

Economics and Governance

Monopolies, are they good or bad, should be fought or not, how should they be handled?

My opinion is that the wrongdoing of monopolies ultimately comes down to the ability and willingness of those with power to take action in self-interest as opposed to public interest.

So society must be changed so that people don't seek self-interest, it's important to ensure that individuals are empathetic, and this can be achieved over time by educating the masses in a different way.

A way that doesn't force people to endure harshness or coldness, and combats the normalization of it. A way that seeks to take blame away from individuals, and redirect any anger upon wrongdoings into fixing the systems that allowed for it.

A system, we would need, that considers the environmental influences, factors, and past history that leads to all decisions. Acknowledging that many people didn't receive nourishment and care that would develop them into the best they can be.

And so, this nourishment and care is what must be given, always must every person be shown a way to improve and not be shown retaliation and malice in response to when they show their worst.

And as this process takes place, the change of people's mindsets into one that cares for others above all else, values empathy, is one mindset that if bestowed to the majority in society, massive societal changes could take place.

And that, is via the process of liquidization of hierarchies in which benevolence and universality bestowed upon people by state officials, which would be in their own interest as it would do wonders to prevent troubling violence in society against their regime or others.

And thus a new generation with people not as selfish can trickle-up to the institutions of society, namely business and government.

And the way that society can be changed to mold into the ideal of empathy, would only be by limiting competition, through conglomeration of business and centralization, a collectivist mindset can better be achieved through universal applications in cooperation that takes place in centralized institutions such as monopolies.

However, not only does societal change have to come from below, but also, in the first place, the inner care for others inherent in most humans must be unlocked in those in power. And the right democratically elected government can take such actions.

This would involve negotiation with business leaders and those with power and wealth, that would allow resources to be better pooled and once again, the diminishment of competition.

And with this, what could take place is offering of the bourgeoisie to live a pleasant life, a secure life, where they don't have to worry, as opposed to where one must act intelligently and

stressfully to maintain one's wealth.

This is of course a life that all people deserve, but one not yet possible to give to all, especially without force, as we should have observed, force does eventually lead to reemergence of counter forces. As it should be said, violence leads to more violence.

Now, continuing on, anything is possible without violence, no one's mind is immune, even the greediest have inner conscience to help others. And perhaps, if they knew their wealth would be turned into something that keeps them happy, safe, healthy, secure, as well as helping others, then perhaps they would be willing to relinquish some of their control.

And then, that wealth can flow to where it needs to go in society, to support a monopoly selected by natural public interest. If you read my proposal of an economic system, you would know how this goes.

In conclusion, monopolies aren't inherently bad, and the inside of them, the inside of society, can all be changed to serve a better function as united sector that represents cooperation of business towards common goals of serving the common good, instead of competing in futility, seeming to be efficient but lacking centralization could never fulfill its full potential.

...

Monopolies are not necessarily anti-liberty.

Some say you could not be given a choice, in whom you sell your labor to, whom you buy your products from, saying that there is not free-will.

However, you should be given a choice

But the current system by which people are given 'a choice' is ineffective.

Consumer choice, of each individual, lacks necessary business transparency and education that would allow for good decision making.

So if you wanted to choose the best company, then society could work together to find out how truly a good business' practices are, and employ that, and support one business together in unison, that makes for cooperation instead of competition, and all that could be done without forcing either party, merely through the influence of collective thinking, that people could reveal information, and then hold votes on actions to be taken for or against a company, then each individual has an optional symbolic responsibility to support the collective in what has been decided, in mass action such as boycott or strike that can easily change those in charge of a monopoly if needed as well as influence a business to change their practices.

But this is a little gist of the economic system. But more below.

...

Unions decentralize workers, they weaken the power of the government and the collective, and due to their position as institutions requiring membership and mandates, could never be as

strong.

My proposal is meant as a solution to modern forceful economics so that there are no longer forceful economics to such a high extent.

It requires transparency of business to the government so that independent watchdog groups made up of citizenry can watch for bad business practices and inform consumers and through an interconnected social net such a message will be spread and also the government will aid in giving advice to the people so that in case any private corporations in charge of a sector falter, they may be swapped out for another which the people will support by stopping buying from one and buying from another instead, as well as not working at one, and offered jobs elsewhere instead

However, this is in extreme cases, in mild cases the government will simply advise a boycott and for people to stop working at a business until their malpractice is corrected.

Due to this, as well as communication and negotiation over years between business owners, bourgeoisie with the government, they would be willing to make the decisions that best serve the people thus abide by the democratic referenda passed by the people for changes in allocation of resources and business practices peacefully as requests to businesses, which if repeatedly turned down would result in aforementioned collective action.

Striking is bad, concerns that are cause for strike must be addressed at the national level with the root cause sought first through which greater collective efforts can alleviate.

My system wants to peacefully resolve problems early before they get out of hand, only taking drastic albeit understanding action when necessary.

In short, people who have economic grievances petition the government who negotiates with business to implement democratically passed changes on behalf of everyone and disseminates information of any business decisions or practices that are against the people's will or interest, which the people can instead support responsible businesses based on.

Regulations can't always apply universally, each business must be reasoned with independently, with the most efficient and ethical being supported by the government through getting an entire populace to buy and work for them through voluntary means since consumers and workers being provided the true relevant information, this makes it no more forceful than a free market where businesses must adapt and figure out the best practices but when consumers and workers are smart, well-informed, as well as a united force with a collective-oriented mindset.

Regulations can sometimes be only short-term solutions and ineffective compared to encouraging beneficial business practices and the thing is, the government doesn't decide what business practices defy the people's will or interest, it simply disseminates any alarming information through an interconnected social net where the people can decide themselves through voting.

"So let me see if I got it right, you want to have the government step in in support of democratically elected regulations (or whatever you wanna call them) based on something people think is not right for a business to do, and negotiate these quasi-regulations individually

with each business.

Do businesses get to refuse said regulations if they feel like it? If so, the government, instead of functioning as a regulatory entity would work as an intermediary between consumers, workers, and business interests (differing from social corporatism where unions are that intermediary and government is simply a mediator), which either are able to refuse as with any agreement, is that not right?

I'm going to be honest, if that's the case, this system seems inherently better to modern form of regulationism. I'd still rather have these negotiations carried out by individuals themselves, or unions, but I've got to admit it's still way better than modern regulationism and/or normal social corporatism"

- An accurate description from an outside perspective.

...

Ok well it can be described as "a collectivist centralized deregulationist corporatist-inspired capitalist market economic system" if you want a short description.

And then for elaboration: "It involves organization of society into united economic sectors on the basis of corporations with a monopoly over services, likewise as in corporatism all members of a particular economic sector join a designated interest group, so that efforts are coordinated together as opposed to a competitive economy.

Unlike traditional state corporatism it strives for noncompulsion so that such an economy can be attained voluntary through the collective choices of workers and consumers as a result of sociocultural change of systems that affect people individually"