

Wolf Socialism (The 3 Tiers)	Wednesday, August 04, 2004	2
Wolf Socialism Applied	Friday, August 06, 2004	5
Myths and other topics	Wednesday, September 01, 2004	8
Defining Socialism	Wednesday, September 29, 2004	11
Socialism Defined Continued	Sunday, October 31, 2004	14
Digesting Economics: A breakdown of economic theory	Sunday, November 07, 2004	17
Business: Sufficiency Model	Monday, November 08, 2004	20
Linguistics: Definitions	Fall 2004	22

Wednesday, August 04, 2004

Subject: Social/Political/Economical -- Wolf Socialism(The 3 Tiers)

You know you're bored when you're up at 2 in the morning and all you want to do now is write about politics and society. Well, I thought I'd just ramble out some ideas about my Wolf Socialism to help me get them organized for whenever I do write a 'formal' document on them. So let me get started with another idea I developed called the Three Tiers

They will generally follow as such:

Tier 1: Local Community (rural)

Tier 2: Micro Community (urban)

Tier 3: Macro Community (production)

Each Tier supports the development and existence of the next. All will begin with the 1st and when sufficient progress and production is made then they develop a Tier 2 community which is supported by the Tier 1s and the Tier 2s further develop and produce the priorities of the 1st. Same kind of relation with Tier 3 to Tiers 2 and 1. Tier 3 is more centralized on the production than on a new found urban community. Basically it produces the goods Tier 2s might need but would be pointless to make or too much requirements to make so a Tier three focuses on those.

I also have a concept of Tier Zero and Tier Sub-Zero. Essentially Zero is the group or family unit that forms together to make the rural/local community. The family unit or group can sustain itself but they get together with other groups to form a community. Then Tier Sub-Zero is nothing but the individuals that are self-sustaining creatures that make up the group or family unit.

The premise is first that one needs to be self-sufficient and can exist as its own entity. From that it forms relationships to better further the progress and potentialization of the entity. We may call this the "social contract" in we form a society to protect the interests of the group entity. Essentially, individuals get together with like kin (subzero to zero). The family can support itself, teach their children to do as they do and move around to get what they need. Zero moves to Tier 1 when a community is formed from these Tier 0s and thus they develop beyond having a father figure or a leader of the group as the governing body from the social contract. This is when Wolf Socialism steps in. To not only present the foundation of the socio-economical roles but to outline the governing body to follow that basis.

A short list that is not written in stone of the important things (not to be mistaken for the hierarchy of importance) would be things such as:

Shelter

Food/Water

Medical/Health

Education

Transportation

Energy

Religion/Belief

However, these sort of do fall into the concept of the Hierarchy of Importance. A community is strong because they have something to believe in. Local communities develop a local religion such as you see in many farming communities in Asia when Buddhism or Taoism gained importance among the people.

Anyway, there are also needs that need to be met. I am still working on the relationship between those two concepts but I believe each Tier tends to focus more so on some of these important factors. The local community will focus more on the religion and beliefs of the people. It will focus solely on shelter and food/water for the people. As it is local, transportation should be simple and likely provided on an individual basis than on the society as a whole. The farming will be done for the community. The shelter will be built by the community as a whole for each family unit. The collective body of these people will have their beliefs and be closer for them. This is the basic structure of a Tier 1 community.

With the surplus of production of a self-sufficient (and efficient) local community, uniting with others, a centralized urban center would develop adequately between them. They will further focus on things the local community couldn't. The local community would have it's own basic health and education to keep people well, deal with basic problems, and teach them how to survive within their local community (they don't need to learn physics and engineering to work in a rural community). Thus Tier 2 will have the belief, the shelter, and the food part moderately supplied from "the outside" (though it will have its own internal farming and such going on). To provide for the Tier 1 communities surrounding, transportation is thus more focused on by the society as a whole. Education of broader subjects is studied and thus better health care for more diverse and more varied problems. Most people don't need to go to the hospital, in some cases things are more serious, so they go to a Tier 2 hospital to seek treatment. A Tier 2 would be an urbanized center. Shelter and such will still be provided, as well as food and water. The focus of daily life however will be more on the education of the community and thus they learn and work at the same time to better their skills and understanding and trades and guilds will be the dominating factor of the governing body.

From these type of communities a broader chain of things will be needed. Not every community needs to make its own toilet paper so to speak. Thus a more centralized area will be made for production and distribution. Centralized specialties or guilds will develop. The community will have the first two tiers involved in its development but the governing body will isolate around the guild and the production it does. This is where the best of the best will go to learn that trade and the mass production of its specialty will be utilized for the Macro Community as a whole.

Now there is no definite scale as to how much land or area these tiers will actually take up. One could say the levels go higher, this is no different than having countries and then maybe a world society. I won't deny that these will be isolated and identities made by what groups are closer together to resemble countries or like boundaries. What is important in this concept, however, is that the scale doesn't matter. The highest level I see is a Macro community that focuses on production in isolated areas (within this socialism doctrine of course). The area the production plant focuses on can vary, even included the world as a whole, or if one imagines a galactic community, could span entire planets. It is still just a Tier 3 community. The network of group entities enveloped in the centralized government that manages the distribution and production of the resources including the labor people give to keep the community functioning is what puts a community on a Tier. Thus these tiers are not absolute. In my mind they have a distinct way of evolving, but that is if this were all to happen naturally from a starting point. The fact is that is unreal. It is more likely the communities will arise within this capitalistic world and have to sustain themselves in relation to that, which is a whole other discussion I will get to and present in its own right. This ideology, however, is simply to discuss Wolf Socialism in a "pure" context.

To recap thus far.

The community that forms when groups come together to form a structured government, "chain of command" or just leadership and guidance is placed on a level or Tier based on the scope of that community's production and where their priorities in things of importance lie. This may very well

directly relate to gratifying and focusing on "what is important" when we get to the relationship between the Hierarchy of Importance and that of Maslow's presented Needs.

Three Tiers are generally available. The local or rural community that is focused on the food production and keeping of water supply, as well as, developing shelter for its people with basic education and healthcare to keep them going. The Micro community spawns from a collection of these tier 1 communities and is an urban centralization of trades to be produced to benefit all the communities therein. Thus tier 2s depend on the tier 1s and produce surpluses to benefit tier 1s not only to better their standards of living but to provide services and expansions on the things they can't focus on as important, such as broader education, and more advanced Medicare and transportation. This is finally capped off by what would lead to a further development in transportation (distribution emphasis than travel, but one leads to the other), as well as focuses on energy or better functionality of the things prior. Thus bettering the standard of living by making things more accessible to everyone and easing the requirements of Tier 1s and 2s. The greater the expansion of this network, the greater the involvement and contributions, more tier 3 communities can centralize and come together in such a manner that a World community can form that is such an expansive community it can all be considered one group entity together (the ultimate goal for any planet, which would thus lead to a galactic community).

While I'm at it. A tier 3 or 2 community does not necessarily mean a group of prior communities "belong" to one of the higher. The world as a whole can be one giant community working together for the benefit of the planet, yet it will be considered one great Tier 3 community with many Tier 3s involved all producing to benefit the vast collection of Tier 2s that support the Tier 3 network. There cannot be a Tier 4 because there is no higher level of focus on priorities or centralization of production since that is what a Tier 3 is, the centralization of production. Thus again, the scale of involvement within the Tier can grow very large but regardless of that scale, it is still on that Tier.

Friday, August 06, 2004

Subject: Social/Political/Economical -- Wolf Socialism Applied

Well I had the urge to start discussing something I didn't really want to for sometime. Now, however, I don't know if I have the energy to get into all that. Went swimming today for the first time in quite some while and my god that tired me out! Then of course getting to or from work is a 30 min bike ride itself.

Anyway, the reason I didn't want to talk about how to apply Wolf Socialism in today's society is because it's the last component that should be discussed and I have yet to even solidify the first two components I have. I plan to present the package in three sections. The first being my Socialist Manifesto, which is just that. I plan to explain why I am a socialist and believe in it above all other systems conceived (though we've only mainly lived in a capitalist society and socialism has never really dominated). This would be my main argument for Socialism and my movement against Capitalism. The second section would be the theory of Wolf Socialism, the principles that guide it. The foundation of the ideology that will lead the movement. This would center, however, around a pure evolution. This is what I have been discussing thus far. Here I would present the analysis of "human nature" and how my socio-economic theory will function naturally with guided principles if there were no interferences. Of course we live in a capitalist society with a world market governed by the World Trade Organization (WTO) and IMF and World Bank, where money dictates power and interests and separates our classes between the working man and the capitalist who hordes and controls the resources, to fatten their live while letting the world starve, suffer and die. This third section would be the application to drive the heart of the movement. How can we make socialism work today? By developing communities as socialist as possible while maintaining the basic principles of my Wolf Socialism. Self-Sufficiency above all. If it can't maintain itself it will die.

I have thought of quite a few scenarios or fantasized about ways socialist communities can try to develop. The first comment I have to say is it requires those who not just 1) want socialism but 2) don't want capitalism! And I mean there's a LOT of people who don't like things the way they are. They're just really fucking ignorant! They'll bitch and moan, hate the two party system, hate our shitty healthcare and just the crappy system we live under and how we send our brothers and sisters out in war for the interests of others (for oil and money!) and still people do NOTHING. Of course people are caught between a false dilemma that either you're not being patriotic and the whole country will be against you (and people don't like being caught out of the group! pussies!) or there's the knee jerk reaction to anything that's not our "democracy" *scoffs* which is automatically viewed as being a system of Nazism or red commies out to destroy freedom. Which is just plain fucking stupid!

The fact is we've never gotten to experience a pure socialist society that is self-sufficient and run by the people. This system will work but it will take the people who want the new system to stand up and work at making it happen and at the very least educating, enlightening and motivating that other large section of the populace that just doesn't like how we're all being fucked but just follow along mindlessly. Socialism takes ... a society! We need people to make it happen. We need to mass together where we can, rely on each other and work toward making a self-sufficient group entity (a tier 0 in a way).

That's the central idea behind my application of Wolf Socialism. But as I said, I'm too tired to really think on the scenarios to apply it and how to make it work. The main idea here is to make a self-sufficient socialist community that relies on each other for as many of the things that it requires. Live together, eat, sleep and drink together. Work together or combine the work you do for the betterment of the whole. Gain members from all trades so that you have someone to give their input and utility in all

areas. Then, the most important aspect. Take as much as you can from the capitalist whore. Suckle her breasts dry! Take, take, take and take some more. Then give nothing back!

In living, support your fellow Man and protect the interests of each other, not the interests of the mass or what the media or popular culture dictates. Remove those internal controls and become your own mind, your own entity of power and will.

In business, combine your forces with anyone who can and will contribute. Keep your supporters close and gain them and make them your community. They are who is important.

With a mass socialist community supporting itself as efficiently as possible can turn around and give back it's "profit" to the market. The things we give will not diminish us in anyway as we have what we need. The return is used as nothing more than our way to make exchange with the capitalist whore, to take in more to better our community. In the end, we have done nothing but taken what we needed, better our society, gained in our strength and gave nothing back than what was required to make the exchange of taking what we want.

Now. I know some ignorant or capitalist supporters will say "that's how our society works anyway. You're just applying the whole medium of exchange to a community entity than your own private gain." This is where there is a great difference because the community as I am referring to it as a single entity does not give its labor resources into the market like an individual does. Each individual is bringing in from the market what they can as we always have done, this is true. Then the community is putting it back into the market to get goods and services as any individual would do. This is also true. However, an individual in this society has to buy things for themselves making the lowest wage and buying at the highest price. The profit margin of this exchange keeps the power and wealth in one direction .. toward the capitalist who invested. While the labor worker that makes up the market and society struggles to get by. Now, it is true that there is strength in numbers. The work of one becomes easier when there are more. It is easier for a group of laborers to support a community than to make it on your own. This concept is no different than saying renting an apartment. You can pay rent by yourself for 700 a month and the full utilities and bills and food, etc. Now you get a roommate, two bedroom for 800 a month. Your rent alone is almost half the price of what you were paying before, and you pay half the bills, half the utilities and the food is easier to manage. Now you move into a three bed with two roommates. 900 a month. It only gets better. Now expand this to a community of 50. People who have the utilities and the expertise will support you at no cost to you. You have transportation problems you go to your friendly mechanic who fixes it right up. You get advice and support for health or help in your education by those who know how. No need to go to the pharmacy or get a tutor because the community gives it to you. In this large of a scale it is much easier to support each other and the "profit" that is massed in the whole can be spent on things to better aid the community.

I'd like to show simple illustrations to show this (which are things I'm also working on creating to add to my documentation), but I'll just try to present it as concise as I can now (which is hard for me! lol I ramble damnit!).

The community as a whole can better support itself by its numbers. The efficiency of this allows them to have lots of "profit" in the total "income" to spend on exchanging for more things from the capitalist society. Also, with the skills of trades the community should aim at having and supporting this allows the community to not rely on the capitalist society to get those services on a whole or individual basis.

This leads me to the next main idea of application.

The community should aim for getting hold of self-contained systems. By this I mean support its own resources and hoard them so that it can be self-sufficient. When it gets enough to be completely self-contained it will be a socialist community! Remember the things of importance here would be providing their own:

Shelter: homes, apartments, large buildings to make into living spaces!

Food: farm land

Water: water purification system that is efficient and not wasteful like the ones we're used to now which aim at having to get "new" water so as to charge more, unlike some systems like the Chinese have which are self-contained and recycle the water and then use the solid wastes to go back to the fields for fertilization and minerals

Energy: there are LOTS of free energy sources out there that just need to be tapped and utilized which the market doesn't want to investigate or put out there because it's not profitable! Utilize these alternative energies in any way possible to supply the community its own energy source

Transportation: This may require a combination into the whole energy part, but the community should be accessible to everyone and not require everyone to have cars. Whether a simple public trans or design a close community that people can walk or bike (or only require short distant and thus more efficient pub trans) to get to where they need to go.

Work: The people who have trades need to be organized and 'collected' so that their skills can be utilized for the community. You have a group of mechanics, put them to work! People of the community get free service, people outside of the community are welcome, but we charge ... and because we're not in dire need of income we can charge much less for service than any other business!!! This alone will bring people toward the society because people can then witness ... this IS more efficient.

To expand on that last one. The more people that join, the more trades and groups of people in these trades will join and the community can then utilize these people. Build its own health facilities, education, etc. Essentially it will jump quickly to an urban or Tier 2 community. In a way the capitalist society will help "provide" as first to build it much in the way a Tier 1 society would. I cannot even begin to speculate how the socialist community would evolve in such a scenario because it has never even been attempted as far as I know (and would meet a lot of resistance, purely by physical attacks if not governmental assaults to disallow such a society to blossom).

Wednesday, September 01, 2004

Subject: Social/Political/Economic -- Myths and other topics

I know it has been awhile since I posted anything. Recovering from my injury took a bit out of me. Now I am back and stronger than ever. Working out again, recovered physically in less than a week really (which is damn fast considering how I looked), and am having a blast with school and making Linux work on my system now. Going to have high speed internet tomorrow and then I can really have fun with IT stuff (which is my major of study for now).

Anyway, I spent a few times talking to people in chat rooms and one thing got me and it's these damn myths! People think they have this conception of anti-capitalism and how socialism is and they're just completely ignorant. So now to begin my first post in awhile, it is going to be on that, and whatever else comes to mind today, but I grant you this ... it will be a long post! Enjoy

Myth 1:

Socialism will fail because people wont want to work

People are lazy

There's no competition -- no motivation

Truth:

First, humans will always be competitive. This is a natural instinct, we struggle to survive and we compete for resources. Some of us are going to be more competitive than others and better at it than others (Alphas!). Capitalism doesn't instill this in humans, they just ... capitalize on it! No pun intended ;)

Second, people are not lazy. The way our society and employment (and schools) are set up are so that we go to work to earn money. This is the difference between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. The basic psychological principle is we're, for the most part, not going to like our jobs and the rewards of it going to eventually wither. We want to do other things that have those intrinsic rewards or do work that has a direct benefit to us. The most simple example I can give of this would be that when we till the soil and make food for ourselves (and we enjoy that activity of course) then we not only enjoy the work we just did, and we get to enjoy the benefits of the work (food!). In our society, we work our asses off then sell what we can for the greatest profits (or in agribusiness have to sell most everything!) and then what? get a wage for it? Then be screwed by our society in having the lowest worth value of that dollar to try and eek by an existence on. Now ... which is better ... enjoying work that we have intrinsic and direct value in or doing work gaining an external reward and learn to hate even if we like it.

Now ... people are lazy? No, we'd rather just do something more enjoyable! Lets put it this way, we have to work 40+ hours doing the 9-5 (and always more) to hardly have time to enjoy what money we do get and look at most indigenous tribes who for centuries and especially in hunting and gathering societies (which are near extinction now) only have to work 4 hours a day and get to enjoy life for what it's worth. Oh, but from the economists view they're lazy ... must be because they're fucking Mexicans right? always sleepy I guess. Not trying to make the profit and keep the cogs of the market system turning. God I hate economists ;)

So to conclude on this point, people are not lazy we work to survive and that is the basic factor of living! The whole point here is to develop a system that is efficient and beneficial for the people who have to work (not for capitalist who get to enjoy the labor of the people), and it is not driven by competition nor does capitalism make competition, it is a natural inheritance of living as well. Competition will always

exist and be alive among people. One person actually said if there was no competition then say school teachers wouldn't want to be the best they could to teach the children ... that doesn't even happen NOW (and I believe it would so more under socialism but I'll explain that another day). Teachers work to get their money and don't give a shit and eventually hate their jobs to further elaborate on my point! So no, socialism won't fail because of this myth. We will always have to work. If someone doesn't ... then they won't be in our community! They can learn to fend for themselves first and then I think they'll better respect doing their part which doesn't require much (again ... we can get everything we need done in 4 hours a day, this is a fact that has been tried for centuries before us).

Myth 2:

Socialism will lead to a dictatorship

The people will have no say, who will be the leader?

Truth:

No. Socialism will have two general political styles I would say and is the most apparent in nature (there's a lot we can learn from watching nature). First is the hierarchical structure of the pack (which I like) where you have an Alpha chosen by the pack or group and if the Alpha doesn't do their job there's no BS about it, if they are weak and lacking they will be removed and the one who has the pack's respect and authority will rise up. The other structure is something only humans can really commend to and that's democracy. The structure of the government itself is open to formation but it functions much like the Hierarchical but the power doesn't trickle down from the Alpha into the choices of the Beta, Delta, etc. When I talk about this subject I'll explain my perspective especially for Wolf Socialism.

Anyway, the Hierarchical method is more prone to leading to a dictatorship but the fact of socialism is the Alpha's power comes directly from the group. Without the group the Alpha is nothing, without an Alpha the group is lost. Thus it is a natural requirement we choose a leader. Those natural leaders will rise up and be chosen by the group, they cannot be dictators because dictators gain their power by control. The Alpha doesn't have control of the pack, his power is from the pack. Control would assume he is more powerful than the pack. Simple logic ... it is not possible.

Someone told me that some people are followers and because there's no competition to motivate people they will be easily controlled by a dictator. As I already laid out it is not possible and yes, some people are followers, others leaders. Those leaders will help establish the socialist society by utilizing the resources. That is what the Alpha does in any group (in canines, primates, humans, etc!) In our societies this would be more complicated than just hunting for food, but the principle basis is still the same and cannot be refuted (but some will always try of course). And again about competition that was already talked about in myth 1. It will always be there, even in followers! God I hate idiots ... moving on.

Myth 3:

Socialism doesn't work just look at those Socialized initiatives, health care, etc.

Truth:

THAT'S NOT SOCIALISM! Neither was the USSR, neither is the totalitarian state of China or Cuba. It is also not Socialized it is Nationalized resources. The fuck who coined that term should be killed very slowly. They basically said hey, let's look at nations that utilize nationalized (as opposed to privatized which capitalist always want!) health care and now look how shitty it is. Yeah ... the ONLY reason a nationalized resource would be crappy is because THEY DON'T SPEND ENOUGH. This ignorant myth always pisses me off. Guess what, if we spent even HALF what we did on the 'war on terror' (great, we're crusading against abstract ideas now!) and put it toward nationalized health care for just the Americas we would have a standard that would probably be equal or better than what the average person

now gets! And that would include EVERYONE within the borders of Canada, USA and Mexico. But we would never do something like that!

Anyway, just pointing that Socialized resources are not a mark of Socialism. Those are just nationalized resources and are usually crappy because they don't turn a profit so the nation isn't going to spend that much on it! And we want to turn them to the private sector? They'd spend even less! Because if they didn't, they'd not get the profit returns their investors and stock holders would want to see which is what truly drives our economy today ;)

Using Britain's health care is not a mark of Socialism failing. It has never even been attempted on any large scale, and on the small scales it was long ago and in small equalitarian societies which didn't have much to utilize in the first place so of course they're not going to be a brimming example of greatness. What we need to do is utilize the technology and the vast amount of resources we have today and make a fully Nationalized state (small of course) that can sustain itself. THAT would be a mark of Socialism. It's not select socialism where oh, they have nationalized health care, socialist bastards and look at it fail. God I hate morons ... wait, I think I already said that!

Socialism works ... much better and much more efficient than capitalism. We can't even begin to perceive what it would be like to live in a socialist state and all these "Socialist" appeals people like to say and believe some nations like Britain are ... well those people are fucking idiots!!!!

Myth 4:

Capitalism is natural

Humans are evil by nature

Truth

I threw in two for this one. One person actually told me Capitalism is natural. It's that "give and take." Well ... that's called interaction. It is a natural process but it's HOW that interaction that forms the society and is regulated and utilized that makes a socio-economic style, and that is definitely not the definition of Capitalism. The guy who said that ... was a moron! Capitalism is hardly natural. Socialism is natural ... that's why most animal social structures function as socialist groups! (ocean dolphins are the only true communists I've really seen too!).

The other topic is the argument always talked about in politics and that's how to govern people when their natural value is _____. Well, Humans aren't evil by nature. That is a concept we created anyway! But even adhering to its concept we are not evil by its definition, any definition. People do evil things, this is true but some people are fucked up and fucking stupid. I believe it is the weakness of our people today that we allow this Capitalist reign to continue that leaves us controlled and easily manipulated and leaves those evil corrupt people in power. We continue to bullshit ourselves and believe we'll get a taste of that "American Dream" and be rich and live the easy life and not work our asses off anymore if we just put up with it for a lil bit more ... just a little bit more. We'll even become like those we hate. We'll become evil if that's what it'll take. Well, not all of us. And not all of us will sit back and let Capitalism continue.

Wednesday, September 29, 2004

Subject: Social/Political/Economic -- Defining Socialism

I find it hard to have a conversation on the topic of Socialism simply because I believe there's a skewed perspective on WHAT Socialism is. I tried to take a random sample poll of what people thought socialism was and maybe where it might be located or examples of it. Well, a lot of the time I got responses like "it's being social and friendly I guess." Obviously they have no idea of socio-economic thoughts at all lol On one hand though, they may very well be correct. If you look at it from such an 'innocent' point of view that is the goal of socialism, to create a tight nit group that is social and friendly (unlike capitalism which goal is to horde and compete for dominance of the market).

Taking away from those who are ignorant, then you have people who look at the USSR, Nazi Germany or China as examples of Socialism or Communism (some see no difference between the two). Others see Socialists themselves as nothing more than liberal Americans voting for nationalized healthcare reforms or Britain with it's "Socialist Reforms" going on (for nationalized resources).

Now lets take a look to the lexical definition: Any of various theories or systems of social organization in which the means of producing and distributing goods is owned collectively or by a centralized government that often plans and controls the economy.

Not to act as the New Webster (which I hate) but this definition is good, however, i think it lacks to address the primary foundation of a Socialist organized society. I think the statement that says it best in that definition though is "social organization in which the means of producing and distributing goods is owned collectively." Social organization ... obviously the whole purpose of a social ideology, the means of producing and distributing (the 'market' in capitalist terms) is the collective organized manner by which the society establishes all its resources and utilizes them for the society, usually by some means of a centralized "government." As I said, I don't want to act as a new Webster and I do not have a problem with the lexical definition as I just pointed out, it is correct but it is taken so wrong.

First, the means of producing and distributing goods is taken as "the Market" usually and there is no market in that sense by a socialist society. The centralized government controlling this market is then the key component of defining a socialist society. This is not true. I will state now, the fundamental aspect that characterizes a socialist society is:

The collective utilization by any various means to produce and distribute the resources available to its community.

Some would have a problem with this simply because I use the term community. What is communism them? "A theoretical economic system characterized by the collective ownership of property and by the organization of labor for the common advantage of all members." This is vastly similar to Socialism which is because Communism is a specific type of Socialism in which there is no private property, only the collective property of the community and it has never ever existed in human history and I doubt it could be possible even among TWO people (simply because we categorize things and will make claim 'this is mine' thus breaking the characteristic of communism).

Back to Socialism, this definition I present to lay the foundation for Socialism is simple and to the point. A socio-economic theory is an ideology by which a society determines how the society is going to

organize itself and moreover how it is going to survive by utilizing the resources of the world it has available.

Note, this definition is not laid in stone and I will be changing it from time to time til I reach a final conclusion. However, always refer to the lexical definition as it is the objective source we utilize in discussion and I only wish to illustrate that there can be a misconception by people trying to fit this socialist idea in their mind through a Capitalized filter (their perspective conditioned by our capitalist society).

Capitalism -- Resources owned privately, the more resources one owns the more 'power' they have in society and the created Market (the interactive 'medium' by which the individual capitalist and labor force interact to produce and distribute these resources)

Socialism -- Resources owned collectively, more resources result in a more independent and powerful society but no one person can attain greater power above and beyond anyone else simply because the collective community is more powerful than any one person so there is no competition to hoard resources. You get back what you put in to the society. A centralized organization (not so much a government as we see it now separate from the market) formed by the labor force themselves determines the best effort way to utilize the resources.

Communism -- Resources owned collectively, a specific form of Socialism where the idea of private ownership or property is completely removed and all resources belong to the community as a whole, each person gets their fair share. Has never existed in humanity, best example is ocean dolphins as far as I know ;)

Those are just my basic summations on each of these ideologies. When I get to discussing in Defense of Capitalism I'll address the fact we don't live in a pure Capitalist society (the free market) as we do have government controls. What needs to be addressed is who is controlling the government, moreover, what is the result of this interaction between capitalist controlling the market and capitalist controlling the government to lay open control on the market even further.

One last topic to address is another example I've forgot to mention in detail (though I'm sure I've talked about it here in the beginning) is the Military. You wanted a concrete example of something in today's time well there it is. The key factor of a Socialist community is how does it get its resources. Note, I am saying community, a collective group and not the society. As I will elaborate on in a second. The Military gets its resources from the government and they through the taxation on the capitalist society. The Military is efficient as hell, no one can argue this (unless their incompetent!). As I explained to some when I was thinking of joining our military it can be looked at as a business in which you pick your role (among a list of hundreds available) which will be the job you want to perform to aid the 'business' collective. You will be supplied all the resources you need to live: shelter, food, clothing, etc. This of course is not a society it is just the military, one aspect of our greater society. The problem I have is that the military is dependant on the government and their taxation. But they are a prime example of how efficient and well maintained (because when not having to die in battle they get to live very comfortably) a socialist community can be when well "funded." Now say we turn their collective role toward just being a society and give them the resources they need to sustain themselves and maintain their society they will be efficient and survive and would be a Wolf Socialist community. Remember, the primary factor of Wolf Socialism is to be self-sufficient. I will say there has never been a large scale socialist society. There are communities as I just pointed out. We look at China and say they're socialist. No, the military authoritarian collective that controls the masses is the socialist aspect, the people themselves are starving or living in poverty. The socialist collective in such cases as these depend on the masses they control and dictate over to survive. On one hand I will say they're socialist

groups then, but on the other hand I don't even like to designate those types of groups as socialist simply because I feel any true socialist society will be as a Wolf Socialist and require to be self-sufficient (otherwise naturally it wouldn't be able to sustain itself and die off, thus not existing). You have to remember, I make this claim as being the characteristic of a Wolf Socialist society (self-sufficiency) but I am making Wolf Socialism because a true Socialist society has never existed on any large scale and those small scale ones were self-sufficient. Also, this is a work in progress. If you have any suggestions, comments, questions or arguments, by all means comment to this post and I'll reply back on it.

Sunday, October 31, 2004

Subject: Socialism Defined ... Continued

I think this is a continuing topic I will have to continually add on and redo to make the point clear and so that any further discussions will maintain their continuity. To put together any logical and rational argument or discussion as I will be maintaining it is a necessity to have the strongest foundation that can be made possible. Thus I will now continue on with this discussion of defining socialism with new perspectives and analogies and more forceful directions.

As I was laying here getting ready to go to bed I had a thought occur to me about the definition of communism as seen in my political science book which I don't like and it talks about the state, government and society as being something separate than the people that make it up. Now I don't like this definition nor the visual representation I see with it. The main idea is that things become "public goods" and as I've stated numerous times I don't feel communism can work with humanity unless we were to return to our primate bestial ways. To illustrate that I had the idea of one resource, water. Say there's a small stream of fresh water to drink from. If we were to forge this under capitalism the first one to come to it would claim it as his and request a medium of exchange for you to use his goods and have a drink. A communist group would come to this and drink from it no matter who they are or their difference. It would be like any other water source in nature and animals coming to drink from it. But what about Socialism? What would be the analogy? It's not quite as simple I see it. How I see it would be that the leader of the pack of this hypothetical group of people would come to it, take a drink and then step aside keeping an eye on the group monitoring that they all get their drink and that everyone is safe in doing so.

The reason I feel this is hard to conceive is because socialism in this very simplified analogy is much like communism for socialism is a "centralization" of all the resources and obviously we were only looking at one, then how the "government" or "centralized agency" would manage the distribution is open to interpretation as well. It is because of these reasons I feel this analogy was hard to present socialism but I think it is a fine example of the polar differences between capitalism and communism (communism being a very specialized form of socialism as well).

I bring this up because I feel it makes a strong point about not only the betterment to the society that socialism as a whole has but also the efficiency. In the capitalist example one person can utilize the resource for his own benefit all he wants but especially since this resource is a necessity of life he can completely get whatever he wants. Obviously it was a monopoly. It is because of such possibilities that regulations are required to make sure people get necessities fairly to benefit the society so on the whole they can progress. I feel socialism itself offers a completely new form of regulation as well as open "market" that utilizes "profits" to better society plus give people everything they deserve, and the profit margin will become a direct betterment for the quality of living of the society.

This seems almost hypocritical if you think I just said that government regulation can allow a free market where people get what they deserve. The main fact is that socialism does not have a separate body of government or controls. Socialism is not having a totalitarian ruler, dictator or militarized state dominating the controls over the society. What I will call it is the "centralized agent" which will be the entity created as a direct representation of the labor force, the "market" itself. Again, this is taken hypocritical as I say the market will regulate itself and will give the controls to the people but you have to remember, the market is not as we have it now. To simply aggregate supply and demand, there are not going to be firms that households interact with but a direct relationship between the resources, labor and

the centralization of all that to reflect the "profits" back into the households or society. This creates a direct control from the labor force that that centralized agent is nothing more than a mirror for than having the controls being in the hands of firms and a separate government body.

Some may argue that this cannot be possible, but let me begin at the root of all economic theory. My model depicts the starting points being Raw Materials, those being the resources that the environment offers us to survive off of. Then there are the individuals that make up the social body, the society that require these raw materials to survive on. However, a plot of land is useless unless through our efforts we pick and gather food or plow the soil and grow it. Thus the society itself utilizes raw materials through its labors to create products (labor production) to sustain the society. This is the very basic model of any economic thought.

The separation of socio-economic theories begins in how these raw materials are "gathered" or more so how they are "filtered" into the social body to be utilized and then how they are spread out to the people. Pure capitalism would leave us all as free agents and each entity gathers what resources it can and anything it needs it doesn't have will require a means of exchange with another free agent that has what they need. Thus hoarding is the quality of virtue and power. Obviously through years of social evolution we have attained a medium of exchange called money (though take a look at what flimsy means its value is determined from!) and we are not a pure capitalist society. We have a government body that regulates the "free market" to insure that we get the necessities we need and that some capitalist (those who are the most powerful or "wealthy") don't monopolize the resources like in the stream analogy. This is a natural formulation of interaction but I think with intelligence, knowledge, sophistication and progression we need to move on to something better. I also think we need to controls in place by the people themselves to create a medium level that we all can live at and that some capitalist bastards aren't living at the top on the backs of the many poor below them because that is the end result of capitalism.

As opposed to capitalism, Socialism can be almost seen as a "next step" or more so as a determined and monitored step in social evolution. One problem I have with pure capitalism is that there is no social agent which we are not all individual entities unconnected. We form a social contract and form ways to interact, thus we cannot live in a pure capitalist society and have progressed to what we have today. Capitalism in itself gives the controls of progression to the capitalist who want nothing to change but to leave themselves in power. Socialism offers the labor force themselves, that utilize those raw materials into things the society can use, to determine and make the controls. As well as in a democratic structure can determine their type of government or representatives like in a tribal society or any pack society determine their chiefs and leader councils. The main difference between socialism and capitalism is that one is centered around the society while the other is focused on individuals. As I've inferred, the problem with that is that we don't live as individuals or hermits, we live in a society with lots of other human beings.

I think I'll conclude this discussion with one last perspective. I don't want to sound too "black and white," but I think we can line these socio-economic theories on a spectrum analysis. The two main focuses being as I just stated, a social structure or an individual structure where off to the left side, the black side, the x side (it doesn't matter!) we have anarchy. From that it melds into capitalism, something in between but switches toward something we are completely unfamiliar with, that being a socially focused society and we have socialism, and then off to the right, the white, the y-side we have communism. Now as I've stated, we as humans as we are now cannot live in anarchy, we cannot live in pure capitalism. We also cannot live in a communist state but we must live in a social society and we need to push ourselves now over to the other side and stop being so egotistical, so self-centered, so focused on our own gains and look at our neighbors and realize we live in a society, we live in a community, we live with lots of other human beings. We create the borders that separate each other whether they be our country, state, or personal limits. We are the limitation of our lives. We need to

become socialist to better all of our society, the world society. I'll leave this spectrum perspective on maybe it is like our light spectrum, we as humans can only see so much of the total spectrum, I think we can only live in so much of this socio-economic spectrum and since we can step back and look at all of this, make the better judgment and venture into the unknown, into the unfamiliar and forge a new society focused on our society and better it for all our lives.

Sunday, November 07, 2004

Subject: Digesting Economics -- A breakdown of economic theory

I know it's hard to swallow economics sometimes but bear with me, the sooner you get this over with, the easier it will become. Economics is a dry subject and if you weren't interested you wouldn't even have read this far. So stay with me and let's learn a bit about how and why our societies are the way they are.

To begin, as usual, I'll have to define the terminology.

Elements of Economy

First concept is the people that make up the society. Whether we're referring to them on the micro or macro level they are the same people individually or collectively. Collectively we refer to them as the households, in the market exchange they are the consumer, in the labor market they are the laborers. We can classify them as many things but the two I'll try and stick to are Laborers (when they are utilizing resources in respect to businesses) and Consumers (when they consume the products). I may also just use an H to refer to the general classification of Households.

Labor Units -- Consumers, Laborers, Workers, Households, Proletariats

The other side of this coin are the collections of productions. They are usually referred to as Firms. I'll also refer to them as Producers, in terms of Capitalism maybe Capitalists, though I try to reserve that for the idea of those who filter the resources into the market and get the profits of the market. I'll also refer to firms as Businesses.

Production Units -- Firms, Producers, Businesses, Capitalists

Another key factor in economic relations are Resources. I break these down because resources for the society and production can come from a number of sources. I break Resources down to Raw Materials, the elements of the planet we utilize such as land, water, ore, trees, animals, energy, etc. Resources for production also include the labor required for a firm to produce a good and service (G&S). In terms of Capitalism, capital may be required to allow for a firm to be generated.

Resources -- Raw Materials, Capital, Labor

Both the Firms and Households generate Waste such as unclean water, trash, pollution, etc. Some of these can also be renewable waste products which can be recycled and added to the resources required to produce things, thus completing the cycle of resources.

Waste -- Renewable resources, non-renewable resources

Issues of Economy

I leave these four basic elements as the key components that make up economic exchange. The next section is to express the main issues shared by any economy.

The Social Contract -- As people come together they naturally develop what is called a Social Contract, whether written as some form of legal document or just common interest that are shared, this is the basis for developing any kind of society which once a society has come together an economy develops which moves into the next issue.

The Need for Survival -- This is the most basic instinct all life has. We all need to live and will fight for survival.

The Problem of Entropy -- The problem with any closed system is entropy. If nothing is added to keep a system in its original state of equilibrium it will continue to deteriorate. The Earth itself is not a closed system, we're powered by the sun. Obviously though, the sun will not last forever. For our sake, it shouldn't be anytime soon enough for us to even consider. The problem of Entropy lies in the economic system we develop however. This problem is a direct result of Waste. If an economy is not functional enough to generate as little waste and make it as much as possible renewable, then it will degrade by Entropy. For the sake of argument, let us say we depend on other economies. Not only does this breed dependency on others, if we look at the absolute system now a closed system, we will see the problem is present. However, in such a system of dependencies, some will further maintain their micro-systems while the rest are degrading much quicker. Along side of the need for survival, the means to control entropy are thus a necessity of any economy.

The Requirement of Labor -- Land by itself is useless unless otherwise cultivated. Unless we're a plant we can't just sit here and survive. Also, if we do nothing, things will fall prey to Entropy. The best analogy I can give is a farmer and his land. The land itself is worthless unless he plants and harvests. Even ancient man realized this. They hunted and gathered and the waste they generated was bodily and food which is all biodegradable and would return to the ecosystem which generates the plants and animals they would rely on for survival. Adding this to the ideas of survival and entropy we can see that labor is the main factor of our economy in maintaining the survival of the society, as well as, making it functional enough to keep entropy down and on top of it maintain the overall ecosystem all of us depend on.

Carrying Capacity and the Threat of Overpopulation -- All societies grow, however the natural sustainable resources for the economy determine how many can live at any time. Remember, the resources need to be renewable which there are lots of (energies, plants, animals, etc). Death will always be a part of life, if we think we can avert death and increase beyond our carrying capacity, not only does this create a society which will crumble by the idea of Entropy alone, but the resources will be distributed unequal, and with scarcity of resources come wars and conflicts for those resources.

Determinants of Economy

Leading from these main ideas economies fall under two type of systems. Individualistic and Cooperative (corporate). Also, economies can either strive for Progress or for Sustainability. If we agree thus far on the elements of Economy and the Issues of Economy (as I call them) let us move onto the Determinants of Economy (because these are what determine how an economy works).

As I have stated in another discussion, economic ideologies can be spread across a spectrum. On one side these will be individualistic while on the other they will be cooperative. The spectrum would look something like this:

Economic Spectrum :: Anarchism -- Capitalism -- Socialism -- Communism

On the left people are left to their own devices, in capitalism we develop a more complex social exchange though we are individual in our means of survival and motivation while a large split occurs and as we shift toward socialism we cooperate further by striving to even out the goods and services to everyone and in communism we all work for the benefit of the group, the community, the pack, whatever.

Whatever the theory may be it is going to be on one side of this spectrum. Of course Anarchism and Communism are the extremes which I don't believe we could ever exist in and I doubt a pure capitalist or socialist system can ever really exist, however, I personally feel we can exist closer to a socialist system and it is more likely a better system for reasons I'll discuss later.

The other separator of economies is the motivator. For the sake of argument I'll leave the classifications between Capitalism and Socialism which make up the polar differences nicely. On one hand we have a society striving for Development and Progress (like ours). On the other hand we have societies striving for self-sufficiency or sustainability (like traditional tribal or folk cultures).

The development model promotes the idea of progress, thus inherently creating a scarcity in the resources, requiring a fixed society to grow and consume more. In classical economics we have the problems of scarcity determining supply and demand which are a direct result of progress and development. Simply put as we develop and progress in our societies we run out of resources to sustain the economy. By the problem of population growth we can see that the carrying capacity dictates a society cannot grow beyond the limits of the resources available. As we recall, the development of waste, specifically non-renewable waste, will add to the destruction or the entropy of the ecology and thusly our economy.

The solution to these inherent problems in the development model is sustainability. In the sustainability model a society's motivation is to strive for self-sufficiency and sustainability. It will work enough to survive (which does not require nearly as much effort as development does!), thus allowing more time to spend on things like society, the arts, etc. and will work to generate renewable waste that will keep the system functional thus eliminating the concept of scarcity among other things.

I will be so bold as to say the development model by which we live in now functions to lead to its own demise, not only be growing beyond its ability to sustain its way of life but also because it leads to the problem of limited and diminishing resources by which we will strive to fight and maintain and horde those resources to keep ourselves happy at the cost of everything else, including the very basis of our economy -- nature.

This concludes the basis of my economic discussion. The next will be on classical and current economic theory with emphasis on my socialist theory by applying the relationships and to obviously show which is the better choice. Of course the most important thing to discover is application of this better to the world we live in today.

Monday, November 08, 2004

Subject: Business -- Sufficiency Model

The basis for this model is to take my concepts of socialism and apply them to the market itself. The other factor is work efficiency improves as number of laborers goes up to a certain degree at which then there's more worker's than needed. Lets use this thought: Say there's five farmers, each with a plot of land. They all produce enough to feed themselves on and a surplus profit by which to sale or exchange with the market for other goods. Lets say the surplus is the same for all five and its 1/5th of the crop. In essence, that extra crop of all 5 equals another whole plot.

Now lets say we combine these workers together removing that entire last plot. Remembering this is completely hypothetical and the statistics completely for the sake of argument, the efficiency of these workers creates a higher yield of surplus on the plot. These five able to do the same amount of work as before (6 plots) now can do it on 4. Lets say for the sake of argument there's a ratio that all of them on three plots can make in essence that same 6 plot of individual work. This is seen as good. Less resources required, in this case land, and the same production quota from labor amount is met yet due to cooperation they produce that production quota with the best fit resource use. Thus making the profit margin the best it can be, which then goes back to the laborers by my model.

To move on, the basic idea is to cooperate, not only within the business but with other businesses -- to make an incorporation of businesses maybe. The goal of the business is not to progress, develop, compete or grow. The goal is to sustain itself with the aid of other businesses. It will develop, it will grow, and it will compete. These are natural state events that occur in a survival arena such as the market (or the jungle!). The main benefits I would outline would be that the business would supply its workers with strong benefits as far as healthcare goes, awarded after a duration of loyalty (6-12 months). The amount of labor required by its workers should be kept to a minimum (4-6) hours unless otherwise requested by the worker. Workers should be paid a livable wage to be decided on an as-is basis. Wage increases should not be sought out as they will be slow to progress. However, workers should be awarded for their merits and achievements in their progression and as they add more to the business, the more they should receive of that proportional increase. Benefits should also be supplied by the business but the main factor of the cooperation is that the benefits should be given across the spectrum. Say hypothetically this business coordinates food, transportation, clothing and housing. The workers within all these businesses should receive discounts so that when they do buy things, they get them from within (instead of supporting another business). The last element of this business model is it should be a local community governance. The goal is not to reach out across the entire country or the globe but to make the business sustain itself where it is at, maybe a large portion of nor cal or something.

Ideally this type of model would become a socialist community if the business controlled the water, transportation, power, food, clothing, housing, etc all within a local community that was made up of its workers. It would be self-contained, self-sufficient and sustained. The only other problem to deal with would be as I stated in Digesting Economics would be removing scarcity and controlling waste issues.

The cycle of sustainability would look something like this

Market -- > Business -- > Laborers
Laborers --> Business --> Market

Essentially the business and the workers would have a relationship. Not only are the workers getting their pay and continuing their relationship with the market for things the business cannot supply it (goal is to unify relations with the community your workers are made of and that they'll be completely loyal to

you since your prices are honest and fair and a result of the cooperation) but then the laborers give back to the business obviously through their labor and their exchanges with it resupply the businesses to sustain itself, in which utilizing labor efficiency as I stated in the beginning, the business will have a profit margin by which they can utilize to interact with the market as well, to get things like healthcare, etc.

Subject: Linguistics -- Definitions

Linguistics is the study of human language.

Language can be seen as a "semantics code." (semantics being the meaning and code how you convert and transfer) If you do not know what semantics or how coding relates then you are not studied enough on this subject.

Dialects are a variety of a language in a geographical area. As these areas are further sub-divided as sub-dialects we establish sociolects which are distinguished to a social class or social group. Further divided are varieties down to each individual's language pattern as an idiolect.

"There are no universally accepted criteria for distinguishing languages from dialects..."

The main facet depends on the user's frame of reference. Dialects begin to differ as mutual intelligibility lessens over what is seen as a "dialect continuum." Thus, well-defined distinctions are seen as impossible as populations and language groups blend, much like there's no well-defined boundary on species through societal blending.

Semantics and syntax are two of the major areas of linguistics. After all, we're concerned with communication, the ideas we are to express and the words that convey them. A lexicon is important to this. A lexicon is a list of words together with additional word-specific information. "In linguistics, a lexicon has a slightly more specialized definition, as it includes the lexemes used to actualize words." Lexeme is a unit of linguistic analysis belonging to a particular syntactic category and having a particular meaning or semantics value. "Lexemes may be simple words, phrasal and compound words and shortened forms." Simply, a lexicon consists of lexemes. Now how do we derive lexemes? Morphemes.

"A morpheme is the smallest meaningful unit in a given language. e.g., The word 'unbelievable' has three morphemes 'un-' a bound morpheme, meaning 'non-', '-believe-' a free morpheme, and 'able'. 'un' is also a prefix, '-able' is a suffix. Both affixes."

Also, lexemes utilize sememes which are meaning expressed by a morpheme. Thus, you have the smallest meaningful unit in a language and the meaning of that morpheme. These lexemes collected formulate the lexicon e.g., a dictionary.

Thus, through syntax (study of how words combine to form grammatical sentences) and semantics (the study of the meaning of words, lexical semantics, and how these combine to form meanings of sentences), we derive with linguistics (among utilizing other things of course). Pragmatics (the study of how utterances are used in communicative acts) also plays a role for context.

Linguistics is primarily a descriptive work. Prescriptive work tends to label "incorrect usage" which a linguist might claim is just a "different dialect" or just "idiosyncratic." As opposed to English which is primarily prescriptive and can be seen as derived from a "standard language" such as our Standard American English. Do not misconceive this with the lexicon of a standard language (which is a particular dialect of a language). The lexicon formulates the words of a language and in totality across the dialects as much as possible (they can be seen as "above" the dialects extending to the words (morphemes) and their meanings (sememes).

To quote:

Dictionaries come in two basic philosophies, prescriptive and descriptive. The Oxford English Dictionary (OED) is descriptive, and attempts to describe actual usage. Noah Webster, on the other hand, who was intent on forging a distinct identity for the American language, exaggerated the difference in meaning and pronunciation of numerous words. This is one reason that American English has the spelling "color" while British English has the spelling "colour". Virtually modern dictionaries of English are descriptive, although many, such as the American Heritage dictionaries make extensive efforts to provide information on the best usage, and almost all dictionaries provide some information on words considered erroneous, vulgar, or easily confused. In any case, in the long run, usage alone determines the meaning of words in English, although dictionaries provide conservative continuity, even the most descriptive.

Thus some dictionaries may prescribe things or some may just be descriptive, however, when it comes to defining words the basis falls to the concepts of intension (not to be confused with intention) and extension. Extension is all the objects a word would relate to. The extension of "person" would be all person's who have ever lived. In such a thing as something that is infinite like "number" it could not be made. However, intensions are the more universal listing of the properties that describe the word. Thus, using intensions for the basis in formulating the definitions for our lexicons are much more usable. Take the word bachelor for example; "The intension of the word is more brief because it includes just two properties: the property of being a man, and the property of being unmarried. Basically, all bachelors are unmarried men, and only bachelors are unmarried men."

Thusly, we can see that dictionaries have their uses in defining. Prescriptive works will give us a standardization and something we can agree upon in our language, which is especially required in "formal" writings. When discussing the aspects of something descriptive works may be more suitable since we would escape the scope of the dialectical lexicon. In such an instance we look to how words are defined in lexicons, the lexemes. More likely we will look to how lexicons themselves organize this data by logically formulating intensions of words to best fit what the usage is capturing. Granted, even in the example of bachelor given, we can see by any dictionary there are more definitions such as a bachelor degree. This is when pragmatics will be involved. I will save the next linguistic discussion to semantics code itself and context defining. Primarily how we transfer ideas through language from one individual to another.