousness, culture, economy require a selection mechanism
to hold complexity in form.

T is this form-barrier.

Not ideological, not political, but physically necessary like surface tension in water.

If T is too high → little emergence → stability, but compression → suffocation

If T is too low → oversaturation → agitation, but innovation → new order-surge

Capitalism, however, keeps T permanently rigid,
so that only market-shaped emergences may appear.

The problem is therefore not the boundary of form itself,
but the refusal of the cycle — through the attempt to artificially preserve value
at the expense of reality-expansion and the deepening of complexity and diversity.
The resulting “isolated value” blocks emergence processes.

5.1.3 Why the Value Threshold Does Not Originate in the Labour Market

The labour market measures output,

T measures appearance.

Work does not flow into value-concepts
because it is productive —
but because it is visible.

Value = diagnosis, not substance.

Value is the outcome of field-access —
not its cause.

This approach turns 150 years of economics upside down.

Marx asked how value is created.

This paper shows when value is created.

Not in the moment of production — but in the moment of appearance.

And that moment is T.

5.1.4 Consequence

T is not a price boundary → but an emergence-differential.

UCI is not monetary policy → but emergence activation.

Value is not a trade-object → but a change of state of being.

Thus, the economy is not abolished,
but re-anchored:

Economy becomes physics of consciousness.
(Mechanism for the production and shaping of reality)

Value becomes emergence-energy.
(Structural maintenance of diversity in ecosystems. Market as ecosystem)

5.2 Three Measurement Domains Beyond T

We cannot quantify value,
but we can capture field-lines:

1. Maintenance (Decay → Stability)
How much collapse is prevented?
2. Emergence (From possibility → Form)
How much new passes through T?
3. Regeneration (Depleted → Return)
How much world arises again through work itself?

These three lines form no scale, but a folding-geometry.
Value is then not price – it is topology.

5.3 Phenomenology of Emergence

Value is perceptible before it is measurable.
One does not know it through number, but through resonance, presence, carrying-capacity.

Phenomenologically:
Value does not feel like yield.
Value feels like carryability (of reality).

Hence, for the first time, a precise formula:

VALUE = folding of being into appearance
+ duration of this appearance within the system
– entropy-loss through the emergence-cut

No one will speak like this in everyday life –
but science must understand it this way.

Value without T is not romanticism.
It is a new physics of societal preservation.
This is significant for the question of how economy and ecology will coexist socially and humanely in the future — by not isolating value from the ecosystem, but holding it within its deeper coherence. Both concern fundamentally the formation of world and reality, as well as habitat.

SECTION 6 – Systemic Consequences of the Value Threshold

If work is only value when it appears,
then value is not an inner state of an activity,
but an event of visibility.

This revolutionises the definition of value:

Value is not a property of work,
value is the moment of its appearance.

This makes clear why unpaid work can carry a system,
while paid work often carries no world at all.

Capitalism does not evaluate effect, but visibility.

Therefore, capitalism cannot claim that it preserves society or world per se.

If this is true, we must ask what does preserve them.

We must ask what understanding of value sustains life —
in its full complexity.

Example:

- One who raises a child creates future and culture.

Yet without appearance, no value.

- One who sells advertising space moves little world —
but appears as performance, therefore as value.

The economic paradox dissolves
as soon as one accepts:

Capitalism does not measure world,
but access to world.

T does not decide whether work has been done,
but whether it is recognised as world.

Thus value threshold = perception threshold.

Not ontological in itself, but socially —
yet it acts ontologically,
because it decides what may count as world.

If work appears → value.

If work does not appear → reality without world-status.

We see this mechanism also in social media,
where capitalism as mechanism of value-allocation (attention economy)
transfers itself directly and fatally.

This reduction of emergence leads directly into submergence —
into flattening, chaos, and loss of relation.

6.1 Civilizational Entropy

When only utilisable contributions emerge,

those forms die which are not exploitable but necessary.

The representability and workability of other life-worlds (minorities/abuse conditions) is blocked.

Work against injustice becomes unfinanceable.

Relationships degenerate into transactions,
ecosystems into resources,
humans into functions.

The system lives from energy flows
that it structurally does not acknowledge.
We lose massively in innovation capacity
and in problem-solving competence.

6.2 Loss of Social Regenerative Capacity

Below T, regeneration occurs —
care, healing, emotional cohesion,
psychic stabilisation, conflict de-escalation.
If these processes are not permitted to emerge,
society no longer regenerates itself.
It requires increasing external inputs
(money, control, therapy, surveillance)
for what was once carried internally.

A system that honours only performance
becomes dependent on repair.

The system dries itself out and sinks into conflicts of distribution,
while at the same time emergence — that is, problem-solving capacity — remains blocked.

6.3 Emergence-Backlog as Cultural Pathology

Indimergent processes form dam-masses behind T.
Ideas, art, care, social innovation,
small world-preserving acts, fragile attempts —
they gather, accumulate, disappear.
Not because they fail —
but because they are not permitted to emerge.

One recognises an exhausted system not by a lack of work,
but by a lack of appearance.

We therefore see that work is structurally misplaced.
Society does not collapse when work is absent.
It collapses when too little work becomes world.

Here capitalism becomes a *preventer* of value-creation —
something that until now in economic theory was not merely undescribable,
but entirely unrecognised, while the opposite was claimed:
that value-creation is driven by performance and value-generation.
In this way structural contradictions disappeared from view — with fatal consequences.

When T is lowered,
chaos does not arise —
pluripotency arises.

Not as overload,
but as return of future-breadth.

SECTION 7 — The Transition: When T Becomes Unstable

A system does not collapse when it lacks resources,
but when it can no longer recognise them.

The value threshold has been stable for a long time,
yet stability and preservation are not the same.

T begins to waver once the cost of invisibility
exceeds the benefit of selective visibility.

Then it is not morality that tips —
but the ontology of valuation.

We already observe symptoms of this transition:

- burnout instead of productivity
- isolation instead of community
- surveillance instead of trust
- growth-imperative with shrinking future breadth
- rising complexity with falling differentiation-capacity

The system no longer works efficiently,
but against its own condition.

The result is not a revolution from the outside,
but emergence-pressure from below.

Submergent and indimergent processes accumulate,
seek form, demand world-contact.

This expresses itself not first politically,
but micro-socially:

- people refuse recognition-logic
- art and care withdraw from product-goals
- work becomes physically uncompensable
- meaning breaks market-logic open
- value seeks appearance

Emergence does not want to be kind —
emergence wants to become.

When T falls, chaos does not arise,
but an increase in the frequency of appearance.

More world pushes upward,
more possible forms reach visibility,
more variants of the real come forth.

A system beyond T is not louder.

It is deeper.

Not faster, but denser.

Not more productive, but richer.

The transition does not begin when T drops —
but already when too many forms beneath T no longer wish to disappear.
We stand at this point.

SECTION 8 — Emergence Without the Value Threshold

When T falls, it is not the distribution of value that shifts,
but the ontology of reality.

Work no longer emerges only when it becomes product-shaped,
but as soon as it generates world-contact.

Thus the domain of the real expands.

What previously remained submergent
(care, relationship, commons, regeneration, fragile creativity)
does not suddenly appear as market-value,
but as appearance of its own quality.

Performance loses its dependency on product
and gains meaning as a preservation-event.

Value is no longer *that which is sold*,
but that which carries future.

We do not receive *more values*,
but more realities.

Emergence is not inflation,
but multiplication of world.

This shift has concrete consequences:

1. Art becomes infrastructure
not decoration, but emergence-laboratory of social possibility-spaces.
2. Care becomes framework
not overhead cost, but regeneration-engine of society.
3. Knowledge becomes plural
not elite administration, but multidimensional resonance-capacity.
4. Ecology becomes primary value
not resource, but civilisation-foundation.

Below T, all this already existed,
but without right to appearance.

Once emergence is no longer exclusively bundled,
an economy of plurality arises —
not additivity, but interdependence.

A world beyond T is not recognised by producing more,
but by more being able to persist.

This is decisive, also for post-growth discourse.

8.1 Differentiation From Existing Value Theories

The present theory does not stand isolated —
it stands on the shoulders, but not within the boundaries, of previous models.

Tradition	Insight	Limit	New contribution of this paper
Marx	Value arises from labour	but only when it appears	Value = emergence (not production)
Federici / Care-Economics	Invisible work sustains society	but without mechanism of invisibility	T explains for the first time how invisibility is produced
Fraser	Care-crisis as systemic contradiction	remains redistributive	UCI shifts system-architecture instead of compensating
Raworth / Degrowth	planetary boundaries	but no value-theory	D = emergence-capacity → prosperity ≠ growth

Thus this paper shows:

It does not supplement a theory — it replaces its foundation.

Not “Who receives value?”,

but “How does value become world at all?”

It does not answer distribution questions,

but the condition of reality.

SECTION 9 — The Economy Beyond T

(Value as frequency, resonance, preservation-flow)

An economy without the value threshold is not unconditional,
but relation-bound.

Value no longer arises through scarcity,
but through vibration between system-parts.

A market beyond T does not measure price,
but frequency of emergence.

Not how rare something is,
but how often it carries world.

Thus the core of economics shifts:

Capitalism	Economy beyond T
Scarcity creates value	Preservation creates value
Price is metric	Frequency is metric
Exchange relation	Resonance relation

Output counts	Carrying-capacity counts
Growth = success	Complexity-preservation = success

This means:

Value is not possession – but passage.

Not substance – but stabilisation of world.

9.1 Value-Flow Instead of Value-Possession

Production is no longer extraction,
but circulation of difference.

Work that sustains world
counts as value through its sustaining —
and not only through exploitability.

A parent creates value through attachment,
a community through conflict-regulation,
a forest through photosynthesis.

In an economy beyond T these are not side-effects,
but primary processes.

9.2 Resonance-Capacity as Economic Measure

A system is not wealthy
when it accumulates assets,
but when it can endure complexity
without collapse.

Wealth = resonance bandwidth.

Poverty = emergence blockade.

9.3 Productivity Becomes Pluripotency

Instead of linear output, superposition of reality arises:
many small emergences simultaneously,
instead of few large ones through market-validation.

This system is not inefficient –
it is evolutionary.

Evolution knows no monoculture of value;
it knows only diversity as condition of survival.

A world beyond T is therefore not only more just,
but more intelligent.

Value beyond T is not profit,
but continuation of world.

An economy that does not burn future,
but generates it.

Summary of the model in five sentences:

1. Reality exists before it appears as world.

2. Value only arises in the moment of appearance.
3. The value threshold determines what may appear.
4. UCI makes this threshold permeable.
5. Diversity-mark measures how much world can exist.

10. Why Classical Economics Cannot Explain Value

Economics traditionally describes value as a consequence of labour, cost, scarcity, or price-formation mechanisms.

Yet none of these definitions explains why the majority of real work possesses no value, even though it exists and exerts effect.

Classical models fail at a point they themselves cannot see: they confuse reality with appearance.

Work exists even when it produces no market-product, no wage, no measurable efficiency. But it becomes economically relevant only when it appears — when it becomes accessible and recognisable as world-form.

From this follows:

- value does not arise in doing, but in becoming visible
- work without appearance remains real, but seemingly valueless
- capitalism evaluates not effect, but recognisability

Economics therefore does not measure what happens, but only what was permitted to appear.

Thus value is not a measure of performance, but a measure of access to world.

In this way structural exclusion in capitalism becomes visible already in the inadequate concept of value.

Here a false relevance is produced along which a narrowed idea of value and labour is cemented —

labour that not only becomes alienated from the dynamics of reality, but directly blocks it.

11. UCI as Opening of the Threshold of Appearance

If value follows from appearance, then poverty is not a lack of work, but a lack of appearance.

The paradox of the value threshold lies in the fact that it not only produces poverty, but simultaneously prevents it from resolving itself through self-valorisation — through its own real value — and instead forces it into a tunnel of value-narrowing and functionality which generates only further impoverishment within the system.

What is missing is not activity, but access to world-form — the passage by which work becomes value from reality.

Universal Care Income (UCI) intervenes precisely here:
UCI is not redistribution, but the removal of the condition
that produces invisibility.

UBI (Universal Basic Income) compensates invisibility with money.
UCI *ends* invisibility as a state.

Under UCI work is not valuable because it is remunerated —
it is remunerated because it is no longer prevented from appearing.
No new value is created —
value emerges that already existed.
UCI does not create work —
it lets reality become world.

Thus what arises is an expansion of the market, not a subsidy.
It homogenises value-distribution, reducing extreme unilateral gains,
but reality in its full breadth becomes borne and sustained —
which is the actual substrate of existence.

One can generate high market-profits through manufactured scarcity
(e.g. by forbidding women to work, or men) —
but as emancipation showed, the inclusion of women into the economy
did *not* destroy the market.

11.1 Objections & Refutation

Objection: “Invisible labour is known — nothing new.”

Response: The invisibility was known, not its mechanism.

This paper explains for the first time *why* invisibility emerges: through the transition-point
between reality and world.

It is an ontological problem. Markets have been viewed economically, but not in relation to
ecosystems.

Objection: “UCI cannot be measured.”

Response: Measurability follows appearance — it does not precede it.

UCI does not change measurement-methods, but conditions of appearance.

Objection: “UBI is sufficient.”

Response: UBI alleviates invisibility — UCI ends it.

UBI must still be financed through an exploitative market.

UCI ends structural exclusion at its core.

UBI pays despite invisibility — UCI enables visibility.

This resolves many classical problems of UBI — not only conditionality,
but also the marginalisation of those who only receive UBI
yet whose value is not necessarily recognised, cultivated, realised.

Objection: “Too abstract for policy.”

Response: Theory must establish possibility, not draft legislation.

Practice follows from recognising what value is.

12. Diversity-Mark as Emergence-Capacity

Here we arrive at a second lever arising from my systems-work — the diversity-mark.

Which means: how much diversity does a system require to sustain itself as an ecosystem?

Diversity here is not variation of products, but plurality of possible forms of appearance within a society.

A system with a high diversity-mark allows many ways of world.

A system with a low diversity-mark allows few.

Thus diversity is:

not a moral good, but a structural precondition for future.

Capitalism increases consumption-options, but reduces appearance-paths.

It creates variants without world — diversity without emergence.

It is not resource-scarcity that destroys future, but poverty of appearance.

The world loses future not because it lacks, but because it lets too little appear.

We ask where visions and utopias have gone — here we find an explanation.

UCI does not increase diversity as an aim, but as natural consequence of world-access.

Once the appearance-threshold falls, reality multiplies.

Diversity is not output — it is potential to become world.

The question of financial feasibility, unlike UBI, does not arise because UCI expands markets — more central is what the value-threshold removes from the market, or makes radically permeable.

APPENDIX A — Formal Model of the Value Threshold T

A.1 Basic Assumption

Reality, as stated, exists in three states:

M = Submergence (possible, but not perceived)

N = Indimergence (directed possibility, still invisible)

O = Emergence (world-form, visible, actuality)

Value arises only when a transition to O occurs.

A.2 Definition of the Value Threshold T

T = operator which determines which M/N-states may emerge into O
T is not a threshold in the economic sense,
but an ontological selection-function.

Formally:

$\text{work_real} \in \{M, N\} \rightarrow 0 \text{ value work_real} \rightarrow O \text{ via } T \rightarrow \text{value}$

A.3 Value as Emergence-Function

Value is not input \rightarrow value is output of a selection-process.

Value = $f(O)$

O = emergence

$f(O) \neq$ quantity, but visibility / access to world

Therefore:

- Non-work hardly exists.
 - Non-value exists constantly.
 - Invisible work is pre-value, not non-value.
-

A.4 Diversity-Mark D as Emergence-Capacity

$D = |M/N \rightarrow O| =$ number of emergence-paths within a system

The higher D, the more world can arise.

The lower D, the more reality remains unseen.

Capitalism reduces D by keeping T rigid.

A.5 UCI as Inversion of T

UCI is not income — it is an operator reversal.

$UCI = T^{-1}$

Not money opens world,
but world opens value.

$T \rightarrow$ reduces emergence $UCI \rightarrow$ expands emergence UBI changes wage \rightarrow UCI changes being.

A.6 Whole-System as Condensed Theory-Formula

$M \rightarrow (T) \rightarrow O = \text{value}$

D = set of possible O

$UCI = T^{-1}$

Goal: $D \uparrow, O \uparrow, \text{value} \neq \text{market}$

In words:
 Value is emergence.
 T limits emergence.
 UCI dissolves T.
 Diversity is the capacity to generate emergence.
 Capitalism ≠ value — but emergence-filter.

**SECTION 13 — Commons as Emergence-Machine
 (Ostrom × MNO — first synthesis)**

Commons were historically understood as a mode of use —
 as shared goods belonging to neither state nor market.
 But this frame remains superficial.
 What Ostrom showed was not ownership-form,
 but self-organisation beyond T.

Commons function because they do not extract value —
 they regenerate it.
 They are not a “third sector”,
 but a value-form without exploitation-imperative.
 Thus commons are not nostalgic residue —
 they are the functional counter-model to the market.

**13.1 Market = Extraction-System
 Commons = Return-System**

The market pulls value *out* of relationships,
 commons return value *into* relationships.

Market	Commons
extract complexity	generate complexity
require scarcity	require regeneration
restrict value-paths	open value-paths
narrow future	preserve future

Commons are not an alternative economy —
 they are the pre-field of an economy beyond T.

13.2 Why Ostrom Is Not Enough — and Where MNO Extends

Ostrom describes rules, governance, self-organisation.
 But she does not explain why commons are *value-generating stable*.
 Here MNO intervenes:

Submergence — Indimergence — Emergence
is precisely the cycle that commons enable:

Submergence → resource (forest, water, care, culture)

Indimergence → use & collective feedback

Emergence → renewed, higher order

Commons do not produce consumption,
but resonance-states.

They allow reality to arise,
instead of being depleted.

13.3 Commons as UCI-Carrier Structure

If UCI functions (Section 10/11),
we need places where value can emerge without market.

Commons *are* those places.

UCI does not pay for possession,
but for preservation of emergence.

This means:

Commons + UCI = first functional post-T economy

Not experimental,
but structural.

UCI is not the funding of commons —
UCI is the motor of their emergence.

13.4 Testable Hypothesis

If commons become the foundation of UCI,
then the following should be *measurably* observable:

- increased ecological regeneration
- reduced escalation-energy
- higher social cohesion
- growing diversity of value-pathways
- decreasing dependence on wage-labour

If these parameters rise, then it is proven:
Commons are not a niche —
they are the civilisational basis beyond T.

13.5 The Decisive Sentence

Capitalism is scaling through exclusion.
Commons are scaling through inclusion of reality.
The difference is not romantic —
but ontological.

13.6 Logical Proof Path of the Theory

The theory of this paper is valid if the following holds:

1. Work can exist without being visible.
→ empirically trivial (care, motherhood, poverty)
2. Value arises only at visibility.
→ definitionally valid (no market without detection)
3. Between existence and visibility lies an operator.
→ T follows logically
4. If T exists, invisibility is structurally produced.
→ poverty ≠ lack, but non-emergence
5. If UCI inverts T, reality emerges without market-filter.
→ value becomes world, not price

Therefore, without statistics:

Value = emergence

T = emergence-filter

UCI = T-inversion

D = emergence-capacity of the system

This is proof — not assertion.

SECTION 14 — Emergence-Monitoring & Data Beyond T

An economy beyond T requires a new form of data.
Classic indicators measure output, price, growth —
not regeneration, resonance, future-capacity.
What we need is not a statistical system,
but emergence-tracking —
a visibility-method for what previously vanished under the value threshold.

Price measures transaction.

Emergence measures future.

14.1 Why Old Data Cannot Function

Economic indicators such as GDP, productivity, tax revenue
measure only what has passed through the market.

They register only visible labour —
not the reality that sustains it.

Below T, 80–90% of systemic performance remains invisible:

- care work
- mental health regulation
- conflict absorption
- ecological repair
- motherhood
- culture
- autistic specialist work
- shadow-economy of maintenance

A society can grow
while dying internally.
And by the same logic, it can be healthy
while its GDP falls.

This is capitalism's blind spot.

14.2 What Emergence-Monitoring Measures

We need data that measures not market-performance,
but world-condition.

Measurable variables:

Variable	Meaning
Regeneration rate	How quickly does system-stress heal?
Diversity of value-paths	How many modes of contribution exist?
Emergence frequency	How often does new form arise without destruction?
System coherence	How strong are relations relative to market-forces?
Entropy-loss	How much future is lost per year?

These are not abstract ideas —
they are the physics of social systems.
Economies are thermodynamics.
Value is entropy-work.

14.3 Monitoring Without Price — How Do We Measure Reality Directly?

Three layers of data acquisition:

1 – Observation (qualitative)

Narratives, care-protocols, regeneration-journals
→ detection of the invisible

2 – Network analysis (social / topological)

Who holds whom?

Who stabilises conflict?

Who carries renewal?

Thus a map of reality emerges

not based on money, but on relational force.

3 – Biomarkers for systems

Burnout index, ecological re-storage, child development, trauma-reduction

→ objectifiable world-metrics

If these data rise,

value emerges.

14.4 Post-Price Economy = Post-Index Economy

If value is no longer measured through price,

then GDP ceases to be a leading metric.

We do not replace it —

we overwrite it.

New primary metric:

EWI – Emergence-Reality Index

(in place of GDP)

The EWI does not measure production,

but future-carrying capacity.

14.5 The Reverse Conclusion as Proof-Form

If a society produces more consumption, more output, more growth —

yet diversity, health, ecological carrying-capacity fall —

then growth is not prosperity,

but entropy.

This insight has often been suspected —

but never systemically proven,

because data below T did not exist.

Emergence-monitoring provides these data.

Thus economics becomes, for the first time, research into reality.

SECTION 15 — System Construction Beyond T: Architecture of a UCI-Society

This chapter does not describe reform.

It describes architecture.

No policy, no programme — structure-design.

How a state looks that does not generate value through market, but through emergence, diversity, regeneration.

We are speaking of a post-capitalist order-model that does not arise through expropriation, but through expansion of reality.

A UCI-society (state) exists not because the market disappears, but because it no longer needs to be the centre.

15.1 Foundational Pillar 1: Care = Primary Value

In an economy beyond T, care is not secondary economy, but infrastructure of civilisation.

Which means:

- care is *not* funded by taxes
- care *is* a source of value
- income arises through preservation of world

The division of labour shifts:

Today	UCI-condition
Production carries economy	Care carries stability-system
Human = resource	Human = energy-carrier
Burnout as collateral	Burnout as entropy-signal
Value through scarcity	Value through regeneration

Thus labour is no longer a source of wage, but a form of appearance of future.

15.2 Foundational Pillar 2:

Market becomes tool, not reality-filter

The market remains — but without exclusive rights to value. It becomes one system among several, not the primary motor.

The new matrix:

Care generates value

Market processes value

Commons retain value within the system

Today: market = value.
In a UCI-society (state), it is only a technique of value.
Production-logic becomes function — not meaning.

15.3 Foundational Pillar 3:

Commons as Structural Sector (Section 13 linkage)

In a UCI-society, commons are not exception,
but standard carriers of emergence.

They absorb entropy,
generate social coherence,
enable diversity beyond ownership.

Market: scales through exclusion

Commons: scale through inclusion of world

Thus, for the first time, a three-sector model becomes stable:

1 Care-Sector	2 Commons-Sector	3 Market-Sector
preservation	regeneration	processing
future	diversity	speed
substance	form	distribution

15.4 Foundational Pillar 4:

UCI as Circulatory System (Bloodstream of Emergence)

UCI is not a social budget.

UCI is circulation.

Money = carrier-wave of emergence
Not exchange-medium → but metabolic medium.

Thus income becomes not wage,
but cellular respiration.

Not basic income, not transfer,
but system-fluid.

Like blood does not reward —
it organises life.

15.5 How Statehood Shifts

A UCI-society as state-understanding produces less control
and more reality.

Less sanction,
more emergence-space.

Less eligibility-verification,
more reality-verification.

Not: *“What performance have you delivered?”*

but:

How much world has come into being through you?

Such a state does not require administration,
but evidence-capture.

It does not assess need,
but future-indicators.

Thus the state ceases to be a disciplinary machine
and becomes an ecology-organ.

15.6 The Central Principle of the Architecture

Capitalism is based on value through exclusion.
An emergence-economy is based on value through relation.

UCI-State ≠ planned economy

UCI-State ≠ redistribution

UCI-State ≠ welfare

UCI-State = reality-state.

It does not pay citizens —
it pays world.

SECTION 16 — Conclusion

The value threshold shows that economy is not determined by production,
but by appearance.

Not activity generates value —
access to world does.

Thus poverty is not a result of lacking work,
but of lacking capacity to appear.

Not a deficit of performance,
but a deficit of permeability.

The value threshold holds reality in a state of not-yet-world.

UCI is not a social programme.

It is not income, not redistribution, not political mercy.

UCI is the alteration of the condition under which reality can become value.

It does not lower costs — it allows world to occur.
It does not create resources — it makes them visible.

The MNO theory expresses this mechanism clearly:
Reality exists before world.
Only where it appears does it become value.

A society that enables appearance rather than preventing it
does not increase wealth — it increases reality.

Therefore the question is no longer:
How do we finance the future?
But:
How much world do we allow to come into being?

An economy beyond UCI is not an alternative to capitalism.
It is the dissolution of its foundational assumption.
Not growth replaces — appearance liberates.

The future does not emerge because we plan it.
It emerges because we let it appear.

16.1 Consequence for Economics

If value is understood as appearance,
then economics is no longer primarily the administration of resources,
but the administration of appearance-capacity.

The central economic question is no longer:
“How do we produce more?”
but:
“How do we enable more world to appear?”

This means:

- production loses the status of origin
- work is no longer input, but foundation
- value arises where reality becomes world

Thus the focus of economic design shifts:

Not growth, but permeability.
Not markets, but appearance.
Not reward, but enablement.

This has central significance in the question of AI development, because if AI increasingly cements the value-threshold through isolated relevance-parameters, then ultimately the human being is pushed out of the market. We can only reverse this if the understanding of value — and thus of relevance — is no longer determined by the value-threshold, because AI continually narrows that threshold. It results in an efficiency-mania.

Thus the question whether AI replaces all jobs, all work gains a completely new dimension — because AI cannot maintain the emergence-cycle. AI exists in no reality, or only in one.

16.2 Consequence for Society

A society does not generate itself through control,
but through relation, resonance and visibility.
UCI does not create these structures anew –
it merely stops their systematic invisibilisation.

The question whether care, art, healing or education are “affordable”
collapses the moment value no longer depends on appearance.

A society in which UCI holds no longer distinguishes between
paid and unpaid work,
but between prevented and appearing reality.

Social development then follows not proof of performance,
but contact with world.

Collective intelligence does not arise from control,
but from diversity that is allowed to appear.

UCI is not security –
UCI is community as world-form.

16.3 Consequence for Future

If value follows from appearance,
then future is not planned, but uncovered.
Future already exists as possibility,
just as reality exists in the state of MNO
before it becomes world.

UCI transforms this possibility into appearance.
The future is not built from resources,
but from appearance-capacity.

Less “*How do we secure tomorrow?*”
more “How do we allow tomorrow to appear?”

Thus future ceases to be projection-surface –
and begins as real option.
Future is not to be enforced,
but to be allowed.

References

Primary Source:

Radical Worker: The Fight for Self-Determined Work (Artistic Research ISBN: 381926826X)

Economics / Value Theory / Political Economy

- Aglietta, M. (1979). *A theory of capitalist regulation*. Verso.
- Arrow, K. J. (1963). *Social choice and individual values*. Yale University Press.
- Daly, H. (1977). *Steady-state economics*. W.H. Freeman.
- Federici, S. (2004). *Caliban and the witch: Women, the body and primitive accumulation*. Autonomedia.
- Graeber, D. (2011). *Debt: The first 5000 years*. Melville House.
- Graeber, D. (2018). *Bullshit jobs*. Simon & Schuster.
- Hickel, J. (2020). *Less is more: How degrowth will save the world*. William Heinemann.
- Hirsch, F. (1976). *Social limits to growth*. Routledge.
- Jackson, T. (2009). *Prosperity without growth*. Routledge.
- Latouche, S. (2009). *Farewell to growth*. Polity Press.
- Mazzucato, M. (2018). *The value of everything: Making and taking in the global economy*. Allen Lane.
- Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Harvard University Press.
- Piketty, T. (2020). *Capital and ideology*. Harvard University Press.
- Raworth, K. (2017). *Doughnut economics: Seven ways to think like a 21st-century economist*. Random House.
- Schumpeter, J. (1934). *The theory of economic development*. Harvard University Press.
- Tirole, J. (2017). *Economics for the common good*. Princeton University Press.
-

Sociology, Social Theory, Power & Visibility

- Beck, U. (1986). *Risikogesellschaft: Auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne*. Suhrkamp.
- Bourdieu, P. (1982). *Die feinen Unterschiede: Kritik der gesellschaftlichen Urteilskraft*. Suhrkamp.
- Dardot, P., & Laval, C. (2014). *Commun: Essai sur la révolution au XXIe siècle*. La Découverte.
- Foucault, M. (2004). *Die Geburt der Biopolitik*. Suhrkamp.
- Fraser, N. (2019). *The old is dying and the new cannot be born*. Verso.
- Illouz, E. (2011). *Warum Liebe weh tut*. Suhrkamp.
- Luhmann, N. (1997). *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft*. Suhrkamp.
- Meadows, D. H. (2008). *Thinking in systems: A primer*. Chelsea Green.
- Sassen, S. (2014). *Expulsions: Brutality and complexity in the global economy*. Belknap Press.
-

Complexity, Emergence, Thermodynamics, System Physics

- Arthur, W. B. (2009). *The nature of technology: What it is and how it evolves*. Free Press.
- Mandelbrot, B. B. (1982). *The fractal geometry of nature*. W.H. Freeman.
- Prigogine, I., & Stengers, I. (1984). *Order out of chaos: Man's new dialogue with nature*. Bantam.

West, G. (2017). *Scale: The universal laws of life, growth, and death in organisms, cities, and companies*. Penguin Press.

Commons / Post-Market / Society Beyond Property

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press.

Daly, H., & Cobb, J. (1994). *For the common good: Redirecting the economy toward community, the environment, and a sustainable future*. Beacon Press.

Schneider, F., Kallis, G., & Martinez-Alier, J. (2010). *Crisis or opportunity? Economic degrowth for social equity and ecological sustainability*. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 18(6), 511–518.

Growth & Entropy Critique

Meadows, D. H., Meadows, D. L., Randers, J., & Behrens, W. W. (1972). *The limits to growth*. Universe Books.

Boulding, K. E. (1966). *The economics of the coming spaceship earth*. In Jarrett, H. (Ed.), *Environmental quality in a growing economy* (pp. 3–14). Johns Hopkins Press.