

HUMANISM

**A Philosophic-Ethical-Political-Economic Study of the
Development of the 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	16
2.2.2	Socialism	19
3	Humanism	23
3.1	Disalienation of the Commune	23
3.1.1	Basis of the Policy of Humanism	28
3.1.2	Basis of the Economy of Humanism	36
3.1.2.1	Good Capitalism	36
3.1.2.2	Good Socialism	39
3.1.2.2.1	Price of Work	49
3.1.2.2.2	Work Division	57
3.1.2.2.3	Commodity Price	67
3.1.2.2.4	Money	71
3.1.2.2.5	Working Capital	76
3.1.2.2.6	Development of the Economy	79
3.1.2.2.7	Income Distribution	84
3.1.2.2.8	Use of Real Estate	92
3.1.2.2.9	Collective Spending	96
3.2	Disalienation of Associated Communes	99
3.2.1	Pooling of the Policies	99
3.2.2	Pooling of the Economy	103
3.2.3	Association of States	107
3.3	Expectations of the New System	110

1. Analysis of the Natural State

1.1 Individual

The nature of 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 and reactions, tensions and equilibriums. The individual is a living part of nature; they possess the sensory ability, thoughtfulness, and the ability 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 needs.

The individual defines their needs through thoughts. Through thinking, the individual creates and accumulates the consciousness of the advantages and disadvantages of their relationships with nature. In different conditions, thoughts form different emotional states. When the state of nature does not suit an individual, it creates a sensory and emotional tension that concentrates energy toward finding an appropriate condition.

Individual mostly meets their needs by conscious action. The intensity of their efforts depends directly on the degree of the disadvantages. Minor disadvantages induce small action energy, while significant obstacles that question their survival accumulate the entire individual's strength in their struggle for survival. The process of activity lasts until the individual satisfies their needs.

Satisfaction of the needs brings advantages proportionate to the intensity of surpassed disadvantages. Advantages appear in the form of relaxation from the 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 are not entirely free. In its broadest sense, freedom represents a state of complete independence and does not allow the existence of needs. The individual with vital needs does not need freedom in the broadest sense. In a narrow sense, freedom should be a state that allows the satisfaction of needs because individuals who cannot meet their needs are not free. Such freedom is a condition for accomplishing the individual's subsistence and developing their abilities, powers, and cognition. Therefore, the individual can and needs to have such freedom.

Nature has unlimited power compared to the individual; however, thanks to their biological development, the individual adapts to the movements of nature 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 is based on their ability to do what

they want; however, such freedom depends on their cognition that they want what they can do.

During their lifetime, individual acquires many favourable and unfavourable sensory and emotional states arising from 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 the individual's most remarkable ability. Knowledge implies forming objective definitions of the laws of movements in nature, the definitions that, under identical conditions, form equal reactions irrespective of the degree of advantage or disadvantage that such definitions create for people. Objective definitions present the laws of the movements in nature as they are.

Knowledge gives power to the individual to meet their needs through conscious and organized work. The individual opposes the disadvantages in nature with conscious work. With their work, individuals produce the means needed for their survival and create more significant advantages. Working ability gives the individual a high power in nature.

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

The 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 brings advantages by itself to some extent so that it has some usable value as well. The individual's bright future lies in finding a job that brings more benefits in its duration because, in that way, the individual reaches more existential conveniences. Generally, such conveniences last longer and might be more intensive than those consuming work results.

By using knowledge, the individual defines the rightness of movements in nature, and the more deeply they reveal them, the more broadly they can apply their regularity. Knowledge gives the individual the power that is, in its form, unlimited to nature. The more individuals develop understanding, the higher the needs they can create and meet and the more control over the conditions forming 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 nature, develop a constructive relationship with nature, and find pleasure in connection with nature. Such an individual necessarily lives in harmony with nature.

The more individual knows, the more they meet their natural needs, the more balanced they are, the more they believe in 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, as such, can be easily recognized.

Wisdom is the highest level of knowledge. It is acquired by the experience gained by healthy, natural living. The wise individual continually satisfies their natural needs and therefore experiences significant satisfaction. They have everything they need, irrespective of the quantity and quality, and consequently, they are 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 lose importance. In other words, when 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 accomplishes a higher power in nature and a greater possibility of satisfying their natural needs. The joining of people represents a community of individuals with specific and collective needs. These needs determine social relationships.

Social relationships do not occur accidentally; they depend on social conditions. When the same social conditions permanently create identical results, they may be called the natural laws of society. This study seeks to prove that the natural laws of society will establish a good community. Now, the question arises if some rules can establish a good society, why has it 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, like how the laws of physics determine powers in nature. Understanding the laws of physics lets people live in harmony with the physical world. Likewise, understanding the natural laws of society will let people live in harmony that is impossible to obstruct. This paper elaborates on this.

Considering that society's natural laws were never defined, this study used the book "Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy" by Isaac Newton¹ 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 people tend to dominate over the weak, forming a repressive society. People of equal power respect and do not try to dominate each other, thus 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 create constructive and harmonious social relations, making people 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. But once a community recognizes the natural laws of society, they should remove perversion in society and establish constructive and harmonious social relations without exceptions.

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 of satisfied people because equal human rights have never existed.

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 allowed to everybody else, and vice versa; what is forbidden to some must be forbidden to all. This study will try to prove that establishing equal human rights is the only 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 the value. In a "society that knows," everyone respects all members of society regardless of the differences in their degree of ability or 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

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

needs forms the optimal collective needs of society, which determine the laws of the social relationship.

Equal human rights demand the responsibilities of individuals as well. Rights determine people's freedoms, while responsibilities diminish them as the people are forced to behave toward nature and society in a way that suits the community. "The society that knows" establishes the social relationship rules to reduce personal inconveniences and increase the collective conveniences for all. Such rules serve all members of society to the most significant extent possible.

Society has the same reactions to the relationship 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 takes the roads of development of society during their lifetime. A child has neither knowledge nor the ability to meet their natural needs. Parents who know how to live following their nature are satisfied and develop a love for their children. They take over ongoing care to meet the child's natural needs. Such an attitude brings warmth and joy, a prerequisite for the child's prosperity. Such people who have not been deprived in their youth later most likely become sound protagonists in society.

"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 movements in nature and educates the young members on the rights, duties, and responsibilities for their well-being in society and nature. The young who see active and satisfied adult members of "the society that knows" form a belief in a convenient future and, therefore, accepts the community's rights, duties, and responsibilities. "The society that knows" creates the education that follows the interest of the 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 interested worker gets the job. In this way, society reaches the most significant productivity and the highest values in production, while freedom in choosing jobs enables work to become a value for itself.

"The society that knows" distributes work and labour results among workers to form balanced conveniences. Such an approach builds an equal interest in workers to perform every work. Such a social attitude toward work allows the coverage of all work posts with the workers who perform their jobs following their natural needs and abilities.

Autonomous worker bears responsibility for their work through their work accomplishments. In associated labour, an irresponsible worker may inflict great inconveniences on the working collective because of connections among the work processes. Therefore "the society that knows" forms the efficient principles of accountability for the workers who fail to perform their work obligations and for behaviour unsuitable to society. Therefore, each member of such a society behaves responsibly toward nature, community, work, and work results. By being aware of their responsibility, they form the work needs following their nature and the possibility of realization. Such an orientation is a precondition for satisfying needs and the basis of a constructive orientation of society.

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 a higher value brings greater conveniences to society and thus deserves a higher reward in the share of collective work products. The distribution of work results among the workers is also performed according to the degree of inconvenience during the work. A more inconvenient work duty requires a 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 guaranteeing the existence of the entire population, regardless of whether they participate directly in the production. In this way, society develops an orientation that an individual is valuable to an individual. Solidarity provides products intended for individual consumption to everyone who needs it. It establishes social stability and helps the development of new forces in society that reproduce such orientation.

A society that continually satisfies its needs is satisfied, mighty, and noble. A community with generous members helps each other and develops unity, bringing prosperity. It believes in its force and is confident in reaching well-being. The consequence of such belief results in love appearing among the members of society, social equilibrium and harmony with nature.

In such a society, each member helps the development of every individual, as in this way, they also contribute to their 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 limitation of their knowledge and their impotence before nature. The lack of knowledge about nature brings sensorial and emotional inconveniences to 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 the fear coming from the individual's insufficient knowledge and impotence 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 where they are objectively unable to surpass it, they then form the 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 brings quickly and easily 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 the sources in each moment of life in search of greater conveniences. 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, the individual adopts nature to the determinations that suit them the best. 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, which creates alienated respect toward the powers in 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 the individual alienates from their nature when they cannot accept the limitations of their nature. Individuals who cannot accept their weakness where they objectively cannot surpass it create a subjective vision of reality that alienates them from objective reality.

Subjectivity creates alienation. However, a subjective vision also has 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 build total naturalness, representing an ideal of the individual's 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 accurate, does not have to come necessarily in direct conflict with natural powers and releases the individual from the inconvenient 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 nature of the origin of such needs. Naturally, the individual cannot surpass the power of nature.

Since alienated needs cannot accomplish satisfaction, they are insatiable as a general rule. Such alienation develops egoistic features of the character and manifests in greed, ambition, infatuation, and fanaticism in the individual's alienated interest. Alienated needs may objectively be entirely unnecessary to the individual's nature; however, they create in their alienated consciousness great importance. They then direct the individual to act contrary to their nature.

Suppose the individual's alienated consciousness can find an illusory confirmation for their alienated power. In that case, the individual then develops a higher degree of subjectivism that creates a narcissistic feature of the character. Narcissism significantly represses and underestimates the objective, unknown, unacceptable reality and glorifies the alienated vision of one's power in nature, which creates a grand illusion of living conveniences. When individuals, by their subjective perception, define their power far more significantly than they can objectively have, they encounter contradiction in real life, which brings tensions and inconveniences. Objectively, narcissistic needs are unnecessary to the individual's nature; however, they become a precondition for ensuring existence in their subjective consciousness. Hence, such an individual invests high energy in fighting for alienated survival.

The more the individual is alienated from their nature, the less they can satisfy their needs and thus find relaxation and conveniences. The alienated individual can be recognized by the fact that they are almost permanently under stress; they are more

nervous than easy-going; they are more bad-tempered than satisfied, and they are more depressed than happy no matter what their accomplishments are. The individual's nature cannot endure permanent tension and inconvenience. Therefore, they inadvertently get perverted and find their way out from 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 conveniences in love, in a constructive attitude toward nature, the alienated individual finds illusory conveniences and relaxation in hatred and destructive attitudes toward nature. To such an individual, destruction becomes a need. The destructive tension that then appears may make the individual unable to perceive the objective causes of their inconveniences.

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 acquires features that range from passivity before natural forces, even where the individual has the power to overcome them, to the 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 need to escape from 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, in that way, find relaxation from the inconvenient tension.

Suppose an alienated individual underestimates the power of nature with their subjective vision. In that case, they find a way out from 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, false human greatness, gets hurt. Depending on the degree of impotence and the lack of respect toward nature, destructiveness manifests in the form of aggression that may develop toward the act of destroying nature.

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 push them to destruction. The alienated individual lives a biologically inconvenient life.

This book is about alienation, but what would that be in one sentence? Alienation is a state where 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 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 accomplish more significant benefits. An individual becomes aware of their power by comparing themselves with other individuals. This study shows that this act is alienated from human nature and harmful to oneself and society. But people have always compared themselves to others, and society has no choice but to accept such a situation until it finds an orientation that will overcome it.

The alienated individual can easily use their power to achieve superiority over others. Successful individuals exercise greater rights than others, impose their wills upon society or, in short, exercise power in society.

Power brings great-alienated conveniences, so people struggle to accomplish their authority 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 by using physical force and by the proclamation of ideologies. They independently establish the state order, laws, regulations, and rules for social relations. They have irrefutable legislative, executive and judiciary power in the state. These are enormous privileges that bring them considerable advantages in society. Dictators secure their rights and benefits by proclaiming ideologies.

Ideologies are a system of ideas and ideals that establish the basis of the organization of society. Dictators use ideologies to manipulate society and thus secure power in society. Ideologies mostly form 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 problems in society. Thus, ideologies become the foundation of the alienation of society. 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 takes alienated knowledge, it becomes a significant burden that hinders the development of society.

Under the impact of ideologies, followers respect dictators on a lasting basis, with great-alienated respect and awe. Such a society may be highly stable and homogenous. The characteristic of the relationship between the authorities and followers is that of supplements in the impotence, which mutually brings a great alienated power that can accomplish impressive acts, high stability in the society and illusory conveniences. Due to the strong links, the relationship between the authorities and followers may give an impression of love; 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 route toward accomplishing significant benefits, a dictator exploits society. Dictators take freedom from followers 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 in greater exploitation of society. Naturally, greater exploitation cannot satisfy alienated needs since they are generally insatiable. Such needs create an inconvenient tension that the individual cannot get rid of naturally. Then, the individual enjoys the perversion of their natural needs. In such circumstances, the authorities find satisfaction in a violent relationship with the followers.

If alienation in society is more significant, the followers find convenience in sacrificing in favour of the dictator, which inevitably develops the disease of the community. In a markedly authoritative society, a productive activity cannot bring benefits. Only illusory benefits can be accomplished; the community lives a biologically inconvenient life.

Autocrats never find the sources of inconvenience in their attitude regarding society. Instead, they transfer them to their subordinates, and even more, it suits them to pass them on to other social groups. False causes of the inconveniences and the impotence of society to accomplish benefits develop a group-narcissistic form of alienation.

Such orientation glorifies one's social group in relationship with others. As such a presentation is false, it quickly develops intolerance concerning other societies, creating nationalism, chauvinism, racism, fascism, and other inconvenient phenomena. Combined with the sizeable destructive energy of the non-satisfied alienated society, such phenomena form a programme for aggression and all social conflicts. Non-satisfied society finds illusory liberation from the inconvenient tension and inconveniences in the superiority accomplished by destruction. As group narcissism develops subjectivity to the extreme, it overvalues the potency of its group. Thus, it overlooks the objective powers surrounding the group, which finishes catastrophically for one's social group.

The less social knowledge, the greater the authoritativeness it creates, and alienation is higher; the less satisfied the natural needs in the society, the stronger the need for destruction in society, and thus the destruction of the society and social accomplishments is more significant. Destructiveness in society lasts until the elimination of the destructive needs of the protagonists. Such a society can hardly comprehend the way of 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 conveniences. Maintaining their power in the alienated consciousness of the dictator equates with the 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 oppose the nature of society, tension develops that forces it to rebel against the power because there are limits "the society that knows" cannot tolerate. Society then directs its energy toward toppling dictators and their ideologies. Suppose new forces sufficiently develop in the community, and the dictator gets lulled into its potency; the new forces take over control and form new rules of social behaviours that benefit society.

Democracy

Society, aware of the problems that the autocratic form of power brings, peacefully forms social relations through mutual concessions made by both the authorities and the people. In such a society, the authoritarian power accepts to provide significant freedoms and fundamental rights to the subordinate members. In turn, the dictatorial regime gets compensatory concessions in some other forms of conveniences that are proportional to the benefits of the ruling.

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, holdings and even lives.

Since Ancient times, society has become aware of the importance of public participation in decision-making processes regarding issues of common interest. This awareness initiated the development of the roots of democracy. An ideal form of democracy should be carried out by a mutual agreement of all community members on the rules for collective action until a consensus is established. Unfortunately, reaching a consensus is often challenging because of the highly variable interests of people. People can hardly agree on something and can never agree on everything. On top of this, every society brings a vast number of decisions that all people cannot decide on, either due to lack of interest, knowledge, or time. In large social communities such as a state, an equal agreement on joint action cannot be achieved due to a large number of entities with a large number of different needs. Therefore, an ideal form of democracy based on the mutual agreement of people at the state level is impossible to achieve.

Society has tried to solve such problems through representative democracy. In such a democracy, the people do not participate directly in decision-making processes but choose a party whose programs reflect their interests. The freely organized individuals in the parties form the agenda of social relations and proclaim them to society. The voters in elections elect the plan that offers them the most significant benefits. The party that gets the most votes in the polls takes power in society. Such election of power is well known today by the name of Liberal democracy.

The governments elected through a multiparty system try to set and carry out the rules for social activity that suit society to the most significant extent possible. The government that fails to meet the needs of the people loses people's support and, consequently, loses power in the next election. The multiparty form of reaching power ensures a peaceful change of authorities without destructive phenomena in society, which is a significant advantage of the system.

Such a democracy has many shortcomings. An elected government usually has no desire to meet the needs of those who did not vote for them, which leaves them dissatisfied. The significant deficiency of the multiparty system lies in the fact that successful parties mainly follow the interests of influential people. In the capitalism of the developed world, big donors finance significant parties and thus influence their decision-making. Politicians come and go and are therefore highly inclined to corruption. They may be corrupted by an attractive work post, career, earning, or friendship. In an immoral society, corruption can take the form of recognition, and in such circumstances, almost nobody can oppose it. In this way, influential rich people cunningly impose their interests also on traditionally leftist worker parties. As a result, practically no significant party would support the claims of the poor people deprived of their rights.

If some politician tries to oppose the interests of the rich, they encounter obstacles everywhere. The rich control allegedly free mass media in the developed world and

advocate their interests. Such mass media will accuse the disobedient politician of not doing their job well, find some sin, and intrigue. Politicians who oppose the rich have to give up or end their careers. Regardless of the public interest involved in the programmes of influential parties, they will, in the end, pursue the policy in favour of the rich.

With the help of political parties, wealthy owners of capital have created a political system where they have control over society. They try to bring all influential factors into a community under their control, making their best effort not to leave anything to chance. The system is glorified through education, work, culture, mass media, social entertainment, sport, etc. When they do not like something, such as the philosophy presented in this book, it does not have access to the media, politics, science, and, consequently, the people.

Since the "society that does not know" is easily convinced, it accepts the suggested alienated determinations of the capitalist system. In such a society, a person has no choice but to accept the alienated rules imposed by wealthy people. Such rules determine the opinion and actions of people. Under the influence of enormous subtle propaganda, an individual accepts that what in society is good, funny, beautiful, tasty, etc. They become what society expects them to be and not what they need to be by their nature. Besides, they often do not have other choices because the alienated society rejects members who do not accept the adopted forms of thinking and acting. The individual passes through studious brainwashing practically throughout their lifetime, and, in the end, they do not critique the correctness of the system in which they live. Such an individual elects, as a rule, the parties that support the programmes of the wealthy owners of capital and the circle of the democratic farce thus close.

There is no need for more proof that liberal democracy is undemocratic because it represents a covert dictatorship. Thus, in the multi-party system, actual decision-making is alienated from the people, contributing to society's alienation. An individual does not influence forming of the rules of joint action. An individual remains powerless.

Socialism has also established a representative democracy. In socialism, the people elect delegates representing their needs in the assemblies. They are obliged to represent their electoral base's interests in forming the rules of social behaviour in administrative bodies at all levels.

The delegate system of decision-making on joint action of society requires a broad discussion of every problem in every segment of society. Decisions are made and then implemented through delegates to administrative bodies that form the legislative, executive and judicial branches. In that way, a social order should be created that optimally satisfies social needs.

There have been attempts in history to create a democratic delegate system. Still, there have always been problems with the difficulty of reconciling the different interests of many entities with the capabilities of society and, of course, the need for authority to

exercise power over society. So, such attempts failed, and the authorities regained power in society. Delegates no longer forwarded the needs of the people to the government but vice versa; they sent the government's directives to the people. Thus, socialism has become nothing but a dictatorship that hides behind democracy.

The practice has shown that the representative form of democracy is not just. It is rather a fraud than the demonstration of the power of 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? That democracy cannot be developed? Scholars of social sciences do not see a solution to the problem of democracy and cannot establish any consensus on how a developed democracy should look. Establishing a developed form of democracy requires discovering a new pathway to implement people's will effectively. To reach such a way, one needs to think outside the box.

Humankind, throughout its history, has undergone a multitude of authoritarian and democratic revolutions. The interaction has improved society in two systems that exist today. The first is capitalism, which dominates the world, and then 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 some 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. The father of the modern capitalist economy is Adam Smith. He presented the market economy of capitalism as the "invisible hand," which leads private producers to promote the public interest through implementing self-interest. The principle inherent in the commodity market is that consumers freely purchase the goods that suit them best, forcing producers to try to produce more suitable commodities. Thus, society achieves great purchasing benefits.

Capital owners are forced to responsibly direct their production because they must cover any failure in production with their capital. Workers are forced to work responsibly or otherwise; they lose their jobs. The capitalistic form of production creates systemic responsibility that achieves high productivity. The great technological discoveries of the history of humankind, such as the steam engine, electricity and information technology, always brought along an enormous rise in productivity for the economy, which increased consumption substantially. Higher productivity brings higher profits to producers, who purchase more, and the process grows progressively. The economy then experiences an expansion in production. When production develops, strong demand for a skilled labour force also emerges. If the labour market exceeds its supply,

the workers may choose the work posts that bring them more conveniences and demand adequate wages. As a result, society generally prospers in economic terms.

However, capitalism also has its very dark side. When the demand for labour becomes less than the supply, workers must accept poorly paid wages to earn a living. Then employers underpay workers so they can make more profit. This creates injustice in the production process, known as the exploitation of workers. In capitalism, jobs are almost always more in demand than workers, which ensures the permanent exploitation of workers. This is the source of great problems in capitalism.

When workers do not have enough purchasing power, they cannot buy enough goods. Reduced demand for labour products brings problems to the economy because it makes it harder to sell its products. If the economy fails to find production demand, it must reduce productivity to avoid losses. Then the economy experiences a recession. A recession in a market economy results in a reduction in corporate profits. Insufficiently productive companies cannot secure their economic existence, resulting in bankruptcy. In a production recession, workers lose their jobs and do not earn money. The less workers earn, the lower the purchasing power of society, so the demand for labour products decreases, which leads to a more significant recession.

During the recession of a market economy, the differences appearing in the distribution of conveniences in society are much more significant than those that the community aspiring for its prosperity should allow. On one side are people without fundamental human rights to ensure economic survival and on the other side are wealthy people who have much more than they objectively need. Therefore, it is not a sound basis for a promising future.

The market economy of capitalism does not have sufficient control over transitions between expansion and recession in production. The market solves these disorders by establishing a painful balance where the disempowered workers suffer the most. The market economy of capitalism cannot provide stable employment for workers, steady production, or distribution. Therefore, it cannot achieve a stable society.

The winners of the free market get richer while the losers fail. With the help of the new wealth, the winners build greater production power and suppress more companies from the market. Thus, large corporations take over the market, and small companies lose market share. The owners of corporations become increasingly wealthy while the people become poorer and poorer.

To stimulate the working activity of citizens from which capitalists draw benefits, they have suppressed the principles of cooperation among the people and imposed a competition system. This results in fear for survival and egotism, in which an individual becomes a wolf to another individual. Everyone fights for survival. Consequently, it destroys good social relationships practically in all fields of social behaviour.

Capitalist propaganda propagates the system of liberal capitalism as a system that offers equal opportunity to everybody. This is not true since the rich hold a markedly privileged position in any respect. Privileges are based on substantial capital that helps them push the competition away. The system is ruthless towards the losers, which can be seen well in the example of the United States of America. The United States of America is the wealthiest country globally. However, this state has enormous social problems

People work hard for low wages and constantly fear losing their job. Generally, they do not have adequate health insurance because it is costly. About 20% of the citizens of the US do not have any health insurance. In 1993, a worker with a minimum wage income 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.

The enormous social differences develop 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. It is a matter of nearly 5 million people. Therefore, one cannot speak of criminal problems but about the political problem of the unhealthy 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 the most alienated country globally, full of stress, patients with psychological diseases, a state with a high rate of alcoholism, drug addiction and crime; the land of broken marriages, loners, and eccentric people. Annually one in ten thousand inhabitants of the USA commits suicide. The information provided is found in the book "Dirty Truths" by Michael Parenti.²

There is no visible way out of the problem of capitalism. This is because wealthy people suppress the knowledge needed to improve society. This repression is organized through the media, politics, and education system. The main subject in all schools is learning obedience to authorities. Through education, students learn that capitalism is the most prosperous social system, so they do not try to change it but instead try their best to adapt to the imposed goals of capitalism. Thus education becomes the foundation of the alienation of society. Alienated people are prevented from finding a good life.

Capitalism has internal contradictions that constantly drag it into crises. Today one can witness extreme economic disparities among countries and people. This outlines significant problems in the future, starting with crime and uncontrolled migration to all kinds of wars. Moreover, capitalism is built on massive production, which wastes our natural resources senselessly. The wasteful spending of natural resources inevitably

² Michael Parenti, *Dirty Truths*, <http://www.michaelparenti.org/DirtyTruths.html>

leads people to fight for economic survival. If something does not significantly 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 the development of society. 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 good capitalism that will be a turning point in the development of society. Good capitalism must contribute to the development of equal rights among people. It will shorten the working hours of workers to let all people have the right to work. Unemployment elimination will increase workers' demand, making them earn more money. 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 the introduction of cooperation between workers, companies and states. The latter is an impossible task for capitalism, which means that radical changes in the political and economic system are necessary for achieving 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 contradictions³. His principles for building communism were a visionary work of a genius. But he also made mistakes. Karl Marx is an authority in social sciences, and without pointing to his mistakes, it would be hard to build a better society.

Karl Marx correctly defined the exploitation of workers by analyzing the surplus value of work. However, Marx did not specify what salary workers objectively need to earn, not to be exploited, because it is impossible to determine by any observation or calculation. Only workers' satisfaction with salaries may eliminate exploitation, which can be achieved by a fair market where jobs and workers are equally demanded. However, Karl Marx believed that economic equality is the only justifiable system, which implies that all jobs should be equally valued, making the salaries uniform until, according to him, workers could consume goods as much as they want.

Marx thought the market economy caused workers' exploitation, so he proposed eliminating the market and replacing it with a production organized by workers. In *The Communist Manifesto*, he introduced the slogan, "proletarians of the world unite," to control production and organize 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 the production to satisfy their needs.

³ 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 to achieve such a goal were unsuccessful. Karl Marx named the first production phase under social ownership of the means of production “the lower stage of communism.” Vladimir Ilyich Lenin established the production principle of the lower stage of communism as “*from each according to his ability, to each according to his work*,”⁴ which later Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin named socialism. Socialism was supposed to release workers from capitalist exploitation and create a just society.

Considering that capitalists would never let workers decide about their capital, Karl Marx proposed in *The Communist Manifesto* a revolutionary takeover of private properties as the solution to build a good society⁵. He justified revolution and the confiscation of private property because capitalists had made their capital on exploiting workers, which is generally accurate to a great extent. Nevertheless, if some people invest years constructing machines to replace many workers, should they not earn more than other workers? Marxian socialists have not found it acceptable, advocating for the equality of people. However, wage inequality should be a philosophical problem, and a good solution should be found democratically.

Karl Marx did not define the term revolution, so some Marxian philosophers questioned his violent intentions even in the *Communist Manifesto*⁶. Still, they have never explained how peacefully the socialist revolution can be performed. This book defines a peaceful socialist revolution for the first time. Marxian revolutionaries have been building socialism only by using force. Although violent revolutions may replace a particular social injustice, they have always been replaced with a new kind. 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 chances for building 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 practically denied the value of past work, which opened a new problem. In capitalism, the owners of capital pay responsibility for the production with their capital, 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 not had a successful method for paying workers' responsibility in production processes. Furthermore, Marx knew that removing the market economy removes productivity indicators, so he called

⁴⁴ Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov, Lenin, *The State and Revolution* (New Delhi: Bahri Publication, 2017)

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

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

upon worker conscience to replace it. Marx tried to impose responsible production by calling on the conscience of workers.

Karl Marx believed that a highly developed human conscience would be capable of providing a responsible society, and he was right about this. 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. Criminals would always find an excuse for whatever crime they commit. Therefore, calling for the conscience of non-conscious people is illusory. Only the freedom of responsible people may form peoples' 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 follow people's needs was doomed from the beginning because no economy could satisfy the needs 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 the case of ideal democracy, people can hardly agree on anything. Workers have never had efficient control of production through their "dictatorship." The most developed self-management production was established in socialist Yugoslavia, where production decisions were based on workers' approval in the worker councils. In practice, such decision-making was time-consuming, and if production failed, the decisions made by workers relieved managers of their responsibilities. "It deteriorated production efficiency and led to economic disaster⁷." There is no better production choice but to select the best workers, including managers, for every work post, letting them freely produce the best they can while making them highly responsible to society for whatever they do. This book presents such an economy.

Marx's idea of a democratically planned economy was noble and correct, but he did not have any evidence based on a previous model that it could work, nor an idea of how it could work. Unfortunately, Marxists still do not have it. Socialism has had a big problem determining how to establish a social policy to satisfy 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 make such an economy produce 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 they needed to feed people. They were relatively successful in planning the needs of the state. They were capable of developing science. However, the individual needs of people were barely considered because socialist leaders could not even gather them. The authorities have also had difficulties managing more complex production processes from one center. As a result, people were not hungry, but their material needs were less satisfied than in capitalism. 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 he accepted from Adam Smith and David Ricardo and adapted it to his 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 in producing commodities equally forms the commodities' objective cost. This was the starting point of Marx's philosophy of equality among people, which is supposed to eliminate workers' exploitation.

However, such a cost of commodities cannot objectively represent the labour value because Marx's definition does not differentiate between productive and non-productive work, responsible and irresponsible work, and challenging and easy work. Karl Marx probably assumed that the equality of workers would involve their optimal effort in producing commodities, but it did not happen.

Socialism did work hard to bring economic justice to society. It eliminated unemployment by providing the necessary right to work to all. Everyone got a job even though their work was not demanded enough in their communities. Socialists balanced salaries regardless of work positions, productivity, efforts, and responsibilities, which built a more harmonious society than capitalism could establish. However, a balanced wage gap in socialism was not motivating for work. The humanist ideology of socialism had protected work positions that, to some extent, contributed to the irresponsibility of workers. The socialist authorities have not had another choice but to increase bureaucracy and decrease workers' incentives, including that of managers. Thus the socialist economy obstructed its possibility of development.

Another challenge for a centrally planned economy is that production has little to do with the market's 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.

Finally, socialism did not destroy classes as Marx desired. Political leaders were high-class citizens. They did not need salaries much because they were privileged and got

most of what they needed for free. People did not fight to earn more money but tried to get as close as possible to the political elite because it gave them privileged power in society. This brought corruption with all its negative phenomena, which damaged socialism.

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, abandoned the Marxist planned economy in 1978, and accepted the regulated market economy. From that moment, it has become the fastest-growing economy globally, threatening to take the number one place. This should prove the shortcomings of the Marxian economy.

Socialism was created as a noble attempt to form human society, but it did not work. 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 the workers' salaries and reduce or eliminate the exploitation of workers? Marx most likely gave up on it because he observed how hard it was to make any agreement between employers and workers. However, reducing or eliminating the exploitation through shorter work hours should have been thoroughly presented to people no matter how hard it was to implement it. Today, struggling for shorter work hours is incomparably simpler and more rational than igniting violent revolutions and completely changing the socioeconomic system.

Karl Marx suggested that alienation in production processes should be eliminated through workers' cooperation and control of production processes, and he was correct. Still, no method to achieve such a goal has been successfully created. The political Left has tried to confront capitalism by developing cooperatives that practice the collaboration of workers in decision-making processes. Realizing this idea is problematic because workers have different needs, so reaching agreements about production matters is challenging. 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; the history of authoritative, imposed and, therefore, alienated categories of values, 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 brought new forms of social relations, which hide an age-old need for an individual to rule over an individual. Today, most presidents swear about democracy, but in reality, they successfully avoid it as much as possible because they like to keep power in their own hands. Most priests pray to God that Jesus is coming soon, but in reality, they would want much more to retain the right to interpret Jesus's words the way it suits them best. Most company owners swear about the free market but try hard to create a monopoly for themselves. Most teachers are convinced that they love to spread knowledge to students, but they prefer to rule over the students with their acquired knowledge. Most parents swear to God about their love for their children, but in reality, they love the power over their children. The situation almost everywhere follows the pattern of these samples. All people incline toward privileges. The problem is that privileges are evil for people and society as a whole.

There is no doubt that all these authorities suppress people at every moment of their lives. Once the individuals become aware of themselves in such a society, they are already under the influences of alienated generations and are forced to accept the alienated world as the other world they do not see. If individuals try to overcome the inconveniences that stem from alienation, it would be hard for them to reach any good result. The obstacles of the alienated society made them think through the alienated premises of comprehending the causes of the inconveniences. After all, the alienation has taken their ability to recognize their natural needs.

Due to the lack of objective knowledge, the alienated society is subject to a random selection of determinations that stem from the alienated visions of conveniences. Such a society inclines toward idolatry, fetishism, and a superficial outlook on life. Individuals in an alienated society base their own beliefs in well-being based on alienated assumptions and, sooner or later, experience disappointment. They contradict their nature, which brings them great inconveniences. When individuals' alienated needs come across obstacles in real life, their vision of survival in their alienated consciousness is endangered. Then the same doubt in the correctness of their orientation brings tension that pushes them to strive for the alienated vision of survival. Such a struggle may, without objective reasons, endanger other people.

The endangering of the alienated needs of individuals brings along aggression by 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 blindly, favouring their impotence and problems.

The individual may suppress their natural needs if external forces are too strong. Such a suppression induces non-defined 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 medicaments.

The more the individual is alienated from their nature, the higher the deviations of their personality are. Also, contradictions in the individual become more significant, 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 non-satisfied 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 the present-day alienated society, where subjective, erroneous categories of values are created, the effect is the opposite. The alienated individual lives with the principle of their negation; they act 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 presented analysis may conclude that all inconvenient social phenomena arise from the individual's inability or lack of knowledge and alienation originating from authoritative suppression. In this connection, one can conclude that all socially positive phenomena may arise from knowledge acquired in natural life based on the freedom and equality of all individuals because the individual's productive power may develop only in this way.

The individual's power over others is undoubtedly the main problem of today's society. People must reject the authorities and subjective knowledge they imposed and establish equal human rights to gain objective knowledge. Society should form a system able to exist productively in the freedom and equality of all its members without the authorities and their ideologies. It would need to allow each individual to acquire knowledge through their practice. An individual can hardly form an accurate idea about the laws of nature because autonomy directs them toward subjective determinations and, consequently, towards alienation. Society, as a gathering of subjective individuals, might form a more objective vision of reality through the practice of equal rights among the members of society. Equal human rights are essential for learning the natural laws and objective categories of values. This will allow individuals and society to come closer to their nature and prosperity.

Authorities have always strongly opposed the establishment of equal human rights. However, people also fiercely resisted the authorities and thus managed to increase 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 developed their ability to prevent the development of human society. On the way to avoiding equal human rights and retaining power and privileges in society, they have transformed into the elite that, through enormous financial power, strongly influences and controls the media, science, and politics, which govern the people. They still have dictatorial control in society, which is less visible but 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, while people cannot do so to presidents. Employers may fire employees, which increases unemployment, while workers cannot lower unemployment to get their jobs back. 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. But there is no such thing as somewhat equal human rights because such rights are unequal. Unequal human rights form privileged authorities who prevent the establishment of a prosperous society. Therefore, the lack of equal human rights should be considered the leading cause of societal problems.

Throughout the history of humankind, authorities have managed to alienate social scientists from the cause of social problems. The foundation of social sciences is still based on knowledge 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 did not develop much from dictatorial times. Under the influence and pressure of authorities, social sciences have not recognized the natural laws of society. As a result, social scientists cannot solve the problems of society. They give the impression that natural social laws cannot be defined due to the complexity of social relations. They do not even believe that it is possible to create a good society.

This paper suggests that social knowledge created by authorities cannot build a good society. It already would if it could. Also, social learning built on the alienation authorities impose cannot be correct. A good community requires creating new social knowledge based on equal human rights. People with equal rights may develop more objective social understanding than subjective authorities. Equal human rights are opposite to hierarchical relationships and have different logic and results. Also, this paper claims that equal human rights may permanently prevent power-hungry authorities from oppressing people. Thus, building equal human rights is essential for creating a bright 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 like to lose control by implementing equal human rights. Social scientists are reluctant to accept the knowledge necessary for equal human rights implementation because it confronts their acquired knowledge. As a result, politicians, media, social sciences and the rich prevent equal human rights. Thus, they block the bright future for humankind. This book fights back by presenting the importance of equal human rights.

Society has interrupted the equal right to work by allowing the existence of unemployment. Unemployed people must accept poorly paid jobs to feed themselves. It causes the exploitation of workers. Equal human rights are supposed to bring justice to the economy by shortening work hours until unemployment is removed. 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 solve today's socioeconomic problems and build good capitalism.

Equal human rights are supposed to improve the economy significantly. One day, every worker will be able to work at every public work post 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 wage. It is nothing but a developed work market open at all times. Of course, such an economy cannot be established soon because it will require a lot of development before people embrace it. But once people establish it, the burdens and benefits of a 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 economic improvement opportunity to build good socialism.

Finally, equal human rights should mean that all people have equal legislative, judicial, and executive powers. Everyone should be given equal rights to judge other people's actions. Each positive evaluation should bring a small award to the assessed person, and each negative evaluation should result in a small punishment. Such a policy would make everyone work hard to please others and avoid hurting anybody. This right of people will form a good society. The equal evaluating power among people presents a new form of democracy, and the 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.

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

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 among people and democracy that really gives power to people will seize power from the authorities and create a sound and sane society. This book presents how such a society can be built. 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 able to exist relatively autonomously or the biggest society that offers a good insight into joint activities. It may be assumed that a commune has from 100,000 to 1,000,000 inhabitants. Still, it may also relate to a small community with several people associated on a regional basis up to, theoretically, associated people of the entire world.

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 allow autonomy of the commune to the extent that will enable the optimal development of the community. The commune organizes its internal order. The commune has an administration consisting of a legislative assembly, a judicial and an executive body. 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. In all democratic systems, there is a big problem in protecting the interests of weak individuals from dominant people in everyday life. In today's alienated society, man can create a mass of inconveniences for man for which he is not responsible to anyone, making unfavourable changes in the community. In this way, inconvenient tensions are created in society. This phenomenon is almost legalized, as one can see in everyday life. In the "developed" West, individuals seek a job by trying to sell themselves. Significant servility to the employer is expected at work; otherwise, the worker may lose their jobs. As a consumer, the individual is exposed to aggressive propaganda. In daily life, individuals have almost no protection against offences, tricks or other forms of behaviour that bother them.

The way out lies in equal human rights. The future of democracy must give people equal rights, which means equal power in society. It will solve society's problems. The future of democracy will no longer be based primarily on voting for the people but on evaluating the people's actions. Individuals will be given equal and independent legislative, judicial and executive powers to judge others. A little power in the hands of

individuals may incentivize people to comply with the interests of others in the best possible way. This kind of democracy will be simple, quick, and efficient. It will completely change the foundation of social policy and build a good society.

Let people allow everyone who, within the scope of their activity, can affect others in any way to do it freely upon their will. People do not even have many choices because they cannot interfere with the freedom of activities of presidents, doctors and mechanics, or any other person, nor do they have the ability, the time, nor the right, not even the desire, to do so. However, all these people may create advantages and disadvantages for members of society through their actions. People can sense whether or not the activities of a president, doctor, mechanic, or any other person, bring some advantages or disadvantages to them. And according to it, individuals should have the right to award a person who creates advantages for them and punish someone who produces disadvantages for them. Such a right would direct all people to perform the most significant benefits and the least damage to others. Such an orientation of society would indeed follow the people's will in the best possible way and, therefore, would present a developed democracy.

This study claims that equal rights of people are the only proper orientation of society. Let each person get the same power to negatively evaluate, let's say, three individuals who hurt them the most in any month and positively assess three individuals who create 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 negatively evaluate them. On the other hand, if a friend, teacher, and singer, produce the most significant benefits to a person, they will normally positively assess them. 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 that individuals receive from others could be publicly presented on the Internet. Counting these evaluations will show everyone how appreciated they are in society. These evaluations will become at least as important to people as page visits, likes, and followers are important 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 creating the most significant advantages for the community and diminishing or abolishing all disadvantages. This will create a good society.

In this manner, all people will become equal authorities with little direct power in society. Given that all people will have equal rights and the power to give their awards and punishments to others independently of any written rules, such a democracy will present anarchy. That is the reason why this evaluation system is named democratic anarchy.

Democratic anarchy is, in fact, a fair marketplace of human behaviour in which individuals have equal power to present good people just as customers portray good products by purchasing them. Such an assessment will objectively show positive

people, just as the commodity market indicates the quality of goods. However, democratic anarchy will be more valuable than the commodity market because it directly presents problematic people, while the commodity market cannot directly point to problematic commodities. It will also be more objective than the commodity market because everyone will have the same power of evaluation. Democratic anarchy will contribute to the improvement of society more than the commodity market can contribute to the advancement of goods.

People will get direct power in society for the first time in the history of humankind. Such power will eliminate uncontrolled or insufficiently controlled individual power originating in privileged social status. People should understand that the privileged positions of individuals are the basis of problems for society. The lack of equal human rights is why humanity was never good. Democratic anarchy would direct each member of the community to respect other people. People will become values to all people. People will be considered equal for the first time, resulting in harmonious and constructive social relations.

Everyone will judge other people freely. Many people complain that individuals might evaluate other people maliciously because of spite or envy. The answer is that such a risk exists, but an individual assessment cannot cause significant harm to anyone. The damage an individual can cause is insignificant compared to state authorities because they can force the entire country in the wrong direction. In the proposed system, such authorities would get a large number of negative evaluations from people, which through minor regulation, could prevent them from producing evil as dictators did throughout history. Is it worthwhile to allow individuals to judge others wrongly if such “trials” would prevent major destructions in society?

However, people performing ill-placed evaluations could not hide their counterproductive orientation. They would show it by their actions, making them receive a negative societal assessment to a greater extent. This will force them to pay more attention to getting to know themselves and find a way to achieve a constructive orientation. Each individual may bring conveniences and inconveniences to society through their activity. Therefore, each individual will get positive and negative grades, which the community must accept. However, the people who create a more significant number of inconveniences to society would get negative evaluations from more people. On a longer-term basis, it will force them to change their behaviour.

The evaluation system is already in place in societies where public opinion is sought about the success of some actions. However, such an assessment does not have direct power. The community would need a lot of courage and wisdom to adopt such a measure, but it will realize huge benefits.

Something similar to democratic anarchy was already implemented on YouTube, where people can vote for songs or videos with a “like” or “dislike.” No more than 5% of people evaluated songs or videos inappropriately, which means that 95% of people valued the authors of these videos fairly. This suggests that democratic anarchy will serve society

properly or even better than YouTube because people will have limited evaluation rights and will not spend the evaluations irrationally. They will most likely evaluate other people honestly because they will feel honoured by having direct power in society.

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

For those still suspicious about democratic anarchy, it may first be implemented by presenting the evaluations only to the evaluated people themselves and not to anybody else. This would be like people listening to anonymous gossip about themselves, which everyone is interested in. As a result, most people will try to improve their social behaviour. However, the secret results of the evaluation will not stop the worst people from continuing bad behaviour. Then, the community may decide to discourage the wrongdoers by democratic acceptance of the full implementation of democratic anarchy. And even then, if people receive more favourable than unfavourable evaluations, they may keep the result a secret from others. If the total assessment is negative, it will be visible to everyone, forcing negatively evaluated people to improve their behaviour.

Many people, including university professors, have criticized democratic anarchy, saying people cannot judge others objectively. The answer to them is that objectivity is desirable but not essential. Besides, voters do not need to be clever or educated to have the right to vote, so why should this be the case in democratic anarchy? People will judge others the way they feel, and everyone will be obliged to consider their actions' consequences on others. This is what is needed for creating a good society. Furthermore, by adopting democratic anarchy, people will appreciate other people, bringing considerable benefits to the community.

But the question remains: To what extent can each person evaluate the causes of benefits and troubles objectively, and therefore, how competent are they to evaluate the actions of another person? People are subjective, so that they may misjudge people with their grades. The answer is: In the direct relationship between people, every person should make decisions as they experience them, and society is obliged to respect every person's sensory and emotional states, no matter how subjective they are. Nevertheless, a system that supports equal human rights will develop objectivity in the community. An orientation that respects every individual in society is the only correct one. People who receive negative grades will have to learn what is wrong with them, which will teach them to form objective criteria for valorizing the benefits and disadvantages of acting in society. As a set of subjective members, humanity will learn objectivity through shared practice.

Objectivity will remove conflicts in society. In the future, people will probably only give and receive good evaluations and then they will know that 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, due to the influences, authorities have been imposing throughout the history of humanity, people hesitate even to discuss democratic anarchy.

Once democratic anarchy is accepted by society, it will not give much power to individuals, but their collective evaluations will have enormous power. A person receiving many negative assessments would try harder to avoid doing anything inconvenient to others. Moreover, the people who receive inadequate evaluations will never know who has evaluated them negatively, so they will try to improve their behaviour towards everyone. As a result, bullies will not exist at school, employers will not abuse their employees, neighbours will not produce obnoxious noise at night, salespeople will not cheat their customers, politicians will not lie to people, etc.

Democratic anarchy will take privileged powers from all the people. This will eliminate social evil and form a good society where all people will try to please others in the best possible way. When people get accustomed to mutual evaluation, they may democratically decide to increase the power of each assessment by assigning, for example, the value of one dollar to each of them. Each positive evaluation a person receives from somebody will bring them one dollar, and each negative assessment will take one dollar away from them. These evaluations would not affect ordinary people much. If two people do not like each other, they may negatively evaluate each other for years, which would not be a big deal. Getting or losing one dollar in the developed world does not mean much.

The power of evaluations will extremely efficiently affect authorities responsible for making societal decisions. The higher the leader's position in the community, the greater their responsibility to people will be. For example, the US President might get 100,000,000 negative evaluations from the American people for bad policies, lies, and criminal aggression against countries. That would cost the president \$100,000,000 in only one month. On the other hand, the president's supporters might not necessarily evaluate such presidents positively because they might have higher positive evaluation priorities and spend their positive evaluations elsewhere. Non-privileged presidents would no longer dare perform bad policies. And if it happens somehow, they would leave their positions. Only the most skilful and brave individuals would dare lead countries. They will not be authorities anymore but people's servants. Democratic anarchy would, in its very roots, eliminate the possibility of an emergence of particularly inconvenient leaders, fascists, nationalists, chauvinists, racists, and all potential dictators who inconveniently or destructively influence society

So, what if influential people who own mass media unfairly accuse someone of evil in society and thus prompt people to give inadequate evaluations of the wrong person? Such things are easily possible today. However, a proverb says: "Lies have short legs." One day the lies will be revealed, and then nobody would like to be in the place of these lying individuals because people will punish them with inadequate evaluations. They may receive punishments for a long time and would not dare to be immoral again.

Furthermore, the system would allow everyone to reach satisfaction by negatively evaluating an individual who creates 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, by which the individual supports the individual who creates conveniences.

The proposed assessment system would allow each member of society to become an authority. Considering that the assessed person would have no opportunity to complain, it may be expected that the community would appreciate the needs of each member, which would contribute to the formation of a convenient social orientation. Once such a system is introduced, everyone will try to get to know another individual and their needs to not inflict problems on them unintentionally. In such a society, the individual will behave vis-à-vis other individuals with respect and in good faith. Moreover, they will try to act in a way that will bring the other individual and society fewer disadvantages and more advantages.

It may be assumed that the system of mutual assessment will lead to a grouping of people according to the principle of related interests. Society members with specific interests will relatively isolate themselves to accomplish more conveniences in mutual contact and avoid making trouble for society members with opposite interests. In this way, the system will allow the exercise of different interests in society and the development of different orientations.

In such a system, all inhabitants will try to create the most significant possible conveniences for individuals and society. Historically viewed, one can accept the rule that in the cases where such social orientation existed, the community used to prosper and lived a prosperous and constructive life, while in systems where individuals found conveniences to the detriment of the society; a destructive orientation used to occur leading to the break-up of the social order.

The point of democracy is to create rules that allow people to live well. So far, the best result has been achieved by the law, but laws have not solved social problems. Democratic anarchy can resolve societal disputes more successfully than rigid normative acts can. Mutual evaluation of people will form unwritten rules of social behaviour that will provide a better solution for individuals and society than laws can regulate. Democratic anarchy will create a fairer society, reducing crime in the community, so the judiciary will have less work to do. 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.

But once democratic anarchy is established, people will have the power to administer justice independently, so they will seek justice in the courts less. As a result, the courts will have less work to do and lose importance along with the state's repressive apparatus, including the police and prisons. State laws will be becoming obsolete in the future, which means they will be going down in history. This will free people from the

alienation imposed by the authorities throughout history and bring them closer to their nature.

Democratic anarchy cannot be corrupted. On the contrary, it will most likely eliminate immorality in society. Through equal evaluation rights, people will learn what is and is not objectively ethical. People will obey the ethic they spontaneously establish. There is no greater morality than equal human rights can provide. This is probably the only moral possible because ethics can hardly be based on privileges. Privileged people cannot escape from promoting self-interests which quickly moves them out of morality. Democratic anarchy alone will be capable of creating an ethical and fair society.

Democratic anarchy will, 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 has accepted the principle of a fair market economy with which it rewards the good behaviour of individuals. It should work perfectly. Once democracy anarchy is established, it will initiate fast and significant social improvement. The moment people get the right to evaluate others and be evaluated by others, they will be less willing to confront others and be more inclined to please them. This is the best outcome of democracy possible. The technology needed for the implementation of democratic anarchy is already available. Democratic anarchy can be implemented soon, so a much better society can be quickly built. Democratic anarchy will most likely realize the dreamers' dreams in the history of humankind.

Ancient direct democracy will be needed again

Under pressure from democratic anarchy, governments will follow the needs of the people. They will not dare make the most important decisions for society alone because they can easily make mistakes that might bring about people's wrath and a large number of negative evaluations. Suppose authorities are not sure what the people's needs are. In that case, their responsibility, clearly defined with respect to peoples' evaluations, will direct them to discover love toward people's participation in strategic decision-making through referendums. In this sense, they are likely to develop a variant of ancient democracy that will quickly and efficiently involve people in direct decision-making about common needs, most likely through the Internet.

The people may directly create their fiscal policy by allowing each individual to decide how much money they want to pay from their gross income for taxes. The total sum of all the people's decisions about taxation would determine the total amount of funds allocated for taxes. People will not pay taxes as much as they want. Instead, they will form the total money for taxes, collected proportionally to their salaries. In the same way, each person can decide how to spend taxes. Each person will determine how much tax they would set aside to develop the economy, safety, education, health, infrastructure, and other collective spending needs.

Something needs to be said about democracy here. People do not have equal incomes. Labour that achieves higher productivity should have a higher income to contribute more to production. People will voluntarily deduct taxes from their income, so higher salaries will have greater voting power. On the other hand, people will have to set aside money for taxes because the organization of society has a price. A tax-free society cannot survive. The management of the commune will have to determine the possible intervals of tax policy in percentages with the approval of the commune assembly. For example, people may allocate up to 10% above and below existing taxes. If the current tax is 20%, people will choose taxes between 10% and 30% of their gross incomes. Such a restriction in determining the amount of taxes will reduce the differences in people's voting power concerning their income. However, the voting power in people's fiscal policy will not be equal.

In the economy, it is more favourable to base voting power on labour productivity than on complete equality. In the economy, people should have the power to vote in proportion to their contribution to creating society's economic wealth. It should be accepted that behind the higher achieved productivity is more valuable work. Therefore, more valuable work should be rewarded with greater voting power to stimulate people's productivity to a greater extent and, hence, prosperity in society. Voting power in an economy based on the realized productive power of workers is a good, suitable, and just method for establishing democracy because it will contribute to the development of society. In making political decisions, people must be equal; of course, one person should have one vote.

Theoretically, people can decide on collective spending within the consumer groups as much as possible. If they are democratically allocated, all shared consumption groups will have a far more significant overall impact. Following the living experience, people will learn how much money should be collected for taxes and how to spend it. Thus, this spending will no longer be alienated from society; it will most efficiently follow people's needs in the best way. Given that the new political system offers stable and good relations among nations, people will no longer allocate money for military expenditures. Armies will cease to exist. In the proposed democracy, waging wars will no longer be possible.

People must directly make strategic societal decisions, such as accepting basic laws, because it creates the best social policy. In making political decisions, every person normally has one vote. Nothing else can better follow the people's interests. Professionals will make all other decisions and be directly responsible to the people. Once people get the power to participate in the decision-making process and judge those who make decisions on their behalf, it will most likely present 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 based on the needs of everyone so that it can be called a humanistic policy. It presents the future of democracy. One day, some political party will adopt democratic

anarchy and win the election. It will be the beginning of significant political system reform and a considerable development of society.

3.1.2 Basis of the Economy of Humanism

3.1.2.1 Good Capitalism

Full employment is the turning point of capitalism

Humanistic reform of the economy must start with the elimination of unemployment. Workers' unemployment cannot form a sound basis for creating a good society. A good community can only develop on equal human rights. A just society requires the availability of work to everyone.

Unemployment creates the exploitation of workers. When a work position opens on the market with a high unemployment rate, a large number of candidates apply. The competition of workers to get a job may tear down their incomes to a level sufficient only for basic survival. Unemployed workers have to accept poorly paid jobs to feed their families. Unemployment has widened the gap between rich and poor, creating injustice and problems in capitalism.

Employers favour unemployment because they profit from the exploitation of workers. Employers can maintain unemployment because they do not necessarily need to hire employees most of the time. 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 and how state policy maintains the exploitation of workers. To secure their privileges, the rich have imposed the belief that unemployment is an unavoidable price to pay for technological development. They have pressured economic science to accept that “0% of unemployment is not a positive thing,”⁸⁸ which they accomplished.

The capitalists have found an unemployment rate of about 5% the most convenient, so 5% unemployment has become a “normal” state in capitalism. This “normal” state exploits workers by dependence on capitalists, while workers' total purchasing power produces enough profits for employers. The market economy should appreciate workers more, but capitalism resists it. Due to long struggles, workers have gained rights through laws and trade unions. Still, the existence of poverty confirms that the interests of workers are not protected enough.

⁸⁸ 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

Society may introduce justice in production processes through a fully employed environment that balances the number of jobs with workers. Reducing work hours will make full employment a reality. Such a measure will require preventing work imports and regulating overtime work. It will increase workers' demand on the market and put them in a better position in production processes. Increased demand for workers on the market will increase workers' wages and reduce exploitation. However, no formula can determine what exploitation is precisely. Only workers dissatisfied with their earnings may present it. Workers will certainly be more satisfied in a fair work market where their work is equally demanded as the jobs they need. Full employment can be regulated through a work-hour policy. If more workers seek a job than jobs are offered, work hours should be reduced, and vice versa; if more jobs are provided than available workers, work hours should be extended. The more balanced the work market, the more fair the production processes. The more satisfied workers are, the less they are exploited.

Society may increase workers' satisfaction by further reducing work hours, which will create negative unemployment. Negative unemployment is a shortage of workers on the market. It will further increase workers' demand and incomes. Negative unemployment may put workers in the privileged position that employers have practically always been in. When workers are unavailable on the market, employers who need more workers will have to attract workers from other companies by raising their salaries. Competition among employers will start a chain reaction in which workers' wages will grow.

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 of 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." Suddenly workers and their labour were in much higher demand, enabling those who survived the Black Death to be in a much better position to negotiate work conditions. The shortage of workers increased the workers' wages. The servants' higher salaries contributed to economic growth, but the employers were unhappy.

- At Cuxham (Oxfordshire, England), a plowman demanded from his Lord a payment three times greater in 1350 than in the previous year.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 political party reduces work to 5 hours per day and wins an election, the lack of workers would increase the lowest salaries two to three times per hour in one year. The minimum daily wages of workers would increase by 30-90% for just a 5-hour shift. The fair work market is the best choice for bringing justice to the economy.

The first problem with eliminating unemployment is employers do not want to increase workers' salaries because they profit from exploiting them. But on the other hand, excessive wage demands of workers may make 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 workers' wages in a fully employed society by moving their businesses out of the country. People need to understand that Western capitalism has established laws that give more freedom to capital than workers, which 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, bringing trouble to a 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. The escape lies in finding the length of work hours that optimally satisfies the needs of workers and employers.

Today people have accepted the 8-hour workday 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 function variable coordinating workers' and employers' needs and economic justice. This function should be primarily based on the full employment of people. If more workers search for jobs than employers search for workers, the work hours should be shortened. And vice versa, if employers need more workers than are available, the economic policy should consider extended work hours. The second essential principle of work regulation should be based on people's desired hours.

The length of a workday can be a potent regulator of the free-market economy and the basic point of democracy in the economy. Political parties may propose the best full-time work period for workers and employers. It would probably be one of the most

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>

critical decisions of political parties, making them elected or not. On the other hand, the work hours can also be directly determined by the work needs of workers. Every worker may express the most desired work hours, and the average value would decide. Democratically determined work hours are supposed to create a fair work market, which will present a turning point for capitalism, making it a decent social system.

Minimum wages would no longer be needed. Full employment will increase salaries for all lower-paid workers at the expense of higher-paid workers and employers' profits, balancing an enormous gap between peoples' wages in the western world. Besides, workers being able to purchase more will contribute to the economy's growth, earning employers more profit and higher salaries to workers, bringing benefits to all.

Shortening working hours proportionally to the unemployment rate will improve capitalism, but from the beginning, this study intended to achieve much more. A better future requires a reconstruction of the economy as a whole. 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 take advantage of 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 are primarily based on the underdevelopment of the market economy. This study will try to present that the main problem of the capitalist economy is not too much but instead not enough market.

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

Workers in capitalism have jobs protected by laws and unions; jobs in capitalism are privileged, though to a lesser extent 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 work cannot efficiently allocate labour and achieve maximum possible productivity. One should protect the existence of workers, not jobs. A better future for humankind necessarily requires that workers become subjects with equal rights in production. This will be achieved when all the 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 at each work post.

Capitalism taught people to love competition and that being the winner brings enormous satisfaction. As a result, people do not hesitate to exert any effort to express themselves. So why would society not 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 work posts. This means that any worker may take the work post of another worker at any point in 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, the workers who offer the highest productivity and accountability and demand the lowest salary in a society-owned company will get the job anytime. Therefore, it would be nothing else but a developed market of work. However, the work market will require time to develop enough and be accepted by people.

The work competition in the market will incentivize workers much more than capitalism can through wages. The existence of workers would never be endangered because every worker will be able to find a job in a fully employed environment. The work competition will establish such a strong responsibility that no one would dare to offer work productivity they would not be able to meet. The market will also regulate workers' salaries most objectively. As a result, the living standards for all people may increase unprecedentedly. People may be very pleased with living in such a system. Only this shall be called socialism. The following text defines the labour division of socialism.

There is no fairer or better division of labour than a competition of workers through their labour productivity for any workplace at any time. Productivity will be measured by earned money, quantity and quality of produced goods or rating workers' productivity by consumers. A worker who offers higher profits, more manufactured goods, a better, cleaner, and cheaper production will get the desired job. Comparing the productivity of workers may be complex but also very simple. Democratic anarchy will make it straightforward.

Permanently open work competition among workers has never existed because nobody believed it was possible and did not invest any effort into developing such an idea. However, this book analyzes the potential problems that an open work competition might bring to society and provides answers to solve such problems. Of course, the work competition will be highly regulated to avoid possible instability in such work distribution. Nevertheless, considering such a division of labour will open the possibility for significant economic and social improvement.

Of course, the work competition will relate only to public companies because if it applies to private enterprises, that will practically mean 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 by law. 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 for any workplace at any time immediately becomes a prime candidate for that position, regardless of whether the workplace is occupied or not. 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, they will continue to hold their work positions. However, if they cannot take on the new responsibilities or would not want it, they will immediately vacate the workplace and leave it to the competitor.

The existential security of workers is necessary as a condition of stability for society, and therefore, society will 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 remove the great fear of unemployment that is prevalent worldwide. Capitalism finds the primary motivation for work from the fear of the workers' economic survival, so it does not provide enough financial security to the people. The new system will build motivation for work from the free choice of choosing a career and its satisfaction.

The advantages of such a division of work will be enormous. The best worker in every workplace ensures maximum productivity for companies, satisfying consumers' needs most efficiently. 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, as mentioned previously, privileges are one of the leading causes of societal problems. Eliminating working privileges means increasing productivity and reducing, if not removing, corruption and immorality in the community. With time, people will realize that the loss of privileges would considerably increase the possibility of finding work that enhances workers' productive power, the power of being. The power of being develops creativity and brings great and stable satisfaction that privileges could not achieve. The proposed socialist labour market will allow a permanent development of the productive being powers in society, bringing significant benefits to the community.

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 process of the productivity of workers, the values of their work and the responsibility they bear for their work, in the system of fast changes in the

work obligations. Capable Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems exist today but must adapt to the socialist business operating system.

This book develops Marx's simplified labour theory of value by extending workers' compensation with functions that can increase economic productivity and 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 are 1. Then a worker who is 10% more interested in a particular position is likely to ask for the cost of that labour at a value of 0.9 to make his offer more competitive for the job. It will make him earn 10% less than in an average job. However, 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 the most convenient for the worker and cheapest for society. The cost of ongoing work will be one factor that determines workers' salaries. The work market will make suitable jobs achieve lower wages, and inconvenient positions will be compensated with higher payments. A developed work market will form an objective price of current work the same way the goods market does, and workers will be satisfied with the earnings. Unions as mediators in determining incomes will no longer be required.

The past work value of workers presents how much workers have contributed to creating the values society possesses. In capitalism, the more valuable the past work is, the more wealth is produced, so wealth shows the value of past work. But capitalism does not recognize other values that exist in society. For example, giving birth, being born, and the productive growth of people is the highest scope of value people may produce, and people must recognize it as a value of past work. Such values are priceless, so they cannot be objectively determined, but they may be formed by arbitration in the best interest of all people. Similarly, society has established punishment for murder that has nothing to do with objectivity, but it is beneficial because it prevents killing.

Recognition of the value of people's past work will enable all to receive a basic income from birth. All people's valuable accomplishments from birth should be valued and accepted as past work. The value of the current work of unemployed people should be adjusted to society's capability. Past and present work will be regulated in such a manner so that all people receive at least a minimum income as a guarantee of a secure existence. The payment of the unemployed population will be automatically generated from the taxes of employed people. Such an idea is propagated today under the name of Universal Basic Income.

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. On the other hand, people will use the value of past work to take responsibility for any damage they do to society. For example, any crime can be assessed by people's past work value. The criminal system will transform to recalculate the prison sentences of criminals by deducting the value of the past work of criminals in proportion to the crimes committed. Losing some of the value of past work will be a more effective and humane punishment for criminals than imprisonment.

The value of past work will be a very efficient tool for being held responsible in society. It will be highly beneficial and necessary for establishing the progress of humanity. The arbitration for the values of past work should be regulated by the law and democratically accepted by the people. This is a challenging task and likely the main reason the socialist division of labour cannot be implemented soon.

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 will determine the worker's labour value or cost value. 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, which will adapt incomes with the values of goods and services produced.

Only the market can establish objective prices of goods. If a company achieves a higher price of goods, making a higher profit on the market than workers' incomes demand, they will make more money than they demand. The difference between required and received incomes would represent a surplus value. In firms that achieve a lower price of goods, making a lower profit on the market than workers' incomes demand, workers would receive lower wages than needed even though they reached the productivity they offered. To avoid competition for work in more profitable public companies, more profitable public companies will surrender surplus earnings to public companies that achieve a shortage of revenues in the market.

The overflow of surplus values of public enterprises into those with a lack of earnings in the market will prevent the imbalance in the division of labour. As a result, everyone will earn as much money as they asked for their productivity. Thus, the labour market will balance employment in all public enterprises, regardless of the revenues of enterprises arising from market inconsistencies. It should be emphasized that the market is the best gift Mother Nature has given to the economy, capable of bringing justice and stability to production processes. Economic development will no longer be based on market benefits but will result from people's conscious decisions. People will base the development policy of the economy on the amount of money they will set aside from the tax for the development of the economy.

The new economic system would have no meaning without efficiently regulating workers' responsibilities in production processes. In the developed work market, workers may unrealistically increase their productivity offers to get 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 use the workers' past work values to establish workers' responsibility in the production processes. This is what socialism has not had, resulting in inefficient production. Workers would guarantee the productivity they propose by the value of their past work. If workers do not meet the proposed productivity, they will bear responsibility by losing the value of their past work.

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 accountabilities the workers offer for the desired workplaces, the greater their right to work in the desired workplaces. If the revenues of public enterprises increase, the workers will share the profits in proportion to the responsibility they have proposed for their work. The such gain will be expressed in the value of the past work. Conversely, if a company loses money, workers who offer greater responsibility for their work will lose more of the value of past work.

Once the company's performance is identified, and the responsibility of workers is determined, rewarding and punishing the workers by the value of past work takes place automatically. In addition, workers will also be held accountable for their work through democratic anarchy. One can imagine how powerful democratic anarchy will be when people are given equal rights to reward and punish others with little value representing their past work.

The following fictitious examples present how the work division in socialism would work: Let a baker produces 1000 loaves of bread daily, making it the standard baking productivity with a coefficient value of 1. Then, let him value his work at a value of 1 (assuming this is an average work price). Finally, let him take responsibility for his productivity at a value of 1 (assuming this is an average responsibility for all jobs). Then a new baker who wants to take the position of the existing baker needs to offer the productivity of a value greater than 1 or needs to request a lower price of the current work, which would be a value lesser than 1, or needs to offer higher responsibility which will be in a value greater than 1. If a new baker proposes a better work offer than the existing one, who cannot or does not want to meet it, the new baker gets the job.

Establishing labour competition among workers can be challenging because comparing different productivity can make choosing the best job offer demanding. Then the work productivity of a new baker should be evaluated, which would require the assessment of the quantity and quality of the produced bread. If the offered productivity is not realized, disputes are possible and finding solutions may be problematic. 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, the workers might spend a lot of time resolving such issues, reducing the time to work. Nobel laureate Ronald Coase

stated that resolving such an issue would require a higher cost than economically justified¹¹. He may be correct, but open competition among workers might still bring superior economic productivity to capitalism.

However, democratic anarchy may completely resolve such a problem. By accepting democratic anarchy, workers will not even need to offer their productivity anymore; it will be assumed their productivity must be equal to or better than the productivity of the replaced worker. The work price will be standardized the same way the prices of goods are standardized today on the market. Practically, the highest responsibility offered by any worker for any job will be the main, if not the only, requirement for getting the job. The fine-tuning of workers' responsibility will be determined through democratic anarchy by the evaluations made by their coworkers or customers. The following paragraphs will present what this means.

Let's say the baker gets the job by offering work responsibility at 1.2. The evaluations of people will be limited, so if the baker does not receive any assessment, the value of his past work will not change. However, if the baker receives two negative evaluations from people, he will lose 2.4 points from the value of his past work. Such responsibility will permanently reduce his salary by 2.4 money units. That means the baker will take responsibility for everything connected to the bread he produces. He will bear the same responsibility of being negatively assessed for any activity outside bread production. On the other hand, suppose a baker makes customers very satisfied with the bread he produces; then he may expect positive evaluations, which will permanently increase his salary. The impact of the assessments may be reduced, for example, a hundred times, and will still encourage people to behave responsibly.

The same will go for every job. The election campaign for a country's president will last as long as the candidates register their responsibilities for the president's position. This will represent the election process because the highest bid will get the job. Then, if living in a country is ordinary, the president might not receive any evaluation. If the standard of living deteriorates, people might give their presidents negative assessments because they will be considered the most responsible for the country. Let's assume a president offers responsibility in the value of 1.6 to get the job; if they get one million negative evaluations, the president will lose 1,600,000 points that present the value of past work. Considering the average value of past work would be 100,000, such a president will most likely drop into a negative value—debt. In this case, the president should pay the penalty to the economy instead of earning a salary. Considering that people would not be able to pay it, the president will receive a minimum wage as long as they do not escape the debt. This will only be possible through highly productive work and very positive behaviour. Of course, if the president improves social life significantly, they will be well awarded by positive evaluations they receive from people.

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

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

In practice, workplace replacements would hardly exist without agreements among workers. When workers take jobs from previous workers, the previous workers would be considered to have performed the needed productivity and would profit from it even when they are replaced and do not contribute to such productivity. The new workers who force previous ones to leave will have to maintain the productivity of their predecessors but will profit only from the increased productivity they had offered. Besides, one should expect that replacing workers without an agreement would probably make the replaced workers dissatisfied. 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 the replacement of workers without negotiations only if the new workers bring noticeably higher productivity.

Managers will have great operational power, but the workers may still control them before making 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 change the values of accepted responsibilities for their work based on new managers' proposals. If they reduce their responsibilities, it might mean they are not confident with the changes managers propose, 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. And on top of that, workers and people will be satisfied. Thus, the open work market will bring an outstanding contribution to the development of the economy and society.

Considering that in socialism, workers will not dare apply for jobs they are not qualified for, there is no need to condition anyone's employment depending on the possession of diplomas. Firstly, a degree does not guarantee skill or workers' productivity. Secondly, conditioning work with certifications unnecessarily reduces the freedom of access to desired jobs. The limitation of employment possibilities with the possession of degrees has evolved to the absurdity that bureaucratically restricts the liberty of choosing work to a vast extent. Besides, the enormous volume of knowledge the education system

imposes on students usually has no connection with people's professions. It serves authorities to ensure the survival of an authoritarian system and presents an unnecessary burden that alienates students from objective reality. Besides, alienated people can hardly solve social problems and improve society. 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 necessary and welcome but not required for employment because knowledge can be acquired independently as well as through practice.

Some regions worldwide will accept the open work competition one day because no economy can be more productive than the one where the best available worker gets each job. Under the competitive pressures of public companies, the owners of private companies will try to increase their productivity as public companies do. However, they would not have the operational capabilities to oppose public companies. Given that workers in private companies will not have the freedom as workers in public companies and will not share the profits, they will be less interested in working for private companies. Considering that public companies will be more productive than private companies, the owners of private companies will be encouraged to join public companies.

Given that the 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. Companies' owners will get the equivalent value of past work in exchange for their firms. It will proportionately increase their incomes in public companies.

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

The high responsibility the proposed work division requires from workers will force manufacturers to avoid economic losses in an unpredictable market by organizing production based on consumers' demands. People will democratically determine the tax rate and directly allocate the tax fund for various consumer groups of collective spending. Furthermore, individual consumers will be increasingly required to order their expensive needs in advance. Production based on the orders of consumers presents a democratically planned economy. Such an economy should be considered the most stable production possible. Information technology can assist such a complex production to operate efficiently, which Vladimir Ilyich Lenin did not have.

Democratic anarchy is all the social power that may remain in socialism. Once equal rights are fully established, people will have no reason to commit crimes. 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 make states go down in history as well.

The complete implementation of equal human rights in the economy should be called socialism. Nothing else deserves this name. Socialism will come spontaneously as the final result of equal 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 definite because this book opens up a spectrum of possibilities. It is challenging to choose the best solutions without practice. Social scientists will develop the best solutions for socialism through experience based on the theory of equal human rights. The development of socialism will eliminate social evil and create a bright future beyond the wildest dreams of today.

What is the underlying concept of the new system? The system will put society on 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 more suitable to the nature of the individual and society. Freedom allows the suspicion, formation of critical views, and the possibility of acting according to them that, together with practice, creates objective knowledge. Practice demystifies the categories of values and, therefore, allows for the breakdown of the dogmatic, non-critically accepted and alienated knowledge that is the cause of 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 forced to rely on their power to realize their needs. Constant reliance on their ability and the defined responsibility would teach the individual to accept the objective perception of their potency. This also means the acceptance of their impotence in cases where they cannot surmount it. By objectively getting to know their powers, the individual will live following their nature. Such an individual would form the needs only where they can realize them, which constitutes the essence of the individual's balance and the formation of a constructive orientation in the relationship with nature and society. Such a system can satisfy the natural needs of individuals and the community, which brings harmony, peace, love, and joy to living.

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 of the use of real estates. 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, while direct work value is defined by the values occurring in the duration of the work.

In capitalism, the work value is shown almost exclusively in indirect form through the work products' value because the work is, per se, generally not favourable. Accordingly, it almost does not have a direct value. Besides, a scale that might measure such a value does not exist. Private companies in the commune will continue to set the price of labour as they do today. The value of work products is formed on the market by the demand and supply of commodities and is determined by the price of the commodities. The work confirms its indirect value through the sale of commodities. Then the price of commodities represents the work price as well.

Under socialism, Marx's labour theory of value is accepted, which did not sufficiently consider the productivity and workload of workers' participation in producing goods. In embracing the ideology of equality among people, Karl Marx neglected research that would develop the objective values 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 work results in production, which will have a stimulating effect on the individual's work and contributions to the prosperity of society.

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 of workers through higher productivity for every publicly owned job. Labour competition will achieve higher productivity than

capitalism in the open labour market. Socialism needs socially owned enterprises to accomplish this goal. In this regard, socialism needs to find an acceptable method of transforming private capital into social. Owners of private capital will voluntarily surrender their private property to society if society values and redeems their wealth fairly. Such capital will create a 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 worth to the community.

Socialism has accepted a labour theory of value which bounds the value of commodities to the labour time needed to produce them. However, each product contains a considerable number of hours of work spent on discovering and developing every product's production process, from the discovery of fire and wheels to the present day. Therefore, it is impossible to summarize the total amount of past work of 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 length of service would generate a slightly higher income. However, such a measure of the value of labour 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 values of past labour more efficiently because it displays it using the value of produced capital. Marxists complain that a part of the value of owned capital arose from exploiting workers, which is true. Still, there is no method to determine which part of their property was created by exploitation. Private property is accepted globally, so socialism should accept it as well because there is no other suitable solution. Socialism needs to reform the distribution system in production to increase justice and improve society.

It should be accepted that a 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 call the unit value of past labour 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 shown in points 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 will get more past work points and earn 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 values the society owns, such as enterprises, land, facilities, infrastructure, natural resources, and other resources. 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 and accepted criteria that will valorize all contributions to building today's society. Such a criterion should be formed by an expert commission and approved by the commune assembly. In the end, the people will accept such regulation in a referendum by a large majority. Such regulation of past work values will not be easy to establish, but people could succeed after optimally acceptable corrections. The solution that will be obtained, no matter how relatively inconvenient it may seem to an individual or a group, will be a big step forward for each individual and society.

Let a certain amount of points of past work be achieved at birth. The work that individuals do by creating themselves brings the greatest perfection that people can make and the most significant value that people can create for themselves and others. In addition, socialism can regulate the birth rate of society through past labour points. For example, in a fall in the birth rate, parents with more children may be awarded more past labour points, stimulating 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 formed so that it stimulates 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. The increase in 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 of past work, depending on the rise in productivity and their responsibilities. This will promote the companies' productivity, bringing 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, which significantly reduces their efficiency. Besides this, work can also permanently damage the productivity of companies. Accountability in the social form of production can be taken through past labour points. 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. Applying such a mode of accountability can solve the fundamental problems in socialist production and non-profit organizations. Taking responsibility by the points of past work will be highly effective because people will be responsible with their past work and their current and future income. The principles of responsibility in production are presented in more detail in the chapter "Development of the Economy."

A certain amount of past work points can be distributed to independent creators as a sign of recognition for scientific, cultural, sports, or other achievements that would stimulate non-economic activities that contribute to society's development. Such a distribution would be made by juries and arbitration commissions based on the valorization of accomplishments and the benefits that society derives from them.

Every society has a judicial system that protects people from the criminal activities of free individuals. Today's system mainly solves the crime problem by taking people's freedom through imprisonment. It is cruel and inefficient. Socialism can achieve an acceptable and effective form of sanctions for offences committed by deducting the statutory amount of past labour points. It should not be a problem for the courts to convert prison sentences into points of past work. Taking responsibility through past labour points is more acceptable than inhumane imprisonment because people retain their freedom and productive power in society. If people commit significant crimes, they may lose all points of past work and even fall into negative value. The proposed system can make the negative value of past work points psychologically, sociologically and economically more painful than prison. People who fall into the negative value of past work points will earn only a minimal income no matter what job they do until they escape from the negative value of 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 forced to wear unique clothing that will tell everyone they are bad. As a result, people will shy away from crime and misdemeanours more than they do today. Suppose people enter the negative value of past work. In that case, they will try hard to get out of it, and this will be possible only with the help of highly productive work and exemplary behaviour over a long period.

In the same way, the judiciary can create the function of rewarding people who bring significant benefits to society, stimulating the development of productive orientation in the community. However, courts have significant shortcomings because their forming of justice in society is authoritative, which means it is alienated from society. As humanity strives for the growth of democracy, each member should be given equal power to sanction and reward other people for creating benefits and troubles in society. With such a right, every person will receive direct and equal executive power in the community, which would anarchically stimulate favourable social actions at all levels of complex social relations. Such power of judging people is called democratic anarchy.

The negative evaluation people receive should take a small part of the points of past work. By introducing such a measure, each person will try not to create disadvantages for another person or create them as little as possible at all levels of complex social relations. In other words, every person should know what does not suit well to another person and will avoid doing it. Moreover, suppose people do not know that they create difficulties for other community members. In that case, the negative evaluations they

receive and the penalties will make them contemplate and realize 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 natural knowledge about realizing societal benefits. 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 form the most significant benefits in society

The number of past work points will be a form of humanistic shares because it will provide income based on the value of past work. More past work points will indicate more valuable past work and generate higher salaries. It will present the productive power of people and become a great 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 will effectively build 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 values of the work through generations. Therefore, the points of past work will require responsible behaviour, bringing social stability through generations. Such a system would be acceptably repressive because it would not deprive people of their freedom but would prevent members of society from using their freedom to create problems in 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, the work also brings inconveniences, which cannot be accepted as a value. The inconveniences occur due to forced work where the individual is a means to realize needs alienated from them or from forced labour necessary to ensure existential needs. Such work is not free and, therefore, cannot realize the individual's productive forces, so it cannot bring direct conveniences to the individual.

A greater value will present the job that suits the individual's nature more, their individual characteristics, which realizes more conveniences in its duration. Let it be accepted that average work equals 1 (one) as direct current value 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 the work they perform is. Therefore, each individual needs to assess the relationship between the magnitudes of everyday work burden and relaxation with all their psychophysical factors and compare them with other work obligations. The assessment result will be between 0.1 and 10, indicating the relationship between work conveniences and inconveniences on a specific work post against average work.

A lower value of current labour represents greater inconveniences during the duration of work and therefore needs to realize a larger share in income distribution to compensate for the work-related inconveniences. Conversely, a higher value of current labour advocates greater conveniences in the work duration in relation to average work and needs from that point of view to realize a smaller share in income distribution and will thus realize smaller 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 proportionate to the direct current labour value. The current labour price will also have a scale of 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 getting a direct current labour value equal to 0.2 will be five times less favourable than average work and will realize the current labour price equal to 5, thus an income five times higher than the one on average work.

In a system of protected work posts, each worker could evaluate their work as markedly inconvenient by their subjective consciousness and require a substantially larger share in the distribution of collective work performance than they would deserve. Socialism will ensure an objective valuation of work with the help of work competition in the work market. This means that in the circumstances of equal productivity, the right to work will be exercised by the worker to whom current labour brings greater direct exchange value or the worker who will demand 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 is possible to achieve by automation of production, by the redistribution of inappropriate forms of labour and by the increased possibility of selecting the types of work where the individual may find the sources of realization of 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 the approach where the work in its duration becomes a value. It can bring conveniences greater or equal to those realized beyond the work.

The result of such an approach to the valuation of current labour is the number that shows the price of current labour of each worker employed in enterprises, where workers directly realize income through 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 in some form to society daily. The individual is a value to the individual, and society must accept this standpoint for such a value to develop.

This measure refers to all unemployed people: preschool children, pupils, persons of advanced age who are no longer able to work, invalids and those not wishing 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 of the unemployed population needs to be determined by the commune's leadership based on the commune's needs and possibilities and adopted by the commune's assembly. Such values may be changeable according to the economic opportunities and needs of the social community. For example, if workers were not sufficiently interested in work, the price of current labour would, with the unemployed portion of the population, fall depending on the category of the unemployed, which would reduce their income and increase, in terms of revenue, the interest in work.

On the other hand, if workers were more interested in work than necessary or, more precisely said, 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 employed and unemployed portions of the population will contribute to the balance in the work demand and supply, contributing to the balance 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 an individual's endangered survival leads to the endangered survival of society. This measure is nothing else but a universal substitution for social, pension and disability insurance, solidarity-based payments to the unemployed, child allowances, or tax facilities in the case of multi-member families. Instead, it means a simpler, more just and more efficient redistribution that is at the same time more natural and wiser when social determinations are concerned.

Each work contains elements of current and past labour. Past labour without the current one maintains it has no value, while present labour cannot exist without the past one.

As current and past labour are mutually linked, and as the 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 price of current labour.

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

Such price of current labour needs to be the basis of the work's indirect value - income. It arises from the formula that the price of each work is proportionate to the number of past labour points and the current labour price. The more past labour points a worker gathers, the higher the price of their work and the higher the supposed income will be. 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 realizes the right of workers to work in any work post. At the same time, the method of substituting indirect forms of past labour values allows them to realize income proportionate to the number of past labour points. The worker with a larger quantity of past labour points will realize a larger income than the worker with a smaller amount of points even though both workers realize the same work performance. Past labour points will become a sort of humanistic shares that will bring income substitution for all kinds of profits, interests, rents, and dividends of 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. It will be better explained in the chapter "Commodity Price."

The current labour price will be maximally objective because it will be directly established by work competition on the market. The small value of the current labour price concerning past labour points should not be misleading because an increase of the current labour price of only 0.1, according to the formula, increases the work price by a significant 10%.

The price of work develops the labour theory of value and will become a basis for forming workers' incomes in socialism. As the price 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. But naturally, the work price will find its confirmation or negation in the realized income that will depend on the realized labour productivity and many other factors.

3.1.2.2.2 Work Division

Socialism will introduce significant changes in the system of labour division. The disadvantage of today's division of labour lies in the insufficient possibility of choosing 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 a constantly open competition for each job and employ the best worker available.

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

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

Managers must respect the production obligations of companies. If the volume of needs for production decreases, they will reduce the number of workers who perform them until the possible closure of the company. Workers whose employment is terminated due to the redirection of the economy are recognized as having fulfilled their contractual obligations and therefore receive rewards for work as if they had fulfilled their responsibilities and will search for new jobs provided by the management.

The management will have great operational power, which is necessary for establishing fast and efficient coordination of work, which is again essential for good economic performance. Some may compare such power to the power of dictators. Still, nothing will be further from that because the managers will directly owe the responsibility to the people and because they can be replaced at any moment.

Under the pressure of labour competition, every worker will strive to achieve maximum productivity within the frame of authorization of the workplace. Changes in the authority at each workplace are possible by an agreement between the employee and manager, provided that the managers have the right to decide. In the transition period, the work of managers will be controlled by commune assemblies and worker councils, but most likely, people will give up on it when the system shows it is more efficient without them.

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

A worker who offers the highest productivity and responsibility and the lowest price of their current labour is the most suitable for the collective staff and society. Therefore,

they should get the right to work at such work posts. Thus, each work, management included, may be defined in the function of productivity, responsibility, and the work price. 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 will require the coordination of the influences of each variable. After that, it will give the value that points to the competitive capability for a needed work post. Each worker proposes a magnitude of coefficients according to their abilities for the job they wish to perform. A worker who offers higher productivity, a higher labour responsibility, and a lower current work price will win the right to work at the desired work post. Besides that, the realized higher C-of-work competition allows each worker to take the work post of another worker with the obligation to assume all labour obligations and responsibilities of that work post.

Labour Productivity

Each work has its measure of productivity. Today, productivity can be measured in the most straightforward, comprehensive, and efficient manner by profit on the market. Cash profit in the free market involves all elements of productive business activity, such as the quantity and quality of work, cost-effectiveness, rationality, usability, serviceability, etc. Profit is the social evaluation of the success of the business performance. However, there are no commodity-money relations within the enterprise, so productivity needs to be expressed by the quantity and quality of the goods and services produced in a determined time interval.

Where it is impossible to precisely establish the labour productivity by the produced goods 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 believing that they can increase their productivity by 10% will assess their productivity higher by 10% of existing productivity, 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 estimate, and if identical with the existing one, will form the coefficient 1 (one). A coefficient larger than 1 (one) will indicate a work 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 valorize the realized productivity to establish the worker's success in the work offer. The realized productivity may be presented by a coefficient with the following formula:

$$\mathbf{C - of realized productivity = \frac{Realized Productivity}{Envisaged Productivity}}$$

The realized productivity expressed by cash profit on the market may efficiently show the success of the business activity, and other forms of productivity valorization are, therefore, unnecessary. However, such a work valorization applies only to self-employed entrepreneurs and companies' management.

In the production of commodities, productivity will be presented by the envisaged quantity and quality of produced goods and services. However, when the number and quality of products and services cannot precisely express productivity or establishing the amount would be time-consuming, an assessment of indirect work value will be introduced.

The evaluation of workers' productivity may be given by managing boards, councils, and workers among themselves. The managing boards and worker's councils of enterprises will monitor and evaluate workers' operational improvements and deteriorates. Their evaluations may show the realized productivity of workers. However, the workers know the quality and shortcomings of each other the best, so the best evaluation of workers would give they to themselves. They should get an equal right to anonymously evaluate the work of several others as a response to their proposed productivity.

The received evaluations will confirm or negate the envisaged rate each worker has given to themselves to offer their productivity. The proposed subjective grade of a worker's productivity will get its confirmation or negation, influencing the production development of objective value categories. Work valorization is necessary not only for establishing the accountability of workers for the realized productivity but also as a determination that defines recognition of the individual's essential powers. Individuals need an objective scale of values to get to know themselves objectively and the possibility of their 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 get a higher income. And vice-versa, the coefficient of realized productivity smaller than 1 (one) will represent the productivity realized in a volume smaller than envisaged, so the income will also be smaller.

It should be emphasized that the presented bookkeeping is based on the capitalist form of running the economy, 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 accept the principle of democratic anarchy, which will apply significantly simpler bookkeeping than in capitalism but will not lag behind it

Responsibility of Workers

Without a defined method of bearing responsibility, workers would not be bound to implement their proposed productivity. In this way, their declarations in the work competition would be exaggerated, and work results could not follow them. Such irresponsibility could have catastrophic consequences for the economy. Therefore, it is necessary to set up a system by which every worker will bear responsibility for realizing their envisaged productivity. It needs to be based on the coefficient of realized productivity. The method of responsibility bearing needs to be thorough, multi-layered and efficient.

Each worker needs to bear responsibility for their work. Since their job is non-alienable from the collective's work, they thus also take responsibility for the productivity of the collective. The level of responsibility assumed by a worker may be set by the coefficient of responsibility.

Let it be assumed that the average coefficient of responsibility has the value of 1 (one). Let it be assumed that the minimum and maximum responsibility interval is 0.1 to 10. Let each worker set the level of commitment they may consider for their work, expressed by a coefficient of responsibility. A higher coefficient of responsibility workers offers needs to render higher work competitiveness in the work market for performing work at every public work post and vice-versa.

Workers will primarily bear responsibility in the production process 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 realize a rise in 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, possibly health care, education and other activities proclaimed by the commune through its leaders and the assembly, do not realize direct income in the market. Instead, they realize it by appropriations from the commune's revenue. In non-profit companies, the measure of the production value needs to be based on the satisfaction of service users. Therefore, a higher grade from the service users will equal a higher profit for economic enterprises. This way, non-profit companies will have a productivity measure and responsibility for their production activity.

The system needs to fully equalize the measure of success in the business activity of profit and non-profit companies. By applying mathematical coefficients, it is possible to compare the revenue of the profit economy and the realized productivity of the non-profit organizations expressed in any magnitude, including the productivity assessment.

Unemployed inhabitants will also have some C-responsibility set by leaders and adopted by the assembly of the commune. They can, on this basis, 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 the production or, more precisely, the profit in the market may show oscillations in the periods of accounting, collective responsibility by way of past labour points needs to be linked with the period when the business activity of an enterprise shows objective indicators of success. Of course, the accounting period may differ for different productions; however, it may be considered that productivity that shows smaller or larger oscillations in the monthly period will give a realistic balance of productivity in one year.

Once the quantity of past labour points that each enterprise realizes or loses is known, then 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:

$$\text{Worker-1 : Worker-2 : Worker-3 : : Worker-n =} \\ \text{C-respons.-1 : C-respons.-2 : C-respons.-3 : : C-respons.-n}$$

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

$$\text{Worker-1 = +/- Quantity of Points-1,} \\ \text{Worker-2 = +/- Quantity of Points-2,} \\ \text{Worker-3 = +/- Quantity of Points-3,} \\ \text{.....} \\ \text{Worker-n = +/- Quantity of Points-n}$$

The obtained values are different magnitudes expressed in past labour points added to (or deducted from) the quantities of past labour points 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 gain a three times larger loss of the past labour points in the case of money losses by the enterprise.

In the proposed system, each worker bears responsibility for the collective work proportionately to the stated size of the coefficient of responsibility. In this way, workers become active creators of their conveniences and inconveniences and are no longer passive collective members. Furthermore, such commitment will require that workers

become familiar with the consequences of company businesses, which will largely contribute to overcoming alienation in production.

In the capitalistic form of production, a more significant profit is, as a general rule, related to a higher risk of investing money. The new system introduces C-responsibilities with which the workers can, according to their own will, speculate the risk assumed for the success of the collective production. However, such speculation is non-alienable from the direct work of the workers, which will contribute to better knowledge about the economic process, which will again contribute to the rise of the workers' responsibility for the output. A higher commitment requires greater confidence in the community, resulting in greater productivity and prosperity. A higher degree of responsibility will be formed by workers who are more familiar with business flows and have more confidence in themselves and the collective.

Besides the collective responsibility of workers, workers' personal responsibility in the production processes needs to be defined. Workers individually might produce benefits and disadvantages in the joint process of production. To create a productive orientation of society that will motivate productive work and prevent irresponsibility in the production processes, it will be necessary to determine principles of rewarding and sanctioning the workers by a certain number of past labour points. Such remunerating and sanctioning of workers should be carried out by the arbitration commissions of the company following the company regulations.

However, the best way to determine individual responsibility will likely be through the mutual evaluation of workers through democratic anarchy. Democratic anarchy would reward good and punish bad workers in the value of the coefficient of responsibility that workers proposed for their work. Let each positive assessment bring the employee points of past work in the value of 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 of evaluating the value of work and submitting responsibilities represents all the influences that work brings in the broadest sense. It may reward any benefit and sanction any inconvenience a worker does to another worker or production. Every worker will be careful not to cause inconvenience or cause as minor inconvenience as possible to any other worker 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 their coefficient of responsibility at 0,1, one positive evaluation would bring them 0,1 points of past labour,

and five negative votes -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, the coefficient of responsibility of 1,2 will bring 12 points to the worker who gets ten positive evaluations. If the same worker has 100,000 past labour income points, they will have 100.012 points after the assessment. If they get 20 negative votes, 24 points will be deducted, and they will, thus, after that, have 99.976 income points. The evaluations will be given monthly, so the mutual evaluation system will require highly responsible work. It should be repeated that the examples are entirely arbitrary and that implementing such measures in practice will require a broad study and social acceptability.

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 the collectives of 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, the greatest responsibility that workers offer 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, productivity offered by workers will lose its meaning. For example, suppose people think that their work is not satisfactory. Then, they will get negative evaluations regardless of what productivity they offered and achieved, or if 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 cautiousness will prevent hasty statements and voluntarism, which are dangerous to production processes. The system will allow each worker to know their capacity and act according to their ability, thus meeting their needs. 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 set their responsibility coefficient, considering they do not work. Therefore, they will probably bear the lowest responsibility possible. 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 be getting and losing the points of past work in the value of 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 contribute to the betterment of 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 made in proportion to the coefficient of responsibility of the people in the same way as rewards and penalties are calculated in companies.

Current Labour Price

Finally, the price of current labour forms the competitive power in selecting the work. The current labour price depends on all the conveniences and inconveniences that work brings in realizing the required productivity concerning the conveniences and inconveniences of other forms of work or from the state outside of work.

The system envisages workers set the current labour price by themselves by a coefficient within a value range from 0.1 to 10. The average price of present labour will have a value of 1(one); a work 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 price on the labour market for equal productivity will realize greater work competitiveness. The system of labour competition will form a threshold value of the current labour price for 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.

Capitalism will face a robust political demand to reduce the work hours of workers until full employment is provided. It will employ all people who want to work, so capitalism's unfavourable form of unemployment will no longer exist. Reducing working hours will increase the demand for workers. Increased worker demand will increase workers' wages and reduce employers' profits. Workers' rights will grow while employers will lose their privileges. This will make capital decrease its significance. 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 then show significant progress in production.

Socialism will introduce workers' competition for every public job. No economy can be more productive than one in which every job gets the best available worker. Private companies will not be able to allocate workers efficiently enough to compete with public companies so public companies will become more productive and profitable than private ones. Above all, private companies will not be able to accept workers' participation in the distribution of profits as workers in public companies will be able to. As a result, workers will be less interested in working in private companies. Consequently, working in private companies will not be as attractive to workers as working in public companies.

The lower productivity of private companies and the lower interest of workers in working in them represent 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 the equivalent in points of past work that will bring them a proportionately higher income in public companies. In addition, the owners of private companies will realize that socialism is more stable to oscillations in the economy, ensuring greater stability of the values they possess. If the owners of private companies could join socialism today, they would most likely do so because they would preserve the value of their capital more in the frequent problems of capitalism.

The commune should also allow residents to sell their past labour points for money. Thus, the points of past work could become a form of humanistic actions in which the commune population will have confidence. 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 the commune's 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.

People have constantly been pressured by authoritarian forces that brought them a sense of inferiority. The reaction to that 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 allows every worker to be the best in their field. It will be a form of compensation for 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 all other forms of competition because it brings socially beneficial results and contributes to the well-being of society.

In socialism, work will no longer be privileged. Revoked privileges will eliminate the power of people over people, which is the mechanism of exploitation of people, which is the basis of problems in society. Under socialism, all workers will be equal 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 tiredness and satiation from over-intensive action on a broad social level so that ambitions will subside. Such an orientation will balance man's natural needs and possibilities. Freedom in socialism will enable workers to follow work processes with interest, develop a critical attitude and act on their strengths. This path will allow workers to examine the validity of the premises that guided them to form their needs. This will contribute to the formation of objective values in production.

In this way, people will get closer to their nature and find values that stem from their nature. Socialism will contribute to removing the subjective vision of reality imposed by the authorities throughout humanity's history, which is the basis of alienation and societal problems. It is a process of disalienation. This will bring values that allow people to find balance and satisfaction.

In socialism, people will accept their helplessness where they cannot overcome it and find fields where they can objectively exercise their power and thus satisfy their needs. People who manage to meet their needs constantly are not destructive. Such people would have no depression, neurosis, or psychosis and are not alcoholics, drug addicts, masochists, sadists, or aggressive. The process of disalienation will make people live responsible life. Socialism will enable the productive and constructive orientation of people, and then they will believe in prosperity based on 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 form a natural way of life with natural needs. The population will give up alienated ambitions to create healthy relationships in society. Relationships will be formed in which adults will respect young people, and mutual contradictions will be resolved by 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 by price. In a market economy, the law of supply and demand determines the price of items. Manufacturing possibilities, purchasing power, and society's needs adjust the cost of goods. Commodities also have their manufacturing value based on the cost of production.

In socialism, the manufacturing value of commodities should incorporate money intended for the work cost of all workers who produce the commodities (1); the pertaining ratio of the work of workers in the non-profit organizations (2); the pertaining proportion of the 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, so it will bring much more justice to wage distribution than possible today. The production value of goods can be presented by the formula:

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

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

A detailed explanation of the formula:

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

B – The total 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 quantity of past labour points is determined by the holdings of workers, while workers determine the current labour price by stating it in a freely competitive way. The product of these two coefficients gives the work price of a worker.

C – The coefficient of workers employed in non-profit organizations. It is expressed by the proportion of the work price of all the workers employed in non-profit organizations and those employed in a profit economy on the commune territory.

The proportion of workers employed in the profit economy and the non-profit organizations is regulated by the commune's management, following the needs and possibilities. The work price of workers in non-profit organizations is established identically to the work prices of workers in the profit economy. The workers in a profit economy produce commodities whose sale generates profit on the commodities market. The workers employed in non-profit organizations, such as teachers and police staff, do not directly realize incomes because their work is free of charge for the workers in the

profit economy and the commune's inhabitants. This means that the total quantity of produced commodities and services is a fruit of the collective work in both the profit economy and non-profit organizations. Workers in the profit economy use the services of non-profit activities; thus, according to the principle of mutuality, the workers in the non-profit activities must use the products of the work performed by the 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 the share of workers 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 in the 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: the young, pupils, retired people, homemakers, invalids and, generally, the whole unemployed population in the commune. The unemployed population needs to receive earnings for past and future labour and the economic security of the people. 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 price of unemployed people determines the commune's management according to the work needs and the power of the commune's production. A lower price of current labour 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 a higher income, decreasing the income-based work interest. This way, the commune's management will direct social work following social and production needs. For example, an increase in the price of current labour of students would stimulate education, etc.

These coefficients represent the income appropriations for all inhabitants in the commune in the cost of commodities. By selling goods on the market, all the commune inhabitants realize their share of the profit.

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

Working money assets are mostly set aside from the commune's reserve fund, which is formed by redeeming cash assets in exchange for past labour points. Operating assets are taken according to the needs of the profit economy. However, the producers are obligated to repay during the accounting period.

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

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

The sum of all labour costs of workers involved in manufacturing products burdened with contributions for workers in the non-profit companies and unemployed people gives the total labour cost for 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 the price of goods equates the total value of all goods produced in the commune with the income of the commune's inhabitants. In other words, it equates the prices of goods with the purchasing power of society. In this way, the production and distribution system achieves balance.

It is crucial to determine the production value of goods because it presents the efficiency of the business performance of enterprises in the commune. If the production value of goods is higher than the market price, the company is unprofitable. And if the production value of goods is lower than the market price, the company operates profitably.

Due to the different work equipment, enterprises' productivity varies, and by selling their commodities on the free market, they realize various incomes. In a free choice of labour system through labour competition, jobs that generate higher salaries with equal workloads would arouse great 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 forms of production. For example, the balance may be increased by employing more workers in enterprises, realizing a more significant profit and decreasing the number of workers in companies that realize smaller profits. If it is not economically justified, the balance may be established, and more significant profits may be earned by investing in companies that already produce profit and closing down the loss-making enterprises. If such an option is not justified, the balance lies in investing in the enterprises operating with smaller profits, which would achieve higher productivity and an increase in profit.

However, the difference in productivity and the realized income among enterprises in the commune will exist as long as a difference in the production equipment exists. This is because sizeable automation of the production process will always significantly reduce the necessary number of workers. In this way, the productivity and income of

workers in such a company will rise in relation to the producers of the commune having a lower level of automation in their production. Hence, if work competition were the only coordinator between the supply and demand of work, it would always create instabilities in the labour division created by the needs of workers 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 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 in the way that companies that perform the surplus-value, in which workers earn more than they demand, give up their surplus value in favour of companies making less money than workers demand. This is a subvention. The subvention is necessary because, in the system of free labour competition, workers would compete for work in more productive companies, where they would earn more money than they asked. This would bring instabilities in the division of labour. Such a measure has the sole task of equalizing the income interest of workers for all necessary jobs.

In this way, the commune becomes the basic working organization. It will allow all goods in all enterprises of the commune to be placed at market value, as this is still the best possible distribution of goods to consumers. At the same time, in socialism, all workers will earn incomes in proportion to the value of work they share in the production process, regardless of the companies' 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 to their companies because joined companies will cover their salaries. By sharing the revenue, everyone will make wages equal to the price of labour they asked for achieved productivity. Highly productive companies will be deprived of the surplus value achieved thanks to better equipment or market advantages, favouring workers who earn less than they demand.

From the standpoint of capitalistic entrepreneurship, socialism is fully non-stimulating because it does not allow the earning of extra profit by speculations beyond direct work. Instead, socialism will form a new work motivation that will arise directly from the competition for work, from the need to find and confirm individual productive power, which is one of the most critical drivers.

In socialism, speculations are only possible by altering statements of the coefficient of responsibility directly linked with work productivity and the business performance of the work collective. Individual and collective profits will continue to be achieved thanks to the rise in productivity. However, these profits will be smaller as they will not include the privileges resulting from a better status in society, from the better work equipment in production or random market conveniences, but exclusively from the equal struggle of workers in accomplishing 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 speak of their essential contribution to the production, and they need not be specially rewarded. However, suppose an individual worker increases their productivity more than other workers can in their position. 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 commodities prices and the number of produced goods give the total value of produced goods. The realization of such production requires an equivalent amount of money in circulation as a means of payment for the goods.

3.1.2.2.4 Money

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

The government uses low-interest rates to create an expansive monetary policy that stimulates investments. As a result, economic development increases workers' employment, national income, and society's welfare. However, the increased mass of money in circulation creates inflation, which raises the prices of goods and leads to instability in the market, 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.

Market regulation of the amount of money in circulation does not create a sufficiently stable economic policy because it is challenging to balance a huge number of independent factors that prevail in the economy. Thus, cyclical economic fluctuations occur, unfavourable for the economy and society. The state's monetary policy is much more adapted to anarchic changes in the market than it is based on 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 creating a monetary policy to ensure adequate 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 purchasing all manufactured goods. This would create economic stability.

Consumers possess a large amount of money. It is much higher than the value of current production and much lower than the total value of everything the society owns because those values were created by turning over the same money. Part of that money is turned over for payment transactions of production and distribution, and a large amount of money is accumulated to achieve economic security and people's investments. The big problem is that privately accumulated capital is placed freely, making it difficult for the economy to plan production. Therefore, it is necessary to introduce more order in the economic policy of the commune 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 of workers brings higher incomes, so people who own money can find their interest in exchanging money for past labour points. By selling money, the commune's population loses the possibility of lending money with interest but realizes a rise in income proportionately to the increase in the number of past labour points.

In a socialist society, everyone is materially secure. As a result, individuals will no longer have to save to ensure their future, so a significant voluntary exchange of money for past labour points may be expected. Each community 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 taxes of individuals and private enterprises will also be pooled.

Thus, the commune will accumulate a large amount of money. The economic policy of socialism will form money intended for the incomes of all the commune inhabitants to buy manufactured goods and pay for the services they use. However, if the amount of money is tied only to the produced value of goods, workers would realize incomes even though the delivered goods are not sold on the market. Such production would create overstock in warehouses and spend accumulated money of the commune, while the commune would not go bankrupt. In this regard, the amount of money for people's incomes should be formed between the total value produced in the merged public company of the commune and the profit realized on the market in the accounting period. The public bank of the commune should determine the monetary policy to realize the commune's optimal productivity and economic stability.

Such an amount of money may be called the revenue of the commune. 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 Economy

In socialism, managers will have the power to make decisions in the name of the people if they dare to do it because they will be directly accountable to people for their decisions. The members of society will be able to punish a manager who makes decisions that do not serve them. In such conditions, no manager can independently take responsibility for making political decisions that guide the whole society because they cannot know how much such decisions will suit the members of society.

This primarily relates to the formation of the macro-economic policies of the commune. For this reason, there is no doubt that the commune's management will include the commune's inhabitants in the decision-making process about the commune's income, fiscal, and development policy. 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 for individual and collective spending. The fund on individual expenditures defines the total amount of money for incomes for all commune residents, excluding workers in private enterprises because private enterprises keep their profits and distribute payments themselves. Collective spending defines the amount of money individuals wish to deduct from their salaries for the joint spending of all the commune people.

Individual spending money implies workers' incomes but also includes tax money for workers' salaries in non-profit companies and unemployed people. In this voting, people decide on the total amount of their incomes they intend for their individual and collective spending. Then, each person will insert their decision in the web application associated with the data processing center of the commune administration.

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

The rationale: 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 fiscal policy of society. The more productive work should have more decision-making power for better motivation. Economic decision-making power needs to be based on the value of past work determined by the number of past labour points.

This will contribute to the development of the economy and society. This measure is equivalent to the power of shareholders' voting rights in capitalism.

Suppose one wishes to allocate more money for individual spending and a smaller amount for collective spending. Then, they will divide the value of their past work points into such a ratio. The commune's leadership should first define the minimum tax money percentage to meet its basic joined spending needs. Then, the summarized declarations of all the commune inhabitants for individual and collective spending will determine the total amount of money for individual and collective spending. Thus, society will directly create the income and partial fiscal policies of the commune.

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

Similarly, society may determine the minimum income of individuals, which will regulate the range of incomes among the 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 productivity of the commune, the people can reduce the minimum income of workers through direct voting. The result would stimulate workers to work more and thus achieve higher productivity and a greater share in the distribution of incomes. On the other hand, if the commune reaches higher productivity than is required, society will increase the minimum income and thus reduce the income stimulation of work.

The system provides a single tax rate because it is simpler to calculate so that the people can determine it through direct democratic voting. Today's regulation of progressive taxation, which has the task of establishing social balance, will be replaced with the commune's income policy, which will be explained later. Harmful forms of spending for health, such as alcohol and tobacco, might be more effectively reduced through the disalienation of society rather than through tax policy.

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

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 the development of the economy will engage social work and economic growth to a more significant extent, which would increase the means of production and, accordingly, productivity. More sizeable investments in the development of the economy will ensure major social conveniences in the future; however, cash assets for current spending would decrease, reducing individual and social standards. Such a system will enable each commune to develop by relying on its forces. The policy of the commune development will be addressed in the chapter: "Development of the Economy."

Assets for collective spending serve to meet all common needs of society. They are used to maintain the existing social standard structure and build new social standard facilities. This includes funding commodity spending in public health, education, security, construction, maintenance of infrastructure, etc. 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.

The money for state spending also needs to be set aside from the funds earmarked by people for collective expenses. This money is used for the expenditure of the state. The Federal Assembly determines the federal spending amount of money through the delegates or representatives of 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 the voters' votes until each voter themselves changes their vote. Also, the new system will enable people to vote whenever they want. Therefore, they will be able to change their voting statements many times per day if they wish, and the system will not have any problem processing such changes.

The proposed system will significantly allow the commune population to determine the collective economic needs. Based on their experience, people will notice the advantages and disadvantages of a particular form of money distribution, adjusting so that all individuals and society realize more significant benefits. In this way, all individuals and society will realize greater conveniences. 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 the macro-economic policy of the commune. This will be an introduction to creating a stable, democratically planned 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 form of the economy as they do today.

The commune will realize common funds by exchanging money from the inhabitants with past labour points and through tax policy. In this way, the commune can accumulate significantly more money than is needed for the population's spending in the accounting period. The surplus of funds represents the monetary accumulation of the commune. 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 itself. The rest of the money will be used as the working capital of the public company of the commune.

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 that the commune's economy processes in its production processes.

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 do not charge themselves for working capital. Therefore, the commune would have no interest in charging loans to itself.

In the capitalist system, producers and consumers who do not have cash take out loans to buy goods. Loans burden the price of goods with interest determined by the market based on supply and demand. Interest requires a higher return on money than borrowed. On the one hand, it is a form of exploitation of people 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, so it is not rational and, at the same time, brings problems to the monetary policy.

Interest-free lending does not increase production costs and eliminates society's exploitation. If the commune can credit production without interest, the economy may, according to its possibilities, postpone collecting the payments for its goods with interest-free loans. When the commune grants loans without interest, private creditors would no longer be able to make money by borrowing money, 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 form such credit policy conditions, discouraging interest in borrowed money.

In the western world, interest rates are already low today because only a slight increase in interest rates may lead to business difficulties that can cause 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 function of earning rent based on accumulated money. They would no longer be profitable enterprises but could perform the role of individual and social bookkeeping of the monetary transactions in the

community. Aided by computer technology, banks may keep records of the earnings and expenditures of the population and companies of the commune.

However, interest can contribute to the efficiency of the economy. A more extended loan repayment period increases the amount of money paid for interest, so loan users' interest is to repay loans as soon as possible.

By introducing a system of non-interest-bearing loans, it will be necessary to set up a new method of monetary distribution that will, in trading and financial terms, be as efficient as the interest lending of capitalism. Since the quantity of working capital is limited, it may happen that such money will not be sufficient 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 in a shorter time will realize a more significant C-of working capital. Therefore, all larger working capital coefficients will ensure non-interest-bearing credit financing by the commune, irrespective of the quantity of the assets claimed, as long as the working capital fund shall have become exhausted.

The system predicts a higher chance of getting money to the economy that envisages a shorter turnover time of commodities. This is understandable because the money repayment is faster and can be used again for lending. Production that finds its spending in the payment period of one month will be able to use working capital with the help of the described distribution system because it returns them practically immediately.

The economy, collectively owned by the commune's 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 the society needs and gets paid for it. In case of failure, the producers will not make enough money. If profit exceeds the amount of working capital spent, companies are still operating relatively positively because they can return working capital. On the other hand, low gains in the accounting period will reduce workers' income.

If the realized profit falls below the amount of used working capital, the enterprise then registers a loss in working capital. Toleration of such a situation would reduce the amount of working capital in the commune's money fund, and producers would have 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 collectively through past labour points they possess.

Companies' production intended for unknown consumers need not be placed immediately on the market. In that case, the turnover of commodities may last longer than the one-month accounting period, and the enterprise may realize less profit than the working capital amount spent in the accounting period. However, as each company operates continuously, it can make the necessary profit and ensure the return of working capital based on the collection of manufactured goods from a previous production period.

The responsibility of workers needs to be taken independently of cyclic oscillations of profits. Over the course of one year, each enterprise takes the working capital as often as it needs 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' higher coefficient of responsibility will bring a more significant loss of past labour points and a lower income. And vice-versa, a lower coefficient of workers' responsibility, in this case, will bring along a minor loss of the past labour points and a smaller decline in the level of income. The initiator of the unsuccessful borrowing decision will also be sanctioned by 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."

Non-realization of the envisaged profit due to natural catastrophes such as earthquakes, floods, and fires need not be considered as lousy productivity of the economy. The commune's reserve money fund would cover such losses.

The working capital in the commune's reserve fund is always limited, and it may happen that some producers do not get the necessary working capital. The economy can't produce without working capital, and such plants need to be closed. For such cases, the commune envisages a reserve source from the development of the economy where working capital may be allocated. If neither of these are possible, they can seek it from private banks with 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

It is worth saying that irrespective of the extent to which the economy will be associated, the market economy will never be insensitive to oscillations in trends. By tightening the requirements concerning risk-bearing that will result from the work competition, the failures of producers may be markedly inconvenient. In this regard, producers will have to seek more certainty in doing business and find it in the production for the known consumers.

The associated producers will question consumers' needs and gradually organize production on their order. The economy can successfully manage production with known spending, and labour competition will enable the most successful work performance. It should be emphasized that such economic production of goods will occur less and less in the market economy and more and more in the planned economy.

3.1.2.2.5 Development of the Economy

In capitalism, the amount of money intended for investment depends on the entrepreneurship of the owner of the means of production. It is formed by an allocation from the realized market profit of the company.

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

Suppose an inhabitant of the commune wishes that the commune's economy develops to a more significant extent. In that case, they will state a more substantial amount of money intended to develop the economy. But, as the total quantity of money is limited, they will have to declare a smaller amount of funds meant for the spending of the commune's inhabitants. And vice versa, an inhabitant wishing for more significant spending will state a larger amount of money intended for spending and a smaller amount for developing the economy. The statements of all inhabitants in the function of their voting power expressed in points of past work, entered into the Internet application of the centre for data processing, will sum up and form the amount of money intended for collective spending and the development of the economy.

Suppose inhabitants will generally tend to a more significant development of the economy. In that case, a larger quantity of assets intended for the accumulation of the economy concerning spending will be appropriated, which would speed up economic development and reduce the population's income and, consequently, the standard of living. Such a monetary policy enables each commune to accumulate money to develop its economy by relying on its forces irrespective of the degree of economic development. When the economy grows to a point where it can ensure expansive production, the need for society to invest in development 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, which means that society will plan its development. Such a monetary distribution form will guide the commune's developmental policy. Thus, the economy gets the framework for development direction to plan its development effectively. In addition, this will 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.

Enterprise managers demand assets intended for economic development based on the development programs of their respective enterprises. The enterprise development program contains a defined amount of needed assets, the company's envisaged profit, and the implementation time.

When the amount of money necessary for economic development is formed, 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 needed assets and a more significant profit realized with a shorter implementation time results in higher C-of development. Therefore, the assets are distributed so that the most significant C-of development will get the needed investments, followed by the subsequent C-of development, and so on. Assets are limited, so they cannot be allocated to enterprises that achieve a smaller than necessary C-of development. Such enterprises must wait for better times or increase the predicted profit with a smaller amount of needed assets and a shorter implementation time.

As the funds intended for the development of the for-profit economy are renewed in each accounting period from the revenue of the commune, they are allocated non-refundable as grants. The commune will become a humanistic corporation, and corporations, even in capitalism, do not charge themselves for their investments. It is enough for companies to realize the envisaged profit, and in this way, the assets intended for economic development find their social justification.

Socialism presupposes precisely determined responsibilities of managers and workers in using 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 get approval from senior management to coordinate the economy's improvement with other economies. Then, the company manager will present the development program to the workers and his responsibility for its implementation with K-responsibility. Higher K-responsibility can give workers, among other things, greater confidence in the manager's plan.

Significant investments will considerably increase the responsibility of workers in production processes, and they will need to declare whether they can accept it. Based on insight into the management program and trust in their management, workers will take the scope of their responsibility by offering their K-responsibility. For example, suppose workers declare an increase in responsibility for their work. This would mean they support the management program so that the company will compete for money for economic development. 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 unless the productivity changes are jointly adopted.

Funds intended for the development of the economy increase the economy's productivity and, thus, the value of newly-produced goods, which requires an increase in the mass of money in circulation to purchase newly-produced goods. Increasing the amount of money in circulation requires increasing the worker's 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 have a measure of productivity expressed in monetary gain in the market. After the expiration of the time required to realize the projected increase in productivity, business success is calculated. For example, suppose the company realizes the proposed monetary profit. Such profit is treated as a permanent work improvement that brings higher income. Thus, the company's workers get the requirements for acquiring points from past work. Then the difference between the achieved realized profit and the profit that the company made before the investment is shown as an increase in profit. Then the past labour points are distributed to the employees in the company in the amount of the projected increase in the company's cash profit.

However, suppose some companies of the commune do not realize the projected profit in the foreseen time with the use of money 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 the quantity of the company's non-achieved profit gain. In this regard, if the company makes half the

expected profit, it will earn half of the expected points of past work and lose half of past work. This means that achieving half of the productivity by using assets for economic development does not bring earnings or losses of the points of past work.

The productivity of a profitable economy makes a direct monetary gain on the market, while the productivity of non-profit and government organizations is realized by the benefits they realize to the commune. Work products of organizations are free of charge for the population. Such a group may include administration bodies, public protection, education, healthcare, and similar activities. In socialism, the productivity of organizations is expressed by the performance assessment of the quality of services provided by the people directly and by specialized arbitration commissions.

Organizations also demand monetary assets for their development, which comes from the collective spending fund. Therefore, evaluation of the success of non-profit companies may have a scale of values equivalent to the monetary profit of the economy so that improvement in the work performance of organizations would increase their success index and vice-versa. The workers in organizations also need to be entitled to increased past labour points in the case of high productivity, which is set aside from the profit economy.

This means that the non-profit organizations of the commune will participate in the profit of the economy. The quantity of income points allocated to the non-profit economy is determined by comparing the realized productivities in the profit economy and non-profit organizations. By using coefficients, it is possible to mathematically compare the profit of the economy and the benefits from non-profit organizations and award and punish them according to their contribution to society. Such comparison will be necessarily objective in the labour division through work competition. Each disproportion would result in the spill-over of work, where the work conditions would be more convenient, 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 perform independently in the same way as the merged public company of the commune. 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 money to develop the commune's economy, so it cannot use these cash assets. Instead, private entrepreneurship has to accumulate cash or borrow it from banks with interest-bearing loans.

Considering that the work competition in socialism will be at least equal to or more productive than the work in private entrepreneurship, it may be expected that private entrepreneurship will lose the productivity fight against socialist entrepreneurship. In addition, under socialism, the productive consciousness of workers will grow, and they will want to make their own decisions, take responsibility for their own decisions, and participate in the distribution of corporate profits that they cannot achieve under capitalism. As workers will have significantly more significant rights and freedoms in the socialist form of ownership of the means of production, it can be expected that private entrepreneurs will lose the labour force.

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

Applying the coefficient of responsibility in socialism represents a favourable substitution for stock-exchange speculations of capitalism. This is because possible gains or losses of past labour points of workers, equivalent to shares in capitalism, are tied to the successfulness of productivity of their companies. Socialism puts workers in an equal position in production and diminishes alienation in production, while collective responsibility contributes to greater prosperity in doing business.

Democratic planning and management of the economy, full employment and work competition, the resolved issue of workers' accountability, and distribution of incomes according to work values will remove the shortcomings of the known socialist and capitalistic 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 the contributions of workers in the process of production as much as they can, which creates the exploitation of workers, bringing problems to society

In socialism, each worker's income level is based on the objective price of labour and the achieved productivity. 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 workers in private companies because they retain their profits. Private companies will pay taxes like they do today. These taxes belong to the people of the commune. They are used, among other things, for the salaries of all the commune inhabitants.

The level of income can be determined by a coefficient with the following formula:

$$\text{C-Income} = (\text{Work price}) \times \text{C-income}_W \times \text{C-income}_E \times \text{C-income}_C$$
$$\text{Work price} = (\text{Value of past labour}) \times (\text{Value of current labour})$$

The work price is determined by the product of the number of past labour points of a worker and the cost of current work. The quantity of points each worker holds is equal to the value of their past labour and past work they inherited from their ancestors. The amount of labour past points is the specific condition of the system where the worker with a higher value of past labour realizes a proportionately higher income, irrespective of what 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 current labour by comparing the work conveniences and inconveniences with other forms of work. They ensure objectivity in valuing the current work price by the work competition where the right to work is exercised by the worker who, in the circumstances of equal productivity, asks for a lower current work price.

In socialism, all inhabitants realize the safety of their survival by income; therefore, it is necessary to set the current work price of unemployed inhabitants. Since unemployed inhabitants of the commune do not perform any profit or non-profit 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 according to the commune's working needs and economic possibilities. More precisely,

it balances the supply and demand for the work in the commune. If the commune's inhabitants were not sufficiently interested in work, the leadership would reduce the price of current work for the unemployed population. This would result in their lower income, which would increase interest in the work of the inhabitants.

Conversely, suppose the interest in work by workers is excessive. In that case, the leadership may increase the current work price of the unemployed, and the workers' interest in employment based on income would go down. The commune management may give a higher price for current work to children and students, stimulating education. The commune's social policy regulates the price of current work for invalids and older people. The people in this commune will no longer need a pension plan as retirement insurance because the new system provides individuals with an income regardless of whether they work. Besides, the individual would be able to work if they wish and can with no age limit.

Finally, each worker's income level depends on the C-of income. The C-of income of each worker depends on the proportion of realized and envisaged productivity of workers, enterprises, and the whole commune in the function of 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 of the realized and envisaged workers' productivity in the function of workers' accountability.

Productivity is expressed in accepted work values that indicate the quantity and quality of products in profit enterprises and services in non-profit work 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 the range of evaluations to indicate work productivity in the same way as in establishing the quantity and quality of produced commodities.

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 force the individual to diminish

their shortcomings and broadly enhance their 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 as they performed the needed productivity. If the realized productivity is higher or lower than the required one, the worker's income will be higher or lower than the envisaged.

Finally, the C-income-W level depends on the C-responsibility of a worker determined by the workers themselves. Mathematically, a function can be defined that will bring the worker who declares small K-responsibilities approximately the income they sought regardless of the productivity achieved. With an increase in K-responsibility, their income will increase in the event of an increase in their productivity or decrease in the event of a reduction in their productivity. Higher K-responsibility gives more competitive power to do any work.

The income of workers will also depend on the productivity of the enterprise. Enterprise productivity may be shown 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 productivity of enterprises is shown by the realized profit on the market. Profit represents the most efficient way for assessing productivity, or more precisely, the values of the result of work in present-day society.

Workers realize the envisaged income in the case of the realization of the envisaged productivity or, to say it differently, if they sell the current production on the market. But, of course, that would require a high speed in assets turnover or, practically, production for known customers. It is challenging to sell all the produced commodities during the accounting period. Some portion of such output will be sold in another accounting period, thus realizing its profit in another accounting period. 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. If

the formula establishes a $C\text{-of_income_E}$ larger or smaller than 1 (one), the enterprise's revenue will be proportionately larger or smaller than the envisaged ones.

The system of work competition in the labour market ensures an even distribution of employment benefits and disadvantages in each company. But if one company has a significantly better means of production than another, employees in the better-equipped company might achieve a higher income than workers 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 of 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 overflow the incomes between companies to ensure a uniform income interest of 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 handle: the protection of the environment against pollution, the deviation from standards of the quality of goods, etc.

States already have developed regulations determining production norms, and socialism will intensify such standards. In addition, socialism will increase the efficiency of regulations. Special commissions will accept the state's standards, analyze possible declines, and propose the intensity of influences of such declines on $C\text{-income_E}$. It will be crucial to consider all criteria for protecting the individual and their environment from pollution. This regulation will need to be accepted by the commune's assembly. Based on such standards, the consumers of commodities, consumer associations, professional institutions, specialized arbitration commissions at the commune level or of the coalition of communes, or international arbitrations will evaluate the quality of work of economic enterprises.

It is noteworthy that the system does not envisage a bureaucratic evaluation of all producers because, in that way, an enormous bureaucratic administrative apparatus would be formed. Instead, the system envisages a customer's free assessment of those enterprises whose products deviate positively or negatively from the determined standards. Every person will also have equal power to evaluate companies. For example, suppose a person evaluates positively or negatively a company that has 1000 employees. In that case, the evaluation will affect the reward or punishment of all the company employees with $1/1000$ of the impact the evaluation would have on an individual. Such an assessment will be minimal but still enough to affect the production process.

The system also provides the evaluation based on the analysis made by expert services of randomly selected or reported enterprises. The enterprises that do not get any assessment will be treated as they operate within the envisaged productivity and adopted economic operation standards.

Analogously to the profit realized on the market, the enterprises producing more socially acceptable products to the established standards will achieve a productivity assessment higher than 1, and realize a higher income. And vice versa, the socially unacceptable enterprises will realize an evaluation lower than 1, consequently, 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_{Income_E} .

By using the coefficients, economic enterprises can efficiently bear responsibility with their income for the pollution of the environment or bad quality of products. Enterprises polluting the environment or producing low-quality products will, dependent on the influence that such declines from the standards have, realize a lower income than they are supposed to receive according to the realized profit. Workers will also be additionally sanctioned by the loss of past labour points. To remove the shortcomings in their economic activity, such enterprises will have to compete for assets intended to develop the economy in the function of a non-profitable increase of productivity expressed by assessment.

Capitalism strongly opposes the protection of the human environment because it makes production more expensive. Socialism will provide a good quality of life to be accepted by the world one day. Then it will ensure that the Earth is clean and healthy.

Nonprofits generally do not have a 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 expressed by performance assessment. The assessment is given by service users, user associations and professional institutions. The evaluation of the performance of non-profit organizations can be presented with a coefficient as successfully as the presentation of the work of for-profit companies. Using coefficients, one can compare the performance of for-profit companies and non-profit organizations and, based on that, reward according to the values of work performed.

In the associated labour, each work is non-separable from another job, so each worker also bears responsibility for the economic activity of their enterprise. Therefore, a worker stating a higher coefficient of responsibility also assumes greater responsibility for the enterprise's productivity and will realize a higher income if the enterprise rise in productivity, and vice versa.

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 of the realized and envisaged productivity of the commune in the function of responsibility of each worker.

This coefficient does not strongly impact the distribution of income within the commune. Differences occur only vis-à-vis the degree of responsibility an individual worker assumes for their own and collective productivity. Nevertheless, establishing the C-of realized productivity of the commune would be highly important in the communes' association and income distribution among communes.

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 a poly-functional system that evaluates the quality of life such as pollution-non-pollution, literacy-illiteracy, and legality-illegality in the acting of the population. By using C-income_C is also possible to make subventions to less-developed communes. That would increase the interest of workers in working in such communes. In the same manner, regulating even the birth rate of the commune population will be possible. If the commune has too low or too high a birth rate, it may be adjusted by C-income_C by an appropriate value.

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

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

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

It arises from the formula that the C-of income of each worker depends on the envisaged work price and the coefficient of realized productivity at the level of the work post, enterprise and the commune in the function of responsibility for the realized productivity. By applying computer technology, all workers' income levels can be quickly calculated, regardless of the number of income factors. Workers may be assumed to be most responsible for their work because oscillations in enterprise productivity are smaller and minimal at the commune level.

Socialism allows the production of independent private entrepreneurship. Work posts in private entrepreneurship are owned by private entrepreneurs and are not subject to

work competition. The owner of an enterprise employs workers according to their needs.

Upon realizing a profit on the market, private entrepreneurs keep working assets according to their needs. They also keep assets for the upgrading and amortization of production. They are bound to pay income and property taxes as they do today. These assets are intended for the employed workers in the non-profit economy, unemployed workers, the commune's collective spending, and federal spending. The tax level for independent private entrepreneurs will be proportional to the taxes of the socialist entrepreneurs of the commune. The population of the commune 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.

Suppose independent private entrepreneurship uses an advanced technology unknown to the public; they may realize a higher profit than the 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 such an extent that it will become more productive than independent private entrepreneurship. When independent private entrepreneurs realize incomes lower than enterprises in collective ownership, the number of workers interested in employment with private entrepreneurs will drop. 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 to work with private enterprises will be even lower.

In short, the new system will outperform the private companies from the free market and take over their workers. Therefore, it may be expected that independent private entrepreneurs will 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, a more robust competitive power in choosing work, and a better 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 quantity of money is determined by direct voting of the population and appropriated from the total amount of funds intended to turnover commodities and services in the commune.

The obtained amount of money intended for the incomes of the commune's population needs, in principle, to correspond with the envisaged quantity of funds designed for the people's payments because the system is based on the price of work corresponding to the income of people. However, deviations are possible due to differently realized

productivities. Therefore, more or less money might be available for the overall revenue of all inhabitants compared to what 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 the troubles in performing income policy. The amount of money designed for income will be distributed to people in proportion to their share in production, and people will be convinced that income distribution is fair.

The technique of income distribution may take place from the commune's computer centre. Actual income can be established according to the extended proportion formula:

$$\frac{\text{Income-1}}{\text{C-income}_1} : \frac{\text{Income-2}}{\text{C-income}_2} : \frac{\text{Income-3}}{\text{C-income}_3} : \dots : \frac{\text{Income-n}}{\text{C-income}_n} =$$

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:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Income-1} &= \text{Value-1} \\ \text{Income-2} &= \text{Value-2} \\ \text{Income-3} &= \text{Value-3} \\ \text{Income-n} &= \text{Value-n} \end{aligned}$$

The obtained income shows the productivity of each commune's inhabitant in a specific monetary amount.

Centralization of the income distribution systems allows the application of uniform distribution criteria according to 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 is 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 have the commune's population by directly declaring the minimum income. All residents will express what minimum salary they find the most acceptable. The average obtained value in the function of voting power

determined in the economy by the value of past work 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 standard would grow. On the other hand, high productivity can create market saturation, reducing labour needs. Then the population could increase the lowest income. Since the amount of money earmarked for the income of all residents is limited, an increase in the minimum income reduces the income gap. By applying the extended ratio, the difference in the amount of income will increase or decrease according to the needs of society. 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 expresses the level of payment of all residents. Workers' incomes may be publicly disclosed or kept secret at the discretion of each individual. Each resident uses their income freely.

3.1.2.2.8 Use of Real Property

Individuals need housing to meet their existential needs. Using living spaces has significant advantages, so the individual ensures it through ownership. However, ownership quickly assumes the subjective features by which the individual attributes a more substantial power than the one they objectively have. Such ownership then becomes alienated from its nature, thus alienating the individual from their nature. In an alienated society that develops possession, real estate ownership becomes a simple, efficient and recognized form of presenting the individual's power. In such a society, the individual becomes what they have. People's alienated needs are insatiable, resulting in struggles between people to appropriate more valuable real estate and relentless exploitation of natural resources that the planet Earth cannot stand.

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

The known alternative to private ownership of real property is social property. Social ownership needs to consider the equal right of all inhabitants to use real estate. However, society has not learned how to establish it. Besides that, society has not found an acceptable way to socialize private ownership, so it used to confiscate real property from private owners 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 society has not managed to resolve the problems related to the distribution of living spaces in social ownership. Real property building and its use carry out the bureaucratic administrative apparatus. Generally, candidates wait years to acquire the right to use living space. The bureaucratic structure cannot monitor the changes in the housing needs of the tenants and even less so to meet their requests. Such social policy results in the disproportion of the real estate distribution, which always results in privileges for some members of society. Indeed, that develops alienation and antagonism in the community as well. It must be noted that users of the housing facilities in social ownership are not owners. Therefore, they do not maintain them and do not have enough responsible attitude toward the same.

The right to use real property in social ownership is less efficient than private rent-based distribution. However, an efficient policy of using real property in social ownership can be enabled by a socialist policy of real property utilization.

In socialism, the right to work is determined by labour competition. Analogously, the use of individual housing needs to be provided by the rent competition of the people. The rent-based competition of real property users requires associated ownership of real property. This is possible to achieve by replacing the private ownership of real property with socialist past labour points, which would set up 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 use the real estate and pay taxes as they do now. However, real estate ownership will no longer represent the status of the individual. Instead, socialist past labour points will have this role. The sale of private ownership increases the number of past labour points, which increases incomes. Having a more significant amount of 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 commune.

The real property value is assessed freely following market value and under 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, while the income-based burden would be shifted to another. 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 efficiently ensure rational and socially acceptable use of the real property, the residences and office premises in the first place. 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 centre with the technical description, position and rent level.

The same real estate may bring more conveniences to one individual than another. Each inhabitant will auction up the real estate in the commune's administrative centre representing their most significant personal interest, following their income possibilities. The inhabitant offering the highest rent acquires 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 subtracted from the income account of the property user. If a user of real property is challenged by a competitor with the rise of rent, wishes to continue using it and can afford the increase of the rent, they will remain a user of this property. A competing party that did not manage to occupy the desired housing premise will further compete for another housing premise.

Each stated rent obliges the real estate user to use it for a certain period at the stated price. After such time expires, the real estate user may lower the rent level if a potential competitive real estate user allows it.

The user of living space who cannot afford or does not wish to accept the highest stated rent will have to surrender the used real estate to a more potent competitor within a reasonable time. They will, during that time, seek a cheaper home to rent. Leaving real estate is inconvenient; however, it will be accepted to achieve greater collective conveniences.

Any space that may serve housing and business purposes is subject to the competition of real property utilization. If enterprises offered a higher rent than tenants, such real estate would become a business premise and vice versa. In this way, the market will determine society's best real estate utility.

Real property, such as public farming land and industrial facilities, are subject to work competition. Therefore, it will not be necessary to pay any rent for such property as another form of competitive establishment for the right of its use.

Public spaces and facilities such as administration, courts, schools, healthcare institutions, and clubs are set by the delegates' decision of the commune's assembly. The whole society uses such facilities for specific social purposes, and they, therefore, are not subject to the competition of the users.

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

The amount of money intended for 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 realize a stake in the amount of money intended for all rents in proportion to their income. A worker achieving a higher income has contributed more to the development of society and thus has a greater right to use real estate. They exercise this right by getting a more significant amount of rent-related money. The amount of money intended for rent will be directly collected in full from the income accounts of tenants. 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 the differences in the income levels of the commune inhabitants, the rent levels, and the value or, more precisely, on the necessity of the real property. More significant differences in income levels will allow more considerable differences in rent-paying power and, accordingly, greater differences in using real estate.

The more valuable real property will realize more effective rents and vice versa. A worker with a relatively low income who would wish to use a relatively more valuable real estate would set aside for the use of real estate the money intended for rent and a part of money intended for their spending in favour of the worker who uses a less valuable real property. The latter would, in this way, retain the entire income and a part of the money intended for rent, increasing their consumer power.

Family communities rent housing spaces. Each family member realizes income in the commune. In this connection, larger family communities or groups get a larger payment and a greater possibility of using real estate.

The proposed system of real property distribution represents the most efficient, most just and most acceptable real estate distribution, regardless of the ratio of the quantity of housing premises and the number of tenants, because the competition of the real estate users on the market balances the best distribution. Moreover, such a form of rent will accept all positive characteristics of private and social renting and reject all negative aspects, which will contribute to the prosperity of society.

The competition of real property users would form an objective value of the real property. Where the rent value of real estate is higher, there is a greater interest on the part of the population. This is a good indicator for earmarking cash assets for constructing real estate. The construction, demolition and adaptation of immovable property are carried out from the fund of collective spending.

Life in such a system will allow each inhabitant to examine the need for living spaces based on practice. This will demystify the alienated premises of perceiving the real property value. Such an orientation may lower the importance of the turnover value of the real estate and reduce it to a usable value. Society can then ensure the meeting of all inhabitants' real property needs.

3.1.2.2.9 Collective Spending

Each society organizes a service that meets the collective needs of 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 profit and workers' income.

Authority determines tax policy on the territory where it has sovereignty. In the present-day social orders, the people choose their representatives in power, and they are supposed to represent their tax interests. However, in practice, the chosen representatives in power are, as a general rule, more inclined to follow their interests or to represent the interests of the privileged society members who have a strong influence on policymaking.

Society does not impact the tax policy, even if authorities try hard to meet their tax policy needs. Therefore, the tax policy is permanently alienated from the members of society, and they cannot accept it as their own. People are forced to accept the tax policy created by the authorities and, therefore, experience it as violence against their own needs. Such circumstances result in dissatisfaction with the tax payment and an insufficiently built attitude toward collective ownership.

Socialism needs a tax policy as well. However, it would substantially differ from the tax policy in capitalism. The commune's population will directly tailor the new tax policy.

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

The distribution takes place using the application over the Internet, where people choose desired values within possible value ranges determined by the commune's leadership and approved by its assembly. An inhabitant who needs more money for collective spending will be setting aside more money for it than for other assets. A more significant amount of money intended for collective spending will satisfy the collective social needs to a greater extent. Still, it will diminish the funds designed for individual expenditure and economic development. The sum of the values opted for collective spending by all inhabitants in the function of their voting powers will represent the total amount of money intended for collective spending

It is worth mentioning that the assets intended for collective spending serve exclusively for collaborative consumption and not for people's incomes. Incomes of individuals are

paid from the fund of individual expenditures. The elemental distribution of the money intended for collective spending is divided into assets designed to maintain and build communal facilities.

Monetary assets intended for the maintenance of communal facilities will need to be further separated among the commune's administration, management, judiciary, social protection, health care, education, science, culture, sports and recreation, the environment arrangement for the needs of infrastructure, transport, and other forms of consumption.

The commune's leadership would set possible value ranges for distributing money to specific groups. They will select the limits for minimal resources that certain groups of collective spending must have to ensure their functioning and the optimal and maximal possible amount of money for certain 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. The statements of all the commune inhabitants are then processed in the commune's administrative centre. The sum of all values stated per groups in the function of the economic voting power of the population 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 will be necessary to increase or decrease cash assets for the needs of particular groups. Each collective spending group has a large number of minor and significant expenses and a limited amount of money at its disposal. However, inhabitants do not necessarily need to be interested in further money distribution. However, the distribution may be carried out by interested individuals as long as they are interested.

The money for the collective spending might also be distributed to non-profit organizations that offer the highest satisfaction to society's needs. That is similar to the principle of money distribution for the development of the economy. 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 of workers, the use of money for collective spending needs will be very responsible.

Authorized managers will determine the final distribution of money assets under each spending group. Due to the high level of responsibility, the managers will use the money intended for collective spending in some 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 conditions. Such a principle guarantees that the final

distribution of even the most negligible money assets intended for collective spending will be earmarked to allow the most efficient way to meet social needs.

The population also directly impacts the construction of new facilities of social interest. Construction of social standard-related facilities refers to building infrastructure and purchasing the equipment that requires large amounts of money. In this connection, the more the population opts for a larger quantity of funds intended for collective spending, including the need for necessary construction, the more possibilities will be in place to build many communal standard facilities and vice versa.

Based on the amount of money at the disposition and social needs, the leadership of the commune will plan the construction of new facilities. It will define the technical characteristics and the money necessary for such construction.

Since construction requires a large amount of money and extensive collective work and introduces lasting changes in the commune's structure, the population needs to approve such a building 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 of money for collective spending is subject to social agreement, which contributes to the constructive orientation of society. In socialism, the population has the power to manage collective spending for the first time directly. Such control will make the people accept collaborative spending as their own. In such a system, communal ownership is no longer alienated in any segment, making the population accept its community. In such a community, one may expect a responsible attitude of the people toward the collective property.

Collective spending is the most rational form of consumption and allows the highest degree of meeting social needs. Therefore, the population may be expected to increase the money intended for collective spending, 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 needs of the state are determined,

they are collected in proportion to the income of the commune and sent to the federal administration.

The distribution of money at the federal level is created by state leadership and approved by delegates of the communes in the national assembly or parliament, the same as 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 the people accustomed to directly deciding about the 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 the decision-making at the commune level; however, it requires compatibility of the decision-making systems. In other words, all communes in the state would need to accept such or a similar method.

3.2 The Disalienation of Associated Communes

3.2.1 Association of the Policies

Generally, the origin of states has rarely had anything to do with democracy. The people have seldom been asked what country they would have liked to live in. The states are the product of the imposition of the needs of autocratic rulers. The solution is not the negation of states because of their non-democratic origin. 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, after the election of leaders, delegates, or a party, the individual has no impact on setting the rules for collective actions. Delegated members of the parliament carry out an indirect form of democracy that easily declines from the election programs. The present-day state is a more or less closed authoritative formation that maintains the coordination of alienated social actions by a system of more or less 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 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 politics and the economy of capitalism, thus allowing the continuation of political and economic prosperity.

One should hope that this book will be of interest to some foundations, state leadership, political parties, associations, and individuals who would not regret their contribution to the development of socialism. Naturally, the socialist system will require comprehensive scientific analysis and a theoretical simulation of the commune. Then, when satisfactory

results are established, it is possible to experimentally apply the socialist system in a smaller social community that would accept it.

The commune is a part of the state as a sovereign social organization. The commune's delegates in the state assembly represent the interests of their respective communes. In this way, each commune makes state decisions in creating 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 collision with the accepted constitutional laws of the state.

The socialist commune will have a closed labour market concerning the state and an independent economy. The workers from the capitalist world will not be able to freely apply for jobs in the commune with the socialist system. They cannot realize income in the socialist commune if they do not have past labour points. Transfer of workers may be allowed administratively if a worker in their commune sells their property and thus gathers sufficient money to buy 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 performed on the level of associated communes. Regulation of the transfer of the value deriving from past labour would be then carried out automatically.

The socialist system will ensure the commune's economic, social, and political stability. It would allow the commune to develop faster and more stable than capitalism in all fields. This also means that people would be reaching more remarkable social advantages than in capitalism. When socialism shows positive results, it may serve as a model to other communes. Then political parties of other communes will accept socialism, contributing to disseminating socialism worldwide.

Accepting socialism by several communes opens up a higher degree of association among the communes based on implementing a new political and economic system. In this way, the commune keeps a part of its political and economic sovereignty and transfers a portion onto the association of communes. The association will be based on the collective labour market and collective capital. Such an association may bring direct conveniences and inconveniences to the commune's population.

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 in which a worker is interested and finding a suitable residence and, consequently, realizing significant conveniences. Further, associated communes are economically more potent. Thus, they can achieve higher prosperity in society and greater certainty in business operations in the case of disruptions in the market.

For the same reasons, the population may also experience the association of communes unfavourably. Namely, more workers create a more substantial work competition, which may result in more difficulty exercising the right to work in one's interest. Moreover, greater economic system stability will inevitably require a spillover of money between the 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 will clearly define the modalities and procedure of the association. Such a program should be adopted with at least 2/3 of the votes of political parties in the assemblies of communes that want 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 benefits and inconveniences 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. After the decision of the political parties, it will probably not be difficult to collect a sufficient number of people's votes in the referendum.

One should assume that the practice will show over time that the association of the communes brings a larger market that enables greater profits. Communes unwilling to associate themselves with other communes would become economically weaker than associated communes. Besides that, a larger-scale association boosts higher productivity realized by stronger work competition and brings more conveniences in operating results. A larger-scale association will result in greater certainty in doing business in the case of any disruption emerging in the market. A larger-scale association of communes will form a more significant accumulation of collective money, ensuring meeting a larger quantity of people's needs. A larger-scale association will allow more possibilities for the population to exert direct influence on making decisions of joint interest on the territory of associated communes. A larger-scale association will enable the people to evaluate the actions of any individual in the region of the associated 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 such a larger-scale association.

Association can develop at the state level as a sovereign social organization in a particular territory. However, unlike the commune, the state, as a completely sovereign social organization, enacts the constituent and other laws of the country. The adoption and amendments to the constitutive and other basic laws are prepared and determined by the state parliament with its expert services. Fundamental rules and decisions regulate the rights and duties of citizens and relations in production and distribution.

Delegates in the state parliament should adopt important state laws with at least 2/3 of the deputies' votes and then forward them to the population in a referendum. 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 population declares itself through computer applications over the Internet by accepting or rejecting such laws. Laws that receive at least 2/3 of the residents who voted and are taken by at least 1/2 of the state's total population would be passed, and the rest would be rejected or revised. Such adoption of the law should not be problematic if political parties in the state parliament have previously done it. As the population directly decides on its laws, it is interested in knowing them and accepting them of its own free will. Therefore, they are no longer alienated from society.

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 2/3 of the representatives' votes in the commune assembly in the same way it adopts its association. Then the decision is adopted or rejected by the commune inhabitants with at least 2/3 of the votes of people who participated in the, and at least 50% of the voices of the total number of commune inhabitants.

If a referendum in the commune would confirm the will of the people for self-determination, then representatives of the commune and state would engage in the division of assets and liabilities, division of the collectively acquired goods of the commune and the state, including regulation of all obligations, claims and the newly established relations. Based on the agreement achieved, a referendum would need to be organized on the territory of 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 that can prevent the secession of the commune. The process of disassociation cannot be easy because the enormous number of ties between and among communes, companies, and inhabitants created from the establishment of the state should be considered.

An objective analysis can assume that the population will reject disintegration through their practice because they cannot bring greater economic or social benefits. Significant benefits and 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 gives more freedom of choice, more power to the people, and more productivity and stability to the economy.

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 still might be possible; however, nobody will be able to raise disputes among individuals 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 Association of the Economy

A larger social community offers more potent possibilities for developing the economy and, accordingly, greater prosperity of society. At the same time, it requires a more concerted effort to accomplish the coordination of collective actions. Every society strives to achieve economic prosperity but cannot because people have not defined methods to achieve more significant and stable economic progress than capitalism offers.

The socialism presented in this book defines new elements that can significantly improve the economic policy of society. Socialism will be based on the agreement of the most productive manufacturers, which allows for maximal productivity of the economy and relative stability of the system. The stability of the new economic system will be based on steady production, stable prices of products, regular incomes and the known needs of the population. Sound production and distribution are preconditions for the stability of a state.

The association of communes into a state allows a higher degree of labour distribution with the total employment of workers, as demonstrated in the commune. Leadership will direct the work to maximize certain communes' regional and manufacturing advantages. 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 garner significant productivity by lowering enterprise competition to the level of work posts. The right to work within the state will be exercised through work competition among workers. Any inhabitant can compete for any work post in the whole state. The work competition will, on one side, give an objective value to each work and, on the other, improve 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 also opens up the problem of excessive migrations of the population from economically less developed to economically more developed regions.

Such migrations would make production planning more difficult and reduce the stability of businesses.

State leaders will be required to consider the interests of all inhabitants of all communes when organizing regional economic productions. If the state managers are unsuccessful, that will cause migrations to regions with privileged status. Also, that would undoubtedly increase work competition for the limited number of work posts in privileged communes, and without a doubt, that would dissatisfy many people. State leaders, who would not offer an equal chance to all communes to develop, would receive negative evaluations from dissatisfied people. Negative evaluations would decrease the bad leaders' incomes and the number of past labour points. Unsuccessful leaders will be responsible to the people for the first time and, therefore, will have to leave their positions. Only the most skilful and brave people would dare to lead countries. This is a good enough warranty of the state's prosperity.

Socialism will completely solve the problem of working migrations from non-developed to developed communes with the past labour points of workers. Workers in non-developed communes have less valuable past labour because their contribution to building their economy is smaller. They also accomplish lower productivity and realize smaller profits and income. Smaller incomes lead to a smaller amount of past labour points as a permanent form presenting their overall power. By migrating from one commune to another, the workers bring the past labour points that form 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 factor that will stimulate workers to migrate from non-developed to developed communes.

Hence, migrations of workers will be possible, but from the point of view of income and past labour points, they will be non-stimulating. On the contrary, workers will be more motivated to remain in non-developed regions, as such areas can, based on grants intended for economic development, achieve a faster increase in profit and, consequently, a more significant increase in incomes and quantity of the past labour points.

The system envisages an establishment of responsibility for the workers, enterprises, and communes to realize a productive life, as demonstrated in the commune. The accountability will be performed through workers' income and past labour points. The system also envisages the establishment of responsibility through mutual assessments of inhabitants, consumers, associations, arbitrations, and evaluation committees at the state level. This will guarantee the establishment of responsible relations in the state's economy and the prosperity of such a state.

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

by its democratic control. The new system forms a single mass of funds that society will distribute to all forms of spending according to market and democratically established principles.

Thus far, the state leadership performed the state's macro-economic policy regulation, i.e. the fundamentals of social relations. This means that autocrats have always ruled society. As authorities often pursue interests that do not sufficiently represent social interests, the population often 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 may say that the present-day macroeconomic policy has reached its maximum efficiency. Further development of economic relations can be allowed only by utilizing democracy in the economy. In socialism, each inhabitant will create the macro-economic 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 in the function of 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 get the macro-economic orientation guidelines of its activity and, thereby, the elements for a higher degree of stability in business activities.

The state issues money. The total money supply in circulation needs to be formed approximately between 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 robust control over inflationary and deflationary processes, ensuring stability in the economy's business activity.

The entire mass of money envisaged for the turnover of commodities in the state is distributed to cash assets intended for the communes and cash assets designed for the use of the state. The ratio of the money intended for the communes and the state is determined directly by democratic statements made by all state inhabitants in the function of individual economic voting powers within possible value ranges set by the state leadership.

Cash assets intended for the communes are distributed proportionately to the realized profits on the market. But also, the assets of the commune will depend on the protection and improvement of society and its environment. More significant improvement of society and its environment will achieve a more substantial share in distributing the funds among the communes. This has already been discussed in the chapter "Income Distribution." This means that each commune will receive at its disposal as much money as it deserves with its overall productive orientation.

By pooling the money earned in all communes, it is possible to make some deviations from the revenues of communes to ensure a stable income for all communes. Namely, suppose a commune registers a significant loss of money in the case of a natural catastrophe or terrible work results. In that case, the income of such a commune can be covered by the collective fund and gradually reduced until the economy in the commune becomes consolidated and then start growing again. In this way, the system ensures the economic stability of all communes.

The population of productive communes may experience the spillover of income between and among the communes as unfavourable. However, considering that the spillover would not be significant nor frequent and would ensure the communes' stable income, it can be assumed that the inhabitants of all communes in socialism will accept such an insurance policy. The asset realized for the commune's expenses will be fully sovereignly distributed by the principles people accepted.

Monetary assets intended for the union of communes serve the whole state's collective spending and development needs. Such funds are formed and distributed by direct voting by all state inhabitants. It is worth mentioning that more assets intended for the state diminish proportionately the resources envisioned for 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 per group, as are the assets earmarked for collaborative expenditure on the commune. The only difference is that the assets satisfy the needs of the state. The funds are used to maintain and build the requirements of state administration and defence, infrastructure, health, education, science, culture and sports, and other purposes that are needed by all state residents and represent an excessive investment burden for each commune.

Collective money assets are used according to the possibilities and are directly distributed by the state's population identically to the one described in the commune. Direct expression of inhabitants' views by votes is one of the most critical measures of socialism. Besides other benefits, the population having ruling power will try to get to know the needs of its state. Socialism will contribute to the disalienation of the people from the state so that they will accept it as their own to a greater extent.

Assets intended for the economic development of the state service the developmental needs of the associated economy, for significant investments of some communes, and for all enterprises unable to realize the assets necessary for economic development in their communes. Assets are distributed to enterprises according to the size of the development coefficient in the same way as in the commune. Enterprises envisaging a more significant profit based on a smaller amount of necessary cash assets over a shorter turnover period will ensure the amount of money intended for economic development.

Cash assets are allocated as grants, as they are renewed from the state's revenue in each accounting period. The whole state will then be associated with a single corporation, and companies do not have to repay themselves invested money. Enterprises are bound to realize the envisaged monetary gains within a determined period. This way, cash assets intended for economic development would achieve their objective, and the whole financial system would find sufficient justification.

It may be assumed that the economically developed communes will be less interested in expanding their development, as their living standard will be so high that they may approach saturation. A rise in the productivity of a developed commune may entail a risk in terms of profit realization due to the saturation of the market and insufficient purchasing power of non-developed communes. Underdeveloped communes will require more money for economic development, and democracy will require developed communes to set aside more funds for development than they need. This fact offers a better chance for non-developed communes to ensure more money assets for development than they could provide for this purpose. By increasing productivity, non-developed communes will increase their purchasing power and thus expand the state market. The system will, in this way, contribute to a more balanced development of the entire state.

3.2.3 Association of States

States organize control in their territories to achieve more benefits for the people. However, when such authority does not suit the nature of a society, the states conduct an alienated, autocratic, and authoritative policy. Such a policy creates an irrational and unstable economy for the people, inappropriate and unjust orientation among nations, and tensions and risks in state relations. As a result, the states are responsible for massive bloodshed in the history of humankind.

The present-day world does not know any model of mutual coexistence that can ensure the prosperity of humanity. On the contrary, the present-day world's relations are based on a dangerous and ruthless competition of determination, not cooperation. The current world policy is creating objective injustices between the states caused by enormous differences in the level of economic development and in the right to use natural resources. On one side is excessive production, and on the other, scarcity.

The history of humankind recorded some attempts at building a better world through association. In that endeavour, world organizations were established to bring closer states and nations into an interdependent whole that complements. For this reason, the Organization of the United Nations, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, Interpol, international health organizations, and many others were established. These organizations had to connect the idea of creating a better planet Earth. Moreover, they were supposed to bring benefits due to the greater association of nations, labour and capital, a more substantial production, incredible wealth and, accordingly, greater

welfare. Furthermore, such organizations were supposed to reduce the possibility of an emergence of war conflict between states. However, the result is contrary to expectations. Despite some positive impacts, these organizations are generally used for winning predominance globally and represent a threat 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. Non-satisfied alienated needs represent an origin of destructive energy, which daily brings enormous problems to the world. Alienation is a disease afflicting the world, whether rich or poor. Authorities may easily canalize such destructive energy to destroy any of its parts. Of course, the most influenced people worldwide are the most dangerous. As the world has not overcome its alienated orientation, it has not found the base for accomplishing its prosperity.

Today, the world is proud of developing technology and production, but it did not move a single step forward in developing human consciousness. Moreover, people enter a significant worldwide 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 raised to a higher level with 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 efficiently solve all of the aforementioned problems. It respects democracy, human rights, general and special individual interests, past and current labour, and the values emerging from natural constructive interpersonal relations. It prevents the existence of alienation, privileges, hegemony, exploitation, and any form of destructiveness. The new system is so productive and elastic that inhabitants of other states can accept it. Such an act opens up the possibility of the association at the level of states. Once the integration process among the states has started, the associated states at the international level will be just a matter of time.

By associating, the states lose a part of their sovereignty because they assign it to the union of states but also, they realize at the same time new social life qualities. 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 reasonable, rational policy and satisfy 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 worldwide.

Freedom will have one limitation. The individual will not be free to cause disadvantages to any member of society. The system will develop very effective protection for everyone from troubles committed by any community member.

Democratic anarchy will allow inhabitants to assess any convenience or inconvenience they experience from any point in the world. They will make a direct statement in the administrative world centre or its satellite, the commune. The system of assessments can form a completely new system of values in the world, valorize and sanction any disadvantage and reward any advantage that the individual causes to another individual. As such assessments will directly impact an evaluated individual's income and past labour points, everyone will be responsible before the whole world. They will try to produce the least possible inconveniences and a maximum number of conveniences for the world, thus forming the base of the productive, constructive orientation of the whole world.

The new system envisages direct statements of all world inhabitants about the essential political, economic and other areas of joint interest. In this way, the rules of collective action will be established in a direct democratic way.

The social system would form the world monetary policy and money distribution. The collective money would be directly and democratically earmarked by humankind for the world's individual spending, collective spending, economic development, and all partial spheres of interest.

The new socialist system introduces in all states 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. Those elements are missing today to develop a stable, productive economic policy and, therefore, society's general stability.

The new economic system envisages a worldwide association of the economy into one large world enterprise, world leadership, world planning of production, and world labour distribution according to the principle of free labour competition. The managers of the world will manage the work in the world as a whole rationally and efficiently. That would form high and stable economic productivity that would optimally satisfy the material needs of the entire humankind. Furthermore, the free labour market will abolish work privileges in the world, which will inevitably entail planning production, labour, and wage distribution that optimally suit the interests of all of humankind and each inhabitant.

Such a system will allow each inhabitant to get to know their natural needs through their practice and, in this way, overcome alienation. The possibility of expressing each individual's direct genuine interest will free the society from alienated ideological, national, religious, cultural, economic and other alienated interests. Individuals will finally have the chance to live their lives fully, and they will not care about alienated values. The nature of the individual is unique to humankind. By bringing individuals

closer to their nature, the conditions will be created to form a harmonious and homogenous social community worldwide.

Each individual will rely on their forces to meet their needs and learn how to form them according to their possibilities of realization. This will represent the basis for meeting needs and, consequently, the constructive orientation of 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 as the chief cause of alienation and conflicts among people will be overcome to benefit natural cooperative relations.

The states and nations will no longer be endangered in such a system. It may be expected that the funds intended for armed forces will be abolished by the direct voting of the population, which would disallow the emergence of wars.

The proposed system will form a new consciousness of the individual, new ethics of society, and new relations in the world. Such a system will enable safety, a convenient existence, and spiritual and material prosperity for all world inhabitants. Shortly, it will form 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. 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 build communism even in theory. Even though their work was based on a noble ideology, they could not find a successful method to improve society, and the final result was a failure.

The prime condition for building socialism and communism must be 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.

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

Lenin's attempt to establish equal human rights experienced such difficulties that he gave up on them and took 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 creates constructive and harmonious social relations, making people satisfied with their lives. If so, people would be willing to build socialism. To reach communism, people will need to allocate all their incomes for taxes by their free will. Then all of the goods and services will be available free of charge to all people. Technically speaking, if some people refuse to allocate all their gross salaries for taxes, all the people will still receive some income, and some of the goods and services will 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 a real need in a scarcely supplied society. The wealthy elite have increased the value of money much more than it objectively deserves because by having money, while people do not, they achieve power over people.

Socialism will significantly change this. It will increase production and workers' salaries, bringing abundant production and 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 influences of other people. They are not even supposed to compare themselves with others because it may alienate them from their nature instead of letting them embrace it. Alienation has put people on the wrong path on which they cannot satisfy their needs. Unsatisfied needs bring disappointment and antagonism and create destructive relationships.

Equal human rights will rid people of authoritative pressure and allow them to follow their interests. Such experiences will teach people to consider the influences of others critically. It will demystify alienated values imposed by authorities throughout the history of humankind. It will help people to get closer to their nature. As a result, people will form objective needs that they may satisfy, which creates a joyful life, bringing living pleasure.

The responsibility the system requires from people will teach people to set their needs according to their ability to satisfy them. Therefore, they should realize the first natural law of society: people who permanently meet their needs create 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 all kinds of values in society by using past labour points that will present 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 a low population. And vice versa, a high population may be decreased by removing a sufficient number of past labour points from couples who would like to have more children than society finds appropriate. Furthermore, the system will develop the same responsibility for protecting the human environment. It will make the whole planet Earth clean and healthy. Using past labour points will make it possible to influence humankind to become highly responsible for its future.

Socialism will not need many of today's work posts anymore. The reduction of work posts will start with administration, national defence, police, marketing, trading, insurance companies, etc. The administration will be significantly less needed because accounting will be automatic. The national defence will not be required because no threat to any nation will exist anymore. Police will not be necessary because no danger for individuals will exist anymore. Marketing will not be needed because no competition among companies will exist anymore. 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 hard to name precisely all the work posts that will not be needed in the future, but one may assume they would probably be work posts in direct production and services to satisfy the natural needs of society. 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 will automatically reduce needed working hours to 4 hours per worker per day to realize the same productivity as today.

The work, in its duration, directly brings conveniences and inconveniences. The individual aspires to a career that brings more advantages and tries to avoid 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 the work that will, in its duration, bring them major conveniences under the condition that they offer the greatest productivity. It may be supposed that each worker will invest more effort in the field of their working interest, improving their abilities and thus exercising their right to work in their interest.

The workers unable to accomplish good productivity at any job convenient to them may be released from work duty; however, they will realize a smaller income than employed workers. During their length of service and by inheritance, each worker gathers past labour points. If they collect enough past work points, they can be released from work and simultaneously acquire a fair share in the income distribution based on past labour results.

Work will be a value to workers, so they will lower the price of current work to achieve greater competitive power for the desired job. Some workers employed at work posts bringing them a great convenience will over time accept income equal to if they are not working, or an even lower one. This means that labour will be of greater value than inactivity for such workers and a greater value than the consumption of manufactured goods and services. They will achieve the right to work in their interest on account of a smaller share in income distribution. Many people today would be willing to work gratis in attractive work posts, such as the state president or a leading movie actor position. The new system will demystify the value of work posts. When all work posts become equally accessible to the people, work practice will remove their alienated mystic value. Also, the system will make all work posts similarly attractive, equalizing demand for all work posts.

The inconvenient jobs will be identified by a considerably higher current work price. These jobs may be assumed to be manual, physical, and non-creative, such as line production, mining, building, or agriculture. Such work forms will be assisted or entirely replaced by automation.

Today's technological progress in production has already managed to rid the individual of markedly inconvenient forms of work, and this process will further develop. Further on, management in the economy can redistribute the unsuitable work conditions onto several work posts over a short work time, contributing to the balanced distribution of the working burden. Furthermore, technology development and new work divisions will benefit the workers greatly. That means that the workers may achieve higher conveniences at work than they can achieve out of work. In socialism, the work will be becoming 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 contribute to the cognition 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 in production and politics, science, culture, sports, and other forms of activity. The proposed system allows a great possibility of being in all fields and therefore gives every person the opportunity to provide significant benefits of living.

The indirect value of the work advocates the conveniences arising from the consumption of goods produced by labour. The socialist system of production will bring an abundance of produced goods. The socialist distribution system of the means of

consumption will enable everyone to consume it. When a lot of the means of consumption are accessible to each individual, it will help the individual eliminate the alienated idea of power created by the possession of goods. If the supply of commodities exceeds the consumption needs, commodities will lose their alienated trade value. In such a way, socialism promotes the demystification of the produced goods, which satisfies 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 said that by accepting work competition, productivity would be much higher than it is today. The increase in 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 community that will decrease society's needs for consumption by finding values of being so that the large production of today will not be needed anymore.

The stagnation of the development of economic productivity in capitalism brings a financial crisis. 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 daily to realize such economic productivity that will satisfy the needs of society. By shortening work time, the inconvenient form of work is reduced even more, while on the other hand, work freedom can provide workers great benefits. Then the direct value of work will grow further.

Reducing working hours does not mean that socialism will prevent some from working as much as they want. Here is presented an average amount of work that will produce a reasonably high standard of living for all people. The workers will probably work two days per week and have a five-day-long weekend.

Is it possible? Not only is it possible, but 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 the production of commodities. The producers often make goods without utility value with the hope that they will sell their products with the help of marketing and low prices. In the capitalist economy, they do not have another choice because they have to produce something to earn money for a living. What a senseless waste of work and natural resources! What a meaningless life!

The future will require the new system to implement a considerable rationalization of natural resource spending. It is possible through new inventions, better organization of work, and the change in human needs through disalienation.

It may be expected that in a more technologically developed production, most workers will experience more and more conveniences at work. As a result, they will reduce their current work price and income to increase their work competitiveness. When the overall

working interest becomes greater than production needs, the entire population will vote to increase workers' minimal income to diminish the income-based interest in employment. A more sizable competition-related reduction in the current work price will no longer be able to lower the revenue. Therefore, the worker's coefficient of responsibility will form a more substantial work competition power coupled with productivity.

The increase in minimal 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 among the workers' incomes will not impact the private holding of past labour points. The individual's quantity of past labour points will remain untouched in the ownership of each inhabitant as a demonstration of personal productive power. Also, by allocating a more significant amount of money from income for tax purposes, net income will decrease, but workers' number of points of past work remains unchanged.

The higher coefficient of responsibility will further increase the number of past labour points of workers in the case of either individual or 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 to a larger extent by reducing the number of past labour points. It is already presented that the system will direct each individual to form their natural needs within the limits of their possibility of realization, which ensures the completion of envisaged productivity. That is also the basis of constructive social orientation.

The market economy that socialism takes from capitalism and improves will not be able to envisage the social needs successfully enough. The economic production that does not find demand for its products incurs losses. In socialism, the issue of producers' responsibility will tighten because the financial losses will sanction workers' past labour points. For this reason, the economy will have to search for a more secure form of business activity and find it in production for known consumers. Even today, special and expensive forms of production are performed following consumer orders.

Socialism envisages collective spending as a consumption based on mutual orders. The associated economy can gradually request the population to plan and order its special material needs to accomplish an even more stable business activity. Production according to consumer orders would progressively create a democratically planned economy, which would no longer be able to develop disinvestments and thus incur losses. 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 according to the following principles of direct democracy. In this way, all world communes will be allowed to influence the formation of the funds intended for economic development and exercise the right to their use by their competitive ability in performing the business activity.

Economically developed parts of the world will sooner or later register a drop in consumer needs due to a general saturation, decreasing the demand for cash assets intended for economic development. The reduced interest in economic growth in developed countries will simplify the access for developing countries to the world's collective cash assets designed for economic development. As time passes, underdeveloped countries will evolve into a state of consumer saturation. The world market, saturated with work products, will diminish the need for economic development and, accordingly, the demand for money intended to develop the economy. The world population will then vote for smaller appropriations of money for this purpose. It may be expected that at a higher degree of economic development of all humankind, assets intended for developing the market economy, as a form of large-size 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 be later earmarked from the fund of collective spending. A developed society's economic growth will depend no longer on the market but on the production plan.

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

A larger amount of money for collective spending will enable a larger, higher quality, and generally better collaborative consumption. The purpose of money assets for communal expenditure will be determined directly by the people by transferring the assets into funds of their interest. Certain funds that receive a more significant amount of money will develop more specific 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 money can be used to pay for certain expenses of individual consumption that will be free to the population in the commune.

As free-of-charge or subsidized healthcare and education already exist today, it will also be possible to introduce free consumption of goods and new services. However, in the first place, free distribution should include goods and services inevitable for each inhabitant, such as food and transport, and then other forms of consumption with which the market is saturated and can always satisfy the demand.

The producers of free-of-charge goods will automatically become non-profit organizations. But, until then, the system will already have equalized work and all values arising from work in non-profit organizations and profit companies. Introducing free-of-charge commodities does not mean a determined distribution of the means of consumption where each inhabitant would get a certain quantity of goods. This is the

most primitive form of consumption and represents a violation of inhabitants' needs. Instead, it understands a free distribution of commodities where each inhabitant will freely use them according to their own needs.

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. Members of families do not charge each other for goods and services. It is about the whole world becoming one big family, which is the intention of this book.

Collective consumption and work competition will enable an expanded building of all facilities necessary for society and their maintenance. Socialism can ensure that each inhabitant utilizes any housing premise if they are ready 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 deprive themselves of some other form of 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 lot of maintenance time against the opportunity of finding the power of being in the prosperous social relations socialism offers. Moreover, with the decreasing income level difference, the possibility of paying rent will also decrease. Uniformity in the payable rent for housing will require the construction and adaptation of real estate of uniformed optimal values to establish a 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 where a surplus of housing space exists, the distribution of the real estate can be performed by mutual agreement among inhabitants. Past labour points will ensure the responsible behaviour of users toward real estate.

Once society overcomes the need to present the alienated form of power by possessing commodities and properties, it can expect to earmark increasingly large amounts of money for collective consumption and decrease the amount of money intended for individual consumption. Society will understand that collective spending is more rational regarding the degree of utilization of goods and consumption of natural resources.

It should be repeated; the decrease in inhabitants' income does not decrease the number of past labour points citizens 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 the decrease in personal income, collective revenue will grow. The gross income will remain the same so that the number of past labour points presenting the individual's power in society will also remain unchanged.

Larger appropriations of funds intended for collective consumption would enable the introduction of new free-of-charge commodities to the point when all collective needs of the society will become satisfied. Funds intended for collaborative spending can then cover the costs of specific material inhabitants' needs.

Socialism will develop the awareness that more significant than natural consumption would not be necessary for the individual 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, irrespective of the fact that possession would not be a value in society. The system may develop social awareness that will portray possession as a negative trait of the individual's character. Such orientation might be shameful and sanctioned by negative assessments of the remaining population. However, if the system fails to meet the alienated needs of individuals, it will have to halt the distribution of free-of-charge commodities.

However, the contribution of such a system lies in the elastic possibility of shifting away from the rigid capitalist form of production and distribution, where each work and commodity is directly charged for, to a completely free form of production where work and commodities distribution is carried out according to the needs of the people. The system can stand any oscillation in the social conditions, including the return to charging for all commodities and services without any crisis, by immediately following the needs of society.

If society would 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 arising from work and the prosperous relationship with society and nature.

When collective spending satisfies the individual needs of inhabitants, then the income as the purchasing power of inhabitants would lose 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 always conduct work duties through competition in productivity and responsibility 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.

When income starts losing importance, the responsibility of workers will be paid only by past labour points. Accountability of workers will be established by mutual assessment of workers and the evaluations of customers. The system enables a ramified system of assessing the production quality of goods and services. Each positive assessment of a worker, workers in enterprises or inhabitants of a commune received from any

inhabitant, consumer association, or arbitration courts will increase somewhat the total number of past labour points of a worker, workers in enterprises or inhabitants 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 performed by subtracting past labour points from the received assessments' function and the worker's responsibility coefficient.

Such a system of valuation of conveniences and inconveniences may form natural norms for the relations in society, which will to a great extent, replace the alienated normative decisions that govern the relationships of society by laws and regulations. Mutual assessment will form new unwritten rules of social relations, covering each pore of social behaviour and giving the community more benefits and prosperity.

When the demand for work, as a manifestation of the power of being, becomes more significant than the supply of jobs, the individual income would lose sense. When the population's income starts abolishing, past labour points will remain as a form of the individual's guarantee to meet obligations, a factor of work competition, and a measure of the individual's existential power.

Over time, work competition could provide an opportunity for general work freedom of workers. Or, differently said, workers could, at a certain degree of production development, choose work posts and working hours according to their wishes and possibilities in agreement with other workers. This is possible by production automation through computer technology that would replace forced and inconvenient work and form suitable jobs based on individual, creative and constructive approaches and relaxing work.

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

Monetary assets would then no longer have the function of establishing payment transactions. Still, they would serve as a means of society for expressing individual and common needs. The money would not symbolize alienation separating the community of people anymore but will be a coordinator of homogeneous action in society. Then the relationship of the individual toward another individual would no longer be the relation of commodities but the relation of beings that suits the individual 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 production abundance will reduce the importance of money. One day, getting good evaluations from other people 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 money, 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 most likely allocate all their incomes directly towards taxes, making all goods and services available free of charge while establishing an efficient, stable, and rational democratically planned economy.

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

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. According to what has been said so far, it may be assumed that at a certain degree of development in society, 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 the work products by the amount of money intended for certain forms of collective consumption and based on their own experience with the supply.

The funds of collective spending can direct the 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. The framework for the distribution of funds will be determined by consumer practice. The population will make corrections by pouring more money into the common consumption groups they need more. Then the production management will assign more work to the fields of increased interest, satisfying people's needs. Further, each inhabitant can partially distribute any fund to the level where they will find its interest. Such money will be necessary until society discovers a better method of coordinating collective actions.

Socialism enables the permanent coordination of a free system of production and distribution. The system has an infinite number of variants that may influence the social life and consciousness of the individual so that each individual in the society can achieve broad prosperity. It is also worth mentioning that the formation of a free-of-

charge production and consumption is not the purpose of the proposed system but the finding of genuine relationships in the 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 the possibility of creating natural and harmonious social relations that will form genuine needs and values.

A new kind of ethics will be formed, where the individual will not need to assess another individual nor be assessed by any 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 suits 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 in search for what they need because all they need will be in their immediate environment or even closer—in themselves. The most important achievement of individuals is themselves. 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 chances to realize a long and good quality of life.

The conclusion of the book

History has shown that authoritarian social systems produce social problems, while social systems where people have more rights create better societies. This should be enough to conclude that the full implementation of equal human rights will make the best social system possible. Nevertheless, authorities prevent the knowledge of equal human rights to keep their social privileges. As a result, social life was always 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 spontaneously do it, and people will love the result of it. This paper tries to convince people that they cannot create 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 invention of all time. Therefore, opening a public discussion about equal human rights is essential for building a bright future for humankind.