

HUMANISM

**A Philosophic-Ethical-Political-Economic Study of the
Development of Society**

Aleksandar Šarović

Table of Contents

1	Analysis of the Natural State	2
1.1	Individual	2
1.2	Society	4
2	The Process of Alienation	8
2.1	Psychology of Alienation	8
2.2	Sociology of Alienation	11
2.2.1	Capitalism	17
2.2.2	Socialism	20
3	Humanism	25
3.1	Disalienation of the Commune	25
3.1.1	Basis of the Policy of Humanism	29
3.1.2	Basis of the Economy of Humanism	37
3.1.2.1	Good Capitalism	37
3.1.2.2	Good Socialism	40
3.1.2.2.1	Price of Work	51
3.1.2.2.2	Work Division	59
3.1.2.2.3	Commodity Price	69
3.1.2.2.4	Money	73
3.1.2.2.5	Working Capital	78
3.1.2.2.6	Development of the Economy	81
3.1.2.2.7	Income Distribution	86
3.1.2.2.8	Use of Real Estate	94
3.1.2.2.9	Collective Spending	97
3.2	Disalienation of Associated Communes	101
3.2.1	Pooling of the Policies	101
3.2.2	Pooling of the Economy	104
3.2.3	Association of States	109
3.3	Expectations of the New System	112

1. Analysis of the Natural State

1.1 Individual

The nature of the individual

A human being is a part of nature. Nature contains an infinite quantity of matter charged with energy, creating an endless multitude of forces, actions, reactions, tensions, and equilibria. The individual is a living part of nature; they possess sensory abilities, thoughtfulness, and the capacity to act consciously. By moving, nature creates sensorial advantages and disadvantages for the individual. The sensory difference between the advantages and disadvantages forms the individual's natural needs.

Individuals define their needs through their thoughts. Through reflection, the individual creates and accumulates an awareness of the advantages and disadvantages of their relationships with nature. In different conditions, thoughts give rise to varying emotional states. When the state of nature does not suit an individual, it creates sensory and emotional tension, concentrating energy toward finding an appropriate state.

Individuals mostly meet their needs through conscious actions. The intensity of their efforts depends directly on the degree of the disadvantages. Minor disadvantages lead to small action energy, while significant obstacles that threaten survival demand the entire individual's strength. The activity process lasts until the individual satisfies their needs.

Satisfaction of the realized needs brings advantages proportionate to the intensity of surpassed disadvantages. Advantages include relaxation from inconvenient tension and sensory and emotional fulfillment. This process results in saturation. The relation between needs and their saturation changes periodically, with the intervals dependent on the nature of the needs. The period of saturation relieves the individual of their needs.

The individual depends on nature; therefore, they cannot be entirely free. In its broadest sense, freedom represents a state of complete independence, acknowledging no needs. The individual with vital needs does not need freedom in the broad sense. In a narrow sense, freedom is a state in which individuals can satisfy their needs; those who cannot are not considered free. Such freedom is a condition for the individual's subsistence and for the development of their abilities, powers, and cognition. Therefore, the individual needs such freedom, and nature does not prevent them from having it.

Nature has unlimited power over the individual; however, through biological development, the individual adapts to nature's movements and develops their abilities so that, in normal, natural conditions, they can meet their genuine needs. As a result, the individual can be free. Their freedom depends on their ability to do what they want; however, that freedom depends on their recognition of what they can do.

Man's freedom is based on his ability to do what he wants, but this freedom depends on his recognition of what he can do.

During their lifetime, individuals acquire many favourable and unfavourable sensory and emotional states arising from their relations with nature. By controlling and arranging their reflective determinations regarding the sensory and emotional aspects of life practice, they create knowledge. With knowledge, individuals develop notions of the conditions that bring them advantages and disadvantages. Knowledge formation is one of the most remarkable abilities of an individual. Knowledge implies forming objective definitions of the laws of movement in nature, which, under identical conditions, elicit equal reactions irrespective of the degree of advantage or disadvantage these definitions create for individuals. Objective definitions present the laws of the movements in nature as they are.

Knowledge empowers individuals to meet their needs through conscious and organized work. The individual seeks to overcome the disadvantages of nature through conscious effort. Through their work, individuals produce the means necessary for their survival and gain more significant advantages. Working ability gives the individual power in nature.

Anything that creates benefits has its value. The individual accepts the value when differences exist between advantages and disadvantages, and when needs are not, or may not be, satisfied. The value is proportional to needs.

Work output has its value in use, or natural value. The natural value of the products of labour meets the individual's natural needs related to survival and living standards. The work has inherent advantages that make it valuable in itself. The individual's bright future lies in finding a job that offers more benefits over its duration, as this allows the individual to access more existential conveniences. Generally, such conveniences last longer and may be more intensive than those that consume work results.

By using knowledge, the individual defines the rightness of movements in nature, and the more deeply they understand these movements, the more broadly they can apply their regularity. Knowledge gives the individual the power that is, in its form, unlimited. The more individuals develop understanding, the higher the needs they can create and meet, and the more control they have over the conditions that form their sensory and emotional states. "The individual who knows" can discover and build their progressive orientations, live in harmony with nature, rely on their forces, and believe in their power and themselves. Such an individual can understand their relationship with nature, develop a love for it, cultivate a constructive relationship with it, and find pleasure in connection with it. Such an individual necessarily lives in harmony with nature.

The more an individual knows, the more they meet their natural needs, the more balanced they become, the more they appreciate conveniences, the more optimism they build toward life, and the more relaxed, content, and joyful they live. This is the

presentation of an individual who lives a naturally productive life and can, as such, be recognized.

Wisdom is the highest level of knowledge. It is acquired through the experience gained by healthy, natural living. The wise individual continually satisfies their natural needs, thereby experiencing significant satisfaction. They have everything they need, regardless of quantity or quality, and are consequently satisfied. A satisfied person is a good person. This simple claim is so significant for the development of humanism that it should be accepted as the natural law of human beings.

By overcoming the inconveniences, the conveniences also become less critical. In other words, when the differences between the possible conveniences and inconveniences get smaller, the needs also get smaller. Therefore, the more the individual knows, the less need they have, which means that by living, they come closer to freedom in its broadest sense.

1.2 Society

The natural laws of society

By nature, an individual is a free biological and social being. "The individual who knows" is aware that they will satisfy their natural needs to a greater extent by associating with other individuals. "A society that knows" achieves that. Such a society achieves greater power in nature and a greater likelihood of satisfying its natural needs. The coming together of people represents a community of individuals with both specific and collective needs. These needs determine social relationships.

Social relationships do not occur randomly; social conditions and influences shape them. When the same social conditions consistently produce identical results, they may be referred to as the natural laws of society. This study aims to demonstrate that the natural laws of society can foster a thriving community. Now, the question arises: if some rules can establish a good society, why have they been so absent from the history of humankind? The answer is straightforward: Society has never defined the natural laws of society. This study presents the natural laws of society and argues that they will build an incomparably better community than has ever existed.

The natural laws of society should determine social behaviour, just as the laws of physics determine forces in nature. Understanding the laws of physics lets people live in harmony with the physical world. Likewise, understanding the natural laws of society will allow people to live in harmony that cannot be obstructed. This book elaborates on this.

Considering that society's natural laws were never formally defined, this study utilized the book "Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy" by Isaac Newton¹, published in 1687, as a reference model for determining natural social laws. Accepting society's natural laws is intended to contribute to the progress of humanity in the same way Isaac Newton contributed to the development of physics.

1st natural law of society: Destructive people are dissatisfied and form destructive social relations. Satisfied people are not destructive and create constructive social relations.

2nd natural law of society: Strong individuals tend to dominate the weak, resulting in a repressive society. People of equal power respect each other and refrain from trying to dominate one another, thereby creating harmonious social relations.

3rd natural law of society: Social privileges create unequal power among people, causing social problems, while equal human rights give the same social power to people, preventing social problems. Equal human rights foster constructive and harmonious social relations, leading people to be satisfied with their lives.

The first and second natural laws of society are self-explanatory. They might have some exceptions due to the perversion existing in the alienated world. However, once a community recognizes the natural laws of society, it should eliminate perversion and establish constructive, harmonious social relations without exception.

The first and second natural laws contribute to understanding the third natural law of society, which is the most important in this study. The third law is not an obvious solution for creating productive social relations among satisfied people, as equal human rights have never been a reality.

A "society that knows" will form equal human rights. The definition of equal human rights should mean that all people have equal opportunities in life. What is allowed to some must be permitted to everybody else, and vice versa; what is forbidden to some must be prohibited to all. This study aims to demonstrate that establishing equal human rights is a necessary condition for creating a good society. Without equal human rights, a good society cannot be formed.

The individual is a natural need for another individual and value. In a "society that knows," everyone respects all members of society, regardless of differences in ability or

¹ Isaac Newton, *Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica* [Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy, 1687] (New York: Daniel Adee, 2006)

power. In such a society, everyone is entitled to participate in decision-making about the rules for joint activities. In this way, the sum of all individual needs forms the optimal collective needs of society, which in turn determine the laws of social relationships.

Equal human rights demand individual responsibilities as well. Rights determine people's freedoms, while responsibilities limit them, compelling individuals to behave toward nature and society in ways that benefit the community. "The society that knows" establishes rules for social relationships to reduce personal inconveniences and increase collective conveniences for all. Such rules serve all members of society as much as possible.

Society shares the same reactions to relationships with nature as individuals. "The society that knows" forms natural needs within the limits of their natural power of realization, and thus satisfies their needs and accomplishes the conveniences.

One can say that the individual follows the path of societal development during their lifetime. A child lacks both knowledge and the ability to meet their natural needs. Parents who understand how to live in accordance with their nature are more satisfied and develop a more profound love for their children. They take over ongoing care to meet the child's natural needs. Such an attitude brings warmth and joy, which are prerequisites for the child's prosperity. People who have not been deprived in their youth are most likely to become sound protagonists in society later.

"The individual who knows" brings benefits to themselves and society. Therefore, "the society that knows" is interested in having each member be familiar with the amount of knowledge they possess. "The society that knows" forms an impartial understanding of the laws of movement in nature and educates young members on their rights, duties, and responsibilities for well-being in both society and nature. The young who see active, satisfied adult members of "the society that knows" form beliefs about a convenient future and, therefore, accept the community's rights, duties, and responsibilities. "The society that knows" creates an education that aligns with the interests of both students and society. In this way, education satisfies the students' needs and benefits society.

The society meets its needs through work. "The society that knows" establishes its needs by mutual agreements, and then, by the associated work, meets the needs and, in such a way, accomplishes benefits. In "the society that knows," each worker has an equal right to work in every work post, and the most productive worker gets the job. In this way, society achieves the most significant productivity and the highest values in production, while the freedom to choose jobs enables work to become a value in itself.

"The society that knows" distributes work and labour results among workers to form balanced conveniences. Such an approach builds an equal interest in all jobs. Such a social attitude toward work enables the coverage of all work posts, with workers pursuing their careers in line with their natural needs and abilities.

An autonomous worker bears responsibility for their work through their work accomplishments. In associated labour, an irresponsible worker may cause significant inconveniences to the working collective due to interconnections among the work processes. Therefore, "the society that knows" establishes the efficient principles of accountability for workers who fail to fulfill their obligations and for behaviour unsuitable to society. Thus, each member of such a society behaves responsibly toward nature, the community, their work, and its results. By being aware of their responsibilities, they shape their work needs in line with their nature and the possibilities for realization. Such an orientation is a prerequisite for satisfying needs and the foundation of a constructive societal orientation.

In "the society that knows," the products of collective work are distributed according to the contribution of everyone in the process of production. The work that produces greater value brings greater benefits to society and thus deserves a higher share of collective work products. The distribution of work results among the workers is also based on the degree of inconvenience during the work. A more inconvenient work duty requires higher compensation; therefore, it receives a higher share in the distribution of the conveniences coming from the result of work. In the distribution of produced goods, the contribution of workers' ancestors should be counted because each result of work contains a vast quantity of past labour.

"The society that knows" forms solidarity distribution elements that guarantee the existence of the entire population, regardless of whether they participate directly in production. In this way, society develops an orientation where each individual is recognized as valuable to others. Solidarity provides products intended for individual consumption to everyone who needs them. It establishes social stability and helps develop new forces in society that reproduce such an orientation.

A society that continually satisfies its needs is satisfied, mighty, and noble. A community with generous members helps one another and develops unity, ultimately bringing prosperity. It believes in its own force and is confident it can reach well-being. The consequence of such a belief is that love emerges among society's members, fostering social equilibrium and harmony with nature.

In such a society, each member helps develop every individual, as doing so also contributes to their own development. Giving is a source of manifestation of the power of being that brings great benefits. "The society that knows" ensures the reproduction of constructive orientation and can plan its development and prosperity. Therefore, such a society is a good society.

2. Process of Alienation

2.1 Psychology of Alienation

The individual is aware of the limitations of their knowledge and their impotence before nature. A lack of knowledge about nature can cause sensory and emotional discomfort for the individual. Sensorial inconveniences are a product of a direct, painful relationship with nature. Emotional inconveniences are products of a reflective relationship with nature. The most apparent emotional state is fear arising from the individual's insufficient knowledge and inability to oppose natural inconveniences. The individual rids themselves of the inconveniences within the limits of their possibilities.

If the individual does not accept their impotence when they are objectively unable to overcome it, they form a need that exceeds their possibilities of realization. Since thoughts are free and may act independently of nature, under the pressure of the inconveniences caused by their impotence and the need to overcome it, the individual forms a subjective idea about nature and the laws of movements within it in the form that suits them. Suppose such subjective determinations overcome the obstacles in the relations with nature, which is possible since there is often no inconvenience in direct contact between the individual and the nature unknown to them. In that case, the individual relieves themselves of the inconvenient tension and accepts such determinations as accurate.

The subjective vision gives the individual an illusion of power in nature, which quickly and easily brings the conveniences that are, by their intensity, identical to those arising from the real surpassing of the individual's impotence in nature. The transition between reality and illusion is smooth and suitable, encouraging the individual to find meaning in each moment of life in search of greater fulfillment. One may say that "the individual who does not know," or, more precisely, an impotent individual, during their lifetime in the unknown, superior, or inconvenient nature, forms an indefinite number of determinations of nature; its parts and natural phenomena in the form that suits them. Such nature is no longer unknown because the individual "becomes familiar with it," it is no longer superior because the individual "wins over it," it does not belong to somebody else because the individual "annexes it." By their subjective visions, individuals adapt nature to the determinations that best suit them. However, such determinations are alienated from their objective essence.

Alienated determinations form an alienated conception of the conveniences and inconveniences in the individual's mind, leading to alienated respect toward the powers of nature, alienated emotional states, alienated needs, and alienated actions. In this way, a subjective consciousness develops alienated knowledge. Therefore, alienated knowledge is false and forms an alienated mode of the individual's living. The alienated style of living separates the individual mentally from their nature, and thus, the process develops.

One may say that an individual alienates themselves from their nature when they cannot accept the limitations inherent in their nature. Individuals who cannot accept their weaknesses, where they objectively cannot surpass them, create a subjective vision of reality that alienates them from objective reality.

Subjectivity creates alienation. However, a subjective vision is also connected to some objective determinations. Absolute subjectivity would form an utterly alienated consciousness, and the individual, as the protagonist of such consciousness, would lose the possibility of existing. On the other hand, complete objectivity would foster total naturalness, representing an ideal of the individual's way of living. The relationship between objectivity and subjectivity represents the relationship between naturalness and its alienation.

Alienated knowledge that illusorily resolves the issue of the individual's impotence before the unknown nature may find justification if it mainly contains the objective determinations of the laws of nature's movements. Such knowledge, although not entirely accurate, need not conflict directly with natural powers and releases the individual from the uncomfortable tension of the relationship with the unknown.

Alienated knowledge loses its justification when it diverts individuals from their natural path. The individual can never fully meet the alienated needs because no activity can capture the essence of their origin. Naturally, the individual cannot surpass the power of nature.

Since alienated needs cannot be satisfied, they are generally insatiable. Such alienation develops egoistic features in the character and manifests as the individual's alienated interests: greed, ambition, infatuation, and fanaticism. Alienated needs may objectively be entirely unnecessary to the individual's nature; however, they take on great importance in their alienated consciousness. They then direct the individual to act contrary to their nature.

Suppose the individual's alienated consciousness can find illusory confirmation of its alienated power. In that case, the individual develops a higher degree of subjectivism, leading to a narcissistic trait in the character. Narcissism significantly represses and underestimates the objective, unknown, and unacceptable reality. It glorifies the alienated vision of one's power over nature, creating a grand illusion of living conveniences. When individuals, through their subjective perception, define their power far more significantly than they can objectively possess, they encounter contradictions in real life, leading to tensions and inconveniences. Objectively, narcissistic needs are unnecessary to the individual's nature; however, in their subjective consciousness, they may become a precondition for ensuring existence. Hence, such an individual invests a great deal of energy in fighting for an alienated vision of survival. Then, alienated needs direct a person to act contrary to his own nature.

The more alienated an individual is from their nature, the less they can satisfy their needs and thus find relaxation and convenience. The alienated individual can be

recognized by the fact that they are almost permanently under stress; they are more nervous than easy-going, more irritable than satisfied, and more depressed than happy, regardless of their accomplishments. The individual's nature cannot endure permanent tension and inconvenience. Therefore, they inadvertently get perverted and find their way out of the anxiety in the perversion of their senses and emotions.

The alienated individual rids themselves of the inconvenient tension and finds illusory relaxation and conveniences in the perversion of their nature. While the natural individual finds peace and convenience in love and a constructive attitude toward nature, the alienated individual finds illusory convenience and relaxation in hatred and destructive attitudes toward nature. To such an individual, destruction becomes a need. The resulting tension may leave the individual unable to perceive the objective causes of their discomfort.

Suppose the subjectivity of alienated individuals overestimates the conditions of nature, which upsets them. In that case, they find the causes of impotence in themselves; they then orient destructively towards themselves. Depending on the degree of powerlessness, self-destructiveness can manifest in various ways, ranging from passivity in the face of natural forces, even when the individual has the power to overcome them, to a need for self-destruction. The individual does not aspire to self-destruct because of objective impotence, such as poverty or famine, but only if they lose the alienated form of power in nature. The individual accepts self-destructiveness as a means of escaping reality. It can develop from, for example, the need to consume alcohol up to an entirely alienated consciousness or lunacy. Such an individual can only find relaxation from the inconvenient tension in that way.

Suppose an alienated individual underestimates nature's power through their subjective vision. In that case, they find a way out of the inconveniences and an illusory relaxation from the tension, in a destructive attitude toward nature. Individuals are never as destructive as they are when their narcissistic character, or false sense of human greatness, is hurt. Depending on the degree of impotence and the lack of respect toward nature, destructiveness manifests as aggression toward the act of destroying nature.

An individual who lives in harmony with their nature overcomes impotence within the limits of their capabilities. Such an individual accomplishes natural conveniences. When individuals alienate their nature, they cannot satisfy their needs. Therefore, tensions emerge that ultimately lead to their destruction. The alienated individual lives a biologically inconvenient life.

This book is about alienation, but how would you describe it in one sentence? Alienation is a state in which an individual does not recognize values where they are. Instead, they imagine values that don't exist. Individuals think as they feel, feel as they live, and live as they think. Since the individual manages their thoughts through knowledge, since thoughts determine needs and thus direct the action, the individual bears responsibility

for realizing their own sensory and emotional states. One can say that an individual is what they think or, more precisely, that they are what they know.

2.2 Sociology of Alienation

Dictatorship of Autocracy

By their nature, each individual aspires to a higher power to achieve greater benefits. An individual becomes aware of their power by comparing themselves to others. This study demonstrates that this act is alien to human nature and harmful to oneself and society. However, people have always compared themselves to others, and society has no choice but to accept this situation until it finds a way to overcome it.

On the path to greater power, an alienated person can easily use their abilities to gain superiority over others. A successful individual achieves greater rights than other individuals, imposes their will on society, or, in short, exercises power in society.

Power brings great alienated benefits, and that is why there is a merciless struggle among people for the realization of the right to power in all fields. In the history of humankind, the most blood was shed in the power struggle. In this struggle, a stronger, more skillful, more cunning or smarter individual wins and rules over society. The power established by force is irrefutably autocratic and represents a dictatorship. Dictators demonstrate their power in a particular territory by forming a state. They ensure the implementation of their decisions through physical force and ideological proclamation. They independently establish the state order, laws, regulations, and rules for social relations. They possess irrefutable legislative, executive, and judicial power in the state. These are enormous privileges that bring them considerable advantages in society. Dictators secure their rights and benefits by proclaiming ideologies that justify their actions.

Ideologies are systems of ideas and ideals that form the basis of societal organization. Dictators utilize ideologies to manipulate society and thereby secure power within it. Ideologies mostly take the form of subjective answers to questions that a "society that doesn't know" can ask. They often relieve people of the painful tension of living in an unknown nature. A "society that doesn't know" accepts any idea that brings benefits and stability to society.

The history of humankind is the history of imposed subjective knowledge by authorities. This manuscript considers authorities as individuals who have power over people. Subjective knowledge is a source of social alienation and societal problems. Thus, ideologies become the foundation of societal alienation. Alienated knowledge alienates people from their nature and the possibility of escaping their inferior position, creating long-term problems for society.

Dictators, of course, fundamentally prevent the establishment of equal human rights so that they can oppress, control and exploit people. Throughout history, resistance to dictators often resulted in the death penalty. People, including scientists, had to accept the subjective knowledge imposed by dictators. Once society accepts alienated knowledge, it becomes a significant burden that hinders societal development.

Under the influence of ideologies, followers develop a lasting respect for dictators, marked by great alienation and awe. Such a society may be highly stable and homogenous. The characteristic of the relationship between the authorities and followers is supplementation in impotence, which together creates a powerful alienation capable of accomplishing impressive achievements, maintaining high social stability, and providing illusory conveniences. Because of these strong bonds, the relationship between authorities and followers may appear loving; however, it is not love. Love is the product of the individual's freedom, knowledge, potency and belief in a good life. The relationship between authority and followers is precisely the opposite. It is characterized by significant dependence, lack of knowledge, impotence and disbelief in a good life. It always presents a sort of sadomasochistic relationship and necessarily develops it.

On their path to achieving significant benefits, dictators exploit society. Dictators deprive followers of their freedom to express their views, make decisions, and act. This exploitation is markedly inconvenient for the followers, as it penetrates the individual's essence, into what makes them an individual. Moreover, that form of exploitation allows unrestricted material exploitation of society, depriving people of the benefits of social work production.

Authoritative power is privileged. Privileges provide an artificial confirmation of overcoming the impotence that forms a narcissistic feature of the character. A narcissistic dictator reduces the possibility of reaching the conveniences in the natural relationship between people and tries to accomplish significant benefits through greater exploitation of society. Naturally, greater exploitation cannot satisfy alienated needs since they are generally insatiable. Such needs create an uncomfortable tension that the individual cannot naturally eliminate. Then, the individual enjoys the perversion of their natural needs. In such circumstances, the authorities find satisfaction in a violent relationship with the followers.

As alienation in society grows, followers find it convenient to sacrifice for the dictator, inevitably leading to a disease within the community. In a markedly authoritarian society, productive activity cannot yield benefits. Only illusory benefits can be accomplished; the community lives a biologically inconvenient life.

Autocrats rarely acknowledge the sources of inconvenience in their attitude towards society. Instead, they transfer them to their subordinates, and it even suits them to pass them on to other social groups. False causes of the inconveniences and society's impotence to accomplish benefits develop a group-narcissistic form of alienation.

Such orientation glorifies one's social group in relation to others. As such, it quickly develops intolerance towards other societies, creating nationalism, chauvinism, racism, fascism, and other inconvenient phenomena. Combined with the sizable destructive energy of the non-satisfied, alienated society, such phenomena form a program for aggression and all social conflicts. An unsatisfied society finds illusory liberation from the tension and inconveniences of superiority achieved through destruction. As group narcissism develops subjectivity to the extreme, it overvalues the potency of its group. Thus, it overlooks the objective forces surrounding the group, which can have catastrophic consequences for it.

The less social knowledge there is, the greater the authoritativeness it creates, leading to higher alienation. The less society satisfies natural needs, the stronger the need for destruction becomes. Destructiveness in society persists until the destructive needs of the protagonists are eliminated. Such a society can hardly comprehend its constructive orientation.

A society with more knowledge seeks greater freedom because it is the only way to accomplish significant benefits. It demands a share in the decision-making about the rules of collective activity. The dictator does not allow such requirements because they represent a loss of their vision of convenience. Maintaining their power within the alienated consciousness of the dictator equates to a view of survival. Dictators have often claimed that God supported their power over people and that people had to accept their opinion. However, according to the Bible, not even God wants power over people because it is fundamentally wrong.

When the requirements of autocrats significantly conflict with society's nature, tension builds, forcing society to rebel against power because there are limits that "the society that knows" cannot tolerate. Society then directs its energy toward toppling dictators and their ideologies. Suppose new forces develop sufficiently in the community, and the dictator becomes lulled into a sense of their potency; the new forces take over control and establish new rules of social behaviour that benefit society.

Democracy

Society, aware of the problems an autocratic form of power brings, establishes social relations peacefully through mutual concessions made by both authorities and the people. In such a society, the authoritarian power accepts providing significant freedoms and fundamental rights to subordinate members. In turn, the dictatorial regime receives compensatory concessions in the form of benefits proportional to the ruling's advantages.

For example, monarchies that renounced their absolute power in favour of parliamentary democracy have retained their privileged status, titles, and holdings and often impact state policies. On the other hand, the monarchs who have not voluntarily

renounced their power to parliamentary democracy have lost their privileges, their holdings, and even their lives.

Since Ancient times, society has recognized the importance of people's participation in decision-making on common interests. This awareness led to the development of democratic principles. An ideal form of democracy should be carried out through a mutual agreement among all community members on social rules until a consensus is established. Unfortunately, reaching consensus is difficult due to diverse individual interests. People can hardly agree on something and can never agree on everything. Besides, every society faces a vast number of decisions that even the most interested, knowledgeable, and time-rich cannot participate in. So, an ideal form of democracy based on the mutual agreement of people at the social level is impossible to achieve.

The first model of democracy was invented by a political reformer, Cleisthenes of Athens, who lived 2,500 years ago. He invented a voting system that replaced rule by noble authorities with rule by the people. It made Cleisthenes of Athens the father of democracy. His democratic principles were guided by the majority's interests, which replaced ancient dictatorial policy. Still, democracy has not changed much to this day because voting processes have not improved much, and people still do not know how to do so. The main reason is that authorities who have always existed in society prevent democratic development to maintain power. As a result, social sciences have not been able to eliminate basic social problems of today. They have improved much less than other sciences.

In capitalism, people have accepted representative democracy, a variant that emerged from ancient democracy. In representative democracy, freely organized individuals form political parties, shape the social policy agenda that best suits them, and present it to the public. In elections, voters choose parties that best reflect their interests. The party that gets the most votes in the polls takes power through the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government within a set period. Such an election of power is well known today as a liberal democracy.

A government that fails to meet people's needs loses public support and, consequently, loses power in the next election, giving a better government the chance to improve social life further. Liberal democracy ensures a peaceful transfer of authority, which is a significant advantage compared to the bloody replacement of leaders that often ends in social destruction.

However, since ancient times, liberal democracy has had numerous shortcomings that social science has not been able to overcome. The basic problem is the principle of majority rule, which shows little concern for minorities' needs, leaving them unsatisfied. It creates problems for society. In a fully developed democracy, the needs of every individual must be considered until a decision is made. The participation of all in decision-making processes is necessary to form a policy that optimally satisfies the interests of all people, creating the best possible policy for all.

Another major problem with liberal democracy is that social authorities wield power over people and need to maintain it. In the Western world, the wealthy elite maintain their power by corrupting political decision-making through campaign financing. Money helps them impose their interests on political parties. Politicians come and go, which makes them highly inclined to corruption. In an immoral society, corruption can take the form of recognition, making it impossible to oppose it. As a result, such parties promise benefits to people to get elected, but then pursue policies that benefit the elite. Voters are cheated too often in the Western world, and as a result, people do not know what is really happening on the political scene. Then how can they possibly make correct democratic decisions? The elite have created a political system that gives them control over society.

If some politician tries to oppose the interests of the rich, they encounter obstacles everywhere. In the developed world, the media will accuse a disobedient politician of not doing their job well or of committing some sin, which will cost them their political ranking. Politicians who try to oppose the elite will need to give up on it or end their careers. In the end, political parties pursue policies that favour the elite.

The elite try to bring all influential factors within a society under their control, making every effort to avoid leaving anything to chance. Their policy is secured through government, media, education, culture, entertainment, sports, and every influential means.

The “society that does not know” readily accepts alienated rules imposed by the wealthy. Such rules shape people’s opinions and actions. Under their influence, people accept what is correct, good, funny, or beautiful in their society. They become what the elite expects of them, rather than what they are supposed to be by their nature. An individual undergoes a thorough brainwashing process throughout their lifetime, and ultimately is not able to critique the correctness of the system in which they live. Such an individual, as a rule, elects parties that support the programmes of the wealthy owners of capital, and the circle of the democratic farce thus closes. There is no need for more proof that Western liberal democracy is not democratic. It is a covert dictatorship of the elite, making people powerless and democracy a charade.

Socialism has also established a representative democracy. In socialism, people are supposed to discuss and decide on issues affecting state policy within their communities. Their delegates represent their needs in the state assemblies. The delegates are obligated to facilitate community decisions and represent the interests of their base in the central administrative bodies that govern society across the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. In this way, a social order is supposed to establish decisions that meet social needs.

There have been attempts in history to create a democratic delegate system. Vladimir Ilyich Lenin initially intended to build socialism and communism based on Marx's idea of equal rights for the people (Lenin, 2017)². It is hard to tell how honest his attempt was because every authority needs to exercise power over society. Still, there have always been problems reconciling the diverse interests of various entities because the people could hardly agree on anything. Lenin's attempt to establish equal human rights encountered such difficulties that he ultimately abandoned the goal and sought to exert control over people. The rest of the socialist leaders followed suit, regaining control in society. It was precisely where everything started going wrong with socialism and communism. Delegates no longer forwarded the people's needs to the government; instead, they sent the government's directives to the people. Thus, socialism has become nothing but a dictatorship that hides behind formal democracy.

People also invented referendums as a form of democracy in which the majority of voters accept or reject a decision concerning their interests. Referendums are rarely held because organizing them is not easy. It is again very difficult to reach consensus on crucial questions in society, making it hard to organize referendum agendas. Finally, those in power do not like people's participation in governing society because it takes power from them, so referendums are rarely organized.

However, there is a more serious problem associated with all democracies we know. Authorities almost exclusively set the voting agenda, while people have little or no influence over it, meaning they vote on issues shaped by authorities' interests rather than those concerning their lives. This is a final deficiency of democracies, especially Western ones, making democracy weak or practically non-existent. Democracies actually succeed in covering the bad intentions of authorities.

Democracy is supposed to improve social life. It must have the potential to make a good society. But we cannot do it because authorities influences prevent democracy from functioning. As a result, the democracy we have today does not represent the people's interests. Social scientists recognize it, yet authorities have created enormous social alienation, leading social scientists to doubt whether social progress is possible. Consequently, one cannot find scientific papers that effectively elaborate on the development of democracy.

The practice has shown that the representative form of democracy is insufficiently just. It is rather a fraud than a demonstration of the power of the people, by the people, for the people. People can hardly achieve their rights through democracy anywhere in the world. Does this mean that the people's will cannot be carried out? Can democracy not be developed? Establishing an expanded form of democracy requires discovering a new pathway to implement the people's will effectively. To achieve this, one needs to think outside the box.

² Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich. 2017. *The State and Revolution*, New Delhi: Bahri Publication.

Throughout its history, humanity has undergone numerous revolutions, ranging from authoritarian to democratic. These interactions have shaped the two systems that exist today. The first is capitalism, which dominates the world, and the second is socialism, a less successful system, which remains in a few countries. Although capitalism is more successful than socialism, it is still far from a decent economic system. On the other hand, although socialism is less successful, one can learn something good from it. The following chapters present the advantages and disadvantages of both systems.

2.2.1 Capitalism

Capitalism is a socio-economic system in which the means of production are privately owned and operated. The father of the capitalist economy is Adam Smith. He presented the market economy of capitalism as the “invisible hand,” which leads private producers to promote self-interest through implementing the public interest. The commodity market allows consumers to freely purchase the goods that best suit them, forcing producers to produce more suitable goods. Thus, society achieves great purchasing benefits.

Capital owners are compelled to direct their production responsibly because they must cover any production failure out of their own capital. To achieve higher productivity, they hire workers who are required to work responsibly or face consequences, including work termination. The capitalist form of production creates a responsibility that drives excessive productivity.

The tremendous technological discoveries in human history, such as the steam engine, electricity, and, more recently, information technology, have led to substantial increases in people’s purchasing power, thereby boosting economic productivity. Higher productivity brings higher profits to producers, who in turn need a larger labour force to sustain it. If labour demand in the market exceeds its supply, workers may choose jobs that offer greater benefits and demand higher wages. By earning more, they can purchase more, and the process continues to grow progressively. The economy then experiences an expansion of production. As a result, society thrives, bringing economic growth and making people satisfied.

However, capitalism also has its dark side. If the economy fails to find demand for the goods it produces, it must reduce production to avoid losses. Then the economy experiences a recession. A recession in a market economy reduces capitalists’ profits, while companies struggle to secure their economic viability, ultimately leading to financial instability and the risk of bankruptcy. In a recession, employers fire workers to avoid losing money.

When capitalism needs workers, it hires them like buying food in a grocery store, and when workers are no longer needed, it fires them like throwing unwanted food. There must be social responsibility in this process that capitalists tend to ignore. This is not

only an ethical problem that harms workers, but also damages the capitalist economy and employers themselves. When workers lose their jobs, society loses purchasing power and cannot buy enough goods, exacerbating economic problems and leading to a more severe recession.

The free market economy of capitalism lacks sufficient control over transitions between periods of expansion and recession in production. Entrepreneurs face difficulties providing stable production, employment, and salaries; therefore, they have difficulty achieving a stable economy and society.

When a job opening occurs in a market with a high unemployment rate, many candidates apply. Competition among workers lowers wages, which they must accept to earn a living. Employers benefit from underpaying workers, creating injustice in the production process known as workers' exploitation. In capitalism, jobs are almost always in greater demand than workers, ensuring the permanent exploitation of workers. This is a significant source of problems in capitalism.

During a market-economy recession, the distribution of benefits among people is more unjust than a community aspiring to prosperity should allow. The market solves these disorders by establishing a painful balance where the disempowered workers suffer the most. On one side are people who have huge problems ensuring economic survival, and on the other side are wealthy individuals who have far more than they objectively need. It is not a sound basis for a promising future.

Capitalists benefit from people's productive activity. To stimulate it more, they have suppressed the principles of cooperation among the people and imposed competitiveness as the major social principle. This results in fear of survival and egotism, in which an individual becomes a wolf to another. Consequently, it breaks good social relationships among people.

Capitalist propaganda promotes liberal capitalism as one that offers equal opportunities to everyone. This is not true, since the rich hold a markedly privileged position in many respects. Privileges are based on substantial capital that enables them to outmaneuver weaker competition. The system is ruthless towards losers, as exemplified by the United States of America. It is the wealthiest country in the world. However, this state has enormous social problems.

In the US, people work hard for low wages and constantly fear losing their jobs. Generally, they do not have adequate health insurance because it is costly. Approximately 20% of the US population lacks health insurance. In 1993, a worker earning the minimum wage in the USA, one of many in that bracket, earned a personal

salary 60,000 times smaller than the President and the CEO of Walt Disney Corporation (Parenti, 1996)³.

The enormous social differences contribute to crime in the United States. Americans often do not leave their homes after dark because they feel unsafe. Almost 1% of the US population is in prison, and the same percentage is under criminal proceedings (Parenti, 1996). This involves nearly 6 million people. Therefore, one cannot speak of criminal problems, but rather of the political issue of the unjust social system.

The average American is a modern slave of the rich, and propaganda has persuaded them that they are free. The propaganda brainwashes them, so they do not even know that the situation can improve. The USA is probably one of the most alienated countries globally, full of stress, patients with psychological diseases, a state with a high rate of alcoholism, drug addiction and crime; the land of homeless people, broken marriages, loners, and eccentric people. Annually, one in ten thousand inhabitants of the USA commits suicide (Parenti, 1996).

Recently, Elon Musk has become the world's first trillionaire. His wealth is equal to 1/32 of the USA's GDP, or to what 10 million Americans earn annually. Never in history has such a wealth discrepancy existed. This is the result of capitalist ideology in which capital is the greatest and often the only value, while people are not valued enough. People who are not valued enough cannot earn enough and, consequently, cannot buy enough. This is not only an injustice but also a problem that slows down the capitalist economy.

There appears to be no apparent solution to the problem of capitalism. This is because wealthy individuals often suppress the knowledge necessary to improve society. This repression is organized through the media, politics, and the education system. The primary focus in all schools is learning obedience to authority. Through education, students learn that capitalism is the most prosperous social system. As a result, they do not attempt to change it but instead strive to adapt to its imposed goals. Thus, education becomes the foundation of societal alienation. Alienated people are prevented from finding a good life.

Capitalism has internal contradictions that constantly drag it into crises. Today, one can observe extreme economic disparities between countries and individuals. This outlines significant problems in the future, starting with crime, uncontrolled migration, and various forms of war. Moreover, capitalism is built on massive production, which wastes our natural resources senselessly. The wasteful spending of natural resources inevitably leads people to fight for economic survival. If something does not significantly

³ Parenti, Michael. 1996. [Dirty Truths](https://www.michael-parenti.org), <https://www.michael-parenti.org>

change sooner or later, it will lead to wars in which a large part of humanity will be erased from the face of the earth. It must be prevented by forming a far better society.

The ideology of capitalist liberalism can no longer contribute to societal development. The time has come to let it go. What preserves capitalism mostly is the lack of a better system to replace it. This book represents a model of good capitalism that will serve as a turning point in society's development. Good capitalism must contribute to the development of equal rights among people. It will shorten working hours for all workers, ensuring everyone has the right to work. Eliminating unemployment will increase demand for workers, leading to higher earnings. The quality of life for all people will improve. It is not an easy task for capitalism. To improve human life and the environment in which people live, the future of humankind will require greater cooperation among workers, companies, and states. The latter is an impossible task for capitalism, indicating that radical changes in the political and economic system are necessary to achieve a better future for humanity.

2.2.2 Socialism

Karl Marx witnessed the enormous exploitation of workers by the owners of the means of production. He fought for justice by defining capitalism and its contradictions⁴. His principles for building communism were a visionary work of a genius. But he also made mistakes. Karl Marx is a renowned authority in the social sciences, and without acknowledging his mistakes, it would be challenging to build a better society.

Karl Marx correctly defined the exploitation of workers by analyzing the surplus value created by labour. However, Marx did not specify what salary workers objectively need to earn to avoid exploitation, as this is impossible to determine through observation or calculation. Only when workers are satisfied with their salaries can exploitation be eliminated, which can be achieved through a fair market where jobs and workers are valued equally. However, Karl Marx believed that economic equality is the only justifiable system, implying that all jobs should be equally valued and that salaries should be uniform until, in his view, workers could consume goods as much as they want.

Marx believed that the market economy led to the exploitation of workers, so he proposed eliminating the market and replacing it with a system of worker-controlled production. In *The Communist Manifesto*, he introduced the slogan “Proletarians of the world unite” to control production and govern it through the “dictatorship of the proletariat.” However, Karl Marx did not define how this economy was supposed to work. He probably believed that workers would plan and organize production to satisfy their needs.

⁴ Karl Marx, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, 1867 (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1984)

Production organized by workers required social ownership of the means of production. According to Marx, social ownership of the means of production would eliminate the deficiencies of capitalism. He was right about it, even though the methods used to achieve this goal were unsuccessful. Karl Marx referred to the first phase of production under social ownership of the means of production as "the lower stage of communism." Vladimir Ilyich Lenin established the principle of production in the lower stage of communism as "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work," which later Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin named socialism. Socialism was intended to liberate workers from capitalist exploitation and establish a just society.

Considering that capitalists would never let workers decide about their capital, Karl Marx⁵ proposed in *The Communist Manifesto* a revolutionary takeover of private property as the solution to building a good society. He justified revolution and the confiscation of private property because capitalists had amassed their wealth by exploiting workers, a claim that is generally accurate. Nevertheless, if some people invest years in developing production processes and building machines to replace many workers, should they not earn more than other workers? Marxian socialists have not found it acceptable and advocate for equality. However, wage inequality should be a philosophical problem, and a good solution should be found democratically.

Karl Marx did not define the term "revolution," which led some Marxian philosophers to question his intentions, even in the *Communist Manifesto*⁶. Still, they have never explained how a peaceful socialist revolution can be achieved. This book defines a peaceful socialist revolution for the first time. Marxian revolutionaries have been building socialism primarily through force. Although violent revolutions may replace a particular social injustice, they have always been replaced by another. To ensure the lasting effect of revolutions, the revolutionary leadership must be autocratic and oppress people. The power of oppression prevents equal human rights, blocking opportunities to build a better society. Therefore, calling for revolutions should be the last option to reach social justice and only when extreme oppression of workers occurs.

By appropriating the means of production from capitalists, socialism has effectively denied the value of past work, thereby creating a new problem. In capitalism, the owners of capital bear responsibility for production with their capital, which is the accumulated value of their past work. Capital made capitalists very responsible in the production processes. By denying the significance of past work, socialism has lacked a successful method for sharing workers' responsibility in production processes. Furthermore, Marx recognized that removing the market economy would eliminate productivity indicators, so he called upon workers' conscience to replace them. Marx attempted to instill responsible production by appealing to the workers' consciences.

⁵ Karl Marx, *The Communist Manifesto* (London: Penguin, 1983)

⁶ Schaff, A. 1973. *Marxist Theory on Revolution and Violence*, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, The University of Pennsylvania Press. (Vol. 34, No. 2, pp. 263-270).

Karl Marx believed that a highly developed human conscience could provide the basis for a responsible society, and he was right. He also thought people would build a conscience in their interests. However, no significant improvement in conscience has ever been realized, nor has society learned how to achieve it. Nothing conscious may come from the need for authorities to control people. The power of authorities increases their narcissism, intensifying people's oppression and producing troubles for society rather than advantages. The authoritative oppression of people generates fear, which cannot develop people's consciences, and a better community can hardly be built. Release from fear of authorities usually creates irresponsible narcissism in people, causing societal problems. Therefore, calling for the conscience of non-conscious people is illusory. For example, criminals always find excuses for their crimes. Only the freedom of responsible individuals can form people's consciences, and according to the principles of this book, only equal human rights can provide it.

Marx's assumption that an economy controlled by the proletariat would successfully meet people's needs was doomed from the beginning, because no economy could satisfy the greed of greedy people. Greedy people are inevitable in societies without equal human rights because every inferiority is a nest for superiority needs. Moreover, even in an ideal democracy, people can hardly agree on anything. Workers have never had effective control over production under their "dictatorship." The most developed form of self-management emerged in socialist Yugoslavia, where production decisions were based on workers' approval through their participation in worker councils. In practice, such decision-making was time-consuming, and if production failed, workers' decisions relieved managers of their responsibilities. Peter H. Liotta states: "It deteriorated production efficiency and led to economic disaster⁷." Liotta might have been a bit harsh, but still not far from the truth. Marx's idea of a democratically organized economy was noble, but it ultimately failed because it was inherently flawed. There is no better production choice than selecting the best workers, including managers, for every job post. This approach allows them to produce to the best of their abilities while holding them highly responsible to society for their actions. This book presents such an economy.

Marx's idea of a democratically planned economy was noble and correct. Still, he lacked evidence from a previous model to support its feasibility and had no clear idea of how it could work. Unfortunately, Marxists still lack it. Socialism has faced a significant challenge in determining how to establish a social policy that satisfies people's needs. By abandoning the market economy, socialism has lost efficient measures for selecting productive workers and managers to achieve prosperous production. As a result, the revolutionary authorities had to control production to ensure that such an economy produced anything at all. Thus, the socialist revolutions replaced experienced entrepreneurs with inexperienced revolutionaries who could not provide a more successful production organization than capitalism.

⁷ Peter H. Liotta, *Paradigm Lost: Yugoslav Self-Management and the Economics of Disaster* (OpenEdition Journals, 2001) VOL. V, N° 1-2, <https://doi.org/10.4000/balkanologie.681>

By abandoning the market economy, the socialist authorities had no choice but to plan society's basic production. For example, they planned how many tons of wheat would be needed to feed the people. They were relatively successful in planning for the state's needs. They were capable of developing science. However, the individual needs of people were barely considered because socialist leaders were unable to gather them. The authorities also faced difficulties in managing more complex production processes from a single center. As a result, people were not hungry, but their material needs were less satisfied than in a capitalist system. As a result, socialist production was less satisfactory than capitalist production.

In an attempt to create a just distribution of incomes, Karl Marx replaced the market value of work with the labour theory of value, which he adapted from Adam Smith and David Ricardo, incorporating it into his own philosophy. According to this theory, *"the cost of a commodity can be objectively measured by the average number of labour hours required to produce that commodity."* Moreover, Marx's definition of the labour theory of value implies that workers' labour values are equal. Thus, according to him, the total number of workers' labour hours required to produce commodities equally constitutes the commodities' objective cost. This was the starting point of Marx's philosophy of equality among people, intended to eliminate the exploitation of workers.

However, the cost of commodities cannot objectively reflect labour value because Marx's definition does not differentiate between productive and non-productive work, between responsible and irresponsible work, or between challenging and easy work. Karl Marx probably assumed that worker equality would cause optimal effort in producing commodities; however, this did not occur.

Socialism worked hard to achieve economic justice. It eliminated unemployment by granting everyone the right to work. Everyone got a job, even though their work was not in demand enough in their communities. Socialists balanced salaries regardless of position, productivity, effort, or responsibilities, which helped build a more harmonious society than capitalism could. However, a balanced wage gap in socialism was not motivating for work. The humanist ideology of socialism had protected workers' positions, which, to some extent, contributed to workers' irresponsibility. The socialist authorities had no choice but to increase bureaucracy and reduce workers' incentives, including managers'. Thus, the socialist economy obstructed its possibility of development.

Another challenge for a centrally planned economy is that production is often disconnected from market demand and supply. Store shelves in socialist Eastern Europe were sometimes, if not often, empty. However, commodities were available on the black market, proving the need for a market economy. The result of the socialist economy was poor.

Ultimately, socialism did not eliminate classes as Marx had envisioned. Political leaders were high-class citizens. They did not need much in terms of salaries because they

were privileged and got most of what they needed for free. People did not fight to earn more money; instead, they tried to get as close as possible to the political elite, as it gave them privileged power in society. This led to corruption and its negative consequences, ultimately harming the socialist system.

The USSR and China accepted the centrally planned economy. As a result, their economies had lower productivity than capitalist economies. The USSR collapsed due to people's dissatisfaction with the inefficiency of the centrally planned economy. China has learned from its mistakes and abandoned the Marxist planned economy in 1978, adopting a capitalist market economy that is regulated in the interests of society. As a result, China has shown that a market economy, built primarily for the benefit of the people, has grown faster than the West's economies, which are regulated in the interests of capital. China's economy is threatening to take the global number one spot. This paper aims to demonstrate that a socialist economy could be significantly more productive than the Chinese economy.

Socialism was created as a noble attempt to form a human society, but it ultimately failed. Karl Marx did not have enough data to build socialism and communism, so he wrote almost nothing about them. His followers created socialism by oppressing people, which could not bring favourable results. No science can fix problems originating from a lack of human rights. As a result, socialism was ineffective.

The main question of the Marxist economy is: why did Marx not insist on shorter work hours to increase demand for workers, which would force employers to compete for them by raising their salaries? It would reduce or eliminate worker exploitation. Marx most likely gave up on it because he observed the difficulty in reaching an agreement between employers and workers. However, the idea of reducing or eliminating exploitation through shorter work hours should have been thoroughly presented to the public, regardless of how difficult it would be to implement. Today, struggling for shorter work hours is incomparably simpler and more rational than igniting violent revolutions and completely changing the socioeconomic system.

Karl Marx argued that alienation in production processes should be eliminated through workers' cooperation and control, and he was correct. Still, no method to achieve this goal has been successfully developed. The political Left has sought to confront capitalism by creating cooperatives that promote worker collaboration in decision-making. Realizing this idea is problematic because workers have diverse needs, making it challenging to reach agreements on production matters. Successful cooperatives are rather an exception than a type of production that might replace capitalism. Only a more productive economy can replace capitalism. This study intends to define it.

3 Humanism

3.1 Disalienation of the Commune

The history of humankind is the history of the powerlessness of individuals and the rule of authorities; it is the history of authoritative, imposed, and therefore alienated categories of values; the history of alienated activities and, consequently, alienated knowledge. The history of humankind is a history of alienation or alienated history.

People believe that the development of science has significantly improved society compared to the past, but that is not entirely true. The development of science has given rise to new forms of social relations, which conceal an age-old need for one individual to dominate another. Today, most presidents claim to be pro-democracy, but in reality, they often avoid it as much as possible, preferring to maintain power in their own hands. Most priests pray to God that Jesus will come soon, but in reality, they would like to retain the right to interpret Jesus's words as they see fit. Most company owners claim to support the free market, but often try to create a monopoly for themselves. Most teachers are convinced they love sharing knowledge with students, but they often prefer to exert authority by imposing their knowledge on them. Most parents swear by their love for their children, but in reality, they often love the power they hold over them. The situation almost everywhere follows the pattern of these samples. All people incline toward privileges. The problem is that privileges can harm both individuals and society as a whole.

There is no doubt that all these authorities suppress people at every moment of their lives. Once individuals become aware of themselves in such a society, they are already influenced by alienated generations. They are forced to accept the alienated world as the other world they do not see. If individuals attempt to overcome the inconveniences stemming from alienation, they will find it difficult to achieve any positive results. The obstacles of the alienated society led them to think through the alienated premises for comprehending the causes of the inconveniences. After all, alienation has taken away their ability to recognize their natural needs.

Due to the lack of objective knowledge, the alienated society is subject to random determinations stemming from alienated visions of convenience. Such a society inclines toward idolatry, fetishism, and a superficial outlook on life. Individuals in an alienated society ground their beliefs in well-being on alienated assumptions and, sooner or later, experience disappointment. They contradict their nature, which brings them great inconveniences. When individuals' alienated needs encounter obstacles in real life, their vision of survival in their alienated consciousness is threatened. Then the same doubt about the correctness of their orientation creates tension, pushing them to strive for the alienated vision of survival. Such a struggle may, without objective justification, put others in danger.

The endangerment of individuals' alienated needs brings aggression, through which the alienation may be recognized. Such an individual is waiting for any opportunity or

authoritative invitation to act aggressively. If the individual forms a narcissistic vision of consciousness, they then induce great destruction toward their environment. A destructively oriented individual terminates the conditions for exercising their benefits. Instead of purifying their thoughts, concluding within the limits of their possibilities, and then moving forward, such an individual passes through life mindlessly, favouring their impotence and problems.

The individual may suppress their natural needs if external forces are too strong. Such a suppression induces undefined anxiety in the individual throughout everyday life. Separation of life from the individual's nature brings neurotic disorders and depressive states. The individual frequently finds a way out of such conditions by temporarily restraining emotions by using alcohol, drugs or medications.

The more an individual is alienated from their nature, the greater the deviations in their personality are. Additionally, contradictions within the individual become more pronounced, and they have less control over their emotional states. The individual is then inclined to any form of self-destruction. In extreme cases, due to unsatisfied needs, alienation generates tension of such proportions that the individual cannot objectively comprehend nature. Such an individual is an ill individual, and such a society is a sick society.

Whatever the individual does in life, they do it intending to reach prosperity. However, in today's alienated society, where subjective and erroneous value categories are created, the effect is the opposite. The alienated individual lives with the principle of their negation, acting against their nature because they cannot recognize it.

The problem of society's alienation is broad and profound; therefore, it should be faced comprehensively. The analysis presented suggests that all inconvenient social phenomena stem from the individual's inability or lack of knowledge, as well as from alienation resulting from authoritative suppression. In this connection, one can conclude that all socially positive phenomena may arise from knowledge acquired in natural life, grounded in the freedom and equality of all individuals. An individual's productive power can only develop in this way.

The individual's power over others is undoubtedly one of the main problems of today's society. People must reject the authorities and the subjective knowledge they impose and establish equal human rights to gain objective knowledge. Society should develop a system that promotes freedom and equality for all its members, without relying on authorities or their ideologies. Such a system should allow each individual to acquire knowledge through their practice. An individual can hardly form an accurate idea of the laws of nature because autonomy directs them toward subjective determinations and, consequently, toward alienation. Society, as a gathering of subjective individuals, may form a more objective vision of reality through the practice of equal rights among its members. Equal human rights are essential for learning the natural laws and objective categories of values. This will enable individuals and society to draw closer to their natural state and prosperity.

Authorities have always strongly opposed the establishment of equal human rights. However, people also fiercely resisted the authorities, thereby advancing human rights. As a result, the United Nations has established the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which has improved the world.

However, the authorities have also enhanced their ability to hinder the progress of human society. To avoid equal human rights and retain power and privileges in society, they have become the elite. With enormous financial power, they strongly influence and control the media, science, and politics that govern the people. They still maintain dictatorial control in society, although it is less visible, yet still very controlling. The elite have accepted equal human rights mainly on a formal level, but in fact, human rights are not equal. Presidents of countries may send people to war, whereas people cannot send presidents to war. Employers may fire employees, which increases unemployment, while workers cannot regain their jobs by lowering unemployment. Teachers force students to accept knowledge, while students cannot force it upon teachers.

One may say that equal human rights have only been partially established. However, there is no such thing as somewhat equal human rights, because such rights are inherently unequal. Unequal human rights create privileged authorities that hinder the establishment of a prosperous society. Therefore, the lack of equal human rights should be considered the leading cause of societal problems.

Throughout human history, authorities have managed to alienate social scientists from addressing the causes of social problems. The foundations of the social sciences are still based on the knowledge that authorities have imposed on society. For example, most laws today are based on ancient Roman law. Thus, countries still have imprisonment sentences and, in some cases, death penalties, which means they have not developed much from their dictatorial times. Under the influence and pressure of authorities, the social sciences have failed to recognize the natural laws of society. As a result, social scientists are unable to solve society's problems. They give the impression that natural social laws cannot be defined due to the complexity of social relations. Most social scientists do not even believe that it is possible to create a good society.

This book suggests that social knowledge created by authorities cannot build a good society. It already would if it could. Additionally, learning built on the alienation imposed by authorities cannot be correct. A good community requires new social knowledge grounded in equal human rights. People with equal rights may develop a more objective social understanding than those with subjective authority. Equal human rights are the opposite of hierarchical relationships and follow a different logic, producing different results.

Additionally, this book asserts that equal human rights can permanently prevent power-hungry authorities from oppressing people. Therefore, establishing equal human rights is crucial for shaping a brighter future. This book presents how to achieve it.

The theory of equal human rights has a significant realization problem. Privileged people do not like equal human rights because it takes privileged power from them. The rich despise equal human rights and suppress them with their financial capability. Politicians would not want to lose control by implementing equal human rights. Social scientists are reluctant to accept the knowledge needed to implement equal human rights because it challenges their existing understanding of the world. As a result, politicians, the media, the social sciences, and the wealthy prevent equal human rights. Thus, they block humankind's bright future. This book counters the notion by highlighting the importance of equal human rights.

Equal human rights should mean that all people have equal legislative, judicial, and executive powers. Everyone should have equal rights to judge others' actions. Each positive evaluation should be accompanied by a small award for the assessed person, and each negative evaluation should result in a corresponding small punishment. Such a policy would encourage everyone to work hard to please others and to avoid harming anyone. Equal rights for people will build a good society. Equal power of evaluation among people presents a new form of democracy, and freedom of evaluation presents a new form of anarchy. Therefore, such a policy can be called democratic anarchy. Democratic anarchy alone should be capable of building a bright future for humankind.

Society has compromised the equal right to work by allowing unemployment to exist. Unemployed people often have to accept poorly paid jobs to support themselves. It causes the exploitation of workers. Equal human rights are intended to bring economic justice by reducing working hours until unemployment is eliminated. It will raise the demand for workers and their salaries in the free market until exploitation is eliminated. Then workers will have greater purchasing power, and the economy will grow. Such a policy would address today's socioeconomic problems and foster good capitalism.

Equal human rights are expected to improve the economy significantly. One day, every worker will be able to work at any public job they want, at any time. Every public job post will be filled by a worker who offers higher productivity, more responsibility, and demands a lower price for the current work. It is simply a developed job market open at all times. Of course, such an economy cannot be established soon, as it will require significant development before people are willing to adopt it. But once people develop it, the burdens and benefits of living will be justly distributed among the people, forming a just society. In addition, private companies will lose the productivity battle with public companies once it is established. This will send capitalism down in history. This idea presents an enormous opportunity to improve the economy and build good socialism.

Natural laws of society are the missing foundation in social sciences, necessary for creating a good society. A good society results from understanding its natural laws. The purpose of this study is to explain this theory and to provide as much evidence as possible to support the results.

This book defines the process of disalienation in society. To perform the process of disalienation, one must establish freedom and equal rights among people. Equal rights for people and a democracy that truly empowers them will seize power from the authorities and create a sound, sane society. This book presents the steps for building such a society. The book emphasizes political and economic relations because they are fundamental societal relations.

Let the primary economic and political community be a commune. Let the commune include the territory of the smallest society that can exist relatively autonomously, or the largest society that offers a good insight into joint activities. It can be assumed that a commune has between 100,000 and 1,000,000 inhabitants. Still, it may also relate to a small community with several people associated on a regional basis, theoretically extending to a global network of associated people.

Therefore, the commune is a part of a state and is bound to respect the state laws. The commune has the right to autonomy to the extent permissible by the state laws. It is necessary to suppose here the favourable orientation of the society. This means that the state will grant the commune autonomy to the extent that it enables optimal community development. The commune organizes its internal order. The commune has an administrative structure comprising a legislative assembly, a judicial body, and an executive branch. They operate the same as today.

3.1.1 Basis of Policies of Humanism

Democratic Anarchy is the Future of Democracy.

The introductory speech concluded that democracy in the world today oscillates between poor and no democracy at all. In all democratic systems, there is a significant problem in protecting the interests of vulnerable individuals from those with greater power in everyday life. In today's alienated society, a person can create numerous inconveniences for others that they are not responsible for. This phenomenon is almost legalized, as one can see in everyday life. In the "developed" West, authorities impose their will on people who lack sufficient defences. Workers seek jobs by selling themselves. Significant servility to the employer is expected at work; otherwise, the worker may face job loss. In everyday life, an individual has little or no protection from insults, fraud, and violent behaviour that bothers them.

The democracy we know today is still based on the privileges of authorities, which create societal issues. Privileges are the main source of social evil, leading to social problems. Even slight privileges can create conflicts in society. This paper argues that social problems can be eliminated by accepting the natural laws of society. These laws should replace authorities with equal human rights, which is the condition sine qua non for social improvement.

Equal human rights have never existed, so no wonder that the history of humankind has never been good enough. This book argues that equal human rights can solve social issues through the development of democracy. A well-developed democracy is supposed to find optimal social solutions for all, thereby transforming the world into a good place to live.

The future of democracy should not be primarily about voting for people, because history has shown that it does not give voters enough power to improve the world. The future of democracy must empower people to evaluate the actions of other people. Individuals should have small, independent legislative, judicial, and executive powers to assess others. A little power in the hands of people should incentivize everyone to make the greatest advantages for others and to avoid creating any disadvantages. This kind of democracy is supposed to transform the foundation of social policy, solve social problems and foster a prosperous society. It is supposed to change the world and make it a much better place to live.

Let people allow everyone who, within the scope of their activity, can affect others in any way to do it freely on their own will. People do not have many choices here because they cannot interfere with the freedom of activity of presidents, doctors, mechanics, or any other person, nor do they have the ability, the time, the right, or even the desire to do so. However, all these people may, through their actions, create advantages and disadvantages for others.

People can sense whether the activities of a president, doctor, mechanic, or any other person bring advantages or disadvantages. According to this theory, people should have the right to reward those who create advantages for them and to punish those who create disadvantages. Such a right would require everyone to bring the greatest values and the least problems to others. Such an orientation of society would reflect the people's will in the best possible way and, therefore, is supposed to develop democracy in the best possible way.

If we accept that equal rights for people are the only proper orientation of society, we must let each person have the same power of evaluation. They may have the right to evaluate negatively, let's say, three individuals who have hurt them the most in any given month and to assess positively three individuals who have created the most significant benefits in a month. For example, if a prime minister, neighbour, and boss harm a person the most in one month, they will evaluate these individuals negatively. On the other hand, if a friend, teacher, and singer produce the most significant benefits to a person, they will get a positive assessment. Also, people may use all the

evaluations for positive or negative assessments or in any combination. This is the essence, and the rest is a technical matter which will be performed through an application on the Internet.

The sum of positive and negative evaluations individuals receive from others could be publicly presented on the Internet. Counting these evaluations will demonstrate to everyone how valued they are in society. These evaluations may become at least as important to people as page visits, likes, and followers are today. Nobody would like to be on the negative side of assessment, but on the positive side as much as possible. They will achieve this goal by delivering the greatest benefits to the community and mitigating or eliminating all disadvantages.

In this manner, everyone will become equal authorities with limited direct power in society. Given that all people will have equal rights and the power to award and punish others, independent of any written rules, such a democracy will, in fact, be anarchy. That is why this evaluation system is called democratic anarchy. Democratic anarchy is supposed to make a flourishing society.

People would gain direct power in society for the first time in human history. Such power will eliminate uncontrolled or insufficiently controlled individual power originating in privileged social status. People need to understand that the privileged positions of individuals should be considered the basis of societal problems. The lack of equal human rights is why society has never been good. Democratic anarchy would require each member of society to respect others. People will become valuable to all people. People will be treated equally for the first time, resulting in harmonious, constructive social relations.

People today rarely have a chance to intervene in issues that bother them, so they remain powerless in society. In democratic anarchy, people will have the power to express their approval or disapproval of any individual action that affects their interests. They will actually judge people who annoy them and express gratitude to those who beautify their lives. People will have the chance to decide their voting interests independently, avoiding any influence or limitations from authorities, thereby allowing democracy to flourish. In addition, democratic anarchy will significantly enrich the poor democratic principle of majority rule, effectively reflecting and serving the interests of every individual. The votes of all people will shape social policy whenever they cast their ballots. Such a democracy will create unwritten rules that best reflect social needs. Technically speaking, it will present the most developed form of democracy, bringing the greatest benefits to society.

The evaluation system is already in place in societies that seek public opinion on the success of specific actions. However, such an assessment does not have direct power. People will need courage and wisdom to adopt such a measure to realize significant benefits.

Something similar to democratic anarchy was already implemented on YouTube, where people could vote for uploaded songs or videos with a “like” or “dislike.” The results of these votes pretty accurately reflect public opinion on the upload. However, such voting does not necessarily present an objective basis for evaluation because subjective people can evaluate others at will. Democratic anarchy will serve society much better than YouTube, because people will have equal, limited evaluation rights so that they will never spend their evaluations irrationally. They would likely evaluate others as best they could because they would feel honoured to wield direct power in society. Democratic anarchy will present the impact of votes more objectively than YouTube can.

Everyone will judge other people freely. In this regard, many complain that people may maliciously evaluate others out of spite or envy. Such a risk exists, but an individual assessment cannot cause significant harm to anyone. The damage an individual can cause is insignificant compared to that of state authorities because authorities can pull entire countries backward. In the proposed system, such authorities would receive numerous negative evaluations from the public, which, through minor regulation, could prevent them from committing the evil acts that dictators have committed throughout history. Is allowing individuals to judge others incorrectly acceptable if such “trials” prevent significant societal destruction?

It can be assumed with high certainty that the equal power of people, by its nature, would make malice and envy hardly exist. However, if something like that still happens, each person would be able to correct a possible wrongful assessment they made of others by instigating a correct evaluation, even many years later, when they experience enlightenment under the influence of equal human rights. Their conscience will likely prompt them to do it.

Furthermore, the system would enable everyone to achieve satisfaction by negatively evaluating individuals who cause trouble for them or society. Such pleasure is more favourable, constructive, and efficient than any form of revenge that the alienated society practices. Satisfaction also brings the power of reward through positive evaluation, where individuals support those who create conveniences. Once democratic anarchy is implemented, people may start liking it very much.

For those still skeptical about democratic anarchy, it may be implemented initially by presenting evaluations only to the individuals being evaluated, not to anyone else. This would be like people listening to anonymous gossip about themselves, and everyone would be interested in hearing it. As a result, most people will try to improve their social behaviour. However, the confidential evaluation results may not stop the worst people from continuing their bad behaviour. Then, society may decide to discourage the wrongdoers by fully implementing democratic anarchy through democratic means. And even then, if people receive more favourable than unfavourable evaluations, they may keep the result a secret from others. However, if the total assessment is negative, it will be visible to everyone, forcing individuals with a negative evaluation to improve their behaviour.

Many people, including university professors, have criticized democratic anarchy, arguing that it is impossible for all to judge others objectively. It can be argued that objectivity is desirable but not essential. Besides, voters do not need to be intelligent or educated to have the right to vote. People will judge others based on how they feel, and everyone will be obliged to consider the consequences of their actions on others. This is what is needed to create a good society. By adopting democratic anarchy, people would appreciate other people, bringing considerable benefits to the community.

Furthermore, a system that supports people's equal rights will develop objectivity in the community. People who receive negative evaluations will have to learn what is wrong with them, which will teach them objectivity. Objectivity will remove conflicts in society. In the future, people will likely only give and receive good evaluations, and then they will know they live in a good society. After these explanations, no one with good intentions for the bright future of humankind should refuse democratic anarchy. However, because authorities have wielded ideological influence throughout history, people hesitate to discuss democratic anarchy.

It can be assumed that the system of mutual assessment will group people by shared interests. Members of society with specific interests will tend to isolate themselves to achieve greater convenience in mutual contact and avoid creating trouble for members with opposing interests. In this way, the system will enable the exercise of diverse interests in society and the development of various orientations.

Once democratic anarchy is accepted by society, it will not give much power to individuals, but their evaluations, joined together, will have enormous power. A person receiving many negative assessments would likely try harder to avoid actions that inconvenience others. Moreover, people who receive inadequate evaluations will never know who evaluated them negatively, so they will try to improve their behaviour towards everyone. As a result, bullies would not exist at school, employers would not abuse their employees at work, neighbours would not produce obnoxious noise at night, salespeople would not cheat their customers, politicians would not lie to people, etc. They will all strive to please others in the best possible way. This would take privileged powers from everyone, eliminating social evils and fostering a good society.

When people become accustomed to mutual evaluation, they may democratically decide to increase the weight of each assessment by assigning, for example, a value of one dollar to each of them. Each positive evaluation a person receives from someone should add one dollar to them, and each negative assessment should take one dollar away from them. These evaluations would not significantly impact ordinary people. If two people do not like each other, they may negatively evaluate each other for years, which would not be a significant issue. Gaining or losing one dollar per month in the developed world has an insignificant impact.

The power of evaluations would effectively influence the authorities responsible for making societal decisions. The higher a leader's position in society, the greater their responsibility to the people is. For example, the US President might receive 100,000,000 negative evaluations from the American people for implementing ineffective policies, lying, and engaging in aggressive behaviour against other countries. That would cost the president \$100 million in just one month. On the other hand, the president's supporters might not necessarily evaluate such presidents positively because they may have higher priorities for positive evaluations and allocate them elsewhere. Presidents would no longer dare implement bad policies. And if it happens, they will quickly leave their positions. Only the most skilful and brave individuals would dare lead countries. They will no longer be authorities but sincere servants of the people. We elect our leaders based on our opinions about them. When our opinions carry equal weight, the world will undergo a significant transformation.

So, what if influential people who own mass media unfairly accuse someone of being evil in society and thus prompt people to give inadequate evaluations to the wrong person? Such things are easily possible in today's society. However, a proverb says, "Lies have short legs." One day, the lies will be revealed, and no one would want to be in the place of these lying individuals, because they would surely be punished with many negative evaluations. They may receive punishments for a long time and would not dare to be immoral again.

The point of democracy is to create rules that enable people to live well. So far, the best results have been achieved through legislation; however, it has not solved social problems. Democratic anarchy may successfully solve all disputes in society by giving direct power to the people. In the future, democratic anarchy may offer a more effective solution for individuals and society than laws can provide. When people have the power to enforce justice independently, they will seek justice less often in courts. The courts would start losing their importance, together with the state oppression apparatus, including the police and prisons. Once democratic anarchy is established, it will begin replacing the enormous regulation imposed by authorities. Many state laws may become obsolete in the distant future, relegating them to history. However, judges and prosecutors, who conduct proceedings against individuals and law enforcement agencies that protect society, will still have some work to do and, therefore, must have evaluative immunity.

Furthermore, democratic anarchy cannot be corrupted. On the contrary, it will most likely eliminate immorality in society. Through equal rights to evaluation, people will learn what is and is not objectively ethical. People will obey the ethics they spontaneously establish. There is no greater morality than equal human rights can provide. Actually, this is probably the only moral possible because ethics can hardly be based on privileges. Privileged individuals can hardly escape promoting their selfish interests, quickly moving them beyond morality. Democratic anarchy alone should be capable of creating an ethical and fair society.

Democratic anarchy may, for the first time, enforce the golden rule “Do unto others as you would have them do unto you,” which is capable of creating a good society. In essence, democratic anarchy embeds the principle of a fair market economy that rewards good behaviour. Democratic anarchy will do even better because it involves negative evaluations, which means everyone should consider the consequences of their actions on others. It should work perfectly. Once democratic anarchy is established, it can lead to rapid and significant social improvement.

Once people have the right to evaluate others and be evaluated by others, they will be less willing to confront others and more willing to please them. No one will dare to be arrogant or aggressive. Only kind people will exist. This is the best possible outcome of democracy. Historically, when people have strived to create the greatest possible conveniences for individuals and society, the community used to prosper and live a prosperous and constructive life, while in systems where individuals found conveniences to the detriment of society, a destructive orientation used to occur, leading to the break-up of the social order. Over time, such a small amount of power in the hands of people will most likely eliminate social evil from the world and create a bright future for humankind.

The technology necessary for implementing democratic anarchy is already available. Democratic anarchy may be implemented soon, enabling a much better society to be built quickly. Democratic anarchy would likely fulfill the dreams of the dreamers throughout human history.

Direct democracy will also be necessary

Under pressure from democratic anarchy, governments would follow the needs of the people. The authorities would not dare to make the most important decisions for society alone, as they could easily make mistakes that might provoke widespread wrath and numerous negative evaluations. Suppose the authorities are unsure of the people’s needs. In that case, their responsibility, clearly defined by respecting people’s evaluations, will direct them to discover love for people’s participation in strategic decision-making processes through referendums. In this regard, they would most likely develop a simple, fast, and efficient method for people to make direct decisions, probably over the Internet.

People must make strategic societal decisions directly, such as accepting fundamental laws, because their direct participation is the best guarantee for creating just social policies. In making political decisions, people will have equal voting powers.

People should also have a direct say in society’s economic policy, as it is the foundation that directs the economy. They may directly set fiscal policy by giving each individual the right to decide how much of their gross income to pay in taxes. The total sum of all the people’s decisions about taxation would determine the total amount of tax funds.

People will not pay as much in taxes as they want. The tax fund will be collected proportionally to their salaries.

Similarly, each person can participate in deciding on how to allocate the tax fund. They will determine how much tax to set aside to support economic development, ensure safety, promote education, enhance health, improve infrastructure, and meet other collective consumption needs. Theoretically, people can decide on collective consumption within consumer groups as they see fit. All these shared consumption groups will have a far more significant overall impact if they are democratically allocated. Through living experience, people will learn how much money they should collect in taxes and the best way to spend it. Thus, this spending would no longer be alienated from society; it would better serve people's needs.

The commune's management can determine possible tax policy intervals, which will be subject to approval by the commune assembly. For example, if the current tax rate is 20%, individuals can set aside, say, 5% below and 5% above the 20% rate. The average expression of the people would create a new tax rate that could be changed at each voting session, directly reflecting society's needs.

Economic democracy will not give equal voting power to the people as long as people have different incomes. People should have economic voting power in proportion to their contributions to creating social wealth. Higher workers' contributions to social wealth bring them higher salaries and greater voting power. Greater economic voting power should stimulate people's productivity, thereby promoting societal prosperity.

Nothing better represents the interests of the people than their direct participation in essential decision-making for society. Professionals will make all operational decisions and be directly responsible to the people. Once people gain the power to participate in strategic decision-making and to evaluate those who make decisions on their behalf, it will most likely result in the most developed form of democracy. One can hardly define a better political system. People will become satisfied with such a democracy and will not allow anyone to seize it from them.

The commune's policies will no longer be formed in alienated centers of political power. It will be tailored to the needs of everyone, making it a humanistic policy. It presents the future of democracy. One day, some political party will adopt democratic anarchy and win the election. It will mark the beginning of significant political system reform and considerable societal development.

3.1.2 Basis of the Economy of Humanism

3.1.2.1 Good Capitalism

Full employment is the turning point of capitalism

Humanistic economic reform must start with eliminating unemployment. Workers' unemployment cannot form a sound basis for creating a good society. A good community can only develop based on equal human rights. A just society requires that work be available to everyone.

Unemployment produces the exploitation of workers. Unemployed workers often have to accept poorly paid jobs to support their families. When a job position opens on the market during a period of high unemployment, a large number of candidates typically apply. The competition among unemployed workers may drive their incomes down to a level sufficient only for basic survival. Unemployment has widened the gap between the rich and the poor, creating injustice and problems in capitalism.

Employers profit from exploiting workers, so they are interested in maintaining unemployment. It is not hard to achieve when new technologies replace workers too often. In addition, large employers support political parties that maintain unemployment through economic policy. It starts with importing cheap labour and ends with rising interest rates. This is how unemployment becomes state policy, which keeps workers exploited. To secure their privileges, the wealthy have perpetuated the notion that unemployment is an inevitable consequence of technological development. They have convinced economic science to accept that "0% unemployment is not a positive thing,"⁸ which has been established.

Capitalists have found that an unemployment rate of approximately 5% is most convenient to them, so 5% unemployment has become a "normal" state in capitalism. This "normal" state maintains the exploitation of workers while they still earn enough money to bring profits to employers. A just economy should appreciate workers more, but capitalism resists it. Through a long struggle, workers have gained some rights through laws and trade unions. Still, the existence of poverty confirms that workers' interests are not adequately protected.

Capitalism has made the economy society's primary interest, which it should not be. It should be understood that the economy exists because of people, not the other way around. Society may introduce justice in production processes by enforcing the right to work for all workers. It will be established through a fully employed environment that balances the number of jobs with the number of workers. Full employment may become a reality by reducing work hours. It will require preventing work imports and regulating

⁸ Mike Moffatt, *Why 0% Unemployment Isn't Actually a Good Thing* (ThoughtCo, 2020) www.thoughtco.com/what-a-0-percent-unemployment-means-1147540www.thoughtco.com/what-a-0-percent-unemployment-means-1147540

overtime work. Such a measure will increase workers' market demand and put them in a better position in production processes. Increased worker demand in the market will lead to higher wages and reduce exploitation.

However, no formula can determine what exploitation is. Only workers dissatisfied with their earnings may present it. Workers will certainly be more satisfied in a fair labour market where their skills are in equal demand with the jobs they need. Full employment can be regulated through a work-hour policy. If more workers seek employment than jobs are available, work hours should be reduced; conversely, if more jobs are available, work hours should be extended. The more balanced the work market, the fairer the production processes. The more satisfied workers are, the less likely they are to be exploited.

Society may increase workers' satisfaction by reducing work hours and creating negative unemployment. Negative unemployment is a shortage of workers on the market. It will further improve workers' demand and incomes. Negative unemployment may put workers in a privileged position that employers have traditionally held. When workers are in short supply, employers who need more workers will have to attract them from other companies by raising salaries. Competition among employers will initiate a chain reaction, leading to increased wages for workers.

The rise of workers' salaries in the negative unemployment environment was proven in the 14th Century when the Black Death killed one-third of the European population. Suddenly, the crops in the fields perished because there were not enough workers to harvest them. The Chronicle of the Black Death, a firsthand account finished in 1350, states: "The shortage of servants, craftsmen, and workmen, and agricultural workers and labourers, left a great many lords and people without service and attendance... there were far fewer people to work the land: peasants were able to demand better conditions and higher wages from their landlords."

Unexpectedly, workers and their labour became much more in demand, enabling those who survived the Black Death to negotiate better work conditions. The worker shortage led to higher wages. The servants' higher salaries contributed to economic growth, but the employers were unhappy.

- At Cuxham (Oxfordshire), a plowman making 2s. weekly before the plague demanded 3s. in 1349 and 10s. in 1350.⁹
- "In Parliament, in 1351, the Commons petitioned Edward III for a more resolute and effective response. They complained that 'servants completely disregard the said ordinance in the interests of their ease and greed and that they withhold their services to great men and others unless they have liveries and wages twice

⁹ David Routt, *The Economic Impact of the Black Death*, (Economic History Association EH.Net Encyclopedia, 2008) <http://eh.net/encyclopedia/the-economic-impact-of-the-black-death/>

or three times as great as [prior to the plague] to the serious damage of the great men and impoverishment of all members of the said commons.’”¹⁰

According to this historical example, if a government reduces working hours to 5 hours per day, the lack of workers should increase the lowest salaries by two to three times per hour in one year. The minimum daily wage for workers should increase by 30-90% for a 5-hour shift. However, reducing work hours might not give the same result as the example from the 14th Century; still, it will undoubtedly put workers in a much better position in production processes.

The first problem with eliminating unemployment is that employers do not want to increase workers' salaries because they profit from exploiting them. However, excessive wage demands by workers may render the economy unsustainable. This would reduce employers' interest in production and slow down the economy.

Negative unemployment will make employers unsatisfied. Unsatisfied employers may avoid paying higher wages to workers in a fully employed society by relocating their businesses abroad. People need to understand that Western capitalism has established laws granting more freedom to capital than to workers, and this needs to change. At the very least, the laws must provide workers with the same rights as capital.

Any capital departure results in business closure and newly unemployed workers, causing trouble for the domestic economy. Full employment would again require a reduction of work hours. Shortening working hours would reduce workers' incomes in the short run. Workers would not like it. On the other hand, it is not easy for employers to organize a new production by finding new employees and new markets.

Shortening work hours will undoubtedly bring new challenges to capitalism. However, finding solutions for these issues will help address the problems with capitalism. The solution lies in determining the optimal length of work hours that satisfies the needs of both workers and employers. The fair market of work is undoubtedly the best way to bring justice to the economy and address the problems of capitalism.

Today, people have adopted the 8-hour workday, first suggested by Robert Owen at the beginning of the 19th Century. There is no particular reason for an eight-hour workday. Society just took it and adapted to it. Besides providing full employment, the workday length should be a variable that coordinates the needs and interests of workers and employers in the economy. This function will be based on the balanced demands of employers and workers. I will repeat this because it is crucial: Work hours should be reduced when more workers are seeking employment than employers are seeking workers. And vice versa, if employers need more workers than are available, the work policy should consider extended work hours.

¹⁰ Michael Bennett, *The Impact of the Black Death on English Legal History* (South Wales: Australian Journal of Law and Society, 1995) Vol. 11, p 197
<http://classic.austlii.edu.au/au/journals/AUJILawSoc/1995/1.pdf>

The length of a workday can be a potent regulator of the free market economy and a fundamental point of democracy in the economy. Political parties may propose the best full-time work period for workers and employers. It would likely be one of the most critical decisions for political parties, determining whether they succeed in their election efforts. On the other hand, work hours can also be directly determined by workers' work needs. Every worker may specify their preferred work hours, and the average will be decided upon. In both cases, democracy should determine optimal work hours to create a fair work market. Its success will present a turning point for capitalism, making it a decent social system.

Minimum wages would no longer be necessary. Full employment will raise salaries for lower-paid workers at the expense of higher-paid workers and employers' profits, thereby narrowing the enormous wage gap in the Western world. Additionally, workers' increased purchasing power will contribute to the economy's growth, enabling employers to earn higher profits and workers to earn higher salaries, ultimately benefiting all.

Shortening working hours proportionally to the unemployment rate will improve capitalism; however, this study's initial intention was to achieve much more. A better future requires a comprehensive economic reconstruction. The introductory statement showed that the planned economy is more stable than the market economy, while the market economy is more productive. A new economy will leverage both systems and eliminate their deficiencies.

3.1.2.2 Good Socialism

A Developed Market of Work will Create Socialism

Most of the problems of today's market economy stem from its underdevelopment. This study aims to demonstrate that the primary issue with the capitalist economy is not too much market but rather a lack of market.

The goods are always on the market, even if they are not formally available, since any product will be sold if a good enough offer is made. On the other hand, jobs are rarely available on the market, which is probably the most significant problem in today's economy. A developed labour market should foster competition among workers to achieve greater productivity in every public workplace at all times. Such an economy will significantly improve society.

Workers in capitalism have jobs protected by laws and unions; these jobs are privileged, though less so than in socialism. A more productive worker cannot apply for a work

position already occupied by another worker. That is why capitalism's division of labour cannot efficiently allocate labour or achieve the maximum possible productivity. One should protect workers, not jobs. A better future for humankind necessitates that workers become equal participants in production. This will be achieved when all workers have equal opportunities to choose any job they want in public companies. Society needs to establish a standard for selecting workers. History has presented no more socially justified employment principle than hiring the best available worker for each job position.

Capitalism taught people to love competition, and that winning brings enormous satisfaction. As a result, people do not hesitate to exert any effort to express themselves. So, why wouldn't society open competitions for every public workplace at any time? It sounds impossible because such a division of labour never existed. However, its realization is just a technical problem and will bring enormous benefits to society.

Work competition, as a form of employment in the labour market, represents an ongoing open competition for all public job posts. This means that any worker may take another worker's public work post at any time if they perform a particular job more productively.

To achieve such an economic system, people need to find an efficient way to evaluate work productivity, define job responsibilities, and harmonize rewards for work at any time. In short, workers who offer the highest productivity and accountability, and demand the lowest price for current work, in a society-owned company will get the job anytime. Therefore, it would be nothing but a developed job market. However, it will take time to develop the job market enough for people to accept it.

Competition in the market will incentivize workers much more than capitalism can through wages alone. The existence of workers would never be endangered because every worker will be able to find a new job in a fully employed environment. The work competition will instill such a strong sense of responsibility that no one would dare offer work productivity they cannot meet. The market will also regulate workers' salaries most objectively. As a result, the living standards of all people may increase at an unprecedented rate. People may be very pleased with living in such a system. Only this shall be called socialism.

The labour division in socialism

There is no fairer or better division of labour than a competition among workers based on their labour productivity in any public workplace at any time. Productivity will be measured by the amount of money earned, the quantity and quality of goods produced, or the rating of workers' productivity by consumers. A worker who offers higher profits, more manufactured goods, and a better, cleaner, and more cost-effective production process will secure the desired job. Comparing workers' productivity can be complex yet also very simple. Democratic anarchy will make it straightforward.

Permanently open competition among workers has never existed because no one believed it was possible, and no one invested any effort in developing such an idea. However, this book examines the potential problems that an open work competition might pose to society and offers solutions to address these issues. Of course, the work competition will be highly regulated to avoid possible instability in the distribution of work. Nevertheless, considering such a division of labour will open the possibility for significant economic and social improvement.

Unquestionably, the work competition will apply only to public companies, because if it were to apply to private enterprises, it would practically amount to a seizure of private property. Private companies will continue their businesses as they do today. It will be necessary to regulate and democratically accept a new division of labour in public companies through legal means. One day, the proposed division of work will be accepted because the principles of such a division of labour are natural, just, and the most productive.

A worker who offers the highest productivity in any workplace at any time becomes a prime candidate for that position, regardless of whether the workplace is occupied. If there are already employed workers at such workplaces who do not want to leave their jobs, they will have to accept the competitors' productivity and, in that case, continue to hold their positions. However, if they cannot take on the new responsibilities or do not want them, they will immediately vacate the workplace and leave it to the competitor.

The existential security of workers is a necessary condition for societal stability, and therefore, society should guarantee it. In the proposed system, all workers will be economically secure after leaving any job. Losing a job will not create income stress, and workers can quickly find new work in a full-employment environment. Such security will alleviate widespread concerns about unemployment. Capitalism primarily motivates workers with the fear of economic survival, thereby failing to provide sufficient financial security to the people. The new system will foster motivation for work by allowing individuals to choose their jobs and experience satisfaction in them.

The advantages of such a division of work will be enormous. The best worker in every workplace ensures maximum productivity for companies and efficiently satisfies consumers' needs. Thus, such a division of labour will find its most significant justification. Furthermore, the labour market will allow people to choose jobs they love more. They will enjoy work far more than they do today. Work will become a value in and of itself.

Furthermore, the open labour market will eliminate privileges. Today, people might experience a loss of privileges as a significant disadvantage. However, it should be noted that privileges are among the leading causes of societal problems. Eliminating privileges increases productivity and reduces, if not eliminates, corruption and immorality in the community. Over time, people will realize that losing privileges could significantly increase the likelihood of finding work that enhances workers' productive power. The power of being fosters creativity and provides a stable satisfaction that

privilege cannot achieve. As a result, the proposed socialist labour market would bring significant benefits to society.

Such a system of production is becoming possible for the first time in the history of humankind because the development of computer technology has allowed people to plan production, monitor the productivity of workers, the value of their work and the responsibility they bear for their work, in a system of fast changes in the work obligations. Capable Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems that provide such an economy exist today, but they must adapt to the socialist business operating system.

The labour theory of value in socialism

This book develops Marx's simplified labour theory of value by extending workers' compensation to include functions that enhance economic productivity and promote social justice. Every produced commodity contains the values of past and present work. Therefore, workers' wages should be based on their past and present contributions to production processes.

The current work value should show how much work brings advantages and disadvantages to workers compared to other jobs. Let's say the average value and price of current labour is 1. Then, a worker who is 10% more interested in a particular position than the average job is likely to request a labour cost of 0.9 to make them more competitive for the job. This results in earning 10% less than in an average job. The worker who demands the lowest price for the current work will receive a better chance of getting the job. The justification for accepting the lowest labour-cost offer is that such work is most convenient for the worker and cheapest for society.

The cost of ongoing work will be one of the factors that determines workers' salaries. The labour market will lead to suitable jobs offering lower wages, while less desirable positions will be compensated with higher payments. A developed labour market will establish an objective price for current work, just as the goods market does, and workers will be satisfied with their earnings. Unions as mediators in determining incomes will no longer be required.

Past work value reflects how much workers have contributed to society's values. In capitalism, the more wealth is produced, the more valuable the past work is. Capital owners who voluntarily surrender their wealth to society will receive an equivalent amount of past labour points in exchange, resulting in a higher income in public companies.

But capitalism does not recognize other values that exist in society. For example, giving birth, being born, and the productive growth of people represent the highest scope of value that people may produce, and they must recognize these as values of past work. Such values are priceless and cannot be objectively determined; however, they may be formed through arbitration in the best interest of all people. Similarly, society has

established punishment for crimes that has nothing to do with objectivity, but it is beneficial because it prevents crimes.

People will bear responsibility for any damage they cause to society through the value of past labour. For example, any crime can be assessed based on a person's past work value. The criminal system will transform the prison sentences of criminals into a negative value of their past work and deduct it from their past work. Losing the value of past work will be a more effective and humane punishment for criminals than imprisonment.

On the other hand, the value of past work will include all the improvements people can make in society. This will motivate people to advance all values, thus bringing more benefits to the community. The value of past work will be a very efficient tool for ensuring accountability in society. It will be highly beneficial and necessary for advancing humanity. The arbitration of the value of past work should be regulated by law and democratically accepted by the people. This is a challenging task, and it is likely the main reason the socialist division of labour cannot be implemented in the near future.

The value of work

Let's assume that the average value of past labour is 100,000 points, while the average value of current work is 1. The multiplication of these values determines the worker's labour value, or labour cost. This means that the average salary will have 100,000 monetary units. The average value of past labour can be adjusted to gross national income per capita, while the average value of current work can be adjusted to 1, aligning the incomes of all people with the values of goods and services produced.

Only the market can establish objective prices of goods. If a company achieves a higher price for its goods, earning more profit than workers' incomes demand, it will make more money than it needs. The difference between required and received incomes would represent a surplus value. In firms that achieve lower prices on the market and make lower profits than workers' incomes demand, workers would receive lower wages than requested, even though they have reached the productivity level they offer. To avoid competition for work in more profitable public companies, these companies will surrender surplus earnings to those experiencing a revenue shortage in the market.

The surplus values of public enterprises flowing into those with insufficient earnings in the market will prevent an imbalance in the division of labour. As a result, everyone will earn as much money as they requested for their productivity. Thus, the labour market will balance employment across all public enterprises, regardless of the revenues enterprises generate from market inconsistencies. It should be emphasized that the market is the best gift Mother Nature has given the economy, as it can bring justice and stability to production processes.

Economic development will no longer be based solely on market benefits, but will instead result from people's conscious decisions. People will base the economy's development policy on a plan that allocates tax revenue to economic development.

The responsibility of workers

The new economic system would have no meaning without efficient regulation of workers' responsibilities in production processes. In the developed job market, workers may unrealistically raise their productivity offers to secure their desired jobs. Such irresponsibility may result in the collapse of the economic system. Today, for example, politicians do precisely that, which is one of the leading causes of people's disappointment and immorality in society.

The proposed socialist economy will establish efficient individual and collective worker responsibilities in production through their salaries and the value of past work. If workers do not meet the proposed productivity, they will bear responsibility by having their wages lowered and their past work values lost proportionally to the unrealized productivity. This is an entirely new idea of making workers highly responsible for the productivity they achieve, which socialism has yet to accomplish.

The workers will numerically determine the scope of their responsibilities in the production processes of public companies. Let's say the average responsibility has a value of 1. The higher the accountability workers offer to the desired workplaces, the greater their right to work in those workplaces will be, and vice versa.

Then, workers will share collective responsibilities for the realized production, with the value of past work determined by the offered coefficients or responsibilities. For example, if a company increases revenue, a worker who offers work responsibility at a value of 2 will earn double the past work value as a worker who provides accountability at a value of 1. And vice versa: if a company loses money, the worker who assumes responsibility at a value of 2 will lose double the past work value than the one who assumes accountability at a value of 1. Once the company's profit or loss is identified and workers' responsibilities are numerically determined, awarding and punishing workers based on past work values is automatic.

In addition, workers will be held accountable for their individual performance through democratic anarchy. Democratic anarchy will give ultimate power to the people by granting them an equal right to award and punish others, with a small value reflecting their past work.

The socialist division of labour in practice

The following fictitious examples illustrate how the division of labour in socialism would function: Let a baker produce 1000 loaves of bread daily, establishing it as the standard

baking productivity with a coefficient value of 1. Then, let them value their work at 1 (assuming this is an average work price). Finally, let them take responsibility for their productivity, assigning a value of 1 (assuming this is the average responsibility for all jobs). Then, a new baker who wants to take the position of the existing baker needs to offer a productivity value greater than 1, or needs to request a lower price for the current work, which would be a value less than 1, or needs to offer higher responsibility, which will be a value greater than 1. If a new baker proposes a better work offer, expressed as a numerical value, than the existing one, which the existing baker cannot or does not want to meet, the new baker gets the job.

Establishing labour competition among workers can be challenging because comparing productivity levels makes choosing the best job offer difficult. Then, the work productivity of a new baker should be evaluated by assessing both the quantity and quality of the bread produced. If the promised productivity is not achieved, disputes may arise, and finding solutions may be complex. For example, if the supplied ingredients of bread are not satisfactory, it may affect the realized productivity of the baker, for which he might not be responsible. Finally, since the job description is usually more complex than presented in this example, workers may spend a significant amount of time resolving such issues, thereby reducing the time available for work. Nobel laureate Ronald Coase stated that resolving such an issue would require a higher cost than is economically justified¹¹. He may be correct, but open competition among workers might still yield higher economic productivity than capitalism.

However, democratic anarchy might resolve such a problem altogether. By accepting democratic anarchy, workers will no longer need to offer their productivity; it will be assumed that their productivity must be equal to or better than that of the worker they replace. The work price is a minor issue compared to productivity, and it might be standardized similarly to how the prices of goods are standardized today on the market. In practice, the highest responsibility required of any worker for any job will be the main, if not the only, requirement for securing the job. The fine-tuning of workers' responsibilities will be determined through democratic anarchy, based on evaluations by their coworkers or customers. The following paragraphs will present what this means.

The baker gets the job by offering work responsibility of 1.2. Evaluations will be limited. Three positive or negative ratings per month per person, intended for individuals who have created the most significant advantages and the worst disadvantages for them, may be sufficient to maintain responsible production and a responsible society. Therefore, if the baker does not receive any evaluation, the value of their past work will remain unchanged. If the baker receives two negative assessments, they will lose 2.4 points from the value of their past work. Such responsibility will result in a permanent reduction of 2.4 money units from their salary. That means the baker will take high responsibility for everything connected to the bread they produce.

¹¹ Ronald Coase, *The Nature of the Firm* (Economica, Wiley Online Library, 1937)
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1468-0335.1937.tb00002.x>

They will also bear the same responsibility if they are negatively evaluated for any actions that impact society beyond bread production, making them accountable to the people for their everyday actions. On the other hand, suppose a baker makes customers or other people very satisfied with the bread or anything else they do. They may expect positive evaluations, which will result in a permanent salary increase. The impact of the assessments may be reduced by a hundred times, yet they will still encourage people to behave responsibly.

Another example: The election campaign for a country's president will last as long as the candidates register the values of their responsibilities for the president's position. This will also represent the election process, as the highest bid will secure the job. If life in a country is ordinary, the president might not receive any evaluation. If the standard of living deteriorates or improves for any reason, people might give their presidents positive or negative assessments because they are considered the most responsible for the country.

Let's assume a president offers a responsibility value of 1.6 to secure the job. If they receive one million negative evaluations in a month, each affecting 0.01 of their past work points, they will lose 16,000 points, representing the value of their past work. If the president possessed 100,000 points of past work, they would lose 16% of those points, resulting in 84,000 points after the evaluation. People's evaluations will be performed monthly. So, if the president receives 10 million negative assessments, they will drop into negative territory, with a debt of 60,000 points. In this case, they should pay the penalty to the economy instead of earning a salary. If the president cannot pay it, they will receive a minimum wage as long as they do not escape the debt. Of course, if the president improves social life, they will be well rewarded with positive evaluations from the people. A million positive evaluations will bring them 16,000 past work points, increasing their salary by 16%.

Those who cannot stand the heat will stay out of the kitchen. The new system will place a significant responsibility on workers, making them less likely to apply for jobs for which they are not qualified. However, if they still choose to apply, they will suffer heavy consequences for performing poorly. Their responsibility may be very painful and force them to resign quickly. Or, even better, they might search for replacements to escape the significant losses in past work value.

In practice, workplace replacements would hardly exist without agreements among workers. When workers take jobs from previous workers, the last workers are considered to have achieved the necessary productivity and would still benefit from it, even if they are replaced and do not contribute to that productivity. The new workers who force previous ones to leave will have to maintain their predecessors' productivity, but will profit only from the increased productivity they have achieved. Besides, one should expect that replacing workers without an agreement would likely lead to their dissatisfaction. They will be able to retaliate by negatively evaluating their replacements through democratic anarchy. Their coworkers and friends may support them. Therefore, workers who want to replace existing ones would most likely negotiate conditions to get

the jobs. Thus, one may expect workers to be replaced without negotiations only if the new workers bring noticeably higher productivity.

Managers will have significant operational power, but workers may still be able to control them before they make executive decisions. For example, suppose company managers want to increase production through substantial investments. Then, workers must support them because the increase in productivity will bring them new responsibilities. The workers will have the right to adjust the values of their accepted responsibilities in response to proposals from new managers. If they reduce their responsibilities, it could indicate a lack of confidence in the changes proposed by managers, which might postpone or block a new production. Managers will have to persuade workers to accept their proposals by explaining the production risks and benefits.

Substantial responsibility in the production process will teach workers to establish mutual relations more on cooperation than competition. However, every job will find the best worker on the market the same way every good finds the best purchaser today. Besides, those who know how to improve production and society will no longer be prevented from doing so. And on top of that, workers and people will be satisfied. Thus, the open labour market will make a significant contribution to the development of the economy and society.

Considering that workers will not dare apply for jobs they are not qualified for, there is no need to condition anyone's employment on the possession of diplomas. Firstly, a degree does not guarantee skill or productivity among workers. Secondly, requiring certifications unnecessarily restricts access to desired jobs. The limitation of employment possibilities due to the possession of degrees has evolved into the absurdity of bureaucratically limiting the freedom to choose work to a considerable extent.

Besides, the enormous volume of knowledge the education system imposes on students usually has no connection with people's professions. It serves the authorities' interests to ensure the survival of an authoritarian system, imposing an unnecessary burden that alienates students from objective reality. Moreover, alienated individuals are often unable to address social problems and contribute to societal improvement. In this regard, it is necessary to remove education as a bureaucratic requirement for having the right to work. This still means that professional education will be unquestionably essential and welcome, but not required for employment, as knowledge can also be acquired independently through practice.

The expectations of socialism

Some regions worldwide will adopt the open work competition one day, because no economy can be more productive than one where the best available worker is assigned to each job. Under the competitive pressures of public companies, private company

owners will strive to increase their productivity, just as public companies do. However, they would not have the operational capabilities to oppose public companies. Given that workers in private companies typically have less freedom and do not share in the profits, they are less likely to be interested in working for these companies. Given that public companies are generally more productive than private companies, private company owners may be encouraged to transition their companies to public status.

Given that a saturated market does not provide substantial profits, which is the final result of every production, the owners of private companies will likely join public companies. Company owners will receive the equivalent value of their past work in exchange for their firms. It will proportionately increase their incomes in public companies.

Over time, it is expected that all regional companies will merge into a single public company, which will operate similarly to large corporations. The company will maintain a management team that remains the best option for organizing production. The new system will make them highly responsible for decision-making, guaranteeing efficient production. Managers will create the jobs most needed and remove those that are not required. High production efficiency will be ensured by lowering competition from the enterprise to the job level.

The high level of responsibility the proposed work division imposes on workers will force manufacturers to avoid economic losses in an unpredictable market by organizing production around consumer demand. People will democratically determine the tax rate and directly allocate the tax funds for various consumer groups to support collective spending. Furthermore, individual consumers will be increasingly required to order their expensive needs in advance. Such production based on consumer orders presents a democratically planned market economy. Such an economy should bring the most productive and stable output possible. Information technology, which socialists have so far lacked, can help such complex production operate efficiently.

Democratic anarchy is all the social power that may remain in socialism. Once equal rights are fully established, people will have no reason to act against the law. Crime will be eliminated. Minor offences may remain and be resolved through democratic anarchy. Once equal human rights are established, police, courts, and prisons as symbols of authoritarian government will become obsolete and go down in history. This will also make states go down in history.

Only the complete implementation of equal human rights in the economy should be called socialism. Nothing else deserves this name. Socialism will emerge spontaneously as the ultimate consequence of universal human rights. It will not replace capitalism as Karl Marx believed; it will transform it.

Building socialism is a much more complicated task than reforming capitalism. The socialist solution presented in this book is not definitive because it opens up a spectrum of possibilities. It is challenging to choose the best solutions without practice. However,

one can be confident that social scientists will develop the best solutions for socialism, grounded in the theory of equal human rights. The development of socialism will eliminate social evils and create a bright future that surpasses the wildest dreams of today.

What is the underlying concept of the new system? The system will put society on a sound footing. It will give every person the right to participate in decisions affecting their interests in the community. It will allow everyone to judge those who make decisions on their behalf. It enables the free activity of any individual and, accordingly, finds a way that is more suitable to the nature of both the individual and society. Freedom allows the formation of critical views and the possibility of acting upon them, which, combined with practice, fosters objective knowledge. Practice demystifies the categories of value, thereby allowing the breakdown of dogmatic, uncritically accepted, and alienated knowledge that causes inconveniences in society today. Practice is the only possible route to understanding the individual's power, the only way to discover society's correct standing and orientation. This will form the process of disalienation of the community.

In such a system, individuals are compelled to rely on their own resources to fulfill their needs. Constant reliance on their abilities and defined responsibilities would teach individuals to accept the objective perception of their capabilities. This also means accepting their impotence when they cannot overcome it. By objectively understanding their own power, individuals will live in accordance with it. Such an individual would form their needs only where they can realize them, which constitutes the essence of the individual's balance and the formation of a constructive orientation in their relationship with nature and society.

There is a vibrant inner world within people, where all emotions, including love, hate, misery, and joy, reside. In a society where people understand that they are equal to all others, regardless of their accomplishments, they will relinquish the need to compare themselves with others. In such a society, exploiting the outer world will barely yield noticeable benefits to people. Therefore, people will begin searching for values within their inner world. When such an orientation is accepted, hate and misery will be eliminated because they do not exist in the inner world of individuals who are relieved from the need to compare themselves with others. In contrast, love and joy will develop significantly because nothing destructive exists in the inner world of individuals who are relieved of the need to compare themselves with others. People who do not compete with others generally prove it.

The most critical point of an individual's creation is themselves. Exploring the inner world enables people to enlighten themselves and become more productive. The more people get to know themselves, the more freedom, peace, joy, and wisdom they can achieve. Developed people achieve what they need on their own; they love the world unconditionally just because it exists. We learn through our lives what is good and what

is bad. Equal human rights are the best teacher. They will enlighten people, enabling them to create a prosperous society that surpasses even the wildest dreams of today.

The new form of socio-economic relations requires the formation of new elements needed to establish: the price of work, work division, the responsibility of workers, the cost of commodities, money accumulation, credit-monetary policy, working assets, development and amortization of the production, distribution of personal and collective spending, as well as the use of real estate. The new socio-economic policy will be presented in greater detail within the limits of possibilities in the following chapters.

3.1.2.2.1 Price of Work

Work has indirect and direct value. The indirect value of work is expressed through the value of work products, whereas the direct value of work is defined by the values that occur during the work.

In capitalism, work value is shown almost exclusively in an indirect form through the value of the work products, because the work is, per se, generally not favourable. Accordingly, it has seldom been considered as a direct value. Besides, no scale exists to measure such a value. Private companies in the commune will continue to set labour prices at the employer's discretion, as they do today. The value of work products is determined by the market demand and supply of commodities, as reflected in their prices. The work confirms its indirect value through the sale of commodities. Then the value of commodities also represents the value of labour.

Under socialism, Marx's labour theory of value is accepted, which holds that the value of goods is determined by the average labour-time required to produce them. In embracing the ideology of equality among people, Karl Marx neglected research that would have developed the objective value of labour. This finally led to the collapse of the socialist economy.

Past labour is the basis of everything society has created, while current labour is the basis of everything the economy produces; therefore, both must be objectively respected. Such respect can create the conditions for a just distribution of the fruits of production, thereby stimulating individuals' work and contributions to society's prosperity.

In connection with the above, let us accept that the indirect work value (in further text: the work price) in the unit of time is equal to the multiplication of past labour income-based value and current labour price.

$$\text{Work price} = (\text{Value of past labour}) \times (\text{Current labour price})$$

Past Labour Value

The new socialist system envisages competition among workers through higher productivity for every publicly owned job. Labour competition is likely to achieve higher productivity than capitalism can in an open labour market. Socialism needs socially owned enterprises to accomplish this goal. In this regard, socialism needs to find an acceptable way to transform private capital into social capital. Owners of private capital will voluntarily surrender their private property to society if society values and redeems their wealth fairly. Such a replacement will create new value in socialism, generating higher incomes for those who sell their property to society. Thus, the owners of capital may be encouraged to sell their wealth to the community.

Socialism has adopted a labour theory of value, which attributes the value of commodities to the labour time required to produce them. However, each product involves considerable time spent discovering and developing its production process, from the discovery of fire and the invention of the wheel to the present day. It is impossible to summarize the total amount of past work across all generations that created the material and cognitive values that society possesses today.

Therefore, socialist systems formally valued the past work of workers through years of service. A longer period of service would yield a somewhat higher income. However, such a measure of labour value did not objectively represent individual contributions to productivity and was therefore not production-stimulating. A significant shortcoming is that socialism did not consider the value of the past work of ancestors who contributed to the creation of all that society possesses.

The capitalist system determines the value of past labour more efficiently because it expresses it in terms of the value of produced capital. Marxists argue that a portion of the value of owned capital stems from exploiting workers, which is indeed true. Still, there is no method to determine which part of their property was created by exploitation. Private property is widely accepted globally; therefore, socialism should also adopt it, as there is no other suitable alternative. Socialism needs to reform the distribution system in production to increase justice and improve society.

It should be accepted that more valuable capital reflects the greater value of past labour. A higher value of past work should generate higher income, motivating private capital owners to cede their capital to society. Let us refer to the unit value of past labour as the point of past labour. The value of past labour points can replace the private property in real estate, securities, and money in the commune. All values expressed in money can also be represented in terms of past work. Private owners of material goods will receive as many points of past labour as their property has value. A

person with more valuable past work experience will earn more past work points and receive a higher income.

People who do not have private property will realize the value of past work to the extent that, together with their ancestors, they contributed to the creation of value in the joint ownership of the commune's inhabitants. Each commune possesses material assets owned by society, such as enterprises, land, facilities, infrastructure, natural resources, and other assets. Therefore, it will be necessary to estimate the total value of the common property of the commune inhabitants and determine its equivalent in points of past labour.

The total value of common material wealth, expressed in points of past work, should be determined by arbitration and then distributed to community members according to jointly agreed-upon and accepted criteria, valuing all contributions to building today's society. Such a criterion should be formed by an expert commission and approved by the commune assembly. Ultimately, the people will accept such a regulation in a referendum by a large majority. Establishing such a regulation of past work values will not be easy, but people can succeed after making optimal and acceptable corrections. The solution obtained, no matter how inconvenient it may seem to an individual or a group, will be a significant step forward for each person and society.

Let a certain number of points of past work be achieved at birth. The work individuals do in creating themselves brings about the greatest perfection and the most significant value people can achieve for themselves and others. In addition, socialism can regulate society's birth rate through past labour points. For example, if the birth rate falls, parents with more children may be awarded more past labour points, which could stimulate an increase in the birth rate, and vice versa.

Furthermore, the value of past work can increase linearly with years of service, education and all the criteria that permanently improve individuals, society and nature. The distribution of past work points will be designed to stimulate the realization of social needs. This measure primarily refers to production where productivity-enhancing work would be rewarded.

The total amount of past labour points of all commune residents can be adjusted to the numerical value of the commune's revenue. Increased production increases the commune's revenue. As the revenue increases, the number of past labour points earmarked for distribution among the commune's population increases. Workers who improve productivity would be automatically awarded a certain number of points for past work, depending on the rise in productivity and their responsibilities. This will boost companies' productivity, thereby promoting social prosperity.

On the other hand, socially owned production has not found a satisfactory solution to the issue of workers' responsibility in the production process, thereby significantly reducing its efficiency. Additionally, work can also permanently damage a company's productivity. The difference between offered and achieved productivity has its value.

This value can be determined and then deducted from the value of the past work of responsible workers by a mutually agreed procedure. Implementing such a mode of accountability can address the fundamental issues in socialist production and non-profit organizations. Taking responsibility for work by using past work points will be highly effective because people will be held accountable by the value of their past work, as well as through their current and future salaries. The principles of responsibility in production are presented in more detail in the chapter “Development of the Economy.”

A certain number of past work points can be distributed as a sign of recognition for scientific, cultural, sport, or other achievements that stimulate non-economic activities contributing to society's development. Juries and arbitration commissions would make such a distribution based on the valorization of accomplishments and the benefits that society derives from them.

Every society has a judicial system that protects individuals from the criminal activities of others. Today's system primarily addresses the crime problem by depriving people of their freedom through imprisonment. It is cruel and inefficient. Socialism can achieve an acceptable and effective form of sanctions for offences committed by deducting past labour points. It should not be a problem for the courts to convert prison sentences into past labour points. Taking responsibility through past labour points is more acceptable than inhumane imprisonment because it allows people to retain their freedom and productive power in society. If people commit serious crimes, they may lose all past work points and even fall into a negative value on their record. The proposed system can make the negative value of past work points psychologically, sociologically and economically more painful than prison. Individuals who fall into the negative value of past work points will earn only a minimal income, regardless of the job they hold, until they overcome the negative value of their past work. The few who commit particularly disgraceful crimes and are considered a threat to society will be rehabilitated in mental health institutions.

Furthermore, people who fall into the negative value of past work points may be required to wear distinctive clothing that signals to everyone that they are considered to be bad. As a result, people will be less likely to commit crimes and misdemeanours than they are today. Suppose people enter the negative value of past work. In that case, they will strive to overcome it, and this will be possible only through highly productive work and exemplary behaviour over time.

Similarly, the judiciary can establish a mechanism that rewards individuals who bring significant benefits to society, thereby fostering a productive orientation within the community. However, courts have significant shortcomings because their authoritative role in shaping punishments makes them subjective, leading to alienation from justice. As humanity strives for the growth of democracy, each member should be given equal power to sanction and reward others for their contributions to society's benefits and troubles. With such a right, every person will receive direct and equal executive power in the community, which, in an anarchic manner, would stimulate favourable social

actions at all levels of complex social relations. The power to judge people is called democratic anarchy.

The negative evaluation people receive should account for a small portion of the points from past work. By introducing such a measure, each person will strive to minimize disadvantages for others and reduce harm as much as possible at all levels of complex social relations. In other words, every person should know what does not suit another person and will avoid doing it. Moreover, suppose people are unaware that they create difficulties for other community members. In that case, the negative evaluations they receive and the penalties they face will prompt them to reflect on and recognize what is wrong with them.

Over time, such an assessment method can replace judicial bodies, laws, and regulations, rendering them unnecessary. People will form unwritten codes of justice based on their natural understanding of societal benefits and values. On the other hand, every community member should be entitled to reward people who have contributed to creating benefits for themselves and society. Democratic anarchy can yield the most significant benefits for society.

The number of past work points will serve as a form of humanistic shares, providing income based on the value of past work. More past work points will indicate more valuable past work and generate higher salaries. It will reflect people's productive power and become a significant value in society. The commune should also be able to exchange past labour points for money to increase confidence in this form of value. This value will continue to be alienated from human nature, but it will effectively contribute to a good society.

Points of past work will be the inviolable property of people that will be inherited through generations. It will thus become a measure of the work's value across generations. Therefore, the points of past work will require responsible behaviour to maintain social stability across generations. Such a system would be acceptably repressive because it would not deprive people of their freedom but would prevent them from using their freedom to create problems within society.

Current Labour Price

The price of current labour depends on the direct value of labour itself. The direct value of labour shows the relation between conveniences and inconveniences arising from work, independently of the value of the work results.

The conveniences connected with the work as such stem from the meeting of the individual's immediate work needs, from the necessary exchange of energy with nature, the realization of both physical and spiritual needs, the need for developing the individual's essential powers, from the status value of the working position, from the presentation of the productive potency in the society, from helping others, as well as in

work contributions to the development of society. The conveniences arising from work as such bring pleasure.

On the other hand, work also brings inconveniences that cannot be considered valuable. The inconveniences arise from alienated work imposed by authorities as a requirement to secure existence. Such work is not free and, therefore, cannot fully realize the individual's productive forces, nor can it bring direct benefits to the individual.

A greater value will present a job that better suits the individual's nature and characteristics, resulting in greater convenience during its duration. Let it be accepted that average work equals 1 (one) as a direct current value of labour. If the interval between the extreme inconvenience and the extreme convenience of work were from 0.1 to 10, then the convenient work would, in mathematical terms, be a hundred times more valuable than the inconvenient.

Each worker can most efficiently establish the direct value of current labour because they know best how convenient or inconvenient their work is. Therefore, each needs to assess the relationship between the magnitudes of everyday work burden and relaxation, considering all their psychophysical factors, and compare these with other work obligations. The assessment result will range from 0.1 to 10, indicating the relationship between work conveniences and inconveniences for a specific work post compared to the average work.

A lower value of current labour represents greater inconveniences during work. It therefore needs a larger share of the income distribution to compensate for these work-related inconveniences. Conversely, a higher value of current labour indicates greater convenience during the work period relative to the average work and needs. From this perspective, it will achieve a smaller share of the income distribution and thus gain fewer minor conveniences in the work results.

The price of current labour determines the share in the distribution of work results. The current labour price is inversely proportional to the direct current labour value. The current labour price will also range from 0.1 to 10. A more favourable work will realize an immediate current labour value higher than 1 (one), so that the price of present labour will be smaller than 1 (one), and the income thus realized will be smaller than the average. For example, very unfavourable work, with a direct current labour value of 0.2, will be five times less favourable than average work and will realize a current labour price of 5, thus yielding an income five times higher than the average income from work.

In a system of protected work posts, each worker might subjectively find their work markedly inconvenient and demand a larger share of the collective work performance than they deserve. Socialism will ensure an objective valuation of work through the mechanism of labour-market competition. This means that, in circumstances of equal productivity, the right to work will be exercised by the worker whose current labour brings greater direct exchange value, or by the worker who demands a lower current labour price and a lower income.

In that way, a new trend in society may be achieved in which the direct exchange value of the work would rise to the point where it would become more important than the operating result. Such a trend may form a turning point in the development of society. This can be achieved through the automation of production, the redistribution of inappropriate forms of labour, and the increased possibility of selecting types of work where individuals can realize their productive, essential forces. Work as a form of realization of the power of being may cause the individual to find non-exhaustive inspiration, necessity, convenience, and value. Such work has its usable value. The prosperity of society lies in an approach where work, over time, becomes a valued asset. It can bring conveniences that are at least as great as those realized beyond the workplace.

The result of this approach to valuing current labour is a number indicating the price of current labour for each worker employed in enterprises, where workers directly receive income from their work. However, each socially beneficial activity would need to be proclaimed valuable, irrespective of whether it participates directly in the production. An unemployed individual contributes to society in some way every day. The individual is a value to society, and society must accept this standpoint for such a value to develop.

This measure refers to all unemployed individuals, including preschool children, pupils, persons of advanced age who are no longer able to work, individuals with disabilities, and those who do not wish to work. Accepting the values of everyone's current labour means ensuring each individual an income-based compensation to the level of the recognized price of present labour. The current labour price for the unemployed population should be determined by the commune's leadership, taking into account the commune's needs and capabilities, and then adopted by the commune's assembly. Such values may change in response to economic opportunities and society's needs. For example, if workers were not sufficiently interested in their work, the current labour price for unemployed people would fall, depending on the category, reducing their income and, in turn, increasing interest in work.

On the other hand, if workers were more interested in work than necessary or, more precisely, if direct work becomes a value, the current labour price of the unemployed portion of the population will rise and increase their share in the distribution of the result of work, which would reduce the income-based share of the interest in work. Therefore, such income regulation between the employed and unemployed portions of the population will help balance the demand and supply of work, thereby maintaining equilibrium within complex social relations.

Such an approach to work valuation will ensure economic and existential independence and freedom for everyone, an essential prerequisite for social freedom, stability, and prosperity. It is necessary to provide basic needs for everyone because if an individual's survival is endangered, it jeopardizes society's survival. This measure serves as a universal substitute for social, pension, and disability insurance, as well as solidarity-based payments to the unemployed, child allowances, and tax benefits for multi-

member families. Instead, it means a simpler, more just, and more efficient redistribution that is more natural, effective, and wiser than the existing system when it comes to social improvements.

Each work contains elements of current and past labour. Past labour without the current one that maintains it has no value, while present labour cannot exist without the past one. As current and past labour are mutually linked, and as production develops by geometric progression, the price of each work may be shown by the product of past labour value expressed in points of past labour and the cost of current labour.

$$\text{Work price} = (\text{Points of past labour}) \times (\text{Current labour price})$$

The current labour price should be the basis for the indirect value of the work, i.e., income. It arises from the formula that the cost of each work is proportionate to the number of past labour points and the current labour price. The more past labour points a worker accumulates, the higher the cost of their work and the higher the income they are supposed to earn. On the other hand, the more productive, challenging, dangerous, complex, inconvenient, responsible, and unhealthy work a worker performs, the smaller the value of current labour is. Therefore, the work price will be justifiably greater, as well as the income.

The association of enterprises in the commune recognizes the right of workers to work in any job position. At the same time, substituting indirect forms of past labour values allows them to realize income proportional to the number of past labour points. The worker with more past labour points will earn a higher income than the worker with fewer points, even though both achieve the same work performance. Past labour points will become a form of humanistic shares, providing income substitution for all kinds of profits, interests, rents, and dividends associated with the capitalist form of production. However, workers' large individual incomes will not significantly burden their companies because the incomes will be calculated at the commune level. This will be explained in more detail in the chapter "Commodity Price."

The current labour price will be as objective as possible, determined directly by market competition for work. The small value of the current labour price compared to past labour points should not be misleading because, according to the formula, increasing the current labour price from 1 to 2 will double the work price.

The price of labour develops the labour theory of value and will serve as a basis for the formation of workers' incomes in socialism. As the cost of work is objectively established, society will accept such a system of income distribution as just. In this way, society will overcome the big problems of today's income distribution. Moreover, such an income distribution system may pave the way for a continuously productive orientation. However, the work price will ultimately be confirmed or negated by the

realized income, which will depend on the actual labour productivity and various other factors.

3.1.2.2.2 Work Division

Socialism will introduce significant changes in the system of labour division. The main disadvantage of today's division of labour lies in the limited opportunity to choose work. Namely, occupied jobs are not accessible to other candidates and unemployed people. Even under capitalism, such positions are privileged and do not achieve sufficient economic productivity. Therefore, socialism will introduce constant open competition for each job and employ the best available worker.

In socialist production, all jobs will be subject to labour competition in the labour market, within the operational possibilities of each job. The worker who offers the highest productivity, responsibility, and the lowest current labour cost will have the right to work in every job position.

The socialist work organization in the commune may vary freely from a centralized production organization to an entirely liberal business operation. The commune's management will establish the division of labour and decision-making authority in production, thereby achieving the most significant benefits for the commune. The commune's managers will organize output to achieve maximum productivity. They will have the authority to form new companies and shut down companies that do not meet sufficient productivity standards.

Managers must respect the production obligations of companies. If the volume of production needs decreases, they will reduce the number of workers until the company is possibly forced to close. Workers whose employment is terminated due to economic redirection are recognized as having fulfilled their contractual obligations and therefore receive rewards for their work, as if they had met their responsibilities. They will then search for new jobs that management has provided.

The management will have significant operational power, which is necessary for establishing fast and efficient coordination of work, a key factor in achieving good economic performance. Some may relate this power to that of dictators. Still, nothing will be further from that, because the managers will directly bear responsibility to the people and can be replaced at any moment.

Under the pressure of labour competition, every worker will strive to achieve maximum productivity within the framework of workplace authorization. Changes in authority at each workplace can be made by mutual agreement between the employee and their manager, provided that the manager has the authority to make such decisions. During the transition period, managers' work will be overseen by commune assemblies and

worker councils; however, people are likely to abandon this approach when the system proves efficient without their involvement.

Private companies will continue to operate just as they do today.

A worker who offers the highest productivity, responsibility, and the lowest price of their current labour is the most suitable for the collective staff and society. Therefore, they should have the right to work in such positions. Thus, each work, including management, can be defined in terms of productivity, responsibility, and the value of the work. To compare the different work functions more efficiently, it is necessary to express the mentioned values for each work post by the following coefficient:

$$\text{C-work competition} = \frac{\text{C - productivity} \times \text{C - responsibility}}{\text{Current labor price}}$$

This formula requires coordinating the influence of each variable. After that, it will provide a value indicating the competitive capability for a desired work position. Each worker proposes a value for the coefficients based on their abilities for the job they wish to perform. A worker who demonstrates higher productivity, assumes greater labour responsibility, and offers a lower current work price will win the right to work at the desired position. Besides that, the increased value of work competition allows each worker to take on another worker's role, with the obligation to assume all labour obligations and responsibilities associated with that role.

Labour Productivity

Each job has its measure of productivity. Today, productivity can be measured in the most straightforward, comprehensive, and efficient manner by market profit. Profit in the free market encompasses all elements of productive business activity, including the quantity and quality of work, cost-effectiveness, rationality, usability, and serviceability. Profit is the social evaluation of a business's success in achieving its performance goals. However, there are no commodity-money relations within the enterprise, so productivity must be expressed in terms of the quantity and quality of goods and services produced within a specified time interval.

Where it is impossible to establish labour productivity by the produced goods precisely or where the establishment of productivity would be time-consuming, productivity can be expressed by assessing the production value. Existing productivity, defined by grade for each work post, has the value of 1 (one). A worker who believes they can increase their productivity by 10% will assess their productivity as 10% higher than the existing level, and the value of their envisaged productivity will then be 1.1. The work assessment may replace all other forms of labour productivity valuation. Each worker can show their C-productivity by the formula:

$$\text{C-of envisaged productivity} = \frac{\text{Envisaged Productivity}}{\text{Existing Productivity}}$$

The envisaged productivity, expressed in money, products, or work estimates and identical to the existing one, will be represented by the coefficient 1 (one). A coefficient larger than 1 (one) will indicate a work that is more productive than the existing one. Workers who offer a larger coefficient will exercise their right to the desired work post.

Once the accounting period is over, it is necessary to evaluate the realized productivity to establish the worker's success in the work offer. A coefficient may present the realized productivity with the following formula:

$$\text{C – of realized productivity} = \frac{\text{Realized Productivity}}{\text{Envisaged Productivity}}$$

The realized productivity, as reflected in market profits, may effectively indicate the success of business activity; therefore, other forms of productivity valuation are unnecessary. However, such a work valorization applies only to self-employed entrepreneurs and company management.

In the production of commodities, productivity is measured by the quantity and quality of goods and services produced. However, when the number and quality of products and services cannot be simply determined, an assessment of work value will be introduced.

Management boards, councils, and workers themselves may evaluate worker productivity. The managing boards and workers' councils of enterprises will monitor and assess improvements and deteriorations in workers' work. Their evaluations may reflect workers' actual productivity. However, workers know each other's quality and shortcomings best, so the most accurate evaluation of workers would come from themselves. They should have an equal right to anonymously evaluate the work of others based on their proposed productivity.

The received evaluations will confirm or negate the rate each worker has assigned to themselves to reflect their productivity. The proposed subjective grade of a worker's productivity will be confirmed or denied, which will influence the development of objective value categories. Work valorization is necessary not only to hold workers accountable for their productivity but also to recognize an individual's essential abilities. Individuals need an objective scale of values to gain insight into themselves and identify areas for potential improvement.

The coefficient of realized productivity that realizes a value higher than 1 (one) will represent the productivity realized in a volume larger than envisaged, and will also result in a higher income. Conversely, a coefficient of realized productivity less than 1

(one) indicates that the achieved productivity is in a volume smaller than envisaged, resulting in a smaller income.

It should be emphasized that the presented accounting is based on the capitalist mode of economic operation, which is quite demanding. Nevertheless, it is presented in such a way that it could explain the new economy to people who think traditionally. The socialist economy will embrace the principle of democratic anarchy, requiring significantly simpler bookkeeping than capitalism, yet it will not lag behind it.

Responsibility of Workers

Without a developed method for bearing responsibility, workers would not be obliged to achieve the productivity they proposed. In this way, their declarations in the work competition would be exaggerated, and their work results would not follow. Such irresponsibility could have catastrophic consequences for the economy. Therefore, it is necessary to establish a system in which every worker is responsible for achieving their envisioned productivity. It needs to be based on the realized productivity coefficient. The method of responsibility-bearing needs to be multi-layered and efficient.

Each worker needs to bear responsibility for their work. Since their job is inseparable from the collective's work, they also take responsibility for the collective's productivity. The coefficient of responsibility may determine the level of responsibility a worker assumes.

Let it be assumed that the average coefficient of responsibility has the value of 1 (one). Assume the minimum and maximum responsibility intervals are 0.1 to 10. Let each worker set the level of commitment they consider for their work, expressed as a responsibility coefficient. A higher responsibility coefficient that workers offer increases work competitiveness in the job market for every public post, and vice versa.

Workers will primarily bear responsibility in the production process by using past work points. The total quantity of past labour points of all workers in the commune needs to be equal to the realized revenue of the commune. Economic enterprises that increase productivity will realize a surplus of cash assets. They will distribute that surplus to workers in the form of past labour points proportionately to their coefficient of responsibility. Conversely, if enterprises lose money, it will be deducted from the past labour points of all workers proportionately to the coefficient of their responsibility.

Enterprises in non-profit sectors, such as administration, healthcare, education, and other activities proclaimed by the commune through its leaders and the assembly, do not generate direct income in the market. Instead, they realize it by appropriations from the commune's revenue. In non-profit organizations, the measure of production value should be based on the satisfaction of service users. Therefore, a nonprofit organization receiving a high evaluation from service users will achieve high profits from economic

enterprises. The system needs to equalize the measure of success between for-profit and non-profit companies in business activities.

By applying mathematical coefficients, it is possible to compare the revenue of profit-oriented economies and the realized productivity of non-profit organizations, expressed in any unit of measurement, including productivity assessments.

Unemployed inhabitants will also have C-responsibilities, which will be assigned to them as a minimum C-responsibility in the commune by the commune's management, and adopted by the commune's assembly. In the final adjustment of the total number of past work points of all inhabitants of the commune and the revenue of the commune, they will receive or lose past labour points, but in a smaller quantity than workers in production. This way, the entire commune population will bear responsibility for the commune's productivity.

Since production, or more precisely, profit in the market, may fluctuate over accounting periods, collective responsibility based on past labour needs to be linked to the period when an enterprise's business activity demonstrates objective indicators of success. Of course, the accounting period may differ across productions; however, productivity, which shows smaller or larger monthly oscillations, is likely to provide a more realistic balance over the year.

Once the quantity of past labour points that each enterprise realizes or loses is known, then the distribution or deduction of these points will be carried out proportionately to the coefficients of responsibility of workers. By applying computer technology in the period of accounting, the distribution of past labour points, as well as their deduction, can be calculated for an unlimited number of workers by the formula:

$$\begin{aligned} &\textbf{Worker-1 : Worker-2 : Worker-3 : : Worker-n =} \\ &\textbf{C-respons.-1 : C-respons.-2 : C-respons.-3 : : C-respons.-n} \end{aligned}$$

Then, computer technology can quickly and easily produce the results in the form of:

$$\begin{aligned} &\textbf{Worker-1 = +/- Quantity of Points-1,} \\ &\textbf{Worker-2 = +/- Quantity of Points-2,} \\ &\textbf{Worker-3 = +/- Quantity of Points-3,} \\ &\textbf{.....} \\ &\textbf{Worker-n = +/- Quantity of Points-n} \end{aligned}$$

The obtained values are expressed as differences in past labour points added to (or deducted from) the quantities held by workers.

An example: A worker who stated a coefficient of responsibility of 1.5 in the case of a rise in enterprise profit would realize, on account of the responsibility function, a three

times larger gain of past labour points than a worker who stated a coefficient of responsibility of 0.5. And vice versa, they would suffer a loss of past labour points three times greater if the enterprise experienced financial losses.

In the proposed system, each worker is responsible for the collective work in proportion to the responsibility coefficient they stated. In this way, workers become active creators of their conveniences and inconveniences, rather than passive members of a collective. Furthermore, such a commitment will require that workers become familiar with the consequences of the company's business, thereby helping overcome alienation in production.

In capitalist production, higher profits are generally associated with a higher risk of investing capital. The new system introduces C-responsibilities, allowing workers, at their own will, to share the risks assumed for the collective production's success. However, such speculation is inseparable from workers' direct work, contributing to a deeper understanding of the economic process and ultimately leading to a greater sense of responsibility for their output. A higher level of commitment requires greater confidence in the community, which in turn leads to increased productivity and prosperity. Workers who are more familiar with business processes and have greater confidence in themselves and the collective will take on a higher degree of responsibility.

In addition to workers' collective responsibility, their personal responsibility in production processes needs to be defined. Workers individually might produce benefits and disadvantages in the joint production process. To create a productive orientation in society that motivates work and prevents irresponsibility in production processes, it will be necessary to establish principles for rewarding and sanctioning individual workers based on their personal contribution to collective production, using a certain number of past labour points. The company's arbitration commissions should apply such remuneration and sanctions to workers in accordance with the company's regulations.

However, the best way to determine individual responsibility will likely be through mutual evaluation within a democratic anarchist framework. Democratic anarchy would reward good workers and punish bad ones based on the responsibility coefficient they assigned to their work. Let each positive assessment reflect the employee's points from past work, valued according to their coefficient of responsibility. Conversely, let each negative assessment deprive the employee of the points of past work in the function of their coefficient of responsibility.

Such a system for evaluating the value of work and assigning responsibilities involves all the influences that work brings in the broadest sense. It may reward any benefit and sanction any damage or inconvenience a worker causes to another worker or production. Every worker will be careful not to cause inconvenience or, if possible, minimize any inconvenience to other workers and the production processes. This will be

the essence of a productive social orientation that will improve interpersonal relationships and production.

For example, let us arbitrarily assume that the commune's average income is 100,000 monetary units. In that case, the average quantity of past labour points is 100,000. If workers cannot take significant responsibility for their work, they will opt for a small coefficient of responsibility. For example, if they propose a coefficient of responsibility of 0.1, one positive evaluation would bring them 0.1 points of past labour, and five negative votes would result in -0.5 points. Then, in the first case, the worker with the average quantity of past labour points will have 100,000.1, and in the second case, 99,999.5 points.

Workers wishing to increase their work competitiveness may also increase their coefficient of responsibility. For example, a responsibility coefficient of 1.2 will give the worker 12 points for 10 positive evaluations. If the same worker has 100,000 past labour income points, they will have 100.012 points after the assessment. If they receive 20 negative votes, 24 points will be deducted, resulting in 99.976 income points afterward. The evaluations will be given monthly, so the mutual evaluation system will require a high level of responsibility. It should be reiterated that the examples are entirely arbitrary and that implementing such measures in practice will require a comprehensive study and social acceptance.

Once democratic anarchy is accepted, workers will no longer have to offer productivity. It will be assumed that their work productivity should meet the needs of consumers and collective joint production. The price of labour will be standardized in the same way that the costs of goods on the market today are standardized. In practice, workers' greatest responsibility for their jobs will be the main, if not the only, indicator of workers' productive power. The example above shows how the fine-tuning of workers' responsibilities will be determined quickly and efficiently through democratic anarchy.

By accepting democratic anarchy, the productivity offered by workers will lose its meaning. For example, suppose people think that their work is unsatisfactory. Then, they will receive negative evaluations regardless of the productivity they offered, or, for instance, whether the President realized what they promised when they won the elections.

There is no doubt that in socialism, each worker will be cautious before declaring their productivity and degree of responsibility. Such caution will prevent hasty statements and voluntarism, which can damage production processes. The system will encourage each worker to objectively recognize their abilities and act accordingly, thereby enabling them to meet their needs effectively. Such an act is a precondition for a constructive orientation of society.

The unemployed population should also bear responsibility for their activities, but the commune's leadership will determine their responsibility coefficient, considering they are not working. Therefore, they will likely bear the lowest possible responsibility. However, their social responsibility will be sufficient to respect society and its environment. This means that the unemployed may also be rewarded and punished by community members for their behaviour. They will gain or lose points based on the minimum coefficient of responsibility in the commune. In this way, the entire population of the commune gets the right to evaluate other people's behaviour and be evaluated by others for their behaviour. It will significantly improve society.

The total amount of past work points of all commune residents should equal the realized revenue of the commune. After all the additions and subtractions of past labour points related to the individual responsibility of all commune residents, it is necessary to settle the total amount of past labour points of all people with the revenue of the commune. The final settlement can be determined based on the coefficient of responsibility of the individuals, similar to how rewards and penalties are calculated in companies.

Current Labour Price

Finally, the current price of labour determines the competitive power in determining the right to work at every public job. The current labour price depends on the conveniences and inconveniences that the required work brings in achieving the required productivity, compared to those of other forms of work or being unemployed.

The system enables workers to set the current labour price themselves by adjusting a coefficient within a value range of 0.1 to 10. The average cost of present labour will have a value of 1(one); a job twice as inconvenient will have a price equal to a value of 2, while a job twice as convenient will have a price of 0.5.

A worker who seeks a lower current labour market price for equal productivity will realize greater work competitiveness. The system of labour competition will establish a threshold value for the current labour price of each job, which will be accepted as an objective by society. The current labour price will be one of the foundations for creating a just income distribution. Such a price of labour will be one of the foundations of building a just society.

Socialism will send capitalism into history

The socialist economy will employ all people who want to work through shorter work hours, so the unfavourable form of unemployment under capitalism will no longer exist. Private companies will be forced to reduce working hours as well until full employment is achieved. Reducing working hours will increase the demand for workers. Increased demand for workers will lead to higher wages for workers and lower profits for employers. Workers' rights will grow while employers will lose their privileges. This will

reduce the significance of capital. The owners of low-profit companies facing higher labour costs might be interested in selling their companies to the commune.

Owners of private companies that make high profits will not be interested in selling their property to the commune. Such companies will continue their production as they do today. Socialism can begin to be realized even if no private entrepreneur unites their property in the commune. Then the socialist system will be based on organizations and institutions owned by the commune.

Socialism will introduce competition among workers for every public job. No economy can be more productive than one in which every job is filled with the best available worker. Private companies will be unable to allocate workers efficiently enough to compete with public companies, leading public companies to become more productive and profitable than their private counterparts. Above all, private companies cannot accept workers' participation in the distribution of profits, unlike public companies. As a result, workers will be less inclined to work in private companies. Consequently, working in private companies will be less attractive to workers than working in public companies.

The lower productivity of private companies and workers' reduced interest in working there signal the end of capitalism. At the beginning of implementing the socialist form of production in public companies, private companies will show interest in joining the public companies of the commune. In return for their property, the owners of private companies will receive an equivalent value in past work points, which will bring them a proportionately higher income in public companies. In addition, the owners of private companies will realize that socialism is more stable in the face of economic fluctuations, ensuring greater stability of the values they possess. If the owners of private companies could join socialism today, they would most likely do so to better preserve the value of their capital amid the frequent problems of capitalism.

The commune should also allow residents to sell their past labour points for money. Thus, past work points could become a form of shares that the community population will have confidence in. In socialism, private entrepreneurs may be interested in selling their property to the commune. Over time, the commune can purchase stock shares, real estate, and other valuables owned by its inhabitants. When the owners of private property leave their property to society, their amount of past labour points will replace the values of the capitalist system and supplement them with new values that will enable the further prosperity of society.

The psychological benefits of socialism

People have been constantly pressured by authoritarian forces that have instilled in them a sense of inferiority. This reaction creates a need for superiority over other people. This is wrong, but since such behaviour exists, it must be accepted as a reality that will prevail in socialism. People need to show their power through competitions.

Being a winner is of great value to people because it proves their power. Victory compensates for the subjective experience of powerlessness.

Labour competition is a constant struggle to achieve greater productivity. It is a struggle that enables every worker to excel in their field. It will serve as a form of compensation for the powerlessness caused by authoritarian influences. People will present their competitive power in their workplaces. That power will be recognized by society and will surely satisfy the workers. Therefore, there is no doubt that work competition is more acceptable than other forms of competition because it brings socially beneficial results and contributes to society's well-being.

In socialism, work will no longer be privileged. Revoking privileges will eliminate the power of one person over another, a mechanism by which people are exploited and the basis of many societal problems. Under socialism, all workers will have equal rights in labour and wage distribution. Everyone can choose a job they like and be satisfied with their income.

Labour competition will not allow anyone to sleep on their laurels. Over time, one can expect exhaustion and a sense of satiation from over-intensive action on a broad social level, leading to a decrease in ambitions. Such an orientation will balance man's natural needs and possibilities. Freedom in socialism will enable workers to engage with work processes with interest, develop a critical attitude, and act on their strengths. This path will allow each worker to examine the validity of the premises that guided them in forming their needs. This will contribute to the formation of objective values in production.

In this way, people will come closer to their nature and discover values that stem from it. Socialism will help eliminate the subjective vision of reality imposed by authorities throughout history, which underlies alienation and societal problems. It is a process of disalienation. This will bring values that help people find balance and satisfaction.

In socialism, people will accept their helplessness in areas where they cannot overcome it and will find ways to exercise their power, thus satisfying their needs objectively. People who consistently meet their needs are not destructive. Such people would have no depression, neurosis, or psychosis and would not be alcoholics, drug addicts, masochists, sadists, or aggressive. The process of disalienation will enable people to live responsibly. Socialism will facilitate a productive, constructive orientation among people, leading them to believe in prosperity grounded in productivity, solidarity, and reciprocity. Then one can believe in peace, love, and the joy of living.

Then, society will form a constructive attitude towards young people. This relationship will no longer be authoritative because no person in the community will be subordinated to authoritarian forces. It can be assumed that such a society will naturally form a way of life that aligns with its natural needs. The population will relinquish alienated ambitions to foster healthy relationships in society. Relationships will be formed in which adults will respect young people, and mutual conflicts will be resolved through mutual agreement.

Relationships will be formed to enable a person to develop appropriately from an early age. And only then can society find its long-term constructive orientation.

3.1.2.2.3 Price of Commodities

Commodities have their sales value expressed as a price. In a market economy, the law of supply and demand determines the price of goods and services. The cost of goods is adjusted based on manufacturing capabilities, individual purchasing power, and societal needs. Commodities also have a manufacturing value based on production costs.

In socialism, the manufacturing value of commodities should incorporate money intended for the gross income of all workers who produce the commodities (1); the pertaining ratio of the gross income of workers in the non-profit organizations (2); the pertaining proportion of the gross income of unemployed people on the territory of the commune (3); and the working cash assets invested in the production of goods (4).

In socialism, calculating the production value of goods is more accurate and just than in capitalism, thereby bringing much more justice to wage distribution than is possible today. The formula can present the production value of goods:

$$A = \sum (B \times (1+C+D)) + E$$

The formula indicates that the production value of goods includes the cost of workers who directly produce goods, the corresponding price of employees' labour in nonprofit organizations, the related earnings of unemployed individuals, and, finally, the value of working capital invested. Hereinafter, production value refers to the total value of goods produced by a company over the accounting period.

A detailed explanation of the formula:

A – The manufacturing value of commodities produced in a company.

B – The gross work price of each worker participating in manufacturing commodities. The price is defined by the number of past labour points and the current labour price of workers. The gross price includes the net cost of workers and the funds they pay for the commune's collective consumption.

The quantity of past labour points determines workers' holdings, while workers set the current labour price in a freely competitive market. The product of these two coefficients gives the gross work price of a worker.

C – The coefficient of workers employed in non-profit organizations. It is expressed as the proportion of the gross work price of all workers employed in non-profit organizations and in profit-making organizations within the commune's territory.

The proportion of workers employed in the profit economy and in non-profit organizations is regulated by the commune's management, in line with needs and possibilities. The gross wages of workers in non-profit organizations are established similarly to those in the profit economy. In a profit economy, workers produce commodities whose sale generates profit on the commodities market. Workers employed in non-profit organizations, such as teachers and police officers, do not receive income directly because their work is provided free of charge to the community's inhabitants. This means that the total quantity of produced commodities and services results from the collective work in both the profit economy and non-profit organizations. Workers in the profit economy utilize the services of non-profit activities; thus, according to the principle of mutuality, workers in non-profit activities must use the products of the work performed by workers in the profit economy. By applying this coefficient, the worker's contribution to the non-profit organizations is built into the product's price. The coefficient establishes their share in the distribution of produced commodities.

D - The coefficient of unemployed inhabitants. It is expressed by the proportion of the number of unemployed and employed workers in the profit economy on the commune's territory as a function of the price of current labour and the quantity of past labour income-based points.

The coefficient represents the entire population that does not work directly, including young people, pupils, retired individuals, homemakers, invalids, and, in general, the whole unemployed population in the commune. The unemployed population needs to receive earnings for past and future labour, thereby providing economic security. Such payment needs to be incorporated into the price of produced commodities.

The value of the past work of unemployed people determines the number of past labour points they possess. The current labour cost of unemployed people guides the commune's management based on work needs and the commune's production capacity. A lower current labour cost for the unemployed will generate smaller earnings, increasing their interest in work. And vice versa, a higher price of current labour for the unemployed will generate higher income, thereby decreasing the income-based incentive to work. This way, the commune's management will direct social work in line with social and production needs. For example, an increase in the price of student labour would stimulate education and related fields.

These coefficients represent the gross income appropriations for all inhabitants of the commune, as a percentage of the cost of the commodities produced. By selling goods on the market, all the commune inhabitants share in the profit. The gross income refers to the net income of all inhabitants and the funds they need to pay for the collective consumption of the commune.

E – The quantity of cash working assets spent to produce the commodities. Operating assets represent the value of parts of products manufactured by other producers and include intermediates, semi-finished products, and raw materials.

Working money assets are mostly drawn from the commune's reserve fund, which is formed by redeeming cash assets for past labour points. Operating assets are acquired based on the needs of the profit economy. However, the producers are obligated to repay during the accounting period.

Factors C and D are unique to the accounting period and can be calculated using the coefficient **k**. Then, the manufacturing price of commodities can be expressed by the formula:

$$C = \sum (A \times k) + B$$

The sum of all labour costs for workers involved in manufacturing products, including contributions from workers in non-profit organizations and unemployed individuals, represents the total labour cost of producing a particular product. By adding the value of working capital spent, one gets the manufactured value of commodities.

This method of calculating the value of goods equates the total value of all goods produced in the commune with the gross income of the commune's inhabitants. In other words, it equates the prices of goods with society's purchasing power. In this way, the production and distribution system achieves balance.

It is crucial to determine the production value of goods because it reflects an enterprise's business performance in the commune. If the production value of goods exceeds the market price, the company is unprofitable. If the production value of goods is lower than the market price, the company operates at a loss.

Due to the varying material equipment used in their work, enterprises' productivity differs, and by selling their commodities on the free market, they generate diverse incomes. In a free-choice labour system, jobs that offer higher salaries with equal workloads would, through labour competition, create a surplus value, inciting greater interest among workers. On the other hand, lower-income jobs with similar workloads would arouse less interest. This would undoubtedly cause instability in the labour market and, thus, in society.

The commune's management needs to balance the demand for all work posts in the commune's enterprises by analyzing the advantages and disadvantages of different production forms. For example, the balance may be improved by hiring more workers in enterprises, thereby achieving higher profits and reducing the number of workers in companies that generate lower revenue than necessary. If it is not economically

justified, the balance may be established, and more significant profits may be earned by investing in profitable companies and closing down loss-making enterprises. If such an option is not justified, the balance lies in investing in enterprises that operate with smaller profits, which would achieve higher productivity and ultimately lead to increased profits.

However, the differences in productivity and realized income among enterprises in the commune will persist as long as production equipment remains unequal. This is because significant automation of the production process will always significantly reduce the number of workers required. In this way, the productivity and income of workers in such a company will increase compared to those in the commune, which has a lower level of automation in its production. Hence, if work competition were the sole coordinator of the supply and demand for work, it would consistently create instability in the labour division driven by workers' need for better-paid jobs.

The proposed payment settlement, in which the total income of all workers corresponds to the full value of goods and services produced, predicts that the surplus value income of enterprises with better material equipment in the commune will correspond to the lack of income of companies with lower material equipment in the commune.

A balance between supply and demand for labour in the commune can be achieved by ensuring that companies generating surplus value, where workers earn more than they demand, transfer their surplus to companies making less than what workers demand. This is a subvention. The subvention is necessary because, in a system of free labour competition, workers would compete for work in more productive companies, where they would earn more money than they requested. This would bring instabilities in the division of labour. Such a measure has the sole task of equalizing workers' income interests across all jobs.

In this way, the commune becomes the basic working organization. It will enable all goods in all enterprises of the commune to be sold at market value, as this remains the most effective way to distribute goods to consumers. At the same time, in socialism, all workers will earn incomes in proportion to the value of work they contribute to the production process, regardless of the company's revenue.

Workers with more past labour points will earn higher incomes even in companies that make less profit in the market. They will not be an income burden on their companies, as all companies in the commune will cover their salaries. By sharing the revenue, everyone will receive wages equal to the price of labour they requested, in exchange for the productivity they achieved. Highly productive companies will be deprived of the surplus value they generate due to better equipment or market advantages, which subsidizes workers in other companies who earn less than they deserve.

From the standpoint of capitalistic entrepreneurship, socialism is considered non-stimulating because it does not allow for the earning of extra profit through speculation beyond direct work. Instead, socialism will foster a new form of motivation that arises

directly from competition among workers and from the need to discover and validate individual productive capabilities, which is one of the most critical drivers of motivation.

In socialism, speculation is possible only by altering statements about the coefficient of responsibility, which is directly linked to work productivity and the business performance of the work collective. Individual and collective profits will continue to grow as productivity rises. However, these profits will be smaller, as they will not include the privileges that come with a higher social status, better production equipment, or random market advantages. Still, they will be the exclusive result of the struggle of equal rights workers to achieve more significant benefits for society.

In other words, if workers can equally increase the productivity of the work collective by using newly developed means of production, they cannot claim an essential contribution to production, and they need not be specially rewarded. However, suppose an individual worker increases their productivity more than other workers in their position can. In that case, this will be their contribution to the production process, and it will have to be accepted and rewarded.

The product of all commodity prices and the number of goods produced equals the total value of the goods produced. The realization of such production requires an equivalent amount of money to circulate as payment for the goods.

3.1.2.2.4 Money

Money is a means of payment for goods and services in a market economy. The state apparatus issues money in circulation through the central bank. The state seeks to equate the money in circulation with the total value of goods and services produced, thereby enabling a stable economy. The central bank regulates the money supply through monetary policy. The primary instrument of the state's economic policy in capitalism is the formation of interest rates on credit.

The government uses low interest rates to implement an expansive monetary policy that stimulates investment. As a result, economic development enhances workers' employment opportunities, increases national income, and improves society's overall welfare. However, increased money circulation creates inflation, raising the prices of goods and leading to market instability, which is unfavourable for the economy.

The state controls inflation and stabilizes the economy with a restrictive monetary policy that limits the money supply by raising interest rates. Then comes the deflationary tension that suppresses the market, leading to a production recession. The recession reduces companies' profits, increases unemployment, lowers people's standards, and leads to economic crises.

Regulating the amount of money in circulation does not create a sufficiently stable economic policy because it is challenging to balance the numerous independent factors at play in the economy. Thus, cyclical economic fluctuations occur, which are unfavourable to the economy and society. The state's monetary policy is more responsive to market fluctuations than to an organized economic policy.

A stable economic policy requires a balanced distribution of labour, the known purchasing power of the population, the known needs of society, and an efficient economy that meets society's needs. A fully balanced economic policy can only be pursued through a developed planned economy, which is why it will have to be accepted in the future. It will necessarily require the creation of a monetary policy to ensure an adequate amount of money in circulation and democratic control of its use.

The most suitable situation for any economy would be to have the quantity of money in circulation identical to the value of produced commodities. In an ideal case, the economy produces what society needs, and the money in circulation enables the purchase of all manufactured goods. This would create economic stability.

Consumers possess a large amount of money. It is significantly higher than the value of current production and substantially lower than the total value of everything the society owns, because those values were created by recycling the same money. A portion of that money is allocated for payment transactions related to production and distribution, and a substantial amount is set aside to achieve economic security and support people's investments. The primary issue is that privately accumulated capital is allocated freely, making it challenging for the economy to plan production effectively. Therefore, it is necessary to introduce greater order into the commune's economic policy through production planning.

The commune does not issue money, but it can acquire it by redeeming accumulated money held by the population using past labour points. A larger quantity of past labour points from workers brings higher incomes, so those who own money find it in their interest to exchange money for past labour points. By selling money, the commune's population loses the opportunity to lend money with interest but experiences a proportional increase in income as the number of past labour points rises.

In a socialist society, everyone is materially secure. As a result, individuals will no longer need to save for the future, so a significant voluntary exchange of money for past labour is expected. Each commune should establish its public bank. Redeemed money should be pooled into the public bank of the commune. The commune will also pool the entire cash fund of the merged companies. The money collected from individual and private enterprise taxes will also be pooled.

Thus, the commune will accumulate a large amount of money. The economic policy of socialism will allocate money intended for the incomes of all commune inhabitants to

purchase manufactured goods and pay for the services they use. However, if the amount of money is tied solely to the value of goods produced, workers would still receive income even if the goods are not sold on the market. Such production would create overstock in warehouses and deplete the commune's accumulated funds, leading the commune to go bankrupt. In this regard, the amount of money for people's incomes should be determined by the total value produced in the merged public company of the commune and the profit realized on the market during the accounting period.

The commune's public bank should determine the amount of circulating funds to let the commune achieve optimal economic stability and prosperity. This amount represents the commune's revenue. The commune's revenue is less than the amount of money that the commune possesses. The remaining funds will be used as working capital and reserve funds for the commune.

Democracy in the economy

In socialism, managers will have the power to make decisions in the name of the people, provided they are willing to do so, because they will be directly accountable to the people for their decisions. Members of society will be able to hold managers responsible for decisions that do not serve their interests. In such conditions, no manager can independently take responsibility for making political decisions that guide the entire society, as they cannot know how much their decisions will benefit society's members.

This primarily relates to the development of the commune's macroeconomic policies. For this reason, there is no doubt that the commune's management will involve its inhabitants in the decision-making process regarding income, fiscal, and development policies. Socialism will introduce a new form of democracy in which commune residents will decide how much of their income they want to set aside for taxes.

The commune's management will undoubtedly let the population decide how much of their salaries they want to set aside for individual and collective spending. The fund for individual expenditures defines the total amount of money allocated to incomes for all commune residents, excluding workers in private enterprises, as private enterprises retain their profits and distribute payments themselves. Collective spending refers to the amount of money individuals wish to deduct from their salaries to cover the joint material expenses of all commune members.

Individual spending reflects workers' incomes, but it also includes tax money allocated to workers' salaries in non-profit companies and to support unemployed people. In this voting, people decide how much of their income they intend to assign to their individual and collective spending. Then, each person will enter their decision in the web application associated with the commune administration's data processing center.

Since past labour points determine income size, people will allocate the points they possess for individual and collective spending. In this way, each resident will exercise decision-making power in proportion to the number of past labour points they possess. Individuals with more valuable past work experience will have greater influence in decision-making.

The justification: Considering that all members of society have not equally contributed to the creation of collective wealth, they should not have the same decision-making power regarding the economic policy of society. More productive work should have more decision-making power to foster production motivation. Economic decision-making power should be based on the value of past work, determined by the number of labour points accumulated. This will contribute to the development of the economy and society. This measure is equivalent to shareholders' voting power in a capitalist system.

Suppose one wishes to allocate more money for individual spending and less for collective expenditures. Then, they will divide the value of their past work points according to that ratio. The commune's leadership should first define the minimum tax revenue percentage required to meet its basic joint spending needs. Then, the summarized declarations of all commune inhabitants for individual and collective spending will determine the total amount of money for individual and collective expenditures. Thus, society will directly determine the commune's income and fiscal policies.

The total amount of money for individual incomes (excluding workers in private companies) will be distributed to the commune population according to their merits. These merits will primarily be based on workers' realized productivity and work costs. This will be addressed in more detail in the chapter: "The Distribution of Income."

Similarly, society may determine the minimum income individuals must have, thereby regulating the range of incomes among people. This will regulate the relationship between work merits, solidarity, and income-based work interest. For example, if workers are unwilling to perform undesirable work and thus reduce the commune's productivity, the people can reduce workers' minimum income through direct voting. The result would encourage workers to work harder, thereby achieving higher productivity and a greater share of revenue. On the other hand, if the commune achieves higher productivity than is required, society will increase the minimum income, thereby reducing the incentive to work.

The system provides a single tax rate because it is simpler to calculate, allowing people to determine it through direct democratic voting. Today's progressive taxation, which aims to establish social balance, will be replaced by the commune's income policy, which will be explained later. Harmful forms of spending on health, such as alcohol and tobacco, may be more effectively reduced through societal disalienation rather than through tax policy.

The people will further divide the money for collective spending on developing production and the shared consumption of commodities.

Assets intended for the development of the economy provide for the expansion of the productive forces, purchases of new means of production, or complete companies that promote production. A larger quantity of cash assets intended for economic development will engage social work and economic growth to a greater extent, thereby increasing the means of production and, accordingly, productivity. More substantial investments in the economy will ensure significant economic development in the future; however, this would decrease cash assets for current spending, thereby reducing social standards. Such a system will enable each commune to develop through its own efforts. The commune development policy will be addressed in the chapter “Development of the Economy.”

Assets for collective spending serve to meet society's material needs. They are used to maintain the existing social standard structure and build new social standard facilities. This includes funding for commodity spending in public health, education, security, construction, and infrastructure maintenance, among other areas. Assets for collective spending may, to a certain degree, be distributed by direct decisions of the population, while interested society members may directly make later partial distributions. However, the authorized management needs to make the final distribution of the smallest spending segments for which it will be directly accountable to society. Increased funding for collective spending would allow a higher common standard at the expense of other forms of spending.

State spending also needs to be set aside from the funds earmarked by people for collective expenses. This money is used for the state's spending. The Federal Assembly determines the amount of federal spending through delegates or representatives from all communes. Collective spending will be addressed in more detail in the chapter “Collective Spending.”

The new voting system will be based on the unlimited validity of voters' votes until each voter changes their vote. Additionally, the new system will allow people to vote at their convenience. Therefore, they can change their voting statements multiple times per day if they wish, and the system will have no problem processing these changes.

The proposed system will enable the commune's population to determine, to a considerable extent, joint economic needs. Based on their experience, people will notice the advantages and disadvantages of a particular form of money distribution, enabling all individuals and society to reap greater benefits. The community will accept the economic policy as its own, which is one of the essential elements of the disalienation of the economy and society.

Identified collective economic needs define the macro spending and thereby determine the production. In this manner, the commune's population will directly and democratically create its macro-economic policy. This will be an introduction to creating a stable and productive, democratically planned market economy.

3.1.2.2.5 Working Capital

Socialism will organize an entirely new form of production. At the same time, privately owned enterprises will continue to operate according to the principles of the capitalist market economy, as they do today.

The commune will raise common funds by exchanging the inhabitants' money for past labour points and through taxation. In this way, the commune can accumulate significantly more funds than are needed for the population's spending during the accounting period. The surplus of funds represents the commune's monetary accumulation. The commune must keep a certain financial reserve from that monetary fund to cover possible investment disturbances and damages caused by natural or other disasters. With these funds, the commune ensures its economic stability. The remaining funds will be used as working capital for the commune's public company.

Working capital is the accumulated means of past labour of producers and serves as a means of payment to other producers for semi-finished products and raw materials processed by the commune's economy.

Socialism can allocate working capital to its economy without interest, provided the economy repays the borrowed money in the settlement period. In reality, the commune is becoming something like a corporation, and companies usually do not charge themselves interest for working capital. Therefore, the commune would have no charge interest in borrowing from itself.

In the capitalist system, producers and consumers who lack cash take out loans to purchase goods and services. Loans burden the price of goods with interest determined by the market based on supply and demand. Interest requires a higher return on borrowed money than the amount borrowed. On the one hand, it is a form of exploitation of people that is unacceptable in socialism. On the other hand, money intended for interest does not exist in circulation, so it must be created to enable the return of borrowed money with interest. Interest does not contribute to the production of value in society; therefore, it is irrational and unnecessary, and it simultaneously poses problems for monetary policy.

Interest-free lending does not increase production costs and eliminates the exploitation of society. If the commune can credit production without interest, the economy may, depending on its circumstances, postpone collecting payments for its goods with interest-free loans. When the commune grants loans without interest, private creditors would no longer be able to profit by borrowing, thus reducing the use of interest as a form of rent. It is important to note that interest rates will not be abolished. They will exist as long as necessary, but the commune will establish such credit policy conditions as to discourage interest on borrowed money.

In the Western world, interest rates are already low today because even a slight increase may lead to business difficulties, potentially causing bankruptcy. An additional reduction in interest rates would practically abolish interest rates and rent-seeking on borrowed money. A further reduction in interest rates is, in fact, the end of capitalism.

With the disappearance of interest, banks would lose their primary function of generating revenue from accumulated funds. They would no longer be profitable enterprises, but could still serve as a means of individual and social bookkeeping for the community's monetary transactions. Aided by computer technology, banks can maintain records of the earnings and expenditures of the population and companies within the commune.

However, interest can contribute to the economy's efficiency. A more extended loan repayment period increases the amount of interest paid, so borrowers are motivated to repay loans as soon as possible.

By introducing a system of non-interest-bearing loans, it will be necessary to establish a new method of monetary distribution that is as efficient as the interest-based lending of capitalism in trading and financial terms. Since the quantity of working capital is limited, it may be insufficient to cover the needs of all beneficiaries. In this regard, the working capital needs to be distributed among the beneficiaries in the function of turnover time, which may be presented in the following formula:

$$\text{C-of working capital} = \frac{360}{\text{Money Repayment Time}}$$

The working capital beneficiary who repays the borrowed money more quickly will realize a larger C-of working capital. Therefore, all larger working capital coefficients will ensure non-interest-bearing credit financing by the commune, regardless of the quantity of assets claimed, as long as the working capital fund has been exhausted.

The system offers greater potential to generate working capital for the economy, anticipating a shorter time to the turnover of goods. This is understandable because repayment of money is faster and can be used again for lending. Production that

spends within the one-month payment period can utilize working capital through the described distribution system, as it returns it practically immediately.

The commune's economy, collectively owned by its population, uses its working capital according to its needs. It is bound to repay the borrowed money within the accounting period. The economy can return the working capital provided if it produces commodities that society needs and gets paid for them. In the event of failure, the producers will not earn enough to cover costs. If profit exceeds the amount of working capital spent, companies are still operating relatively positively because they can return working capital. Small profits made during the accounting period will reduce the worker's income.

If the realized profit falls below the amount of working capital used, the enterprise then registers a loss in working capital. Tolerating such a situation would reduce the commune's working capital, and producers would face difficulties renewing production. No economic system can tolerate financial indiscipline, so neither can socialism. Therefore, the commune will introduce measures for bearing the responsibility of workers. In socialism, all workers are accountable when companies lose money and compensate for such losses through the value of their past labour points.

Companies' production intended for unknown consumers does not need to be placed on the market immediately. In that case, the turnover of commodities may extend beyond the one-month accounting period, and the enterprise may realize a profit that is less than the working capital spent during the accounting period. However, as each company operates continuously, it can generate the necessary profit and ensure the return of working capital by collecting manufactured goods from a previous production period.

Workers' responsibilities need to be considered independently of cyclic fluctuations in profits. Over the course of one year, each enterprise borrows working capital as needed and repays it after realizing a profit on the market. Suppose such an enterprise fails to repay the working capital within one year. The difference between the borrowed and refunded assets shall be subtracted from the past labour points of all workers proportionately to the coefficient of their responsibility. If an enterprise loses money, workers with a higher coefficient of responsibility will incur a greater loss of past labour points and a lower income. And vice versa, a lower coefficient of workers' responsibility will result in a minor loss of past labour points and a smaller decline in income levels. The initiator of the unsuccessful borrowing decision will also face sanctions through workers' negative evaluations and special commissions. In this way, borrowing money involves a great responsibility of the whole collective, which is a precondition for productive production. The technique of adding and taking past labour points is presented in detail in the chapter: "The Development of Economy."

The failure to realize the envisaged profit due to natural catastrophes, such as earthquakes, floods, and fires, need not be considered a sign of poor economic productivity. The commune's reserve money fund would cover such losses.

The working capital in the commune's reserve fund is always limited, and some producers may not have access to the working capital they need. The economy can't produce without working capital, and such plants need to be closed. In such cases, the commune envisages a reserve source of funds from economic development, from which working capital may be allocated. If neither of these options is possible, they can seek it from private banks at the market interest rate.

However, as the working capital of the commune will be distributed interest-free, the demand for interest-bearing loans will fall, and the holders of accumulated money will have difficulty earning a commission. Then the owners of the funds will be more interested in exchanging them for past work points, enabling the commune to possess money for interest-free lending to the economy and consumers. That will strengthen the socialist economy.

In the end, it should be said that no matter how much the commune's economy unites, the market economy will never be insensitive to fluctuations in the economy. With the tightening of liability conditions that labour competition will bring, manufacturers' failures can be highly inconvenient. In this connection, producers will need to seek a higher level of business security, which can be found in producing for well-known consumers.

The associated producers will survey consumers about their needs and gradually organize production in accordance with their orders. With known consumption, the economy can manage its activities effectively, and labour competition will enable the most efficient organization of work. It should be emphasized that such production of goods will take place in a planned-market economy.

3.1.2.2.5 Development of the economy

In capitalism, the amount of money allocated for investment depends on the entrepreneurial skills of the owner of the means of production. It is allocated from the company's realized market profit.

In socialism, society achieves economic development by allocating funds for economic growth from the commune's revenue. In socialism, people directly distribute the commune's revenue to funds intended for developing the commune's economy and for people's spending.

Suppose inhabitants will generally tend toward more significant economic development. In that case, a larger quantity of assets intended for economic spending will be allocated, which would accelerate economic growth but also reduce the population's income and, consequently, the standard of living. Statements from all inhabitants, expressed in terms of their voting power based on past work values, will be compiled to determine funds allocated for individual and collective spending and economic

development. This information will be entered into the Internet application of the data processing centre. Such a monetary policy enables each commune to accumulate funds to develop its economy by relying on its own resources and capabilities. When the economy reaches a point where it can support expansive production, the need for society to invest in growth will diminish. This way, the amount of money intended for spending would increase, as would society's standard of living.

Perhaps the essential value of such a form of distribution is that the money is earmarked democratically, allowing society to plan its development. Such a monetary distribution form will guide the commune's developmental policy. Thus, the economy receives a framework for development direction, enabling it to plan its development effectively. Additionally, this will help overcome the alienation in the production process that has arisen from making authoritative societal decisions.

Assets intended for economic development services for economic investments by which enterprises acquire new machinery, industrial installations and working capital, helping them achieve higher productivity.

Company managers request assets intended for economic development in accordance with the company development program. The enterprise development program includes a defined amount of necessary assets, the company's anticipated profit, and the implementation timeframe.

When the amount of money necessary for economic development is determined, it will be distributed according to the C-of development in the following formula:

$$\text{C-of development} = \frac{\text{Envisaged Cash Profit}}{(\text{Needed Cash Assets}) \times (\text{Time of Implementation})}$$

It is clear from the formula that a smaller amount of required assets and a larger profit realized with a shorter implementation time result in a higher Coefficient of Development. Therefore, assets are distributed so that the most significant C-of-development receives the necessary investments, followed by the next C-of-development, and so on, until the funds intended for economic development are fully utilized. Assets are limited, so they cannot be allocated to enterprises with a development coefficient below the required level. Such enterprises must wait for better times or aim to increase predicted profit with fewer required assets and a shorter implementation time.

As the funds intended for the development of the for-profit economy are renewed each accounting period from the commune's revenue, they are allocated non-refundably as grants. The commune will become a humanistic corporation, and corporations, even in a capitalist system, usually do not charge themselves for their investments. It is enough

for companies to realize the envisaged profit, thereby enabling the intended assets for economic development to find their social justification.

Socialism presupposes precisely defined responsibilities for managers and workers in allocating funds to develop the economy. For example, suppose the company's management wants to significantly increase production by proposing to take large amounts of money from the economic development fund. In that case, they must first obtain senior management's approval to coordinate the economy's improvement with other economies. Then, the company manager will present the development program to the workers and outline his responsibility for its implementation, with a K-responsibility. Higher K-responsibility can, among other things, give workers greater confidence in the manager's plan.

Significant investments will significantly increase workers' responsibility in production processes, and they will need to declare whether they are willing to accept it. Based on insights into the management program and trust in their management, workers will take on a broader scope of responsibility by offering their K-responsibility. Suppose that workers maintain or increase their K-responsibility. This would mean they support the management program, enabling the company to compete for economic development funding. On the other hand, if workers reduce their K-responsibilities, it would mean they are unsure of the investment program managers propose, which could delay or prevent the investment. Therefore, managers will need to persuade workers to accept their proposal by explaining the risks and benefits of investing.

The proposed K-responsibilities from workers and management will be in force until the time required to realize production development. They cannot reduce or increase their K-responsibility for projected productivity during this period, except in cases where productivity changes are agreed upon jointly.

Funds intended for economic development increase the economy's productivity and, consequently, the value of newly produced goods. This requires an increase in the money supply to purchase these goods. Increasing the amount of money in circulation will lead to higher salaries, necessitating higher workers' past work points. Therefore, the new amount of past labour points should be distributed among the enterprise's workers in proportion to their K-responsibility for contributing to the production of the newly created value.

Businesses measure their productivity by market returns. After the period needed to achieve the projected increase in productivity, business success is calculated. For example, suppose the company realizes the proposed monetary profit. Such profit is viewed as a permanent improvement that yields higher income. Thus, the company's workers meet the requirements for acquiring points based on their past work. The difference between the newly realized profit and the company's earnings before the investment is shown as an increase in profit. Then, past labour points are distributed to employees based on the projected increase in the company's profit.

However, if some companies in the commune do not achieve the projected profit within the foreseen time frame, they may not utilize funds to develop the economy. In that case, the difference between the expected and realized profit is shown as a loss. Then the past labour points are deducted from the company's employees in an amount equal to the company's unachieved profit gain. In this regard, if the company makes half the expected profit, it will earn half of the expected points for past work and lose half of the points for past work. This means that achieving half of the productivity by using assets for economic development does not result in earnings or losses related to past work.

The productivity of a profitable economy results in a direct monetary gain in the market. In contrast, the productivity of non-profit and government organizations is realized through the benefits they provide to the community. The work of organizations is available to the public at no charge. Such groups may include administrative bodies, public protection, education, healthcare, and similar activities. In socialism, the productivity of organizations is measured by assessing the quality of services provided directly by customers and through specialized arbitration commissions.

Organizations also require monetary assets for their development, which are derived from the collective spending fund. Therefore, the success of non-profit companies may be measured on a scale of values equivalent to the monetary profit of the economy. An improvement in a non-profit organization's work performance should increase its success index, and vice versa. Workers in non-profit organizations should also be entitled to increased past labour points in cases of high productivity.

This means that the commune's non-profit organizations will benefit from the commune's economic growth. The allocation of income points to the non-profit economy is determined by comparing productivity across the profit and non-profit sectors, then rewarding or punishing them based on their contributions to society. Such a comparison will necessarily be objective because each injustice would lead to a spill-over of workers to the more convenient work conditions, which would be in nobody's interest.

When the total amount of past labour points which need to be added to or deducted from all workers in all companies and organizations is known, then with the help of computer technology, the rewards or sanctions against each worker are calculated by the following formula:

Worker-1 : Worker-2 : Worker-3 : ... : Worker-n =
C-of respons.-1: C-respons.-2 : C-respons.-3 : ... : C-respons.- n

And the result is achievable in the form of:

Worker-1 = +/- Quantity of points-1

Worker-2 = +/- Quantity of points-2

Worker-3 = +/- Quantity of points-3

.....

Worker-n = +/- Quantity of points-n

Private entrepreneurs operate independently. Private entrepreneurs are accountable for their business operations with their capital. The workers employed by private entrepreneurs are responsible for their work directly to the private entrepreneur. Private entrepreneurship does not allocate funds to develop the commune's economy, so it cannot utilize these financial assets. Instead, private entrepreneurship must accumulate cash or borrow it from banks through interest-bearing loans.

Considering that work competition in socialism will be at least as productive as, and perhaps more productive than, work in private entrepreneurship, it may be expected that private entrepreneurship will lose the productivity battle against socialist entrepreneurship. In addition, under socialism, workers' productive consciousness will grow, leading them to want to make their own decisions, take responsibility for their actions, and participate in the distribution of corporate profits, which they cannot do under capitalism. As workers will have significantly more rights and freedoms under public ownership of the means of production, it can be expected that private entrepreneurs will lose their labour force.

Private entrepreneurs will then be required to surrender their enterprises to the commune in exchange for the equivalent amount of past labour points. A larger quantity of past labour brings a higher income, more opportunities to choose work posts, and, generally, greater recognition of productive power in society.

Applying the principle of responsibility in socialism represents a favourable alternative to stock-exchange speculation in capitalism. This is because the possible gains or losses of past labour points, equivalent to shares in capitalism, are tied to the success of their companies' productivity. Socialism places workers in an equal position in production, diminishing alienation, while collective responsibility contributes to greater prosperity in business.

Democratic planning and management of the economy, full employment and work competition, resolving workers' accountability, and distributing incomes according to work values will address the shortcomings of existing socialist and capitalist business models. This will enable the development of socialism.

3.1.2.2.7 Income Distribution

In the capitalist economy, the distribution of income is regulated by privileged owners of the means of production, whose subjectivity diminishes workers' contributions to the production process as much as they can, thereby creating worker exploitation and societal problems.

In socialism, each worker's income is based on the objective price of labour and the level of productivity achieved. In socialism, equal human rights require the commune to provide income to all residents to secure their living.

All commune residents are involved in the income distribution system, except for workers in private companies, who retain their profits. Private companies will continue to pay taxes as they do today. These taxes belong to the people of the commune. They are used, among other things, to pay the salaries of all the commune's inhabitants.

The price of labour determines the income:

$$\text{Work price} = (\text{Value of past labour}) \times (\text{Value of current labour})$$

The product of a worker's past labour points and the cost of current work determines the work price. The quantity of points each worker holds is equal to the value of their past labour and the past work they inherited from their ancestors. The number of work points is a given of the system, in which the worker with a higher past labour value realizes a proportionately higher income, irrespective of the work they are performing. Past labour points present a humanistic form of shares that will bring profit based on the value of past work. Such a profit may be significant, but it will not burden companies because it will be distributed on the commune level, as explained in the chapter "Commodity price."

Each worker autonomously determines the price of their labour by comparing the conveniences and inconveniences of their work with those of other jobs. They ensure objectivity in valuing the current work price through work competition, in which the worker who, in circumstances of equal productivity, requests a lower current work price exercises the right to work.

In socialism, all inhabitants ensure their security and survival through income; therefore, it is necessary to set the current work price for unemployed inhabitants. Since unemployed inhabitants of the commune do not perform any job, they cannot autonomously set the costs of their current work (every activity will be considered as work). The price of the current work of unemployed people will be determined by the commune's leadership with the consent of the assembly of the commune. It will be done in accordance with the commune's operational needs and economic constraints. More precisely, it balances the supply and demand for work in the commune. If the

commune's inhabitants were not sufficiently interested in work, the leadership would reduce the current work price for the unemployed. This would result in lower income, increasing their interest in work.

Conversely, suppose workers' interest in work is excessive. In that case, the leadership may increase the current work price for the unemployed, which would decrease the workers' interest in employment based on income. The commune management may offer higher wages to students for their current work, stimulating education. The commune's social policy regulates the price of current work for the elderly and people with disabilities within the framework of the commune's social policy. The people in this commune will no longer need a pension plan as a form of retirement insurance, because the new system provides individuals with an income regardless of whether they work. Additionally, individuals can work if they wish, with no age limit.

A worker's income level will additionally depend on the Coefficient of income. The Coefficient of income for each worker depends on the proportion of realized and envisaged productivity of workers, enterprises, and the whole commune, in relation to workers' accountability for the realized productivity. The following formula can present the C-of income of a worker:

$$\text{C-income}_W = \frac{\text{Realized Productivity of Worker}}{\text{Necessary Productivity of Worker}} (\text{f-of Accountability})$$

C-income-W establishes the relation between the realized and envisaged workers' productivity in the function of workers' accountability.

Productivity is expressed through accepted work values that reflect the quantity and quality of products in for-profit enterprises and services in non-profit organizations. Where productivity cannot be precisely established by the quantity and quality of products or services, it can be determined by mutual evaluations of the labour productivity of workers. The assessment system can be designed to allow a range of evaluations to indicate work productivity, as it does for the quantity and quality of the commodities produced.

The mutual assessment of inhabitants gives each inhabitant equal decision-making power, introducing a new form of anarchic-democratic behaviour in society. Thanks to equal assessing power, each individual may become both a prosecutor and the accused without the right to complain. The impact of individual assessment on the population's income cannot be significant. Quite to the contrary, it will be minor because the accused will not have the right to defend themselves; however, it will be sufficiently strong to make people respect each other. Such respect will pave the way for significant conveniences in society. The assessment system will encourage individuals to address their shortcomings and develop virtues in their behaviour toward the community.

Suppose the realized productivity equals the necessary productivity; then the C-income-W = 1. In that case, the realized income will correspond to the envisaged income. If people do not receive any evaluation, they will be considered to have met the required productivity standards. If realized productivity is higher or lower than the required level, the worker's income will be higher or lower than the envisaged income.

Finally, the C-income-W level depends on the C-responsibility of a worker, which the worker themselves determines. Mathematically, a function can be defined that brings the worker who declares small K-responsibilities approximately to the income they sought, regardless of the productivity achieved. With an increase in K-responsibility, their income will rise more with increased productivity or fall with reduced productivity. Higher K-responsibility gives more competitive power to get the job.

Workers' income will also depend on the enterprise's productivity. Enterprise productivity can be measured in the same way as a worker's productivity. The formula may have the following form:

$$\text{C-income}_E = \frac{\text{Realized Enterprise Productivity}}{\text{Needed Enterprise Productivity}} (\text{f-of responsibility})$$

C-income_E establishes the relation between the realized and envisaged enterprise productivity in the function of the worker's responsibility.

The realized profit on the market shows the productivity of enterprises. Profit is the most efficient way to assess productivity, or more precisely, the value of work results in present-day society.

Workers realize the expected income if their company sells its current production on the market. However, that would require a high asset turnover rate or, practically, production for known customers. It is challenging to sell all the produced commodities during the accounting period. A portion of such output will be sold in a subsequent accounting period, thereby realizing its profit later. However, it may be assumed that the commodities remaining from the past labour period are sold in the current accounting period and generate profit in the current period.

If an enterprise's profit on the market equals the envisaged profit, then the C-income_E will equal 1 (one). The enterprise's realized income will be identical to the envisaged one. If the formula establishes a C-of-income_E greater or less than 1 (one), the enterprise's revenue will be proportionately greater or less than the envisioned one.

The system of work competition in the labour market ensures an even distribution of employment benefits and disadvantages across companies. However, suppose one

company has a significantly better means of production than another. In that case, employees at the better-equipped company may earn higher incomes than those at the company with outdated technology. In this case, workers would be more interested in working in better-equipped companies. Therefore, the commune's leadership will organize production in enterprises within the commune so that an equal value of work, based on productivity and past labour points, achieves equivalent income. In this matter, managers may improve technology in companies with redundant equipment or redistribute income between companies to ensure a uniform level of interest among workers in all workplaces.

It is further possible to regulate with the coefficient of productivity other forms of success of the production, which cannot be presented by cash profit on the market, and which would include: the protection of the environment against pollution, the deviation from standards of the quality of goods, etc.

States develop regulations determining production norms, and socialism will intensify these standards. Additionally, socialism will enhance the effectiveness of such regulations. Special commissions will accept the state's standards, analyze potential declines, and propose the extent of their influence on $C\text{-income}_E$. It will be crucial to consider all criteria for protecting the individual and their environment from pollution. The commune's assembly must approve this regulation.

It is noteworthy that the system does not envision a bureaucratic evaluation of all producers, as this would create an enormous bureaucratic apparatus. The system also provides assessments based on analyses made by expert services of randomly selected or reported enterprises. Enterprises that do not receive an evaluation will be treated as if they operate within the envisaged productivity and adopted economic operation standards.

The system also allows customers to conduct a free assessment of enterprises whose products deviate from the established standards, either positively or negatively. Every person will also have equal power to evaluate companies. For example, suppose a person evaluates a company with 1000 employees positively or negatively. In that case, the evaluation will affect the rewards or punishments of all company employees, with an impact $1/1000$ th of what it would have on an individual. Such an assessment will be minimal but still enough to affect the production process.

Analogously to the profit realized on the market, enterprises that produce more socially acceptable products in accordance with established standards will achieve a productivity assessment above 1 and realize higher income. Conversely, socially unacceptable enterprises will receive an evaluation below 1, resulting in lower salaries. Calculating the realized productivity may be presented in an indefinite number of factors that will, through mutual multiplication, give the final value of the coefficient $K\text{-Income}_E$.

By using the coefficients, economic enterprises can efficiently bear responsibility for environmental pollution or the poor quality of their products with their revenue. Enterprises that pollute the environment or produce low-quality products will, depending on the impact of such declines from the standards, realize lower income than they would otherwise, based on their actual profits. The loss of past labour points will additionally sanction workers. To address the shortcomings in their economic activity, such enterprises will have to compete for assets intended to develop the economy, focusing on increasing productivity in a non-profitable manner, as assessed.

Capitalism strongly opposes environmental protection because it increases production costs. Socialism will provide a good quality of life that the world will eventually accept. Then it will ensure that the Earth is clean and healthy.

Nonprofit companies generally do not have a developed measure of labour productivity. This group includes government institutions, education, health, and other service activities that do not generate income directly on the market but are funded by the budget.

Non-profit organizations should be placed under the same business conditions as for-profit companies. The productivity of non-profit organizations can be evaluated through assessments of service users, user associations, and professional institutions. It can be presented using a productivity coefficient as effectively as for-profit companies. Using coefficients, one can compare the performance of for-profit companies and non-profit organizations and, based on that, reward them according to the value of the work they perform.

Inhabitants of the commune are responsible for the productive orientation of the commune. Therefore, the coefficient of the commune's realized productivity can be expressed by the following formula:

$$\text{C-income-C} = \frac{\text{Realized Commune's Productivity}}{\text{Necessary Commune's Productivity}} \quad (\text{f-of Responsibility})$$

C-income_C establishes the relation between the realized and envisaged productivity of the commune in the responsibility of each worker.

This coefficient does not strongly impact the distribution of income within the commune. Differences occur only in terms of the degree of responsibility an individual worker assumes for their own and collective productivity. Nevertheless, establishing the coefficient of realized productivity would be more critical for the communes' association and income distribution among them.

At the commune level, productivity is expressed by the economy's revenue. It is possible to expand the measure of the commune's productivity by implementing a poly-

functional system that evaluates the quality of life, such as pollution versus non-pollution, literacy versus illiteracy, and legality versus illegality in the population's actions. Using C-income_C also allows subsidies to be directed to less-developed communes. That would increase workers' interest in living and working in such communes. Similarly, regulating the birth rate of the commune population will also be possible. If the commune's birth rate is too low or too high, it may be adjusted by C-income_C with an appropriate value.

The definition of such categories and their regulation will be the task of the state parliament. Defined categories of coefficients for values would enable a more efficient implementation of social, economic, ecological, cultural, and all other policies associated with these communes.

The income of each worker in socialism and of the commune's inhabitants can be presented by the following formula:

$$\text{C-income} = (\text{Work price}) \times \text{C-income}_W \times \text{C-income}_E \times \text{C-income}_C$$

The formula indicates that the Coefficient of income for each worker depends on the anticipated work price and the coefficients of realized productivity at the work post, enterprise, and commune levels, in proportion to responsibility for realized productivity. By applying computer technology, all workers' income levels can be quickly calculated, regardless of the number of factors that contribute to their income.

Socialism allows independent private entrepreneurship. Private entrepreneurs hold positions in private entrepreneurship and are not subject to competition at work. Enterprise owners employ workers based on their needs.

Upon realizing a profit on the market, private entrepreneurs continue to manage their assets according to their needs. They also retain assets for upgrading and amortizing production. They are bound to pay income and property taxes as they do today.

These taxes are intended for the salaries of employed workers in the non-profit sector, the commune's collective expenditures, federal expenditures, and unemployed workers. The tax rate for independent private entrepreneurs will be proportional to the tax rate paid by socialist entrepreneurs in the commune. The commune's population will directly determine the level of appropriations. The owner of a private enterprise may decide to distribute the income of their workers autonomously or may integrate into the collective distribution of incomes of the commune's inhabitants.

If independent private entrepreneurs utilize advanced technology unknown to the public, they may achieve higher profits than socialist companies. Such private entrepreneurship may survive in socialism and attract the labour force.

However, the newly proposed economy will invest money in its development as much as needed. The system of work competition will develop the economy to the extent that it becomes more productive than independent private entrepreneurship. When independent private entrepreneurs earn lower incomes than enterprises in collective ownership, the number of workers interested in employment with private entrepreneurs will decrease. In addition, if one takes into account the right of workers in socialism to freely choose the work they want, to make all decisions about their work, to choose their salaries, and to share the profits of the companies that socialism offers, the number of workers interested in working with private enterprises will be even lower.

In short, the new system is expected to outperform private companies in the free market and potentially attract their top talent. Therefore, independent private entrepreneurs may surrender the ownership of the means of production to society in exchange for an equivalent amount of past labour points. A larger number of past labour points will ensure a higher income, greater competitive power for job selection, and a better quality of life.

The money intended for the incomes of all commune inhabitants is formed at the commune's administrative centre from the revenue of the commune. The amount of money is determined by the residents' direct statement, who allocate it from the total funds intended for the circulation of goods and services in the commune.

The amount of money intended to meet the income needs of the commune's population, in principle, should correspond to the envisaged quantity of funds allocated for people's incomes, as the system is based on the price of work corresponding to the income of individuals. However, deviations are possible due to varying levels of productivity. Therefore, more or less money might be available for the overall revenue of all inhabitants than the system initially anticipated.

Problems with such deviations can be solved by distributing the entire amount of money intended for workers' income in proportion to their C-income. In this way, the shortage of funds for payments will no longer exist, nor will the troubles in performing the income policy. The amount of money allocated for income will be distributed to individuals in proportion to their share of production, and people will be convinced that income distribution is fair.

Income distribution may be carried out from the commune's computer centre. Actual income can be established according to the extended proportion formula:

$$\text{Income-1} : \text{Income-2} : \text{Income-2} : \dots : \text{Income-n} =$$

C-income₁ : C-income₂ : C-income₃ : ... : C-income_n

From the overall amount of money envisaged for incomes and the extended proportion of C-incomes that may include millions of members, the income of each worker can be quickly and precisely calculated by using computer technology in the form of:

Income-1 = Value-1

Income-2 = Value-2

Income-3 = Value-3

Income-n = Value-n

The obtained income reflects the productivity of each commune's inhabitants in monetary terms.

Centralization of the income distribution system allows the application of uniform distribution criteria, based on the principle that equivalent work earns equal incomes. The profit that in the capitalist economy overwhelmingly benefits the owners of the means of production is now distributed in a socially acceptable manner. Socialism will justly distribute income to all people. The exploitation of people will no longer exist.

No work is independent; therefore, income from the collective operation result should not be independently distributed. Income distribution through the extended proportion of the coefficients allows the entire amount of money intended for payments in the commune to be elastically distributed among the commune's workers and inhabitants, proportionate to the prices of the invested labour and the workers' responsibility for the realized production, without a surplus or deficit of money assets in the balance sheet.

The final say in income distribution should be given to the commune's population by directly declaring the minimum income. All residents will express what minimum salary they find most acceptable. The average value obtained in the function of voting power, determined by the value of past work in the economy, would determine the minimum income necessary to secure the existence of people.

A low minimum income for the population would increase work engagement and, thus, the economy's productivity and social standards would grow. On the other hand, high productivity can lead to market saturation, reducing labour requirements. Then the population could increase the minimum income. Since the amount of money earmarked for all residents' income is limited, increasing the minimum income reduces the income gap. By applying the extended ratio, the difference in income amounts will increase or decrease in accordance with societal needs. A smaller income gap will reduce income-based work engagement until labour supply and demand balance.

This completes the complex approach of determining the income distribution of commune residents, excluding workers in private companies who retain their income. The value obtained reflects the payment level of all residents. Workers' incomes may be

publicly disclosed or kept secret at each individual's discretion. Each resident uses their income freely.

3.1.2.2.8 Use of Real Property

Real estate is necessary for humans to satisfy existential needs and achieve greater benefits. The use of real estate brings great benefits, which is why humans secure it through ownership. Ownership often assumes subjective qualities, in which humans attribute greater power to themselves than they objectively possess. Such ownership then becomes alienated from its nature, thus alienating the individual from their nature. In an alienated society that develops a culture of possession, real estate ownership becomes a straightforward, efficient, and recognized means of demonstrating an individual's power. In such a society, the individual becomes what they have. People's alienated needs are insatiable, resulting in struggles to appropriate more valuable real estate and in the relentless exploitation of natural resources that the planet Earth struggles to sustain.

Inhabitants who have not acquired an apartment or house are forced to enter into a rent relationship with real property owners. They pay rent based on the principle of supply and demand, which generates income for real property owners. Although market rent contributes to a rational use of real estate, it is not socially acceptable because it glorifies alienated values that are insatiable by nature and thus create social problems.

The known alternative to private ownership of real property is social property of socialism. Such ownership needs to consider the equal right of all inhabitants to use real estate. However, socialism has not adequately learned how to establish equal rights. Besides that, socialism has not found an acceptable way to socialize private property, so it has resorted to confiscating real property through revolutions. It is a seizure of the accumulated value of past labour of the real property owners and represents, as such, the injustice committed in the name of equality among people. Such injustice brought numerous problems to society.

Furthermore, it must be noted that socialism has not resolved the problems of the distribution of living space under social ownership. Real property and its use are carried out through the bureaucratic administrative apparatus. Generally, candidates wait years to acquire the right to use a living space. The bureaucratic structure is unable to monitor changes in tenants' housing needs effectively or to meet their requests. Such social policies result in a disproportionate distribution of real estate, often granting privileges to some members of society. Indeed, this also develops alienation and antagonism within the community. It is worth noting that users of social housing facilities are not owners. Therefore, they do not maintain them and lack a responsible attitude toward them.

The right to use real property in social ownership is less efficient than the private rent-based distribution system. However, a new socialist approach can facilitate an efficient policy for utilizing real property in social ownership.

In socialism, the right to work is determined by labour competition. Analogously, individual housing needs in socialism should be met through tenant rent competition. Such competition among real property users requires socialist ownership of real property. This can be achieved by voluntarily replacing private ownership of real property with socialist past labour points, thereby establishing public ownership of real property.

Real estate owners do not have to sell their ownership to the commune if they do not wish to. In such a case, they can continue using the real estate and paying taxes on it as they do now. However, real estate ownership will no longer reflect an individual's status. Instead, socialist past labour points will have this role. The sale of private property increases the number of past labour points, which in turn increases incomes. Having more past work points will be very convenient. As past labour points are inheritable, it may be highly interesting for real estate owners to sell real property to the commune.

The real property value is assessed based on market value and is subject to administrative control. Real estate owners whose residences are in other communes cannot be assigned past labour points because the past labour benefit would remain in one commune. At the same time, the income-based burden would shift to another commune. For this reason, real property owners from other communes must sell their properties to their communes for money collectively owned by the commune's inhabitants. Then the inhabitants may exchange that money for past labour points in their communes.

The rent-related policy needs to ensure the efficient and socially acceptable use of real property, including residences and office premises. Therefore, society needs to provide an accessible insight into real property values. Records of all real estate can be maintained in the commune's information center, including technical descriptions, locations, and rental amounts.

The same real estate may bring more conveniences to one individual than another. Each inhabitant will bid for the real estate they prefer, based on their ability to pay. The inhabitant offering the highest rent will get the right to use the real property.

The procedure for acquiring the right to use real estate is straightforward. The highest offered rent becomes effective immediately and is deducted from the property user's savings account. A user of real property who wishes to continue using it must accept the challenger's bid. The user of living space who cannot afford or does not wish to pay the higher rent will have to surrender the used real estate to a more potent competitor

within a reasonable time. During that time, they will seek a more suitable rental home. Leaving the real estate may be inconvenient; however, it will be worth it to achieve greater collective conveniences.

Winning the competition will oblige the real estate user to use it for a specific period at the indicated price. After the specified time period expires, the real estate user may lower the rent if a potential competitor agrees.

Any space that may serve both housing and business purposes is subject to competition for real property utilization. If enterprises offered higher rents than tenants, such real estate would become a business premise, and vice versa. In this way, the market will determine the most effective use of real estate in society.

Real property, such as public farmland and industrial facilities, is subject to competition for work. Therefore, no rent is required as an alternative method for competitively determining usage rights.

Public spaces and facilities, such as administrative buildings, courts, schools, healthcare institutions, and clubs, are established by the decision of the commune's assembly. The entire society utilizes such facilities for specific social purposes, and they are therefore not subject to user competition.

Socialism does not need rent in the capitalist sense as a form of income because society owns real property. It also does not require rent as a cash asset for constructing and maintaining the real property, as such assets are allocated from the collective spending fund. Socialism requires rents only to regulate the rights to use of real property.

The total amount of money intended for the rent of all real estate in the commune is established by the sum of direct statements of all real estate users. Such money should be distributed to the commune's population in proportion to their incomes and then added to their incomes. This means that each inhabitant will have a stake in the amount of money allocated for all rents, proportionate to their income. A worker with a higher income has contributed more to society's development and thus has a greater right to use real estate. They exercise this right by receiving a larger amount of rent-related money. The amount of money intended for rent will be directly deducted from the tenants' income accounts. Therefore, it will not obstruct the balance between buyers' power and the value of produced commodities in the commune.

The distribution of real property will depend on differences in income levels among commune inhabitants, rent levels, and, more precisely, the value or necessity of the real property. Significant differences in income levels will lead to greater variations in rent-paying power and, consequently, more substantial differences in the use of real estate.

Families rent housing spaces. Each family member realizes income in the commune. In this context, larger family communities or groups receive larger payments and greater opportunities to use valuable real estate.

The proposed system of real property distribution is the most efficient, just, and equitable method, regardless of the ratio of housing premises to tenants, because market competition among real estate users ensures optimal allocation. Moreover, this form of rent will incorporate all the positive characteristics of known private and social renting while rejecting the negative aspects, thereby contributing to the prosperity of society.

Competition among real property users determines the real property's objective value. Where real estate rents are higher, there is greater interest from the population. This is a good indicator for earmarking cash assets for real estate construction. The construction, demolition and adaptation of immovable property are carried out from the fund of collective spending.

Life in such a system will enable each inhabitant to assess their own need for living spaces based on personal experience and preferences. This will demystify the alienated premises underlying the perception of the actual value of real property. Such an orientation may lower the market value of the real estate's turnover, reducing it to a usable value. Society can then ensure that the real property needs of all inhabitants are met.

3.1.2.2.9 Collective Spending

Each society organizes a service that meets the collective needs of people in a particular territory. Collective services need cash assets for public spending. Such assets are provided by the tax policy arising from the sale of commodities, enterprise profits and workers' income.

An authority determines tax policy within the territory over which it has sovereignty. In contemporary societies, people choose their representatives, and they are expected to represent their interests in taxation. However, in practice, the chosen representatives are, as a general rule, more inclined to follow their own interests or to represent the interests of privileged members of society who have a strong influence on policymaking.

Society does not significantly impact tax policy, even though authorities strive to meet people's tax policy needs. Therefore, the tax policy is permanently alienated from people, and they cannot accept it as their own. People are forced to accept the tax policy imposed by the authorities and therefore experience it as a form of violence against their own needs. Such circumstances lead to dissatisfaction with tax payments and a lack of understanding of collective ownership.

Socialism also requires a tax policy. However, it would differ substantially from tax policy in a capitalist system. The commune's population will directly tailor the socialist tax policy.

The realized profit of public enterprises is registered at the commune's administrative centre to determine each enterprise's productivity. Then all the money is pooled in the commune's public bank. The pooled funds enable the population to distribute joint funds for both individual and public spending, as well as economic development. The result defines collective monetary policy and directs joint action.

The distribution occurs through an Internet application, where people select desired values from the possible ranges determined by the commune's leadership and approved by its assembly. An inhabitant who needs more money for collective spending will allocate more money to it than to other assets. A larger amount of money intended for collective spending will more effectively satisfy collective social needs. Still, it will diminish funds allocated to individual expenditure and economic development. The sum of the values chosen for collective spending by all inhabitants, in proportion to their voting powers, will represent the total amount of money intended for collective spending.

It is worth noting that the assets intended for collective spending are used exclusively for collective consumption, not for individuals' incomes. All individual incomes are paid from the fund of individual expenditures. The money intended for collective spending is allocated as assets to maintain and build communal facilities.

Monetary assets intended for the maintenance of communal facilities will need to be further allocated among the commune's administration, social protection, healthcare, education, science, culture, sports, recreation, environmental protection, infrastructure, transportation, and other essential services.

The commune's leadership would set possible value ranges for distributing money to specific groups. They will set the minimum resources that certain collective spending groups must have to function, as well as the optimal and maximum possible amounts of money for specific forms of consumption.

People of the commune who assess that a specific form of collective spending requires a larger amount of money to meet their own needs to a greater extent will appropriate a larger amount of money for such requirements at the expense of the less necessary form of spending, in their opinion. The statements of all the commune inhabitants are then processed in the commune's administrative centre. The sum of all values stated for

spending groups, in relation to the economic voting power of the individuals, would represent the ratio of cash asset distribution.

The known amounts intended for the collective spending groups will create a certain standard for these groups. Based on practice, inhabitants will learn whether it is necessary to increase or decrease cash assets to meet the needs of particular groups. Each collective spending group has numerous minor and significant expenses, as well as a limited budget. However, inhabitants do not necessarily need to be interested in further money distribution. However, the distribution may be carried out by interested individuals as they require it.

The money for the collective spending might also be distributed to non-profit organizations that best meet society's needs. This is similar to the principle of allocating money for economic development. The evaluation of such satisfaction will be performed by arbitration commissions, evaluation courts, various associations, and directly by inhabitants of the commune. In a society where such work evaluations directly impact income or even the distribution of income-based points for workers, using money for collective spending needs will be a responsible approach.

Authorized managers will determine the final distribution of funds and assets within each spending group. Due to the high level of responsibility, managers will use the money intended for collective spending in accordance with an agreement with the interested population. In socialism, managers will be the workers who can no longer meet their own needs without first meeting the social needs of others. Such a principle guarantees that the final distribution of even the most negligible monetary assets intended for collective spending will be earmarked to the most efficient means of meeting social needs.

People also directly influence the construction of new social interest facilities. Building facilities related to social standards involves infrastructure and equipment, both of which require significant funding. In this connection, as the population opts for more funds for collective spending, including necessary construction, more possibilities will become available to build various communal standard facilities.

Based on the available funds and social needs, the commune's leadership will plan the construction of new facilities. It will define the technical characteristics and the cost of such construction.

Since construction requires a large amount of money, extensive collective effort, and introduces lasting changes to the commune's structure, the population must approve the construction through a referendum. Therefore, each inhabitant will have to consent to build capital or an expensive project and may express their views about constructing any facility in the commune. Capital projects will be developed if most of the population

approves them. Other facilities of lower significance that require less investment will need a majority of votes on the project.

The proposed distribution system for collective spending is subject to social agreement, which fosters a constructive orientation within society. In socialism, the population has the power to manage collective spending directly for the first time. Such control will enable people to accept collective spending as their own. In such a system, communal ownership is no longer alienated from people, thereby allowing the population to accept its community. In such a community, one may expect people to have a responsible attitude toward the collective property.

Collective spending is the most rational form of consumption, enabling the most efficient satisfaction of social needs. Therefore, the population may be expected to increase the funds allocated to collective spending, thereby contributing to society's well-being and prosperity.

The commune is fully sovereign in the allocation of its collective spending assets. However, in terms of its political affiliation, the commune represents a part of the state community. It regulates relations with other communes through delegates in the assembly of a broader territorial community. Representatives of all communes on the state territory establish collective spending at the state level in the federal parliament.

Funds for federal spending are needed for the state budget. The funds are used for administration, state defence, and the construction and maintenance of facilities of national interest. When the necessary funds for the state's needs are determined, they are collected in proportion to the commune's income and sent to the federal administration.

The distribution of money at the federal level is created by state leadership and approved by delegates from the communes in the national assembly or parliament, just as it is today. In other words, the commune population would not directly impact the formation and distribution of cash assets for collective spending at the federal level. Nevertheless, it may be expected that people accustomed to directly deciding on joint spending at the commune level will seek the same right at the national level. Direct decision-making by the population at the federal level is technically feasible, as is decision-making at the commune level; however, it requires compatible decision-making systems. In other words, all communes in the state would need to accept the political and economic system of the commune or a similar one.

3.2 The Disalienation of Associated Communes

3.2.1 Pooling of the Policies

Generally, the origin of states has rarely had anything to do with democracy. People have seldom been asked which country they would like to live in. States are the product of the needs of autocratic rulers. The solution is not the negation of states due to their non-democratic origins. The exit lies in their maximal democratization.

In present-day states, the parliamentary form of democracy prevails. Society accepts it as the most democratic form of ruling society. However, once leaders, delegates, or a party are elected, the individual has no impact on setting the rules for collective action. Delegated members of parliament practice an indirect form of democracy that often deviates from their election programs. The present-day state is a more or less closed authoritative formation that maintains the coordination of alienated social actions through a system of substantial pressure. This state produces alienation, autocracy, exploitation, protectionism, nationalism, and destructiveness.

Elements of the politics and economy of capitalism have achieved progress in democracy and the economy; however, they cannot develop further and therefore impede the development of society. The new method of social behaviour in the commune substitutes for and promotes all elements of capitalism's politics and economy, thus allowing for the continuation of political and economic prosperity.

One should hope that this book will interest foundations, state leadership, political parties, universities, institutes, associations, and individuals, so that they will not regret their contributions to the development of socialism. Naturally, the socialist system will require a comprehensive scientific analysis and a theoretical simulation of the commune. Then, once satisfactory results are established, it is possible to experimentally apply the socialist system in a smaller social community willing to accept it.

The commune is a part of the state as a sovereign social organization. The commune's representatives in the state assembly represent the interests of their respective communes. In this way, each commune participates in making state decisions on the country's external and internal policy and defence. The commune alone defines its internal affairs. Nevertheless, each commune is sovereign enough to enact its laws and regulations on its territory if they are not in conflict with the accepted constitutional laws of the state.

The socialist commune will have a closed labour market vis-à-vis the state and an independent economy. Workers from the capitalist world outside the commune will not be able to compete freely for jobs within the commune. Such workers could not realize income in the socialist commune because they had not accumulated past labour points.

Transfer of workers may be allowed administratively if workers sell their property in their commune and thus accumulate sufficient funds to purchase past labour points in the socialist commune.

Such workers will also be unfavourable because they cannot be compensated for their participation in building collective ownership of their commune. Therefore, they would have a lower income than workers who have realized equally valuable past labour in the new commune. The transfer of workers from one commune to another will be accessible only if communes establish an equal system. Then the work organization would be carried out at the level of the associated communes. The regulation of the transfer of value derived from past labour would then be carried out automatically.

The socialist system will ensure the commune's economic, social, and political stability. It would allow the commune to develop more rapidly and stably than capitalism in all fields. This also means people would gain greater social advantages than in a capitalist system. When socialism shows positive results, it may serve as a model to other communes. Then, political parties in other communities will adopt socialism, contributing to the global dissemination of socialism.

Socialism fosters a higher degree of association among several communes. In this way, the commune retains a portion of its political and economic sovereignty and transfers a portion to the association of communes. The association will be based on a joint policy, the labour market, and collective capital. Such an association may bring direct conveniences and inconveniences to the population of communes.

Conveniences would manifest in a free choice of labour in associated communes. In this way, there would be a higher probability of finding a job that interests the worker, finding a more suitable residence, and consequently, realizing more of the benefits of living there. Further, associated communes are economically more potent. Thus, they can achieve higher prosperity in society and greater certainty in business operations, even in the face of market disruptions.

For the same reasons, the population may experience the association of the communes unfavourably. Namely, more workers create greater competition for jobs, which may make it more difficult to exercise the right to work in one's own interest. Moreover, greater economic stability will inevitably require a flow of funds between communes for income, collective spending, and economic development needs. The population may assess such a redistribution of money as unfavourable.

In this regard, the assemblies of the communes wishing to unite will form a program that clearly defines the modalities and procedures of the association. Such a program should be adopted with at least two-thirds of the votes of the political parties in the assemblies of the communes that wish to unite. Naturally, such decisions will not be easily or quickly implemented, which is acceptable because society needs time to adapt to significant changes.

As the association of communes can bring advantages and disadvantages to the inhabitants, it must be carried out by the democratic vote of the population through a referendum. The association of communes is an act that significantly affects social action, so a substantial majority of the people should accept it. Let it be at least 2/3 of the votes cast and at least 1/2 of the total population of each commune. Following the decision of the political parties, it is likely to gather a sufficient number of votes in the referendum.

One should assume that, over time, the practice will demonstrate that associating the communes yields a larger market, enabling greater profits. Communes unwilling to associate themselves with other communes would become economically weaker than associated communes. Besides that, a larger-scale association boosts productivity through stronger work competition and provides greater operational efficiency. A larger-scale association will provide greater certainty when doing business in the event of market disruption. A larger-scale association of communes will result in a more substantial accumulation of collective funds, ensuring the meeting of a greater number of people's needs. A larger-scale association will enable the population to exert greater influence over decisions of joint interest within the territory of associated communes. A larger-scale association will allow the people to evaluate the actions of any individual in the region of the related communes. Briefly, a larger-scale association brings more benefits to the community. Therefore, it may be expected that the population of the communes will aspire to association.

An association can develop at the state level as a sovereign social organization within a particular territory. However, unlike the commune, the state, as a completely sovereign social organization, enacts the country's constituent and other laws. The adoption and amendments to the constitutive and other fundamental laws are prepared and determined by the state parliament with the assistance of its expert services. Basic rules and decisions govern citizens' rights and duties, as well as their relationships in production and distribution. Representatives in the state parliament should adopt important state laws with at least 2/3 of the representatives' votes and then forward them to the population in a referendum.

The population declares itself through online applications by accepting or rejecting such laws. Laws that receive at least 2/3 of the residents who voted and are supported by at least 1/2 of the state's total population would pass, and the rest would be rejected or revised. As the population directly decides on its laws, it is interested in knowing them and accepting them of its own free will. Therefore, these laws are no longer alienated from society.

Less critical laws, regulations and decisions covering specific activities and not being of general interest to the people are accepted if they receive a majority vote of the delegates or representatives in the state's parliament.

The democratic approach to the association of the communes also requires freedom of disassociation and limited mutual links. Today, no international rules govern the secession of parts of the states. The right to secession should be equal to the freedom of association. Every republic, province and even the smallest territorial community of people, in this case, a commune, should have the right to self-determination. Such a decision should be made by at least two-thirds of the representatives' votes in the commune assembly, in the same manner as it adopts its association. Then the decision is adopted or rejected by the commune's inhabitants, with at least 2/3 of the votes cast by those who participated and at least 50% of the votes cast by the total number of commune inhabitants.

If a referendum in the commune were to confirm the will of the people for self-determination, then representatives of the commune and the state would engage in the division of assets and liabilities, as well as the division of collectively acquired goods between the commune and the state, including the regulation of all obligations, claims, and newly established relations. Based on the agreement reached, a referendum would need to be held across the entire state.

Established disassociation would be accepted if it were in the interest of at least half of the total number of inhabitants of the state. Since the commune has the right to self-determination, the state also needs to have the right to self-determination to prevent the secession of the commune. The process of disassociation cannot be easy, given the enormous number of ties among communes, companies, and inhabitants created from the establishment of the state.

An objective analysis can assume that the population will reject disintegration through practice because it cannot deliver greater economic or social benefits. Significant benefits generally arise from the integration process. An integrated state in socialism can function better than a commune. It will bring more benefits to society than the commune can, because it offers greater freedom of choice, greater power to the people, and increased productivity and economic stability.

More associated people will have more power to develop objective values and thus demystify authorities and overcome the alienation they have imposed. Less alienated people create less problems and are less aggressive. Of course, conflicts among individuals may still occur; however, no one will be able to escalate disputes to a social or national level, as democratic anarchy will sanction such attempts. And because the progressive orientation offered by socialism will not produce followers who would support them.

3.2.2 Pooling of the Economy

A larger social community offers greater potential for economic development and, accordingly, greater societal prosperity. At the same time, it requires more intensive

effort to coordinate collective actions. Every society strives for economic prosperity, but it cannot do so because, so far, people have not developed methods for achieving economic progress more significant and stable than capitalism offers.

The socialism presented in this book introduces new elements that can significantly improve society's economic policy. Socialism will be based on the agreement of the most productive manufacturers, enabling maximum productivity and system stability. The stability of the new economic system will be based on steady production, stable product prices, incomes, and the known needs of the population. Sound production and distribution are preconditions for a state's stability.

The association of communes into a state enables a higher degree of labour distribution among workers, as demonstrated in the commune. Leadership will direct the work to maximize the regional manufacturing advantages of communes. Socialism will lead to the merging of enterprises, diminishing competition between enterprises with similar production programs until it eliminates it. Vertical hierarchical subordination will ensure rational production and stable business activity.

Socialism will increase productivity by reducing enterprise competition to the level of individual work posts. The right to work within the state will be exercised through a competitive work environment among workers. Any resident can apply for any job posting throughout the state. The work competition will, on one hand, assign an objective value to each work post and, on the other, enhance the productivity of each work post. A socialist state will, in this way, achieve a more productive and stable economy than capitalism can.

Free work choice in the state may also raise concerns about excessive population migration from economically less developed to more developed regions. Such migrations would make production planning more challenging and reduce business stability.

State leaders will be required to consider the interests of all inhabitants of all communes when organizing regional economic production. If the state managers are unsuccessful, it will lead to migrations to regions with privileged status. Additionally, this would undoubtedly increase competition for the limited number of job openings in privileged communes, thereby leaving many people dissatisfied. State leaders who would not offer equal opportunities for all communes to develop would face negative evaluations from dissatisfied people. Negative assessments would reduce the incomes of insufficiently successful leaders and decrease the number of past labour points. Responsibility before people will force unsuccessful leaders to relinquish their positions for the first time. Only the most skilful and brave people would dare to lead countries. This guarantees the state's prosperity.

Socialism will completely solve the problem of labour migration from non-developed to developed communities, utilizing workers' past labour points. Workers in non-developed communes have less valuable past labour because their contribution to economic

development is smaller. They also achieve lower productivity and realize smaller profits and income. Smaller incomes lead to a smaller number of past labour points, which serve as a permanent representation of their overall power. By migrating from one commune to another, workers bring their past labour points, which form the basis of their income. By moving to more developed areas, they will realize a relatively equal income for the same work as in the non-developed communes. In socialism, income will not be the primary factor motivating workers to migrate from underdeveloped to developed communes.

Hence, worker migration will be possible, but from the perspective of income and past labour value experience, it will be non-stimulating. On the contrary, workers will be more motivated to remain in non-developed regions, as such areas can, through grants intended for economic development, achieve faster increases in profits and, consequently, larger increases in incomes and the number of past labour points.

The system envisions establishing responsibility for workers, enterprises, and communes to achieve a productive life, as demonstrated in the commune. Accountability will be ensured through workers' income and past labour records. The system also envisages establishing responsibility through mutual assessments by inhabitants, consumers, associations, arbitrations, and evaluation committees at the state level. This will help establish responsible relations in the state's economy and promote its prosperity.

Socialism can ensure a considerably higher degree of stability in society and coordination of its activities than capitalism. This will be achieved by pooling money and democratically controlling it. The new system forms a single pool of funds that society will distribute across all forms of spending in accordance with market and democratically established principles.

Thus far, the state's macroeconomic policy, which shapes social relations, has been determined by the state leadership. This means that autocrats have always ruled society. As authorities often pursue interests that do not sufficiently represent social interests, the population usually remains dissatisfied with the authorities' decisions. Moreover, the decisions made by leaders are alienated from the people, and therefore, the people cannot accept them as their own.

One might argue that contemporary macroeconomic policy has reached its maximum efficiency. Further development of the economy and economic relations can be facilitated only by incorporating democracy into them. In socialism, each inhabitant will create the macroeconomic policy of the state by direct participation in the distribution of collective money. Thus, by distributing joint money, the people will directly form an economic policy of socialism.

The sum of all residents' statements, based on their economic voting power, will replace the monetary, credit, development, income, and fiscal policies of capitalism. Direct distribution of collective money will drastically reduce alienation in production and distribution. At the same time, the economy will receive macroeconomic orientation guidelines for its activities, thereby providing the basis for greater stability in business operations.

The state issues money. The total money supply in circulation should be approximately equal to the value of the commodities produced and the overall realized profit on the market, as described in the commune. The system allows relatively easy control of the money in circulation and firm control over inflationary and deflationary processes, ensuring stability in the economy's business activity.

The entire mass of money allocated for the turnover of commodities in the state is distributed between cash assets for the communes and those designated for state use. The ratio of funds allocated to the communes and the state is determined directly by democratic statements from all state inhabitants, based on their individual economic voting powers within the value ranges set by the state leadership.

Cash assets intended for the communes are distributed proportionally to the realized market profits. However, the commune's assets will also depend on protecting and improving society and its environment. A greater improvement in society and the environment will result in a larger share of funds being distributed among the communes. This has already been discussed in the chapter "Income Distribution." This means that each commune will have as much money as it deserves, based on its overall productive orientation.

By pooling the money earned in all communes, adjustments to the revenues of individual communes can be made to ensure a stable income for all. Namely, suppose a commune registers a significant loss of money in the case of a natural catastrophe or poor work results. In that case, the income of such a commune can be covered by the collective fund and gradually reduced until the commune's economy becomes consolidated. At this point, it can start growing again. In this way, the system ensures the economic stability of all communes.

The population of productive communes may perceive income spillovers to other communes as unfavourable. However, given that the spillover would not be significant or frequent and would ensure the communes' stable income, it can be assumed that the inhabitants of all communes in socialism would accept such an insurance policy. The assets realized for the commune's expenses will be fully distributed to the people in accordance with the principles they accepted.

Monetary assets intended for the union of communes serve the collective spending and development needs of the entire state. Such funds are formed and distributed by direct voting by all state inhabitants. It is worth noting that the proportion of assets allocated to

the state reduces resources available to the communes. In the portion of money earmarked for state needs, communes lose their economic sovereignty.

Money assets intended for the collective spending of the state are distributed among consumer groups, as are the assets earmarked for collective expenditure at the commune level. The only difference is that the assets meet the state's needs. The funds are used to meet the requirements of state administration and defence, infrastructure, health, education, science, culture, and sports. They also support other purposes that all state residents need, representing a financial burden for each commune.

Collective monetary assets for the state are democratically distributed, similarly to the practices described in the commune. Direct expression of the inhabitants' views through voting is one of the most critical measures of socialism. Besides other benefits, the population with ruling power will try to understand the needs of its state. Socialism will contribute to the people's disalienation from the state, allowing them to accept it as their own to a greater extent.

Assets intended for the state's economic development serve the developmental needs of the associated economy, as well as significant investments made by some communes. They also support all enterprises that are unable to realize the necessary assets for economic development within their own communes. Assets are distributed to enterprises based on the size of the development coefficient, similar to the commune system.

Cash assets for economic development are allocated as grants and renewed from the state's revenue in each accounting period. The entire state will then be associated with a single corporation, and companies will not have to repay themselves for the money they have invested. Enterprises are expected to realize the anticipated monetary gains within a specified timeframe. This way, cash assets intended for economic development would achieve their objective, and the overall financial system would be adequately justified.

It may be assumed that the economically developed communes will be less interested in further growth, as their living standard will be high enough to approach saturation. A rise in the productivity of a developed commune may also pose a risk to profit realization due to market saturation and the insufficient purchasing power of non-developed communes. Underdeveloped communes will request more funding for economic development, while the state's democracy will demand that developed countries allocate funds for development even though they do not need it. This fact provides a better opportunity for underdeveloped communes to secure additional financial resources for development than they could on their own. By increasing productivity, non-developed communes will enhance their purchasing power, thereby expanding the state market. In this way, the system will contribute to more balanced development of the entire state.

3.2.3 Association of States

States organize their politics within their territory to ensure greater social benefits for their people. However, when the government fails to align with society's nature, it leads to an authoritarian, alienating policy. Such a policy creates unjust relations between people, tensions and risks between states. States are responsible for the greatest bloodshed in human history.

The world today lacks a model of mutual coexistence that can ensure humanity's prosperity. On the contrary, the present-day world's relations are based on a dangerous and ruthless competition of determination, not cooperation. Current world policy is creating objective injustices between states due to enormous differences in levels of economic development and unequal access to natural resources. On one side is excessive production, and on the other, scarcity.

The history of humankind has documented several attempts to build a better world. In that endeavour, world organizations were established to bring states and nations closer together into an interdependent whole that complements global cooperation. For this reason, the United Nations, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, Interpol, international health organizations, and numerous other organizations were established. These organizations had to connect the idea of creating a better planet Earth. They were supposed to bring benefits, including greater integration of people, labour, and capital; greater production power; greater wealth; and thus greater well-being. Such organizations were supposed to reduce the possibility of conflicts between states. However, the result is the opposite of what was expected. Such organizations are primarily used today to achieve global dominance and, as such, pose a danger to humanity.

However, there is no doubt that the greatest danger in the world arises from the alienation imposed by the authorities. People live in an alienated, selfish, narcissistic world where they form alienated needs. Alienation can deceive an individual into overcoming their impotence before nature, but no activity can realize it, and therefore, an alienated individual is generally insatiable and unsatisfied. Unsatisfied alienated needs are a source of destructive energy, bringing enormous problems to the world daily. Alienation is a disease afflicting the world, whether rich or poor. Authorities often channel such destructive energy to achieve global supremacy, which is a basis for global destruction. Of course, the most influential people worldwide are the most dangerous. As the world has not overcome its alienated orientation, it has not found a foundation for achieving prosperity.

Today, the world is proud of its technological advancements and production, but it has not taken a single step forward in developing human consciousness. Moreover, people worldwide are experiencing a significant degradation of fundamental human values. In this connection, one cannot say that all negative phenomena, destructions, and wars

belong to the past. This problem has been elevated by technological development and is threatening humankind more than ever.

OK, but what is missing to change the situation? Knowledge is missing! This book presents the knowledge necessary to form a sound and sane society. It will take power away from the authorities and give it to the people. Socialism can effectively address all the problems mentioned above. It respects democracy, human rights, individual interests, both general and specific, past and present labour, and the values arising from natural, constructive interpersonal relations. It prevents alienation, privileges, hegemony, exploitation, and any form of destructiveness. The new system is so productive and flexible that residents of other states can adopt it. Such an act opens up the possibility of an association at the state level. Once integration among states begins, it is only a matter of time before a united world is achieved on a global scale.

By association, the states relinquish a portion of their sovereignty as they transfer it to the community of states, yet they gain new qualities of social life. When humankind accepts the described socio-economic system, the world will function as a commune. For the first time, the world will know exactly, at any point in time, how many inhabitants it has and what their individual and collective needs are. For the first time, it will be able to pursue a rational policy that meets the population's needs.

In a socialist world, each inhabitant will have the freedom to act on the territory of the whole world. They will be free to choose a place to live and work anywhere in the world. Freedom will have one limitation. The individual will not be free to cause disadvantages to any member of society. The system will provide adequate protection for everyone against troubles committed anywhere around the world.

The described system will enable every resident to provide a direct statement at the administrative world center or its satellite in the commune, assessing any advantages or disadvantages they experience from any point in the world. The system of assessments can form a completely new system of values in the world, valuing and sanctioning any disadvantage and rewarding any advantage that an individual causes to another. As such, assessments will directly impact an evaluated individual's income and past labour points; everyone will be held accountable before an audience around the world. Everyone will strive to minimize disadvantages and maximize benefits for the world, thereby laying the groundwork for a productive, constructive global orientation.

The new system envisions direct statements from all inhabitants of the world about essential political, economic, and other areas of joint interest. In this way, the rules of global action will be established through direct democracy.

The social system would determine the world's monetary policy and the distribution of money. The collective wealth would be directly and democratically allocated by

humankind for individual and collective spending, economic development, and all related spheres of interest worldwide.

The new socialist system introduces a universally established value in the form of the price of labour, which objectively presents the past and current labour values of all workers globally. Upon such values, all other economic values may be built to establish a just distribution of all forms of conveniences and inconveniences arising from the past and current labour of all workers. Today, those elements are missing to develop a stable and productive economic policy, and therefore, society's overall stability is compromised.

The new economic system envisions a worldwide association of the economy into one large global enterprise, with world leadership, world planning of production, and world labour distribution based on the principle of free labour competition. The managers of the world will manage work rationally and efficiently. This would result in high, stable economic productivity, optimally meeting the material needs of the entire human population. Furthermore, the free labour market will eliminate work privileges worldwide, thereby requiring the planning of production, labour, and wage distribution that optimally serve the interests of all humanity and each individual.

Such a system will enable each inhabitant to become aware of their natural needs through practice and, in this way, overcome alienation. The possibility of expressing the immediate, natural interest of every person will free society from dependence on alienated ideological, national, regional, cultural, economic, and other interests. Individuals will finally have the chance to live natural lives, free from alienating values. The nature of a human being is unique to all of humanity, so by addressing human nature, the conditions for forming a homogeneous global social community are created.

Each individual will rely on their own strengths to meet their needs and learn to develop them in line with their potential for realization. This will serve as the basis for meeting needs and, consequently, for a constructive orientation in society. The people who permanently satisfy their needs are not destructive. Such a system will form genuine equality among people. In such a world, the narcissistic trait of the character, which is often the chief cause of alienation and conflict among people, can be overcome to foster natural cooperative relations.

The states and nations will no longer be endangered in such a system. It may be expected that people in each country will, through direct voting, abolish funds intended for the armed forces, thereby finally preventing the outbreak of wars.

The proposed system will foster a new consciousness in individuals, new societal ethics, and new relationships worldwide. Such a system will enable safety, convenience, and spiritual and material prosperity for all inhabitants of the world. In the near future, it will shape the bright future of humankind. As such, a socioeconomic system will be directly created by humanity, and the state, as a form of authoritative pressure over society, will no longer be needed.

3.3 Expectations of the New System

Communism should be considered the best social system.

Karl Marx created the term communism. It presents a political and economic system in which society owns the means of production and produces for the benefit of the people. Marx defined communism as “*From each according to their ability, to each according to their needs.*”¹² According to Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, communism is the final stage of socialism. Communism should provide all goods and services free of charge to all people, which socialism could not. This is the only difference between socialism and communism. Karl Marx and his most prominent students—Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin, Mao Zedong, Josip Broz Tito, Fidel Castro, and now Kim Jong-un—have failed to establish communism, even in theory. Even though their work was based on a noble ideology, they were unable to devise a successful method for improving society. Their work more or less failed.

The primary condition for building socialism and communism is the equal rights of people. Karl Marx thought the same, but failed to define them. Vladimir Ilyich Lenin initially intended to build socialism and communism based on equal human rights, but he failed because the people could hardly agree on anything. Democratic anarchy is the solution, but the technology required was unavailable in Marx’s and Lenin’s time. Lenin’s attempt to establish equal human rights encountered such difficulties that he ultimately relinquished the goal and sought to exert control over people. The rest of the socialist leaders followed suit. It was precisely where everything went wrong with socialism and communism.

Hopefully, this study has convincingly presented the third natural law of society: establishing equal human rights fosters constructive and harmonious social relations, leading to people being satisfied with their lives. If so, people would be willing to build socialism. To achieve communism, people will need to voluntarily allocate all their income to taxes. Then, all goods and services will be available to everyone free of charge. Mathematically speaking, if some people refuse to allocate all their gross salaries for taxes, everyone will still receive a tiny income, and some goods and services will still be charged. This would still be socialism and not communism.

Most people believe that communism is impossible to realize due to the weaknesses of human nature. This is false. Money is an absolute necessity in a society that is scarcely supplied. The wealthy elite have inflated the value of money far beyond its objective worth, as having money, while others do not, affords them power over others.

¹² Karl Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, 1875 (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1970)

Socialism will significantly change this. It will increase production and workers' salaries, bringing abundant consumption available to everyone. Socialism will give stability and justice to the process of production and distribution. Each work position will be theoretically open to everyone at any time. The work market will make all jobs equally desirable, contributing to social harmony. People will have equal rights to represent their interests everywhere. By implementing equal human rights, people will become genuinely equal. Then they should realize the second natural law of society: equal power among people builds harmonious social relations. The proposed socio-economic system should create a harmonious society.

The history of humankind is a history of imposed knowledge by authorities that has alienated people from their nature. People should not uncritically accept the influence of others. They are not even supposed to compare themselves with others, as it may alienate them from their true nature and prevent them from embracing it. Alienation has led people down the wrong path, preventing them from satisfying their needs. Unsatisfied needs lead to disappointment and antagonism, ultimately creating destructive relationships.

Equal human rights will liberate people from authoritarian pressure and enable them to pursue their interests. Such experiences will teach people to critically consider the influences of others. It will demystify alienated values imposed by authorities throughout human history. It will help people reconnect with their nature. As a result, people will form objective needs that they may satisfy, creating a joyful life and bringing satisfaction.

The responsibility the system requires from people will teach people to set their needs according to their ability to satisfy them. Therefore, they should recognize the first natural law of society: people who consistently meet their needs establish constructive social relations. Such people are not destructive. Once people accept the natural laws of society, they will contribute to building a natural, harmonious and highly prosperous society.

Socialism can regulate various values in society by utilizing past labour points, which will determine people's incomes and decision-making power in the economy. Among other things, past labour points may regulate the world population. For example, granting a stimulating quantity of past labour points for childbirth may increase the population. And vice versa, a high population may be decreased by taking a sufficient number of past labour points from couples who wish to have more children than society considers appropriate. Furthermore, the system will share responsibility for protecting the human environment. It will make the whole planet Earth clean and healthy. Utilizing past labour points will enable people to establish a responsible relationship between humanity and its future.

Socialism will likely render many of today's jobs obsolete. The reduction of work posts will begin with administration, national defence, police, marketing, trading, and insurance companies, among others. The administration will be significantly less needed because accounting will be automatic. National defence will not be required because there will be no threat to any nation. Police will no longer be necessary because there will be no danger to individuals. Marketing will not be needed because there will be no competition among companies. Traders will be in less demand because consumers will mostly order their consumption directly from producers. Insurance will not be needed because the system will directly ensure all people.

It is difficult to identify precisely all the work posts that will not be needed in the future. Still, one can assume that only work posts in direct production and services that satisfy society's natural needs will remain. Therefore, one can assume it is approximately half of today's work posts. Furthermore, suppose one considers that the system ensures the full employment of workers. In that case, such a reduction would automatically reduce the required working hours to 4 hours per worker per day, allowing for the same productivity as today.

Work, in its duration, directly brings conveniences and inconveniences. The individual aspires to a career that offers more advantages while avoiding inconvenient work. Shorter work hours will reduce the inconveniences that work may bring. In the proposed system, each worker will have an excellent opportunity to choose work that brings them significant benefits, while also providing the greatest productivity. It can be assumed that each worker will invest more effort in their area of professional interest, thereby improving their abilities and exercising their right to work in their best interest.

Workers who cannot achieve good productivity at any convenient job may be released from work duty; however, they will receive a smaller income than employed workers. During their productive lifetime and by inheritance, each worker accumulates past labour points. If they collect enough past work points, they can be released from work and simultaneously acquire a fair share of the income distribution based on their past labour results.

Work will be a valuable asset to workers, so they will lower the price of their current work to achieve greater competitive power for the desired job. Some workers employed at work posts, which bring them great convenience, will, over time, accept an income equal to, or even lower than, what they would receive if they were not working. This means that labour will be of greater value than inactivity for such workers and more valuable than the consumption of manufactured goods and services. They will achieve the right to work in their interest at the account of a smaller share in income distribution. Many people today would be willing to work for free in attractive positions, such as the presidency of a state or a leading role in a major motion picture. The new system will demystify the value of work posts. When all work posts become equally accessible to everyone, work practices will remove their alienating, mystical value. Also, the system will make all work posts similarly attractive, equalizing demand for all jobs.

A considerably higher current work price will identify the inconvenient jobs. These jobs may be assumed to be manual, physical, and non-creative, such as those in line production, mining, construction, or agriculture. Such work forms will be assisted or entirely replaced by automation.

Today's technological progress in production has already significantly reduced the inconvenience of certain forms of work, and this trend is expected to continue. Furthermore, management in the economy can redistribute unsuitable work conditions across multiple job postings over a short period, contributing to a more balanced distribution of the working burden. Furthermore, technological development and new work divisions will significantly benefit the workers. That means the workers may enjoy greater advantages at work than outside of work. In socialism, work will become a direct value.

The work's immediate value represents the being benefits derived from the work itself. The benefits of being have long and intense periods until saturation. Socialism can foster the understanding that a lasting and balanced form of convenience arises from being. Being implies all activities in the formation and satisfaction of needs. It primarily affects free decision-making and creative action across fields such as science, culture, politics, production, sports, and other forms of activity. The proposed system allows everyone to achieve significant benefits in their daily lives.

The indirect value of the work highlights the conveniences that arise from consuming goods produced by labour. The socialist system of production will lead to an abundance of goods. The socialist distribution system of the means of consumption will enable everyone to access and consume them. When many means of consumption are accessible to each individual, it helps them eliminate the alienating idea of power associated with the possession of goods. If the supply of commodities exceeds demand, their trade value will decrease. In this way, socialism promotes the demystification of goods, satisfying people's natural needs. The characteristic of the natural use of commodities is an easy and quick saturation, after which further spending on goods can no longer bring convenience to the individual.

It should be noted that by embracing work competition, productivity would be significantly higher than it is today. Increased production in the developed world will create general consumer saturation. The consumer mentality will become less pronounced, and society's interest in commodity consumption will stagnate or fall. Besides that, one should consider the process of disalienation of the community that will decrease society's needs for consumption by finding values of being, so that the large production of today in the Western world will not be needed anymore.

The stagnation of economic development in capitalism often leads to financial crises. Socialism will overcome such a crisis by reorganizing labour and further shortening the necessary working hours. Most likely, the future will not require more than two to three hours of work per worker per day to achieve the economic productivity needed to satisfy society's needs. By shortening work time, the inconvenient aspects of work are reduced

even further, while work freedom can provide workers with great benefits. Then, the direct value of work will continue to grow further.

Reducing working hours does not mean that socialism will prevent some from working as much as they want. This presents the average amount of work required to produce a reasonably high standard of living for all people. Workers will likely work two days a week, totalling 10-15 hours, and have a five-day weekend.

Is it possible? Not only is it possible, but it is also a necessity for future production. Today, many companies spend more hours searching for products that the market demands than producing them. They also invest more work hours in marketing to find customers than in producing commodities. The producers often create goods with little utility value, hoping to sell them through marketing and low prices. In the capitalist economy, they have no alternative because they must produce something to earn a living. What a senseless waste of work and natural resources! What a meaningless life!

The future will require the new system to rationalize natural resource spending significantly. It is possible through new inventions, better work organization, and changes in human needs resulting from disalienation.

In a more technologically advanced production environment, workers are expected to experience greater workplace conveniences. As a result, they will reduce their current work price and income to increase their work competitiveness. When the overall working interest exceeds production needs, the entire population will vote to increase workers' minimum pay to reduce the income-based interest in employment. A larger competition-related reduction in the current work price will no longer lower revenue. Therefore, greater labour competitiveness, along with productivity, will be shaped by the worker responsibility coefficient.

The increase in minimum income will proportionally lower other salaries because the total amount of money for all people's earnings is limited. However, a decrease in the difference in workers' incomes will not affect the private holding of past labour points. The individual's quantity of past labour points will remain unchanged in the ownership of each inhabitant as a demonstration of personal productive power. Additionally, by allocating a larger portion of income for tax purposes, net income will decrease. Still, the number of past work points of the worker remains tied to gross income and thus remains unchanged.

The higher coefficient of responsibility will further increase the number of past labour points of workers in the case of either an individual or a collective rise in productivity. Conversely, in the case of a fall in workers' individual or collective productivity, workers who express a higher coefficient of responsibility will be sanctioned more severely by having their number of past labour points reduced. It has already been established that the system will direct each individual to fulfill their natural needs within the limits of their potential, ensuring the completion of the envisaged productivity. That is also the basis of constructive social orientation.

The market economy, derived from capitalism and improved by socialism, will not be able to address social needs effectively. Economic production that fails to find demand for its products incurs losses. In socialism, the issue of producers' responsibility will intensify because financial losses will penalize workers' past labour points. For this reason, the economy will need to adopt a more secure form of business activity, such as production for known consumers. Even today, specialized and expensive forms of production are performed according to consumer orders.

Socialism envisions collective spending as consumption based on mutual needs and orders. The associated economy can gradually encourage the population to plan and order its essential material needs, thereby achieving even more stable business activity. Production, based on consumer orders, would progressively create a democratically planned market economy. Such an economy would bring stability and prosperity to society.

Assets intended for economic development will be determined at the commune, state, and international levels in accordance with the principles of direct democracy. In this way, all world communes will influence the formation of funds intended for economic development and exercise the right to their use based on their competitive ability in performing business activities.

Economically developed parts of the world will eventually experience a decline in consumer demand due to general saturation, reducing the need for cash assets intended for economic development. The reduced interest in economic growth in developed countries will make it easier for developing countries to access the world's collective financial assets, which are designed for economic development. Over time, underdeveloped countries will evolve toward consumer saturation. The world market, saturated with goods and services, will diminish the need for economic development and, accordingly, the demand for money intended to support economic growth. The world population will then vote for lower appropriations for this purpose. It may be expected that, with a higher degree of economic development across the world, assets intended to develop the market economy, as a form of large-scale spending, will decrease to zero.

However, humankind will always need to develop its production, which will require work and money. Money required for economic development can later be earmarked from the collective spending fund. Economic growth in a developed society will depend less on the market and more on production plans.

Once the assets intended for the development of the market economy are depleted to zero, society will allocate all assets for spending. It is expected that a population saturated with individual expenditures and aware of the rationality of collective spending will dedicate a large portion of the assets used for economic development to collaborative spending.

A larger amount of money for collective spending will enable more extensive, higher-quality, and generally better world consumption. The purpose of money assets for joint world expenditure will be determined directly by the people by transferring the assets into funds of their interest. Funds that receive more money will develop more specialized forms of collective consumption.

It may be expected that at some point in society's development, some money for collective consumption will remain unused due to general saturation after meeting the mutual consumption needs. However, such funds can be used to cover certain individual consumption expenses that will be free to the commune's population.

As free or subsidized healthcare and education already exist today, it will also be possible to introduce free access to goods and new services. However, in the first place, free distribution should include goods and services essential to each inhabitant, such as food and transportation, as well as other forms of consumption that the market is already saturated with and can consistently meet demand. It may be assumed that the introduction of free-of-charge commodities will begin in the territory of the most developed communes from the surpluses of the collective consumption fund in the commune.

Producers of free goods will automatically become non-profit organizations. However, until then, the system will have already equalized work and all values arising from work in both non-profit organizations and profit companies. Introducing free commodities does not mean a predetermined distribution of the means of consumption, where each inhabitant would receive a certain quantity of goods. This is the most primitive form of consumption and violates the inhabitants' needs. Instead, it advocates free distribution of commodities, so that each inhabitant can use them according to their own needs. Family members do not charge each other for goods and services. This book intends to have the whole world become one big family.

Collective consumption and work competition will facilitate the expansion and maintenance of all necessary social facilities. Socialism can ensure that each inhabitant has access to housing if they are willing to pay the competitive rent. It may be assumed that over time, some individuals with lower incomes will be able to lease more valuable housing premises if they sacrifice other expenses. Such a possibility will contribute to the demystification of real estate values, respectively. It will enable each individual to establish the limits of natural needs in using real estate based on their practice. The use of large housing requires a significant amount of maintenance time compared to the opportunity to enjoy the benefits of being in the prosperous social relations that socialism offers. It will require the construction and adaptation of uniform real estate properties with optimal values to establish consistent demand.

A surplus of housing space may appear in socialism. The surplus of housing space does not have a trade value because nobody needs it. As uniform, high-quality standards will characterize all housing spaces, living spaces may be expected to lose their trade value. It may be anticipated that rent for using real estate in the developed

world might tend to be zero. In an exceptionally developed society with a surplus of housing space, the distribution of real estate can be performed by mutual agreement among inhabitants.

Once society overcomes the need to present the alienated form of power through the possession of commodities and property, it can expect to earmark increasingly large sums for collective consumption and decrease the amount allocated to individual consumption. Society will understand that collective spending is more rational in terms of the degree of goods utilization and consumption of natural resources.

It should be understood that the decrease in citizens' income does not decrease the number of past labour points they hold. The quantity of past labour points of all workers in the commune is equal to the commune's gross income level. The gross income of the commune consists of assets for individual and collective consumption. With a decrease in personal income, collective revenue is expected to grow. The gross income will remain the same, so that the number of past labour points, which represent the individual's contribution in building the wealth in society, will also remain unchanged.

Larger appropriations of funds intended for collective consumption would enable the introduction of new free-of-charge commodities, ultimately satisfying all society's collective needs. Funds intended for collaborative spending can then cover the costs of specific material needs of individual inhabitants.

Socialism will develop the awareness that, more significant than natural consumption, would not be necessary and would thus not represent value. However, the system needs to be strong enough to satisfy the inhabitants who would still have alienated material needs, even though possession would not be a valued aspect of society. The system may develop social awareness that portrays possession as a negative trait of an individual's character. Such an orientation might be perceived as shameful and stigmatized by negative assessments from the broader population. However, if the system fails to meet the individual's needs, it will have to halt the distribution of free commodities.

Nevertheless, the contribution of such a system lies in its flexibility to shift away from the rigid capitalist form of production and distribution, in which each work and commodity is directly priced, to a completely free form of production, where work and commodity distribution are carried out according to the needs of the people. The system will be able to withstand all oscillations in social needs, including the return to charging for all commodities and services without crisis, by immediately meeting societal needs.

If society were to form natural material needs, then even the present-day economy in developed countries could meet them. In such a society, the distribution of material goods could no longer be the basis for conflict in the community, as everyone would achieve a share according to their needs. The individual would then lose the need to possess goods, favouring the values of being that arise from work and a prosperous relationship with society and nature.

When collective spending satisfies the individual needs of inhabitants, income, as a measure of their purchasing power, loses its significance. Naturally, work will be further necessary to maintain or increase the social standard. Work will survive because it will become a value in itself. The work organization will be strictly determined and performed by management. Workers will conduct their work duties through competition based on productivity and responsibility, as determined by past labour points. That will force the most productive producers to agree on joint production process strategies. The work competition may develop to the point where associated producers will assume responsibility for the general satisfaction of all social needs through mutual cooperation.

When income starts losing importance, workers' responsibilities will be fulfilled only through past labour points. Accountability of workers will be established through mutual assessments and customer evaluations. The system enables a ramified system of assessing the production quality of goods and services. Each positive assessment of a worker, enterprise, or inhabitant of a commune received from any inhabitant, consumer association, or arbitration court will increase the total number of past labour points of a worker, enterprise, or inhabitant of a commune, thereby increasing the expression of their productive power. And vice versa, a negative assessment would burden the inhabitants, enterprises, and communes according to the degree of responsibility established directly by the population, consumer association, and arbitration courts. Sanctions will be imposed by subtracting past labour points from the received assessments and the worker's responsibility coefficient.

Such a system of valuing people's advantages and disadvantages may form natural norms for social relations, which will, to a great extent, replace the alienated normative decisions that govern social relationships through laws and regulations. Mutual assessment will establish new, unwritten rules of social relations, encompassing every aspect of social behaviour and yielding the community greater benefits and prosperity.

When the demand for work, as a manifestation of one's power, becomes more significant than the supply of jobs, individual income loses its meaning. When the population's income starts to decline, past labour points will remain as a form of the individual's guarantee to meet obligations, a factor in work competition, and a measure of the individual's existential power.

Over time, work competition could offer greater work freedom. Or, differently put, workers could, at a certain level of production development, choose work posts and working hours according to their wishes and possibilities, in agreement with other workers. This is possible through production automation using computer technology, which would replace forced and inconvenient work with suitable jobs that cater to individual, creative, and constructive approaches, thereby relaxing the work environment.

If coordination of activities without force is established and the needs are satisfied, income would lose importance. In contrast, the usable value of work as a manifestation of workers' existential needs would remain. Once work stops conditioning material remuneration and starts basing its existence on satisfaction derived from the free expression of being needs, it becomes free work and possesses direct value for itself.

Monetary assets would then no longer function to establish payment transactions. Still, they would serve as a means for society to express both individual and social needs. The money would no longer symbolize alienation separating the community, but would instead serve as a coordinator of homogeneous action in society. Then the relationship between individuals would no longer be a relation of commodities, but a relation of beings that suits the individual's natural needs.

By accepting society's natural laws, people should understand that work itself is a great value; individual-to-individual relations are an exceptional value, while goods will lose their alienated value. Values of work and the abundance of production will reduce the importance of money. One day, receiving good evaluations from others may become more important than earning money. Having desired jobs should also become more important than earning money. Today, some job positions are more attractive to people than financial compensation, but this is an exception. A developed work market will make all jobs equally desirable, and the process of disalienation might make jobs more desirable than earning money.

People should also understand that collective consumption is the most rational spending. As a result, one day, people will likely allocate all their income directly towards taxes, making all goods and services available free of charge while establishing an efficient, stable, and rational, democratically planned market economy.

In such a system, the income of all individuals, as a form of individual purchasing power, would be equal to zero through direct voting by the population. The system would then achieve free-of-charge production and consumption of commodities. This is communism, likely the most effective social system possible. This is what Karl Marx desired but could not define—a flourishing society. In such a system, individuals will discover new interests in the outer world and pursue spiritual development. In communism, people will be free to pursue their passions and indulge in activities such as work, science, philosophy, culture, the arts, sports, entertainment, and relaxation.

In such a system, all assets would be intended for collective spending. The collective spending will be established at the commune, state, and international levels by a direct vote of inhabitants. Based on what has been said so far, it can be assumed that at a certain level of societal development, each consumer will be able to plan and order the specific means of consumption. However, it is unrealistic to expect each inhabitant to determine all the necessary forms of consumption because such a list may be too detailed. Instead, each inhabitant can influence the partial and global supply of work products by the amount of money allocated to certain forms of collective consumption, based on their own experience with the supply.

The funds for collective spending can influence overall consumption in society. The amount of money would further correspond to the overall value of goods, and all products would preserve the price set by the agreement. The total amount of money and the costs of commodities will serve as an instrument for the democratic determination of production. Consumer practices will determine the framework for distributing funds. The population will make adjustments by allocating more resources to the common consumption groups that require additional support. Then, production management will assign more work to the fields of increased interest, thereby satisfying people's needs. Furthermore, each inhabitant can partially allocate any funds to the level where they will find it most beneficial. Such money will be necessary until society develops a more effective method of coordinating collective actions.

Communism enables the permanent coordination of a free system of production and distribution. The system has an infinite number of variants that can influence the social life and consciousness of individuals, enabling each person in society to achieve broad prosperity. It is also worth mentioning that the formation of a free-of-charge production and consumption system is not the primary purpose of the proposed system, but rather the discovery of genuine relationships in society that such a system enables. The system will overcome antagonism among the people due to alienated needs, values, and actions. The highest value of the proposed socio-economic system lies in its potential to create natural and harmonious social relations that will give rise to genuine needs and values.

A new kind of ethics will emerge, where the individual will no longer need to assess or be assessed by another individual. Once individuals stop creating needs by comparing themselves with others, they will become closer to their nature. They will form the kind of relations with nature and society that suit their nature. Past labour points may be the last alienated form of manifesting the individual's power, which the individual will overcome by finding the values in themselves and their environment.

Once people recognize the natural laws of humanity, they will not have to go anywhere to find what they need because all they need will be in their immediate environment—or even closer: in themselves. The most important achievement of an individual is self-realization. The more people get to know themselves, the more freedom, peace, joy, wisdom, and love they can achieve. In communism, people will have the best chance to lead a long, high-quality life.

The conclusion of the book

History has shown that authoritarian social systems produce social problems, whereas social systems that grant more rights create better societies. This should be sufficient to conclude that the full implementation of equal human rights will make the most optimal social system possible. Nevertheless, authorities prevent the dissemination of knowledge about equal human rights to maintain their social privileges. As a result,

social life has always been based on generating personal power over people instead of equal human rights. As a result, people cannot reach social prosperity.

Equal human rights may solve social problems and provide the best life possible for all. Teachers will not need to teach people how to create a good society; equal human rights will do so spontaneously, and people will love the result. This book argues that people cannot achieve more significant societal progress than by implementing equal human rights. Nothing more is needed to build a bright future for humankind, and nothing less can make it. Equal human rights are the greatest discovery of all time. Therefore, opening a public discussion about equal human rights is essential for building a bright future for humankind.