

It is proven that Automatic Stabilizer programs like unemployment benefits & social security lessen the effects of cyclic unemployment, deters recession, & keeps people spending money even when their employment, health, etc challenges their ability to make & earn money.

It makes sense then that a total expansion of these programs would have a positive effect on a nations economy & well-being overall.

Problem with Capitalism:	Socialist Problem	Socialist Solution
If you are unable to work or choose not to work for any reason, you are punished harshly by the threat of homelessness, starvation, etc.	Starting simply, a socialist system should eliminate the threat of starvation or homelessness (H&S) (Goal: house & feed every individual). How?: using state revenue or labor from the working class taxation / direct mobilization of Means of production	<p>② The free-loader problem: without the biological threats posed by lack of shelter or starvation it would be difficult to compell a person to work when they don't have to to survive.</p> <p><u>Rebuttal:</u> There are already many in our society that work even though they never face the threat of starvation. Socialist theory works on the premise that lives are supposed to be purposeful & thus work for purpose & not profit or fear of H&S.</p> <p>The question is whether or not the number of people that choose to work is enough to sustain those that do not. By necessity then, the bare minimum lifestyle must be bland & uninteresting. You should have to work to provide value to your life beyond just pure survival.</p> <p><u>Comment:</u> I imagine that in any functional socialist society there will still be a job market. There will thus be demand for work which solves the problem of people not wanting to take unsatisfactory jobs. Jobs will most likely still pay wages which can be used to sustain hobbies, buy better housing, buy different food, afford</p>

Luxury, save for a fulfilling retirement, etc.

People will want to buy the ability to not work.

How do we prevent this?

People can come into money in many ways, owning a corporation, inheritance, winning the lottery, etc. If people already have money how do we prevent it from starting a chain of those that do not work?

Inheritance / gifting seems like the easiest target. If someone were to accrue wealth, that wealth (plus ability to afford luxury lifestyles without contributing to the labor force) should stay & die with them. If someone is wealthy it has to be because they personally earned it / won it, etc. This way, wealth is not allowed to snowball intergenerationally.

Without investors who have access to large sums of money, how will large expensive projects be funded?

What about niche experiments?

High risk investments into emerging technology. How will you get the state to back a project that might yield nothing at all?

The state, controlled by the people will decide where the excess wealth gets spent. (the state generates revenue when someone dies & absorbs the wealth that in a capitalist society would have otherwise gone to their children. They use this money to fund public projects.)

What's stopping bad actors in a state from simply killing people if the state benefits when a person (& thus their wealth) dies?

Could have a sort of deficit system where the state can spend money of the people that have not died yet knowing that at some point they will & will absorb their wealth.

What about competing peoples

or corporations? If two different parties both believe that their use of funding is better than the other, who wins?

What happens to the loser? without finding their corporation may cease to exist along with it their wealth of information.

Abolishing the corporation all together does not seem like a good idea. Another beautiful perk of free-market capitalism is the idea that competition breeds innovation, with a complete state-mobilized means of production the people producing the goods, technology, etc are not compelled to outdo each other & thus improvements stagnate.

How do you prevent monopolies?

Anti-trust legislation
Just like with Capitalism

Democracy implies that
Dumb/Uninformed people make decisions, how are decisions made when the public does not care to be informed about the impacts of their decisions?

Example: Shall the state invest in X form of nuclear energy, Y form or not at all?

Expert panels & committees
The public can elect Experts in their respective fields to make the decision
[Hm... sounds like a republic...]

Company secrets / patent
seems inefficient when the technology would best serve all those that can benefit within a state

Not Viable: Without the information advantage, companies would not be compelled to develop such technological improvements or developments, critical for competition, allows one corporation to maintain a technological advantage over another & thus encourage competitors to innovate.

~~Remove Company Secrets / patents all together~~

Problem of national security:
How do you maintain national secrets & maintain power & competitiveness on a global scale if the role of national security is run by the collective?

You can't really, there must be a branch of the state that makes defense, espionage, counter-terrorism, security, etc. decisions separate from the public

How do you prevent bad actors from taking advantage of secrecy & withholding of information from the public? What if these agencies turn against the public & are used to control the population?

In the same way we do now, legislation, whistleblowing, etc.

How do you keep the state out of private matters? You would create a fascist government if your neighbors can opp on you for non compliance with policy, etc?

How do you manage the black market economies that will inevitably pop up?

How do you deal with the drug problem?

Socialism should not require participation, both in the proceedings of the state nor in the society itself.

If a person would rather start on homestead, and sustain their own living, they should be allowed to do so & not be compelled to do anything that they do not want to do. The parts of socialism (free housing, food, transportation) etc should be optional & only used if the person wishes to use it.

Banger ohh
Thought Right
Here

How do you predict demand
state provided
for housing? Where do you
decide where it's put?

NIMBY problem: You can have

housing but it might not be
where people want it. Where people are
placed determines the strength of the
labor force too. Who decides where it
goes, access to labor would be
extremely beneficial to corporations

AI & automation problems:

What if there's simply no supply of
work?

What if someone chooses homelessness?

What if the state mispredicted demand
in a certain area? Is the state
going to compel people to move to a
place where there is housing?