

MANIFESTO FOR NEEDSECONOMY

Tomas Blomberg

Manifesto
for
Needseconomy

Provide for everybody's rightful needs
not for our greed at the sacrifice of others suffering

Working group for needseconomy

Also published in Spanish and Swedish

Manifiesto Para la Necesiconomía

Satisfacer las necesidades legítimas de todos -
No nuestros deseos al costo del sufrimiento de los demás
(earlier ISBN 9789178510030) NOW FREE PDF

Manifest för Behovsekonomi

Tillgodose allas rättmätiga behov
inte våra begär på bekostad av andras lidande
(Earlier ISBN: 97891778568259 NOW FREE PDF from May 2022

(Earlier Publisher: BoD – Books on Demand, Stockholm, Sverige)

© Tomas Blomberg 2019

FREE PDF <https://www.drpilotti.info/solidaritet.html>

(Earlier Förlag: BoD – Books on Demand, Stockholm, Sverige

Tryck: BoD – Books on Demand, Norderstedt, Tyskland

ISBN 9789178510009)

A spectre is haunting the world –□the spectre of Communism. This spectre scares everybody, those in power and others, economists, enterprise leaders, politicians in **all parties** in all countries, all workers, all unemployed – everybody □□to uncritically accept the global capitalistic system.

Where is the party in opposition that dares to question capitalism's incessant and obviously more and more desperate job-growth-demagogy? Where the opposition that calls attention to Marx' concept of surplus value and its consequences instead of, in competition with other parties, shout for more jobs? Jobs that one ought to understand are created to satisfy the capitalists' greed for profit. Jobs that, directly or indirectly, by capitalism's unrestrained ravages inevitably leads to a global environmental disaster and a global, at the end *everybody* striking, social catastrophe.

The problems with environmental destruction and the many peoples suffering can neither the private capitalism nor communism's/marxism's/ socialism's/ Left's state capitalism solve. There is a fully practicable alternative: Needseconomy.

Unemployment –□an unnecessary,
by capitalism created, scourge

What is a job?

Why does one execute jobs?

And – above all:

Why is it so horrible to become unemployed?

(See next section!)

It would be a good idea if one thinks about these questions – first – before one goes out and shouts for jobs. Or, as the politicians, shouts about how to “create jobs”.

Is it really necessary to “create jobs” when there are so many tasks that **must** be done and **can** be done but are not executed? There are plenty of meaningful jobs for everybody. Tasks that all the time is shouting for being performed. It is the capitalistic system, which, through its incessant ruthless **capitalgrowthcoercion**, regardless of people’s feelings, that **prevents** these tasks to be performed. Unemployment is a concept and a phenomenon that only exists in the capitalistic system.

Something seems to paralyze our thoughts. A lack of will to understand what is meant by **must** and **can**.

Why is it so horrible to become unemployed?

Anyone who has involuntarily become unemployed and suffers from it has obviously not got some rightful basic needs satisfied. Instead of considering everything from the economic perspective of money, let us look at our problems in a human perspective. Let us look at people's basic rightful needs.

Behind the unreflected use of the word "unemployed" lies a long list of different unsatisfied needs. The most obvious threat for many in connection with unemployment is to lose the possibility to provide for one's and one's family's living. Already here we can see a long list of different basic needs. To have enough to eat. To have some place to live. To get new clothes when the old are worn out etc. . But also the need to care of the sick, possibility for the children to go to school etc. .

Many people are lonely. To experience feeling of togetherness and to feel solidarity and to feel oneself needed is one of the most central needs in our life.

And people are different. To get ones individual needs satisfied, to be respected as an individual person with individual personality and abilities which ought to be developed are also among our basic rightful needs.

Different needs must generally be met by different, often quite different, social solutions. The economists do all they can to make us believe that all these problems must be solved by being squeezed into the economic profitable wage-labour. An old sick or a single mother may feel lonely. Shall this always be treated by some profitable wage-labour performed by some employee in some profitable business company? Human solidarity cant be substituted by smiles on business lines.

We have today in view of the technological development an overcapacity to produce both goods and services. The basic claim of needseconomy is:

It is quite possible to satisfy all the basic and rightful needs of everybody provided that we direct our efforts towards the needs themselves and give them the highest priority instead of being dependent on the quite different priorities of the global financial market, where people's rightful needs have to compete for the capital. Compete with all sorts of quite different interests and especially the profit-driven interests of certain persons.

Why a manifesto for needseconomy?

There is something morbid in the world. People are all the time afraid for losing their jobs. And the unemployed are all the time suffering of fear not to get any job. Everybody lives in an incessant fear. A way to repress and deaden this fear and angst is submission.

Many do not get their basic rightful needs satisfied. Many lives constantly underfed. Many even starve while others live in the most distasteful and disgusting luxury. One can not blame anything but the ruling economic system. For reason which we shall soon explain we shall call this system “the capitalistic system” instead of the more awkward and cumbersome “the existing economic system”.

Many people – and animals – are subjected to a horrible suffering. You can not blame the political system. Whether we call it democracy or dictatorship. The complete global world is submitted to the same global economic dictatorship. One can also not blame all power-hungry and money-hungry capitalists. They are also participants in a world completely governed and dominated by an **overhuman system** that they can't (and of course wish not) change. The complete humanity is submitted to an overhuman system. A **Monster**. A Monster that totally invades our life.

This Monster controls all humans and animals, controls all groups of peoples and their leaders, controls all politicians, governments, international organisations, controls (=destroys) the complete nature.

This Monster controls all of our life. What (and if) we shall eat, what clothes we shall wear, how we shall reside, what we shall do in our holidays, what we shall buy, what we shall consume, what we shall learn at school, which education, training and competence we shall get, what job we shall have, what care of sick we (if there is money) will get.

Our highest leaders do not rule. They are only part of the Monster as obedient, submissive and helpful cells in the Monster's brain.

In some countries this is usually called democracy, since one has general elections every fourth year. And they are of course free. You may vote on whichever political party (of the due to some peculiar system already determined) you wish. Parties that all dwell on details while the world approaches a catastrophe.

The democracy has been captured by the capitalism. The capitalism has become a superideology – the only allowed superideology – which is superior to the democracy.

What democracy is this when people do not dare to oppose?

But one does not even seem to understand what one should oppose against.

Ultimately it is the question of the economical system and a by this system created global environmental catastrophe and a global social catastrophe.

All historical experience shows that opposition, and even worse revolution, is fruitless, or even worse leads to chaos, if one does not have a constructive alternative. An abundance of ideas exists already. On different levels, some general, all-embracing, and many concerning concrete everyday problems. Ideas that can all be called ideas of needseconomy. But the most important and basic ideas are today spread out and systematically concealed by the capitalistic system's all defenders and fellow-travellers. Therefore there is need for a simple and constructive compilation of these ideas.

Part one
Needseconomy

I. What is needseconomy?

I.I What is needseconomy?

It is very simple to explain what **needseconomy** is:
It is an “economy” – a social organization – such that **everybody** gets his basic rightful needs satisfied.

Everybody!

(We have introduced the term “needseconomy” – as a *single word* ! – to denote the economic system we define in this manifesto in order to make a distinction to the more flexible term “economy of needs” which can be used with many different interpretations in special cases. A single word is also more practical as a scientific term, which can then be used in various compositions. Similarly we introduce below the terms “needssovereignty”, “wagelabourcoercion” and “capitalgrowthcoercion”.)

I.2 Needssovereignty

The ruling economic system is **not** a needseconomy.

The main difference between needseconomy and the ruling (capitalistic, see chapter II) system is that needseconomy gives absolutely highest priority to everybody's basic needs, while the capitalistic system does not give this any proclaimed priority at all, but lets these basic needs be satisfied only to the extent they can keep up in competition (which they to a large extent can't) with other stronger forces. The strongest of these forces is what we call the capitalgrowthcoercion. It summarises all those forces, institutions etc. that forces the capital to incessantly grow. **The capitalism gives priority to capital growth before the basic needs of human beings.**

This implies two things:

1. We must **proclaim highest priority to everybody's** basic and rightful needs.
2. We must build an economy, an administration of production, distribution and consumption of all that is required to satisfy all these needs, which is **not dependent on the quite different priorities** of the ruling economic system.

We summarise these two requirements 1 and 2 in one concept:

Needssovereignty

I.3 The realeconomic basis of needseconomy

Needseconomy is no impossibility. We have today an overcapacity. It is important to use this overcapacity in a wise, intelligent and meaningful way.

The capacity to produce all that is required (A-products, see next section) to satisfy everybody's rightful needs **already exists** more than enough since long time as the consequence of the technology. The overcapacity is today used to produce a super- abundance of luxury products (B-products, see next section) using forced labour according to Marx' concept of surplus value (see section III.4 below). And the catastrophic ruthless exploitation of nature is not necessary for the production of all that is required to satisfy the rightful needs of everybody. There is food for all and nevertheless starves people. The problem is that the poor does not have the money they must have in order to by food. The money has, as a consequence of the capitalgrowthcoercion, been accumulated by the rich.

I.4 Distinguish between needs and greed

An economist is a person that can't see the difference between a luxury swimming pool to a bank-director and a helping serving of food to a starving. This is in no way an incisive wording. Both are called "products" (goods and services) and are produced to the extent they are profitable. And there exists among economists many serious arguments that some investments on welfare could in fact be motivated by being profitable. And the economists assure us that the environmental problems will be solved by the technical development. Provided, of course, that this technical development is profitable. (Otherwise we have to look around for just these technical engineering tricks.)

We reject definitely such ideas.

Here extends a sharp dividing line between today's economism and what we call needseconomy.

We must distinguish between needs and greed. This is the very fundamental condition for what we call needseconomy. It is completely impossible to talk about needseconomy without first making clear the difference between needs and greed.

But now comes the objections, rapidly on long conveyor bands. Quite natural, of course, since it is among **capitalism's** basic prerequisite tactics **not** to accept this difference between needs and greed. For capitalism it is fundamental to exploit people's greed. And we are indoctrinated to take part in capitalism's many defence mechanisms. We can already here anticipate the enormous difficulties we will come back to.

A common fault when some new idea is presented is to immediately come with objections. Often long before the presenter is allowed to speak to and end. And often with a preconceived opinion that the whole thing of course is

unreasonable. One already knows, so a discussion is unnecessary. We can talk about something else. (Preferably not about environmental problems or poverty.) This is not very constructive. We therefore ask the reader of this little booklet (it is not very long) to read it first. Then we welcome objections. Provided they are constructive, of course.

If we can't make and get some consensus about a division in needs and greed is all talk about welfare meaningless. It will be a "welfare" for the rich at sacrifice of the poor (which perhaps, in some countries, "only" constitutes a small minority). It is the question of initiating a, to great parts restricted, debate on what ought to be part of society's common responsibility and what we can leave to individual citizens. Here we must suppose that a reasonable consensus is possible if such concepts as "society" and "state" above all shall have meaning.

The two words "needs" and "greed" ought to be so firmly established in our language and have so clearly distinguished meanings that it ought to be clear in general what we mean.

There are of course lot of borderline cases of many kinds where it is difficult or more or less impossible to decide between needs and greed. One can of course work with more detailed classifications. For borderline cases between needs and greed we can introduce a category of wishes. The needs themselves can be graded according to Maslow's hierarchy of basic needs. All this belongs to the more detailed development of different forms of needseconomy.

However. And this is important! We must not get lost in details. We must first find the most important **general basic principles**. This is only possible with **very coarse**

simplifications. This gives a firm ground on which we can then build further with rich structures of complementary additions of many kinds.

There is one very strong argument for making a division in two principally different groups of “products” to talk in “economic” terms. We must not be satisfied with the lowest steps in Maslow’s hierarchy. Everybody, even those living in poor countries, must have the possibility to live a life in dignity.

We must not get trapped in the economism’s materialistic way of considering human beings!

To eliminate poverty must also include eliminate spiritual poverty!

The first group of “products” we call A-products and corresponds to what we intend with the word needs. It contains of course food, clothes, some place to reside, care of the sick, schools etc. ... , that everybody reasonably must be able to “consume”, but also a lot of other things to satisfy **individual needs**, such as Art museums, various possibilities for physical training, universities, **individual tools of different kinds** etc. ... , furthermore general functions, such as public administration, judicial system, roads, etc. To live in a good local and global environment is the most important of all needs. The group of A-products can be defined as what is required to give everybody what one could call **lowest acceptable standard for a life in dignity.**

The other group of “products” includes all other things that are produced. We call them *B-products* and corresponds to what we intend with the word “greed” in a general sense.

The problem with greeds is of course not the satisfying itself of the greed but the hurt this satisfying can lead to. Anyone that satisfies his greeds can hurt both himself and others. There lies an undertone of this in the word “greed” itself which gives the word a negative sound. And properly speaking it is wrong to use the word in cases where it is quite harmless. In cases where it not leads to any hurt.

Here we must complement with a comment to the partition in needs and greed. There goes a sharp dividing line between needs and greed if we take *potential hurts* into consideration. Needs, provided they are satisfied in a right way (which needseconomy shows is possible) does **NOT** lead to any **HURT**. Greed leads to hurt. We must here also give a comment concerning individual needs. Some individual needs may require large use of (natural, material, cultural etc. ...) resources. But as long as they don't lead to any hurt for the individual himself or others is it quite acceptable and we can use the term needs. To hurt others must be interpreted in very broad sense: if you hurt Nature or the environment you will hurt others – ultimately all others. It is also extremely important to realise that **hurt** can occur **indirectly through many** – often seemingly harmless – **intermediate** steps and that the hurt therefore can manifest itself far away in space and time.

I.5 A simple stepwise realistic way forward.

Combined A- and B-economy

If not Lenin, Stalin, MaoZedong, Pol Pot and many others through coercion, violence and tyranny totally distorted and destroyed the original ideas many once had, the words “communism” and “socialism” would perhaps have more or less the same meaning as we give to the word “needseconomy”. (Cf. “From everyone according to ability, to everyone according to needs”. Saint-Simon.) But today the words do not have that meaning. The words are destroyed. Exhausted.

Let us once learn from history. Let us apply **one** important thought that was a corner stone in the original conservatism, as it was formulated by Edmund Burke and others. (The word “conservatism” is since long time destroyed by being abused in many totally different meanings. “The Conservatives” means today simply those defending neo-liberalism. Those who defend (wish to “conserve”) the privileges of the propertied classes. The political Right. Even the word “conservatism” is since long time exhausted. The word is useless in any serious discussion.)

Change must be realized continuously and in a stable way - not by violent revolutions. Those who have been given the task to rule must listen to the people when they complain about that their rightful needs are not satisfied. Otherwise the rulers themselves will sooner or later be thrown out by a violent revolution, everyone suffering and many killed. We can everyday read in the newspapers and see and listen to the news to todays copies of the French revolution.

With **A-economy** we mean an economy for production, distribution and consumption of A-products (“needs-products”) that fulfils the principle of needssovereignty.

With **B-economy** we mean an economy for production, distribution and consumption of B-products (“not-needs-products”).

Our economy produces both A- and B-products. In order to realize needssovereignty we must successfully build an **independent self-supporting A-economy** within the existing social order by successively making production, distribution and consumption of A-products independent of the existing economic system’s two institutions the wavelabourcoercion and the capitalgrowthcoercion, two concepts we will soon explain. This implies a **successive** transition to a **division** of the economy in two parts: One independent A-economy and beside this a B-economy. We call this **combined A- and B-economy**.

The same persons can of course act (produce, distribute and consume) in both the A-economy and the B-economy if they wish. The essential is:

1. All action in the A-economy must be independent of all economic institutions that concern the B-economy. (Needssovereignty.)
2. Any action in the B-economy (any cooperation in production, distribution and consumption of B-products) must be **voluntary**.

Establishing an independent A-economy gives people a possibility to choose an alternative way of living. An independent A-economy gives people a possibility to avoid the **consumptioncoercion** equipped with the so-called “consumption society” where those who wish to live in a simple way are not allowed. An independent A-economy gives people a possibility to live a richer life being freed from the **consumptionrestriction** which follows from the restrictive standardisation caused by the capitalistic system’s incessant

demand for growth of capital profits (the capitalgrowthcoercion). (This has among other phenomena been called “the tyranny of the market”.) An independent A-economy gives a much greater possibility for many to engage in and take responsibility for the – local and global – society we all live in. It frees what we call *the voluntariness potential*.

As far as possible **freedom** with responsibility instead of coercion we consider as part of the general right and privileges – and duties – is therefore **part of** what is commonly called “**everybody’s general rightful needs**”.

That this way is simple does not of course mean that it will not meet enormous difficulties in the form of a compact resistance from the propertied classes. A-products and B-products are also in many cases strongly coupled and interwoven in today’s economy. But this must not hinder creative problem solving. But what this way really means is simple to understand by everyone. Everyone who wants to understand.

Think realeconomically, not moneyeconomically

We can’t eat money
We can’t dress in money
We can’t reside inside money
We can’t make anything of money

The A-B-division means that we have to differentiate between two different concepts of money. Two completely different functions of money. In A-economy – possibly – money is a pure

means of payment. In B- economy, today's capitalistic economy, money is a way to "invest" in B-economy and thus get the monetary amount to increase at the sacrifice of nature and others suffering.

The most important with the A-B-division is that it shows that it is **possible** with today's technique and with **responsible use of natural resources** to build a world that fulfils the main goal of needseconomy: Provide for everybody's rightful needs.

I.6 The group, the local society, the national state and the global world

We live today in a global world. Even if most of our daily occupation must concern the near environment, we can't shield ourselves from suffering in far places in the world. If we shield ourselves from suffering outside our own world this will sooner or later strike back on us. If we learn to listen to our inner moral compass this will rationally and logically necessary also be self-evident.

We must strive for different suitable forms of needseconomy both on a local level and on more or less global levels.

The concrete development of needseconomy will of course be different for different levels. Local developments must of course take differences in such as nature, geography, culture etc. into consideration. But the general principles of needseconomy - to distinguish between needs and greed, A-B-division and needssovereignty - are applicable on all levels. The general principles can be realized in various ways. Here is opportunity for many alternative solutions. Here can everyone – everyone according to his ability - take part in the successive discussion where one tries various alternatives.

I.7 Needseconomy is not a Utopia

Don't listen to all those who by ease, laziness and egoism and by inability and unwillingness to think on new ideas and lack of arguments of facts call all new ideas they don't like utopias.

Needseconomy is not an impossibility. It **already exists**, although in incomplete fragments, in many countries' fairer distribution of income, welfare systems, securities systems and social insurance systems. The problem is that this is not sufficient. Not even in the so-called rich part of the world, when 5%, perhaps 10%, perhaps many more are subjected to the by capitalism created unemployment and with it various kinds of suffering.

Despite the enormous development during the 20th century, the continued development has instead ceased. And not only ceased. Welfare systems are now being more and more impaired.

It is easy to understand the reason for this. Just listen to the arguments and thoughts that politicians (in all parties) express. "How shall the welfare be **financed**?" "Can we afford ... ?" "How shall the welfare be **financed**?" If you can think in several steps (here it just suffices with two) you will realize that the problem lies in the economic system itself. This can't today's politicians change. Welfare politics is therefore ultimately doomed to fail, as long as we are bound to the existing economic system.

We can never build a human society if we do not make ourselves independent of all profit-fixated, capitalgrowth-fixated economists. We must produce what is reasonable. For everybody – not what is profitable for some at the sacrifice of others suffering.

Welfare politics and its continuation in needseconomy is not impossible. But it presupposes that we change the economic system

I.8 Obstacles to overcome

Before we in Part Three continue the discussion on needseconomy and how it successively can be realized we must first discuss the two most important obstacles that must be overcome.

In order to build a righteous society one ought to have the simple division in needs and greed as guiding principle instead of all unnecessary priority problems caused by the economists' unnecessary financing problems. ***The problem is not so much about what to do but rather about what NOT to do!***

We are now faced with an enormous set of difficulties. An enormous complex of difficulties of apparently quite different kinds. But as we shall see can they all, despite their apparently differences, be related to one single cause – the capitalistic system. This means an enormous simplification.

What is then capitalism? We will come back in the next section to this equally important as suppressed question. But already here can we say that the complete enormous complex of rules, institutions, laws etc. that build the existing economic system – which we here call the capitalistic system – is built on two simple principles, firmly grounded, not the least by far reaching legislation:

1. The Capitalgrowthcoercion

2. The Wagelabourcoercion

Even this means an enormous simplification. That the complete complex global economic system, with all its terrible consequences, can be reduced to two well-defined problems.

This makes it possible to attack the very cause of the evil, instead of as now with a plethora of rules, additions to the rules, and additions to additions to the rules, fruitlessly mend details in an intrinsically morbid system.

Here we can relate to another idea in the original conservatism we mentioned above in section I.5. Don't trust too much complicated society systems, laws and rules, that restrict instead of help, implies coercion instead of freedom.

The Capitalgrowthcoercion, with all its complicated legislated rules and institutions, is a mean to, directly or indirectly, take from the poor and give to rich.

The Wigelabourcoercion makes it possible for the capitalistic system to force people to produce goods and services that to a large extent are only consumed by the rich (see the discussion on Marx' concept of surplus value below in section III.4).

It now ought to be clear why this characterization of the very foundation of the existing economic system is completely absent in the total existing economic literature. Here begins the real difficulties. We must be prepared for an enormous resistance from all those who now get privileges just from the existing system. Privileges ultimately at the sacrifice of suffering of others. Here we must trust to all the possibilities that an open constructive and respectful discussion opens.

Here is not the place to refute all arguments defenders of capitalism will use against needseconomy. Many of these arguments (e.g. the "trickle down" myth, see III.3) are already known as capitalism's incessant justifications. The defenders of capitalism have obviously felt something instinctively. This gives hope of the possibility to constructive debate. An open constructive and respectful dialogue is the best way to handle

questions for or against something. We can't in the long run have a society for only half (or perhaps 2/3) of the people.

It is also an enormous simplification that we can realize needseconomy successively as part of a greater combined A- and B-economy. This gives an enormously important and valuable possibility to realize and test different steps locally in small scale first instead of directly make perhaps drastic decisions for a whole country or a complete great association of countries.

Part two Capitalism

II What is capitalism? Distinguish between market economy and capitalism!

We feel strongly that many realize that there is something wrong with the existing economic system. Many also realize that just the word capitalism is, in some way, a natural term for the existing economic system. But here the thoughts stop in the whole existing debate and literature.

Two circumstances make it problematic to use the term “the capitalistic system”. First it leads many to associate with “socialism” as the only alternative. **Socialism**, at least as it is formulated and defined (cf. VI.3 below), stateowned means of production, is **not** an **alternative** that would help suffering people. Even less saves us from the accelerating environmental catastrophe. Socialism, or what you which to call it (the Link, communism etc.) is in reality a form of capitalism, **state-capitalism**, with the same built-in growth coercion as the so-called private capitalism. The socialism has been captured by the capitalism. The only real alternative to today’s economic system is needseconomy.

That communism in reality is not an opposite to the capitalistic system shows the case China. There is the communist spectre a most living and by threat suppressing pure dictatorship. This in combination with the remaining global economic system reinforces the capitalistic system’s dictatorship and is therefore an important part of the global economic system. This is confirmed by all those economists that praise the fast economic growth of China and see this as a model for the whole poor world. Human rights and privileges are past over to silence. It will obviously be a later question. (Cf. trickle-down myth, see III.3.)

The other circumstance which makes it problematic to use the word capitalism is the almost total conceptual confusion which prevails. If you look up the word capitalism in a reference book or, even worse, consult some textbook in economy, you will usually get as definition “privately-owned means of production”. This definition is worthless. Most books and treatises in economics avoid the term capitalism. For obvious reason. It leads the reader to direct his attention away from the really evil: The **capital's** incessant forced growth at the sacrifice of many people's suffering.

The almost total conceptual confusion that prevails with respect to the words “socialism”, “capitalism” and “market economy” has catastrophic consequences both for the society and for the environment. This conceptual confusion shows that economy, as it is performed today, can't be called a science. When an activity is so totally permeated with (systematic) conceptual confusion is called science has the word been so abused that it has lost its original meaning: To seek an objective truth. How could one, above all, express some precise scientific truth if one so completely confuses quite different concepts?

But the most important reason that disqualifies economy as a science is that it is not unprejudiced. There is **no critical** study and **questioning** of the very foundations of the ruling economy and *no* objective **study of other possibilities**. Despite that so **many shouts for an alternative**.

Three **different** basic concepts are consequently mixed up.

I. **Private ownership** of the means of production. The opposite would then be “socialism” which then is just (see VI.3 below) defined as State-owned means of production. But with this definition of socialism falls all those other meanings away that nevertheless many wish to associate with the word socialism. Especially such concepts as solidarity and co-operation.

2. **Market economy** ought to mean a reasonably free and therefore to a great extent self-regulating exchange of goods and services. A kind of opposite to a more regulated such exchange. What is often contemptuously called planned economy. Despite that all, especially the largest, enterprises internally essentially uses planned economy. And despite all regulations concerning the financial market/capital market, which are governed by states and associations of states.

3. **The financial or capital market.** This comprises all those institutions - banks, stock exchanges etc. – that lends out money with a *demand for* different forms of “interest” in return, partly what is called *interest* e.g. bank interests, but also *share (stock) dividends* etc. . We call all these forms of “interest” the **capitalgrowthcoercion**. A common term for this **common concept** is lacking in the economic language and the economic literature.

That such a central and important general concept (the capitalgrowthcoercion) has not been given a notation in **one word** shows how in principle unsystematic and unscientific economy is. That a simple word for what we call **capitalgrowthcoercion** does not occur in the general debate makes it almost impossible to submit our criticism of the capitalistic system and submit our alternative. That the economic theory only deals with details and systematically avoids – divide and rule – basic general principles and general understanding of what is most important in the economy is already clear from this simple fact. One has not even coined a name, a notation, for the most important concept: the capitalgrowthcoercion. And any mathematical models for this the most important concept, which e.g. should give support for our understanding of such **general concepts** as **inflation** and **unemployment**, is of course not

to expect. How construct a mathematical model without a notation of the most important concept in the model? Some simple such models should have occurred in elementary academic textbooks. But such simple mathematical models would immediately uncover that it is the capitalism – in *our definition!* – that creates the unemployment. The economic literature is instead permeated by an enormous plethora of empirical often statistical studies of details in the existing economy – often with inserted, advanced but essentially without practical importance, mathematical models and theories in order to give a false impression of science – all the time ***silent presupposing*** the existing economic system as it is.

The three above mentioned concepts are incessantly and systematically confused and mixed up. They are used, all the three different concepts, as notation for the existing economic system.

The word capitalism is used, in various situations, as synonymous with one of the three different concepts. The word capitalism is most often defined as private ownership of the means of production. This definition is worthless if one has an intention of using the word capitalism as notation for the existing economic system. Should the whole enormous apparatus of rules and institutions (banks, share (stock) exchanges etc.) which constitutes the financial market be some small practical detail in what is called private ownership of the means of production and is thus not needed to be included in the definition of capitalism? And should a poor peasant proprietor that owns a small field that scantily gives daily food be an example of capitalism?

The word capitalism is alternatively defined as or is used as market economy. This is convenient. You can then intentionally slip in the financial/capital market – as any market, why shouldn't it be allowed to deal with money? - without need to direct the attention to what is quite specific for just the capital market, that we wish to emphasize: the capitalgrowthcoercion and its negative

consequences. Interests is then just simply the price of money. As any other price. Completely natural. Economists love this “simplicity”.

And then, which one would expect to be critics of capitalism, has uncritically accepted this definition and is shooting on the wrong target. You can often hear people from the Left complain of “the market”.

Should the poor peasant who gets some extra yield and can go to the market-place and get a pair of shoes in exchange be capitalist and be a representative of capitalism just because the market on the market-place is not some planned economy governed by the State.

The words “capitalism” and “market economy” must reasonably denote **quite different concepts** if it above all should be meaningful to use the word capitalism. (Which is just what many capitalists wish to avoid.)

But the word capitalism is actually used by many, even if vaguely, as notation for the third concept: the financial/capital market. And the word catches the aversion that many feels for the economic system, with banks that forces people into debt and the corresponding coerce to pay **interests** so that they ultimately have to go from their houses, and nevertheless be left with their debts and *interests*, multinational enterprises that perform ruthless exploitation on nature, poisons the nature and with support from international organisations such as the World Trade Organisation (WTO), competes out peasants in poor countries, leaves them without possibility to provide for their living, unemployed and ultimately forces them to except slave contracts etc. .

Governments are coerced by capitalism’s economic interests to force through environmental destroying projects leading to total extirpation of primitive people’s cultures. Capitalism is **global** and **everybody** has his part of **responsibility** for this.

It is this aversion that we will catch by using the word capitalism in just that meaning which is the root to the evil: The *capital* market and its leading principle the capitalgrowthcoercion. This is also the only reasonable and natural interpretation of the word capitalism which just contains the word capital and which ascribes to **the capital** the **total controlling function** it has on the existing economic system.

But there is one problem left. The whole enormous financial/capital market with all its complicated institutions, banks etc., could not exist without its strong coupling to another equally firmly established coercion in the economic system. We call it the “**Versorgungskoercion**” (the coercion on everybody to provide for his own living, see section III.1 below) and its economic consequence “**the wagelabourcoercion**” (see next chapter III). It is therefore natural to define and use the word capitalism so that it includes the concept “the wagelabourcoercion”. The word capitalism is then an adequate characterisation of the existing economic system.

We use here, in this manifesto, the word capitalism **in this meaning**. This manifesto proclaims use of the word capitalism in this meaning! And this manifesto proclaims that the above discussed abuse of terms/words market, market economy, socialism (with the definition State-owned means of production) and capitalism (with one of the meanings 1. and 2. discussed above) must be rejected. (If you in a debate meet some problem with using the word capitalism according to our definition you can alternatively use “the existing economic system”, “the capital market/financial market controlling system”, “the capitalgrowth governed system” or “the capitalgrowth prioritizing system”).

This manifesto’s obviously adequate characterisation of the existing economic system with its two basic principles, the **capitalgrowthcoercion** and the **wagelabourcoercion**, which should be the bases for an adequate theory and a

description of the existing economic system is totally absent in the whole economic literature. For an obvious reason. It would point to the basically unjust in this, the existing, globally ruling system.

But something gives nevertheless hope. This manifesto's definition of capitalism is nevertheless unconsciously committed by all economists and their submissive lackeys the politicians. What they all shout most desperately about is just jobs (read: wavelabour) and growth (read: capitalgrowth).

But they don't talk about coercion!

But that we do in this manifesto!

III The Wagelabourcoercion

III. I The versorgungcoercion. An anachronism with built-in conflict ground

In nature are all living creatures, so even human beings, generally coerced to provide for their own living. Many animals have developed different forms of social cooperation. The long history of man has changed between more or less individual ways and more or less developed, complicated ways of cooperation in order to cope with the problem of provision for the living (“Versorgung”, see below). Until modern time could discontented people move to another place or another country, start from the beginning and as settlers build a new life and a way of providing for their living. But **today’s societies** are **much more integrated** than all earlier. Most of what active people earlier as settlers could do would today be simply illegal. Whether you move to another place or to another country you are directed to the jobs that the labour-market offers. Very few manage today to start an own economic activity in the hard competition from the big enterprises.

But even today we are left with the coercion on the **individual** to provide for his own living. Here we have a basic **conflict** and with it also a built-in conflict ground. On one hand a coercion (“duty”) on the **individual** level of enterprising spirit – a coercion on the individual to self take the initiative to go out to get some provision for living (job) (“Versorgung”). (It sounds so beautifully when the liberalists are talking.) On the other hand a coercion to **submit** to the **collective** society of the total labour-market. An in all respects from the top of the global financial world ruled society.

(We have introduced the German word “Versorgung” to denote “provide for the living” and coined the term

“versorgungskoercion”, “the coercion on everybody to provide for his own living “. This is our suggestion to get a handable “scientific” term in one word. English words with corresponding meaning have unfortunately at the same time also quite different meanings.)

III.2 Forced labour

We call the lack of freedom that the coercion to accept the jobs that the **labour-market, as it is today**, offers the **wagelabourcoercion**. If only one job is offered the unemployed in search of job is forced (coerced) to take this job – even if it is very repugnant for the unemployed. This submission is really a lack of freedom. You are not allowed to choose your life yourself. You are all the time forced to occupy yourself with something that others have prescribed. Many would certainly wish to occupy themselves with something quite different. There is no valid argument for that this would be of less advantage to the society. This manifesto claims that the **lack of freedom** that **today's labour-market forces to** is **unnecessary** and **destructive**. And it is an obstacle to real development. We must distinguish between real development and (economic) growth (see chap. V, The Prisoners dilemma).

Even if the words wage-slavery and forced labour to many sound too strong they do not so to many others.

The wagelabourcoercion in combination with the total **restricting standardization** (c.f. the consumptionrestriction I.5) that strikes the whole economized society has led to a restricting standardization of the complete labour market. This in turn has led to a growing group of people with many different abilities that can't find their place in today's labour market or, above all, in society. Here we have a more and more growing group of people whose abilities are not given their rightful opportunity to be developed for the benefit for society.

For clarity we will make clear that it is not the wage itself coupled to some work we are against. What we object to is that everybody's "versorgung" (provision for living) is coupled to a job in the labour market ruled by capitalism.

III.3 The hypocrisy of labour moralizing

In today's society, where idealistic work is derided as pure stupidity, there are only two reasons for people to work: For the rich to get even more money and for the poor not to starve to death.

The poor have learnt that it is a duty to work. But his duty is today nothing else than the duty to work for the incessant growth of the richness of the rich. The duty to serve our new idol: The Growth.

As so many other words has also the word "duty" lost its moral dimension. So then we see that, as everything else, the words themselves, the language itself, has been captured by the capitalism.

Everything is being captured by the capitalism. Moral, Art, Science and Love. And now, last, the still weak environmental movement. When moral has been captured is hypocrisy the most successful way to the world's happiness. Peoples love of hypocrisy has a history of many thousand years, that now, ultimately, has culminated in the belief in "the sustainable economical growth": That ruthless exploitation and final destruction of nature (the absolute condition for life on earth) is described and worshiped as something good. But everything depends of course on what you mean – wish to mean – with the words "good" and "life". And for who and for which time period – the present or the future – one is concerned. Hypocrisy is the most refined and sophisticated way of lying: To describe something evil as something good. To do violence to the truth.

The capitalism's incessant job-demagogy, with the wigelabourcoercion in the background, resemble too much the communism's/marxism's dogmatic worshipping of the work. The communistic labour-"moral" is on the other hand in China replaced by the capitalism's dogmatic trickle down myth: If the

rich by means of the capitalism will become unrestricted rich first, then the richness will trickle down to the poor.

Marxism has evolved to something that has let itself to become captured by the capitalism. So has, then, the marxism taken the role of the capitalism's most obedient servant: We must create jobs! (Marxism. Or socialism. Or the Left. Or what you wish to call it, in this epoch, the time of great conceptual confusion.) The **marxism** is today the **capitalism's strongest support** by being **proclaimed** as the **only alternative** to capitalism. The only alternative to capitalism would thus be (some kind of) state-capitalism!

Hypocrisy accepts the strongest contradictions. When all other resistance to capitalism than marxism has been eliminated, one can then – as in China – let marxism and capitalism join. They are basically, all about, of the same coercion ideology. “Anyone that don't work shall not eat”. The work line.

“There is no working alternative to the capitalistic economic system.” This lie together with all that it implies is strongly cherished by today's academic establishment with well-paid professors of economy at the head. This stops effectively any kind of change and real development.

People are all the time afraid for losing their jobs. And the unemployed are afraid not to get any job. Unemployment is one of the capitalism's hard methods for putting pressure on people. To **force** (coerce) them to take the jobs the capitalgrowthcoercion of capitalism determines. And this is called freedom! With a finer word “liberalism”. But it is a freedom for the capital. Not for the people.

Everybody is incessantly afraid. Many do of course feel safe in their employments. As long as you perform your job and perform your imposed tasks. "It is everyone's duty." And you wish to feel yourself (and also show to others) that you have a good labour-moral. But the problem is this: As long as you perform your imposed tasks. Without questioning! But almost anyone dare to question **immoral jobs**. If you question your tasks, especially if they contain something immoral, you risk to loose your job.

So what we call labour-moral has nothing to do with whether the tasks are moral or not. This is a consequence of the wgelabourcoercion: The labour-moral ultimately becomes demoralizing.

III.4 Marx' concept of surplus value

Quite simply the surplus value is that part of the worker's performance that does not, in some way, benefit the worker, e.g. as wage or general social service. Marx' principle of surplus value is that this benefits the capitalists/employers.

As "profit" would many say.

But **STOP!** Here the discussion must not stop. The word "profit" is not unproblematic. It has several – both positive and negative - meanings. Here we see again the difficulties of the verbal languages. We must here couple the word "profit" to what we call the **capitalgrowthcoercion**. And this explains why the capitalists are so eager to create jobs - jobs in profit driven enterprises. We must stress the importance of seeing the most important concepts in a total perspective. Split and rule is the power's desperate way of surviving. It is the capitalgrowthcoercion that lies behind what we call the wagelabourcoercion and all its negative consequences.

This circumstance – exploitation of people – that the concept of surplus value describes, was obvious already in Marx' time and it ought to be even more obvious today. But it is completely suppressed, away from the general debate, by the capitalists. And by the marxists ! (see next section)

What really lies behind the idea of surplus value and makes it even much more relevant today than it was in Marx' time is what we call the realeconomic basis of needseconomy: That it is fully possible to satisfy everybody's basic rightful needs. And this more than enough. A large part of what is produced concerns completely different things, what we call B-products. Many of them can be characterised simply as unnecessary. Many can be classified as more or less harmful. Many can be characterised as pure luxury that only goes to a limited class. What the surplus

value really expresses, its essence, is exploitation of people. That many are **forced** (coerced) to work with production of **B-products** despite that they never will get the economic possibilities to consume these products. It is the overproduction of B-products at the sacrifice of the production of A-products that leads to that many will not get their basic rightful needs (what we call A-products) satisfied.

An elucidation is important. What we today have to fight against is a much more dangerous form of capitalism (the hypercapitalism, the extremely monetary, money governed, capitalism which has developed explosively during the last decades) than the earlier forms of capitalism. Therefore we have here in this manifesto stressed the importance and effect of the production of B-products. The technical development has made the production of (some!) A-products (needs-products) much more effective. In Marx' time were many more workers occupied with the production of A-products which they never got the possibility to consume. Such workers exist of course even today and must be taken account of in a more accurate analysis. In an important sense we have this situation even today: We have in section I.4 pointed on the importance of non-material "products", and both production and consumption of these non-material "products" are strongly suppressed by the production and consumption of B-products (luxury products).

III.5 The marxists and the Left have completely given up all arguments based on the surplus value

It is important to make clear what the development of marxism has led to in this context.

It is easy to criticize (which of course is in the capitalists' interest) both Marx' own formulations of and some of his arguments for the surplus value. His own discussion is strongly coupled to the much criticised so-called labour theory of value. It is remarkable that even Marx' putative followers, the marxists, have joined this criticism. On one hand, indirectly, and certainly much unconsciously, by stressing quite different questions. On the other hand also, as one modern school within marxism (the analytic), directly criticise and refute the labour theory of value, which they claim to be completely wrong. But not only that! They actually **refute Marx' whole idea of exploitation of people.**

It was Marx that introduced the concept of surplus value and he had no developed economic theory to start from. Therefore was Marx' discussion preliminary and therefore by necessity needing a continued development. Any later such developed theory, that continues Marx' work and really would give a firm basis for the extremely important idea of surplus value as the capitalists' profit and this profit's consequences has, however, never been developed. (Many basic textbooks in economy do not even mention the surplus value in their (very short!) section on Marx, marxism, common ownership of means of production and planned economy as opposite to the generally ruling "market economy".)

It is symptomatic that so much of the discussion concerns the labour theory of value. There is a simple explanation to why this theory is very problematic, but this does not excuse to, as the marxists, in reality throw the complete idea of surplus value and the on this concept based discussion of exploitation of workers on the refuse tip. As we shall see, in the next section, can the

idea of surplus value be clearly formulated with use of a consideration of working hours and the A-B-division of needseconomy.

The “value” of labour performance is a complicated concept with many different aspects. To give this a general measure by a simple mathematical number is equally absurd and ridiculous as to give a general mathematical quantitative measure of the “value” of all separate cultural performances. If one and the same measure determines the value of paintings and music and a painting is given the value 7.5 and a musical composition is given the value 6.9, is therefore the value of the painting greater than the value of the musical composition? And for who? Shall all people be completely equal in their experiences? This is in fact what capitalism means when everything shall be evaluated in one and the same measure – money. That cultural performances shall be judged by their degree of economic profit (the capitalgrowthcoercion).

When one got stuck with the problems with the labour theory of value and therefore couldn't manage the problem of exploitation, one simply gave up this important (economic!) problem and escaped to Hegelian dialectics, which one wove into a tangle of general, diffuse, academic in this word's worst meaning, ideas. This led, even worse, to an escape to a general worship of labour in combination with a general worship of dictatorial violence and that this violence, just by having its “ground” in a (generally diffuse! but nevertheless) **completely dogmatic** marxism, should solve all problems on a “higher” level. The direct open violence has been covered by a general “righteous” labour coercion, which it is everyone's duty to submit to. There we have now the marxism. Power and submission. Instead of solving the problem with capitalism's exploitation of people (“the workers”), **marxism itself has taken over the exploitation!** Therefore the concept of surplus value does not suit the ideology.

Save Marx and his thoughts from the marxists!

III.6 Working-hours and surplus value

The division in A- and B-products of needseconomy gives, as we already indicated in a preceding section, a possibility to clearly formulate the concept of surplus value (and to give a rough estimate of its magnitude) by considering working hours. We do this by comparing today's working hour, which we can assume to be full-time T_F , with the mean working hour that is needed for production of only A-products. In a free independent A-economy we suppose that all – in various ways – help each other to produce these A-products. The mean working hour T_A for this A-production is then obviously much smaller than T_F in *today's* economy where both A-products and lots of B-products are produced and **most people works with** producing **B-products**.

(As a rough measure of the relative (percentage) surplus value, one could then take

$$\text{relative (percentage) surplus value} = \frac{T_F - T_A}{T_F}$$

.)

This does not mean that we use working hours as a general measure of labour performance value. It is clear that the worker's performance has a value. But for the worker also time has a value. If he did not have to work full-time just to get his provision for living, could he use the freed time in many different ways to improve his life quality. Needseconomy will not force (coerce) people to a situation where everything that people do in order to improve their life quality – if they above all get freed time for this – must be done through some of the capitalism's wage labours.

The concept of surplus value is only relevant for the capitalistic system and is needed to highlight on one of this system's catastrophic consequences – the often ruthless exploitation of people and by means of this exploitation stealing their time.

Needseconomy's discussion of surplus value gives strong support for an essential reduction of the general working hours. (When shall the left-wing people come to such thoughts?) The general by capitalistic economy ruled politics goes in the opposite direction. During the worst periods of industrialism was 12 hours working day a terrible scourge. And it is so in many places even today when many people are forced to take double jobs in order to get enough money for the living. (Another form of forced increase of working hours is the more and more loud demands from the capitalists for postponing of the pensions.) An example of the indoctrination in connection with the waga labour coercion is the often – not least from the Left – expressed demand: Everybody shall have their right to full-time. Any demand on part-time – the **right** to time for **self-development** – is **never** expressed.

The middle class is tempted with an enormous supply of material products. Everybody is forced into a more and more materialistic and artificial life. Everything is performed with an underlying coercion! Anyone that **wishes** to work part-time is **not allowed**, c.f. consumption coercion I.5. Everything shall have the purpose of earning money. And above all to earn money for others.

It is the freeing of people's time ("life time"), which is the purpose of the idea of basic income (citizen salary).

Basic income is **one way** of liberation from the waga labour coercion. It is one of the most important ideas for realizing a successive transition to an independent A-economy according to I.5 above.

We can't in this general manifesto go in further on all different possibilities that exist for developing needseconomy – an independent A-economy. But we must mention the idea of interest-free banks. Interest-free banks is another important idea

for realising a successive transition to an independent A-economy according to I.5 above. Public purpose, non-profit driven, interest-free banks is **one way** of liberation from the capitalgrowthcoercion.

IV The capitalgrowthcoercion

It is not until now, by the appearance of the so-called hypercapitalism, that the everything influencing capitalgrowthcoercion, with all its catastrophic consequences, has unmasked itself in full scale. The capitalgrowthcoercion in all its various forms – **interests, share (stock) dividends** etc. – has since long time, directly or indirectly, so permeated the whole society that it is now generally considered as something quite self-evident. But this which is considered as completely self-evident has now forced a too obvious and manifest destruction of nature and culture, poisoning of our total environment etc. A **THREAT** against the **COMPLETE BIOLOGICAL LIFE**. And, as if this is not enough to raise sufficient protests, a drastic change of earth's climate.

What once started with recurrent justified moralising on taking of interests - to get own profits by exploiting other's embarrassment – has now increased to a situation so obviously unsustainable that it is no longer enough to moralise. We are faced with extremely horrible facts. Faced with these facts helps no excuses or attempts to direct the attention to something quite different.

We must act. Fastly.

Part three

Liberation

V The prisoners' dilemma

Today's locked situation with respect to the economic system can be described by the concept of the prisoners' dilemma. The prisoners' dilemma is a beautiful example of how an originally pure mathematical game-theoretical problem can be generalised to a problem of far-reaching importance for the whole society.

(In the original formulation are two prisoners faced to an ultimatum: If you both confess, you will both be free. If you both deny, you will both get 10 years in prison. But if one confesses and one denies will he who denies be free but he who confesses get life imprisonment. Both prisoners now have to confess or deny without knowing what the other prisoner says.)

The prisoners' dilemma deals with a situation where two, several or many would benefit if all perform a certain action, but if only one or few perform the action but all the others do not, will those who performed the action be struck by something very negative.

The prisoners' dilemma can occur in many variants. A simple example is given by a situation very common in today's labour-market between an employer and a worker. The employer dares not increase the salary since he believes that the worker will nevertheless work slow and the worker will not work harder since he believes that he will nevertheless not get any rise in salary.

The prisoners' dilemma deals with the question of **trust**. They would both/all benefit if they knew that they could trust each other(s).

Two elucidations must be made. Both have to do with time. Preliminarily would the realization of the alternative economy, which in its general principles is described in this manifesto, lead to that not everybody would benefit from this. The rich upper class would lose large parts of its luxury living. This will obviously meet great resistance. But if one could convince these materialistic epicures to think a little further would two things happen.

The first is concerned with **scientific research**. If medical scientific research could be freed from the drug companies economic profit interest and many potential creative researchers get (e.g. by some form of basic income) the possibility to work with all those promising ideas that actually exist and which are today suppressed, would great achievements be made. It has in fact been made many **medical achievements**, which are **suppressed** and is therefore unknown, not only for the public, but also to a great majority of the medical expertise. Here we can see how *real development* is *suppressed* by the *short-sighted* forces (the capitalgrowthcoercion) which lies behind *economic growth*. The shares of drug industry must compete with shares in completely different branches.

We must **distinguish** between the concepts of (real) **development** and (economic) **growth**. Real progress in science is basically nothing one can buy for money. What today is called science and scientific research becomes more and more completely, directly or indirectly, commercialized. The demand for objective truth is replaced by the demand for profit. This leads to a more and more catastrophic abolition of the **open society**.

The other elucidation concerns our grandchildren. It is our grandchildren, not we adults, that will be ultimately struck by the more and more accelerating environmental and social catastrophe.

The enormous sets of coercion mechanisms in the economic system can be described as different forms of the prisoners' dilemma. We cannot here further discuss all these cases. They are often very interwoven and therefore difficult to analyse. Let us confine ourselves with one example: International competition. How often do you not hear - as an excuse for various negative consequences of some activity - that "we must keep up with the international competition". This is in fact a competition to death. A growth to death.

If a managing director wishes to radically diminish the environmental destruction caused by his enterprise – and therefore also diminish the capital growth of the enterprise – will he be rapidly replaced. Only if sufficiently many managing directors act can the environmental destruction be stopped, which in the long run benefits everyone.

A condition to break the prisoners' dilemma is that some individuals start thinking themselves instead of following the stream. Dares to take the initiative and be forerunners.

Inability to radically attack the **environmental destruction** problems is the absolutely most dangerous example of the prisoners' dilemma.

The prison that keeps the prisoners captured is the – global ! – economic system.

VI Liberation of thought

VI.1 Realize and overcome the great economic threat

It might seem as too much a simplification to consider every evil as due to one single evil. But this has been necessary during several periods in history, not the least during the 20th century. Under such circumstances one has to give priority to fight this single evil. And to give it priority before all other activities. We are in this situation now. One part - the capitalism – has already given priority before everything else by its total domination. Domination by lack of emotion and by being unsensitive to reason. The other part – represented by Nature, Culture and all suffering people – must take up the fight against the attacking capitalism, which would otherwise totally extinguish every kind of freedom.

VI.2 Recapture your personal responsibility.

Be aware of your own and other's excuses.

It is everyone's responsibility – **everyone according to his possibilities** – to oppose to all catastrophic problems that are, directly or indirectly, caused by the capitalistic system. It is not sufficient just to call attention to these problems. We must actively work to eliminate these problems. This is a responsibility that everyone has. No one can escape from this responsibility. Whether we take this responsibility or not we are all doomed to this responsibility. We have chosen to call this a responsibility, since it is in accordance with everyday language. We can just simply call it a choice. But it is a choice with consequences.

We can choose different models, theories, life philosophies – call it what you wish – to cope with life. This manifesto gives one way to consider and cope with life.

This manifesto deals with a simple idea, which is the exact opposite to the capitalism and its consequences. You can believe in what you choose to believe in. But you can't deny that this idea exists. Not only in this manifesto. And you are nevertheless doomed, in one way or other, to choose your standpoint to the idea, whether it is done actively, for or against, or passively, for some reason, by completely ignoring the idea.

To only passively follow the stream and hide behind what we call **formal commission responsibility** is not to take real responsibility. It is to **excuse** oneself with having done one's duty. The duty towards the system. It is to fall into the **false freedom from responsibility**. Excuses are almost always indication of a moral question.

Take the real, moral, responsibility!

VI.3 Debunk and oppose

the conceptual confusions of politics

This is not a manifesto for socialism!

What is socialism?

We have pointed out the conceptual confusion that exists concerning the words “socialism” and “capitalism” and the catastrophic consequences caused by this conceptual confusion.

Many mean with socialism a society basically of the same construction and function as the communistic society. Many, both to the political Right and Left, lay this meaning in the word socialism.

Many mean with socialism a society where the means of production are State-owned. This manifesto rejects this definition of socialism, which unfortunately is the most common, accepted, in reference books, textbooks and in almost all discussions. This manifesto claims that this definition is worthless since it does not capture what many think of when they intuitively say that they believe in socialism or join the Left. This definition says nothing about cooperation and solidarity and these concepts does not exclude a reasonable private ownership. And this definition says nothing that excludes an environment destructing growth-driven state capitalism. This leads to another question: What is the Left?

Let us first discuss the question: What is the political Right? This question is easier to answer. Various nuances and opinions exist even here. Nothing in political context is mathematically logically rigorous. But an unconditional belief in the economical growth (which among other things justifies great wage differentials, in both directions) will be sufficient for our discussion. With **our definition** of capitalism, we can simply characterize the Right as a clear and unconditional belief in capitalism.

But what is then the Left? Here the confusion is total. One both wish to throw away the poisonous cake (the capitalism)

and eat it. To try to perform some sort of Left-politics by means of a Right-economy is doomed to be a failure. For jobs the Left trust completely that these will be created by the capitalistic labour-market (if not by a communistic state-capitalistic dictatorship). This leads to that the socialists' or the Left's supporters (or what they shall or wish to call themselves) can't be united and offer the capitalism any real resistance. They don't even know themselves what socialism or Left is. Or rather what it ought to be. And even worse. They don't even understand what the capitalism, they believe they are opposing, really is. That does not the Right understand either. Or wish not to understand.

Today's "Liberalism" hides its raw capitalism behind a putative liberty. It is a liberty for the capital – not for people. The original liberalism has been divided into two separate parts: One general human liberty outside the party politics, now generally formulated as human rights and privileges. The other part is concerned with free enterprise. A general freedom for such creative "private" enterprise, which, without causing hurt and in the long run benefits everybody, is nothing that is in conflict with needseconomy. And that this is performed in a reasonably free market economy according to our definition of this concept, is quite consistent with needseconomy. A free enterprise according to the intentions of one of the fathers of liberalism, Adam Smith, is in complete concordance with needseconomy. What needseconomy objects to is when the goal of this enterprise is changed from producing something good to a more and more ruthless way to earn big money at the sacrifice of others' suffering.

That Adam Smith presupposed that free enterprise must be performed with responsibility is obvious. It is important to call attention to the fact that Adam Smith, long before he wrote his famous economic work “The Wealth of Nations”, wrote one of moral philosophy’s most important works “The Theory of Moral Sentiments”. This moral philosophical work has unfortunately been overshadowed by other moral philosophers and their works. But Adam Smith was one of our greatest moral philosophers and his thoughts are all the better gaining their rightful recognition.

There is of course a strong element of socialism, in a broader sense, that contains concepts as solidarity, cooperation and general helpfulness, in what we call needseconomy. But there are equally important elements of Edmund Burke’s conservatism (see I.5) and Adam Smith’s liberalism. But separate reasonable elements can’t justify these ideologies. This manifesto rejects these ideologies. Needseconomy can in no way be described with traditional political concepts. Especially not in the way they are used today. The traditional political words socialism, marxism, communism, liberalism, conservatism, Right and Left and corresponding ideologies are all so totally destroyed by a total conceptual confusion that they are since long time worthless for any serious discussion. And all these leads to **catastrophic consequences** that are **hidden behind** these **conceptual confusions**. All these ideologies are in reality subordinated to the capitalistic dictatorship. The non-Socialist politics is catastrophic with its egoism and ruthlessness. The other more or less Left influenced politics is equally catastrophic with its total unsuspectiveness. All existing parties and their ideologies are morally catastrophic.

There are many political hypocrisies. Today’s “Christian”-democratic parties hide their brutal capitalistic Mammon-worship behind a putative christian façade. Environmental parties in

different countries have a rather soft partial environmental element that hide the fact that they **don't reject** the capitalism's environmental destruction. To try to perform some sort of environmental politics with help of the environmental destructive capitalistic economics is doomed to fail.

In order to fight the communistic Monster one has taken help from another Monster and then fall victim to this Monster. And not only fall victim. It has gone so far that one has let this Monster totally invade ones thoughts. Ones total spiritual life. One has become this Monster. In reality it was the same Monster, only in another figure.

This manifesto has a simple solution of all these catastrophic conceptual confusions. The only real alternative to the existing economical system, which we in this manifesto defined and called capitalism, is needseconomy.

It is a general problem with the words in a language, especially in the political language. Divide and rule has always been the power's desperate survival technique. Confucius said: "One shall mention things by their correct names". Conceptual confusions and abuse of words is a way of destroying the language itself and with that mean wrest the most important weapon out of the hands of the real opposition.

VI.4 Recapture the political power
from the economists!

The world is absurd.
Divided into two worlds:

One world – the economic world.

The other world – the remaining society.

For the remaining society economy is an expert territory that we other, according to the ruling doctrine ought to delegate to the experts.

For the economists, the remaining society is nothing they need to care about when they perform their work.

For the two worlds, one by one, those that work in one world need **not take responsibility** for the other world.

However, the one world, the economists' world is the ruler of and controls the other world.

Needseconomy is not a “system”. It is no “ideology”. No “ism”. It is a way of life. A life philosophy. This way of life has consequences for the practical development of organizations of different and various kinds that are needed to administrate the provision for our needs. We call these organizations “economy”. But they are intended to help. They must not become a totalitarian “system” of its own that takes over the power and freedom from the people.

Don't let the economists hide the economy's totalitarian and political power behind a putative expert territory that nobody dares to question.

VI.5 Don't shoot on the wrong target!

Sympathisers of various forms of the Left are certainly, many, completely aware that a threat exists. But they are, in most

cases, not clear about how terrible this threat really is. And even if they call this threat capitalism, they do not in general realize that it is the capitalgrowthcoercion that basically builds up the capitalism. As long as we are dependent on the capitalgrowthcoercion in form of profit demanding, **interest** requiring, banks and other forms of the incessant profit requiring capital/financial market, share (stock) market with demands for **share (stock) dividends**, etc., will all other activities, however important they might be, yet, ultimately, be a beat in the air.

VII Liberation of Mankind by means of a general unconditional helpfulness.

What has been written down here is in reality nothing new. But we must apply old wisdom on today's problems. Confucius said: "Do not do against others what you do not wish that they shall do against you!" Buddha called our attention to the importance of controlling our greeds. With this as basis it then follows, **pure logically**, what we call needseconomy.

We are all given the ability to rational, logical thinking and we are all given the ability to feelings and empathy. Do not let an enormous plethora of irrelevant trash in a more and more thickening and choking trash culture destroy these fundamental abilities of life.

Independent of economical conditions and political social system we must, when we meet somebody who needs help, it maybe a neighbour or someone from another country, give the help we can give, without making demands for something in return. This is not only true for human beings. If you meet an animal needing help, you must give the help you can give. For animals the help must, for natural reasons, be unconditional.

It might seem that human beings are the only creatures who are faced with the problem of controlling greeds. And why should not strong demands be made on human beings when they have been given such fantastic abilities. One such demand that is made on mankind as a species – by the biological evolution with its struggle for life, if you prefer to see its so – is to not destroy itself. Neither as individuals nor as species. If one succeeds with the intent to kill others, and therefore finally oneself, by the total chaos that follows from an everybody's war on everybody (something that so many biological species during the evolution, by various functioning cooperation forms, has been successful in avoiding) will the future determine who will take over. Cockroaches? Technical computer monsters? He who "lives" will see. The future? Everything must go so crazily rapid now. Everywhere a terrible stress. All earlier societies that have collapsed by themselves (even if some external pressure may

have contributed), it may be the Maya culture, the Roman Empire or our own time's many already collapsed dictatorships, has obviously one thing in common: The chaos and lack of functionality that is the result of the transformation of helpfulness into the **catastrophic** and **conflict causing we and they thinking** and the more and more extreme egoism and irresponsibility.

Rules are needed, regulations and complex organizations must be developed with reason in order to help. They must not be an end itself, which, short-sightedly, in some respects, perhaps benefits certain groups at the sacrifice of others. The basic rule of economism is to, as far as possible, be paid money for everything and get that payment as large as possible. That all "help" shall have as ultimate goal the "helpers" profit. New charges of various kinds are continuously introduced. The economism and its development into more and more complicated forms for getting payment for everything – everything must be "financed" – traps us all in the economic Monster's complicated web. We must get free from the economic Monster. We must be willing to help one another without a continues demand for getting something in return.

Free the voluntariness potential!

Volunteers of all countries, unite!

But it is not enough to go around and be kind. And it does not suffice to grow ecological tomatoes on the balcony when the oil companies destroy the Arctic. **As long** as we have the great

threat from the capitalism everywhere, we must, before everything else, **help one another** to **overcome** this terrible threat.

End-word

Existing economic institutions, rules and theories are developed in order to get the *ruling economic system function*. All ruling and available economic expert knowledge and theories can therefore in principle not comment on what is said in this manifesto. For that reason, you that argue for needseconomy need not be afraid of arguments from the economic expertise. What the economic expertise says is true for the ruling economy - not in a needseconomy. What we call needseconomy has a **totally different starting point** and a totally **different goal**: to provide for **everybody's** rightful needs.

Everybody's !

If there is something that the ruling economy has failed with is it this everybody's. You only need to look around in the world. So much suffering - despite all technical improvements and achievements that it has been so boasted about - can't be excused with that so and so many - at some places! – have become better off. Needseconomy has a completely different and much higher ambition. For *all* individuals. And this ambition must be realized **NOW** ! – not, perhaps, in some future.

The economists blame the politicians. And the political systems. But politics – in all countries, irrespectively of political ideology – is today subordinated to the global economic system. The ruling global economic system is in reality a political superideology

For that reason needseconomy is not only a question of economy. Above all it is a question of **RESPECT** for **HUMAN DIGNITY** and with this respect as basis built politics.

A politics that does not accept all the suffering we see around us in the world.

A politics that does not accept the ongoing environmental destruction.

The Manifesto for Needseconomy aims at showing that this
politics is
ECONOMICALLY POSSIBLE.

Other works by Tomas Blomberg

Blomberg T. (1968) On Bound states in S-matrix theory.
Arkiv för Fysik Band 37 nr2
Utg. Kungliga Svenska Vetenskapsakademien Almqvist & Wiksell

He has formulated a realistic stochastic quantum theory where states are replaced by events presented in two unpublished works:

Blomberg T. (1987) Principles of Deductive Theoretical Physics. A proposal for a general deductive physical theory based on successive Confidence estimates on Quantum Mechanical wave functions. Outline of a mathematical theory.

Blomberg T. (1987) Successive Confidence Estimates on Solutions to the Many-particle Schrödinger Equations. Basic Concepts.

These are now published in one book at Lambert Academic Publishing 2015

Principles of Deductive Theoretical Physics

A Proposal for a General Deductive Physical Theory Based on Successive Confidence Estimates on Quantum-Mechanical Wave Functions

ISBN 978-3-659-68549-1

A deductive physical theory should in principle be a pure mathematical theory together with an identification of certain quantities/concepts (“observables”) in the theory and corresponding observable entities in the real world. This identification – the “interpretation” of the theory – should be unproblematic, both for the theoretician and the experimentalist. A general basis for a deductive physical theory, comprising both classical and quantum physics in a unified way, is proposed. The

theory is based on successive confidence estimates on quantum-mechanical wave functions corresponding to space-localizations of particles. This allows a direct and simple way of describing both macroscopic and microscopic phenomena by means of the same basic concepts.

Central in the axiomatic of the outlined theory is a concept called equiangular sequences of projection operators. It describes a successive sequence of “collapses of the wave function”.

The proposed theory gives a basis for a general theory of irreversible processes based directly on quantum mechanics. It gives an alternative definition of entropy and an alternative derivation of entropy increase in irreversible processes.

The book can be bought from <https://www.morebooks.de/>

and by kind permission from Lambert be

downloaded here as full text pdf

<http://www.drpilotti.info/eng/deductive-theoretical-physics-Tomas-Blomberg.html>

Contents

A spectre is haunting the world...

5

Unemployment □□	
an unnecessary, by capitalism created, scourge	6
Why is it so horrible to become unemployed?	7
Why a manifesto for needseconomy?	9
Part one	
Needseconomy	11
I What is needseconomy?	12
I.1 What is needseconomy?	12
I.2 Needssovereignty	13
I.3 The realeconomic basis of needseconomy	14
I.4 Distinguish between needs and greed	15
I.5 A simple stepwise realistic way forward.	
Combined A- and B-economy	19
I.6 The group, the local society, the national state	
and the global world	23
I.7 Needseconomy is not a Utopia	24
I.8 Obstacles to overcome	25
Part two	
Capitalism	29
II What is Capitalism? Distinguish between	
market economy and capitalism!	30
III The waglebourcoercion	37
III.1 The versorgungsoercion. An anachronism	
with built-in conflict ground	37
III.2 Forced labour	39
III.3 The hypocrisy of labour moralizing	40
III.4 Marx' concept of surplus value	43
III.5 The marxists and the left have completely given	
up all arguments based on the surplus value	45

III.6 Working-hours and surplus value	47
IV The Capitalgrowthcoercion	50
Part three	
Liberation	51
V The prisoners dilemma	52
VI Liberation of Thought	55
VI.1 Realize and overcome the great economic threat	55
VI.2 Recapture your personal responsibility. Be aware of your own and other's excuses!	56
VI.3 Debunk and oppose the conceptual confusions of politics!	57
VI.4 Recapture the political power from the economists!	61
VI.5 Don't shoot on the wrong target	62
VII Liberation of mankind by means of a general unconditional helpfulness.	63
End-word	66
Other works by Tomas Blomberg	68
Content	70
Information and dialogue about NEEDSECONOMY	72

Information dialogue about
NEEDSECONOMY
Facebook

<https://fb.me/Behovsekonomi>

Blog

behovsekonomi.home.blog

Working group for Needseconomy
needseconomy@telia.com