**Equal Human Rights are Essential for Creating a Good Society**

1. **The Natural Laws of Society**

Social relationships do not occur accidentally; they depend on social conditions. When the same social conditions permanently create identical results, they may be called the natural laws of society. The natural laws of society may establish a good society, but they have not done so because they have not been defined yet. This paper defines the natural laws of society. Furthermore, this paper claims that once people accept the natural laws of society, they will build an incomparably better community than ever.

Society’s natural laws should determine social behaviour, similarly to the laws of physics determine powers in nature. Understanding the laws of physics lets people live in harmony with the physical world. Likewise, the natural laws of society should define social relationships. Understanding society’s natural laws is supposed to let people live in social harmony that is impossible to obstruct. This paper elaborates on it.

Considering that society’s natural laws were never defined, this study used the book “Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy” (Newton, 2006), written in 1687, as a reference model for determining natural social laws. Accepting society’s natural laws is supposed to contribute to the progress of humanity in the same way Isaac Newton contributed to the development of physics.

**1st natural law of society:** Destructive people are dissatisfied and form destructive social relations. Satisfied people are not destructive and form constructive social relations.

**2nd natural law of society:** Strong people tend to attack the weak, forming a violent society. People of equal power respect and do not attack each other in normal social conditions. They form harmonious social relations.

**3rd natural law of society:** Social privileges create unequal power among people, causing social problems, while equal human rights give the same social power to people, preventing social problems. Equal human rights create constructive and harmonious social relations, making people satisfied with their lives.

The first and second natural laws of society are basically self-explanatory. They might have some exceptions due to the perversion existing in the alienated world. But once society recognizes the natural laws of society, they should remove perversion in society and establish constructive and harmonious social relations without exceptions.

The first and second natural laws contribute to understanding the third natural law of society, which is the most important in this study. The third law is not an obvious solution for creating productive social relations of satisfied people because equal human rights have never existed. The definition of equal human rights should mean all people have equal opportunities in life. What is allowed to some must be allowed to everybody else, and vice versa; what is forbidden to some must be forbidden to all.

Authorities prevent the establishment of equal human rights to be able to oppress, control and exploit people. This manuscript considers authorities as individuals who have power over people. Authorities have always had a common interest in preventing equal human rights to keep their power and privileges in society. Additionally, they impose subjective knowledge on people to manipulate them. Such knowledge alienates people from their nature, from the possibility of finding an escape from an inferior position, and creates long-term problems for society. The history of humankind is a history of imposed subjective knowledge by authorities. It is the prime origin of social alienation and problems in society. For example, powerful authorities have often claimed that God supported their power over people and that people had to accept their subjective opinion. However, according to the Bible, not even God wants power over people because it is fundamentally wrong.

Authorities tend to increase their power by becoming dictators. When they achieve such a goal, people have considerable difficulties escaping from their oppression. Throughout history, resistance to dictators could have resulted in death penalties. People, including scientists, had to accept the subjective knowledge imposed by dictators. Once alienated knowledge is accepted by society, it becomes a substantial burden that prevents the development of society.

This paper argues that only objective knowledge can solve social problems and improve society. People had to dismiss authorities and the subjective knowledge they imposed to reach objective knowledge, but authorities resisted it. People also resisted authorities and succeeded in building a better world. Scientists have created more objective knowledge that has improved society. The development of society has increased human rights. The United Nations have established the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which has improved the world. Social scientists have developed democracy that replaced historical dictators, bringing better lives to all.

However, authorities have also developed their skill to prevent social improvements. In this regard, authorities have transformed into the elite with enormous financial power that strongly influences or controls media, science and politics. They still have dictatorial power in society, which is less visible but very controlling. The elite have allowed the acceptance of equal human rights mainly on a formal level, but in fact, human rights are not equal. Presidents of countries may send people to war, while people cannot do so to presidents. Employers may fire employees, which increases unemployment, while workers cannot lower unemployment to get their jobs back. Teachers force students to accept knowledge, while students cannot force it upon teachers.

One may say that equal human rights have only been partially established. But there is no such thing as somewhat equal human rights because such rights are not equal. Unequal human rights form privileged authorities who prevent the establishment of a prosperous society. The lack of equal human rights ought to be considered the leading cause of societal problems.

Throughout the history of humankind, authorities have managed to alienate social scientists from the cause of social problems. The foundation of social sciences is still based on knowledge authorities have imposed on society. For example, laws today are based on ancient Roman law. Thus, countries still have imprisonment sentences and, in some cases, death penalties which means they did not develop much from dictatorial times. Under the influence and pressure of authorities, social sciences have not recognized the natural laws of society. As a result, social scientists cannot solve the problems of society. They actually give the impression that natural social laws cannot be defined due to the complexity of social relations.

This paper suggests that social knowledge created by authorities cannot build a good society. It already would if it could. Also, social knowledge built on the alienation authorities impose cannot be correct. A good society requires creating new social knowledge based on equal human rights. People with equal rights have much more objective social knowledge than subjective authorities can produce. Equal human rights are entirely opposite to hierarchical relationships and have an entirely different set of logic and results. Also, this paper claims that equal human rights may permanently prevent power-hungry authorities from oppressing people. Thus, building equal human rights is essential for creating a bright future for humankind. This paper elaborates on it.

The theory of equal human rights has a significant realization problem. Privileged people dislike equal human rights because they take privileged power from them. The rich despise equal human rights and suppress them with their financial power. Politicians would not like to lose their power by implementing equal human rights. Social scientists are reluctant to accept the knowledge necessary for equal human rights implementation because it confronts the knowledge they have acquired. As a result, politicians, media, social sciences and the rich prevent equal human rights. Thus, they block the bright future for humankind. This paper fights back by presenting the importance of equal human rights.

\*\*\*

Society has interrupted the equal right to work by allowing the existence of unemployment. Unemployed people must accept poorly paid jobs to feed themselves. It causes the exploitation of workers. Equal human rights are supposed to bring justice to the economy by shortening work hours until unemployment is removed. It will raise the demand for workers and their salaries in the free market until exploitation is eliminated. Then workers will have greater purchasing power, and the economy will grow. Such a policy would solve today’s socio-economic problems and build good capitalism.

Equal human rights are supposed to improve the economy significantly. One day, every worker will be able to work at every public work post they want at any time. Every public job post will be filled by a worker who offers higher productivity, more responsibility, and demands a lower price of current work. It is nothing but a developed work market open at all times. Of course, such an economy cannot be established soon because it will require a lot of development before people embrace it. But once people establish it, the burdens and benefits of a living will be justly distributed among the people, forming a just society. In addition, private companies will lose the productivity battle with public companies, which will send capitalism down in history. This idea presents an enormous opportunity for socio-economic improvement capable of building good socialism.

Finally, equal human rights mean that all people should have equal legislative, judicial, and executive powers in society. Everyone should get equal rights to evaluate others for whatever they do. Each positive evaluation should bring a small award to the assessed person, and each negative evaluation should result in a small punishment. Such a policy would make everyone work hard to please others and avoid hurting anybody. This has to create a good society. The equal evaluating power among people presents a new form of democracy, and the freedom of evaluation presents a new form of anarchy. Therefore, such a policy can be called democratic anarchy. Democratic anarchy alone should be capable of building a bright future for humankind.

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

1. **Full Employment is the Turning Point of Capitalism**

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

Employers favour unemployment because they profit from the exploitation of workers. Employers can easily maintain unemployment because they do not necessarily need to hire employees most of the time. Large employers support political parties that maintain unemployment through economic policy. It starts with importing cheap labour and ends with rising interest rates. This is how unemployment becomes state policy and how state policy maintains the exploitation of workers. To secure their privileges, the rich have imposed believing that unemployment is an unavoidable price to pay for technological development. They have pressured economic science to accept that “0% of unemployment is not a positive thing” (Moffatt, 2020), which they accomplished.

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

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

Society may increase workers' satisfaction by further reducing work hours, which will create negative unemployment. Negative unemployment is ashortage of workers on the market. It will further increase workers’ demand and incomes. Negative employment may put workers in the privileged position that employers have practically always been in. When workers are not available on the market, employers who need more workers will have to attract workers from other companies by raising their salaries. Competition among employers will start a chain reaction in which workers’ wages will grow.

The rise of workers’ salaries in the negative unemployment environment was proven in the 14th Century when the Black Death killed one-third of the European population. Suddenly, the crops in the fields perished because there were not enough workers to harvest them. The Chronicle of the Black Death, a firsthand account finished in 1350, states: “the shortage of servants, craftsmen, and workmen, and of agricultural workers and labourers, left a great many lords and people without service and attendance… there were far fewer people to work the land: peasants were able to demand better conditions and higher wages from their landlords.” Suddenly workers and their labour were in much higher demand, enabling those who survived the Black Death to be in a much better position to negotiate work conditions. The shortage of workers increased the workers’ wages. The servants’ higher salaries contributed to economic growth, but the employers were unhappy.

## At Cuxham (Oxfordshire, England), a plowman demanded from his Lord a payment three times greater in 1350 than in the previous year. (Routt, 2008)

* “In Parliament, in 1351, the Commons petitioned Edward III for a more resolute and effective response. They complained that ‘servants completely disregard the said ordinance in the interests of their ease and greed and that they withhold their services to great men and others unless they have liveries and wages twice or three times as great as [prior to the plague] to the serious damage of the great men and impoverishment of all members of the said commons’” (Bennett, 1995).

According to this historical example, if a political party wins an election by reducing work to 5 hours per day, the lack of workers would increase the lowest workers’ salaries two to three times per hour in one year. The minimum daily wages of workers would increase by 30-90% for just a 5-hour shift. The fair market of work is the best choice for bringing justice to the economy.

The first problem with eliminating unemployment lies in the fact that employers do not want to increase workers' salaries because they profit from exploiting them. But also, excessive wage demands of workers may make the economy unsustainable, reducing employers’ interest in production and slowing down the economy.

Negative unemployment will make employers unsatisfied. Unsatisfied employers may avoid paying higher workers’ wages in a fully employed society by moving their businesses out of the country. People need to understand that Western capitalism has established laws that give more freedom to capital than workers, which needs to change. At the very least, the laws must provide workers with the same rights as capital.

Any capital departure results in business closure and newly unemployed workers, bringing trouble to a domestic economy. Full employment would again require a reduction of work hours. Shortening working hours would reduce workers’ incomes in the short run. Workers would not like it. On the other hand, it is not easy for employers to organize a new production by finding new employees and new markets. The escape lies in finding the length of work hours that optimally satisfies the needs of workers and employers.

Today people have accepted the 8-hour workday suggested by Robert Owen at the beginning of the 19th Century. There is no particular reason for an eight-hour workday. Society just took it and adapted to it. Besides providing full employment, the workday length should be a function variable coordinating workers’ and employers’ needs and justice in the economy. This function should be primarily based on the full employment of people. If more workers search for jobs than employers search for workers, the work hours should be shortened. And vice versa, if employers need more workers than are available, the economic policy should consider extended work hours. The second essential principle of work regulation should be based on people's desired hours.

The length of a workday can be a potent regulator of the free-market economy and the basic point of democracy in the economy. Political parties may propose the best full-time work period for workers and employers. It would probably be one of the most critical decisions of political parties, making them elected or not. On the other hand, the work hours can also be directly determined by the work needs of workers. Every worker may express the most desired work hours, and the average value would decide. Democratically determined work hours are supposed to create a fair work market. It will present a turning point for capitalism, making it a decent social system.

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

1. **Democratic Anarchy is the Future of Democracy**

Generally, it is assumed that democratic decision-making is the best possible and most acceptable. The problem is nobody knows precisely what this means. Of course, it will be ideal if people mutually agree and create rules on an equal basis that would be valid in their collective. However, this is impossible to achieve because every society brings a vast number of decisions that all people cannot decide on, either due to lack of interest, knowledge, or time. People also cannot do it because they can hardly agree on something and can never agree on everything.

Therefore, society accepts an indirect form of democracy where people elect representatives in governments to rule in their names. Candidates, who present the best choice to the people and win the most votes at the polls, receive the mandate to represent the people and govern on their behalf in a given period.

Such a democracy has many shortcomings. An elected government usually has no desire to meet the needs of those who did not vote for them, which leaves them dissatisfied. Also, representatives of the people are generally quite privileged and preferably represent self-interests and not the interests of the people who voted for them. Aside from that, politicians get elected with financial support from the rich, so they are forced to follow their will if they want to be elected. Ultimately, decisions in society are brought by authorities who do not sufficiently follow the people's will. The improvements in society occur when the elite support the changes. If the elite do not support them, the changes would most likely not happen. Such a democracy cannot be just. It is rather a fraud than the demonstration of the power of people, by the people, for the people. People can hardly achieve their rights through democracy anywhere in the world.

Does this mean that the will of the people cannot be carried out? That democracy cannot be developed? Scholars of social sciences do not see a solution to the problem of democracy and cannot establish any consensus on how a developed democracy should look. Establishing a developed form of democracy requires discovering a new pathway to implement people’s will effectively. To reach it, one needs to think outside the box.

\*\*\*

The future of democracy should not be primarily based on voting for people anymore but rather on evaluating peoples’ actions. Individuals should get equal and independent legislative, judiciary, and executive powers to assess others. A little power in the hands of people may incentivize people to comply with the interests of others in the best possible way. This kind of democracy will be simple, quick, and efficient. It will completely change the foundation of social policy and build a good society.

Let people allow everyone who, within the scope of their activity, can affect others in any way to do it freely upon their will. People do not have many choices because they cannot interfere with the freedom of activities of presidents, doctors and mechanics, or any other person, nor do they have the ability, the time, nor the right, not even the desire, to do so. However, all these people create advantages and disadvantages for others through their actions.

People can sense whether or not the activities of a president, doctor, mechanic, or any other person, bring some advantages or disadvantages to them. And according to it, individuals should have the right to award a person who creates advantages for them and punish someone who produces disadvantages for them. Such a right would direct all people to perform the most significant benefits and the least damage to others. Such an orientation of society would indeed follow the people’s will in the best possible way and, therefore, would present a developed democracy.

This paper claims that equal rights of people are the only proper orientation of society. In this regard, let each person have the same power to negatively evaluate, let’s say, three individuals who hurt them the most in any month and to assess positively three individuals who create the most significant benefits in a month. For example, if a prime minister, neighbour, and boss harm a person the most in one month, they will negatively evaluate them. On the other hand, if a friend, teacher, and singer, produce the most significant benefits to a person, they will normally positively assess them. Also, people may use all the evaluations for positive or negative assessments or in any combination. This is the essence, and the rest is a technical matter which will be performed through an application on the Internet.

The sum of positive and negative evaluations that individuals receive from others could be publicly presented on the Internet. Counting these evaluations will show everyone how appreciated they are in society. These evaluations will become at least as important to people as page visits, likes, and followers are important today. Nobody would like to be on the negative side of assessment, but on the positive side as much as possible. They will achieve this goal by working hard to create the most significant advantages for the community and diminish or abolish all disadvantages. This will create a good society.

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

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

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

Something similar to democratic anarchy was already implemented on YouTube, where people could vote for songs or videos with a “like” or “dislike.” No more than 5% of people evaluated songs or videos inappropriately, meaning 95% valued others fairly. This suggests that democratic anarchy will serve society properly or even better than YouTube because people will have limited evaluation rights and will not spend the evaluations irrationally. They will most likely evaluate other people honestly because they will feel honoured by having direct power in society.

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

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

Many people, including university professors, have criticized my work, saying that people cannot judge others objectively. The answer to them is that objectivity is desirable but not essential. Besides, voters do not need to be smart or educated to have the right to vote. People will judge others the way they feel, and everyone will be obliged to consider their actions' consequences on other people. This is what is needed to create a good society. By adopting democratic anarchy, people will appreciate other people, and that is what will bring considerable benefits to the community.

Furthermore, a system that supports people’s equal rights will develop objectivity in the community. People who receive negative evaluations will have to learn what is wrong with them, which will teach them objectivity. Objectivity will remove conflicts in society. In the future, people will probably only give and receive good evaluations and then they will know that they live in a good society. After these explanations, no one with good intentions for the bright future of humankind should refuse democratic anarchy. However, due to the influences authorities have been providing, people hesitate even to discuss democratic anarchy.

Once democratic anarchy is accepted by society, it will not give much power to individuals, but their evaluations joined together, will have enormous power. A person who receives a large number of negative assessments would try even harder to avoid doing anything inconvenient to other people. Moreover, the people who receive bad evaluations would never know who has evaluated them negatively, so they will try to improve their behaviour towards everyone. As a result, bullies will not exist at school, employers will not abuse their employees at work, neighbours will not produce obnoxious noise at night, salespeople will not cheat their customers, politicians will not lie to people, etc. They will all try to please other people in the best possible way. This will take privileged powers from all the people; this will eliminate social evil and form a good society.

When people get accustomed to mutual evaluation, they may democratically decide to increase the power of each assessment by assigning, for example, the value of one dollar to each of them. Each positive evaluation a person receives from somebody will bring them one dollar, and each negative assessment will take one dollar away from them. These evaluations would not affect ordinary people much. If two people do not like each other, they may negatively evaluate each other for years, which would not be a big deal. Getting or losing one dollar in the developed world does not mean much.

The power of evaluations will extremely efficiently affect authorities responsible for making decisions in society. The higher a leader's position in society, the greater their responsibility to people would be. For example, the US President might get 100,000,000 negative evaluations from the American people for bad policies, lies, and criminal aggression on countries. That would cost the president $100,000,000 in only one month. On the other hand, the president’s supporters might not necessarily evaluate such presidents positively because they might have higher positive evaluation priorities and spend their positive evaluations elsewhere. Non-privileged presidents would no longer dare perform bad policies. And if it happens somehow, they would leave their positions. Only the most skilful and brave individuals would dare lead countries. They will not be authorities anymore but people’s servants.

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

The point of democracy is to make rules which make people live well. So far, the best result has been achieved through laws, but laws have not solved social problems. Democratic anarchy can successfully solve all disputes in society by giving direct power to people. In the future, democratic anarchy will likely create a better solution for individuals and society than the laws can regulate it. When people get the power to enforce justice independently, they will seek less justice in courts. The courts will start losing their importance together with the state oppression apparatus, including police and prisons. Once democratic anarchy is established, it will begin replacing the enormous regulation imposed by authorities. Most state regulations will become obsolete in the distant future, which means they will go down in history. It will release people from alienation imposed by authorities and bring people closer to their nature.

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

Democratic anarchy will, for the first time, enforce the golden rule “Do unto others as you would have them do unto you,” which is capable of creating a good society. In essence, democratic anarchy has embedded the principle of a fair market economy with which it rewards the good behaviour of individuals. It should work perfectly. Once democracy anarchy is established, it will initiate fast and significant social improvement. The moment people get the right to evaluate others and be evaluated by others, they will be less willing to confront others and more willing to please them. This is the best outcome of democracy possible. The technology needed for the implementation of democratic anarchy is already available. Democratic anarchy can be implemented soon, which means a much better society can be quickly built. Democratic anarchy will most likely realize all the dreamers’ dreams in the history of humankind.

\*\*\*

Under pressure from democratic anarchy, government authorities will follow the needs of the people. The authorities would not dare make the most important decisions for society alone because they can easily make mistakes that might bring about people’s wrath and a large number of negative evaluations. Suppose authorities are not sure what the people’s needs are. In that case, their responsibility, clearly defined by respect for peoples’ evaluations, will direct them to discover a love for peoples’ participation in strategic decision-making through referendums. In this regard, they will most likely develop a simple, fast, and efficient method for direct decision-making of the people, probably over the Internet.

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

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

The people must directly make strategic decisions in society, such as accepting basic laws because it creates the best social policy. Nothing else can better follow the people’s interests. Professionals could make all other decisions and be directly responsible to the people for those decisions. Once people get the power to participate in the decision-making process and judge those who make decisions on their behalf, it will most likely present the most developed form of democracy. One can hardly define a better political way. People will become satisfied with such a democracy and will not allow anyone to seize it from them.

1. **Developed Market of Work will Create Socialism**

Karl Marx witnessed the enormous exploitation of workers by the owners of the means of production. He fought for justice by defining capitalism and its contradictions (Marx, 1984). His principles for building communism were a visionary work of a genius. But he also made mistakes. Karl Marx is an authority in social sciences, and without pointing to his mistakes, it would be hard to build a better society.

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

Marx thought the market economy caused workers' exploitation, so he proposed eliminating the market and replacing it with a production organized by workers. In The Communist Manifesto, he introduced the slogan, “proletarians of the world unite,” to take control over production and organize production through the “dictatorship of the proletariat” (Marx, 1970). However, Karl Marx did not define how this economy was supposed to work. He believed that workers would plan and organize the production to satisfy their needs.

Production organized by workers required social ownership of the means of production. According to Marx, public ownership of the means of production would eliminate the deficiencies of capitalism. He was right about it, even though the methods to achieve such a goal were not yet successful. Karl Marx named the first phase of social ownership of the means of production “the lower stage of communism.” Vladimir Ilyich Lenin established the principle of the lower stage of communism as "*from each according to his ability, to each according to his work*" (Lenin, 2017) which Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin named socialism. Socialism was supposed to release workers from capitalist exploitation and create a just society.

Considering that capitalists would never let workers decide about their capital, Karl Marx proposed in The Communist Manifesto a revolutionary takeover of private properties as the solution to build a good society (Marx, 1983). He justified revolution and the confiscation of private property by the fact that capitalists had built their capital on exploiting workers, which is generally true to some extent. Nevertheless, some people invest years in constructing machines that replace many workers. Should they not have more say and earn more than other workers? Marxian socialists have not found it acceptable, advocating for the equality of people. However, wage inequality is a philosophical problem, and a good solution should be found democratically.

Karl Marx did not define the term revolution, so some Marxian philosophers questioned his violent intentions even in the Communist Manifesto (Schaff, 1973). Still, they have never explained how the social revolution can be performed peacefully. This paper defines a peaceful socialist revolution for the first time. Marxian revolutionaries have been building socialism only by using force. Although violent revolutions may replace a particular social injustice, they have always been replaced with a new kind. To ensure the lasting effect of revolutions, the revolutionary leadership must be autocratic and oppress people. The power of oppression prevents equal human rights, blocking chances for building a better society. Therefore, calling for revolutionsshould be the last option to reach social justice and only when extreme oppression of workers occurs.

By appropriating the means of production from capitalists, socialism has practically denied the value of past work, which opened a new problem. In capitalism, the owners of capital pay responsibility for the production with their capital, which is the accumulated value of past work. Capital made capitalists very responsible in the production processes. By denying the significance of past work, socialism has not had a successful method for paying workers' responsibility in production processes. Furthermore, Marx knew that removing the market economy removes productivity indicators, so he called upon worker conscienceto replace it. Marx tried to impose responsible production by calling on the conscience of workers.

Karl Marx believed that a highly developed human conscience needed for communism would be capable of providing a responsible society, and he was right about this. He also believed people would build a conscience in their interests. However, no significant conscience improvement has ever been realized, nor has society learned how to achieve it. Nothing conscious may come from the need for authorities to control people. The power of authorities increases their narcissism, intensifying people's oppression and producing troubles for society rather than advantages. The authoritarian revolutionary oppression of people generates fear, which cannot develop people's consciences, and a better society can hardly be built. Release from fear of authorities usually creates irresponsible narcissism in people, causing societal problems. Criminals would always find an excuse for whatever crime they commit. Calling for the conscience of non-conscious people is illusory. Only the freedom of responsible people may form peoples’ consciences, and according to the author of this paper, only equal human rights can provide it.

Marx's assumption that an economy controlled by the proletariat would successfully follow people's needs was doomed from the beginning because no economy could satisfy the desires of greedy people. Greedy people are inevitable in societies without equal human rights because every inferiority is a nest for superiority needs. Moreover, even in the case of ideal democracy, people can hardly agree on anything. Workers have never had efficient control of production through their "dictatorship." The most developed self-management production was established in socialist Yugoslavia, where production decisions were based on workers' approval in the worker councils. In practice, such decision-making was time-consuming, and if production failed, it relieved managers of their responsibilities. “It deteriorated production efficiency and led to economic disaster” (Liotta, 2001). There is no better production choice but to select the best workers, including managers, for every work post, letting them freely produce the best they can while making them highly responsible to society for whatever they do. This paper elaborates on it.

Marx's idea of a democratically planned economy was noble and correct, but he did not have any evidence based on a previous model that it could work, nor an idea of how it could work. Unfortunately, Marxists still do not have it. Socialism has had a big problemdetermining how to establish a social policy to satisfy people's needs. By abandoning the market economy, socialism has lost efficient measures for selecting productive workers and managers to achieve prosperous production. As a result, the revolutionary authorities had to control production to make such an economy produce anything. Thus, the socialist revolutions replaced experienced entrepreneurs with inexperienced revolutionaries who could not provide a more successful organization of production than capitalism.

By abandoning the market economy, the socialist authorities had no choice but to plan society's essential production. For example, they planned how many tons of wheat they needed to feed people. They were relatively successful in planning the needs of the state. They were pretty capable of developing science. However, individual needs were barely considered because socialist leaders could not even gather them. The authorities have also had difficulties managing more complex production processes from one center. People were not hungry, but their material needs were less satisfied than in capitalism. As a result, socialist production was less satisfactory than capitalist production.

In an attempt to create a just distribution of consumption, Karl Marx replaced the market value of work with the labour theory of value he accepted from Adam Smith and David Ricardo and adapted it to his philosophy.According to it, "*the cost of a commodity can be objectively measured by the average number of labour hours required to produce that commodity.*" Marx's definition of the labour theory of value implies that workers' labour values are equal. Thus, according to him, the total number of workers' labour hours in producing commodities equally forms the commodities' objective cost. This was the starting point of Marx's philosophy of equality among people, which is supposed to eliminate workers' exploitation.

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

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

Another challenge for a centrally planned economy is that production has little to do with the market's demand and supply. Store shelves in socialist Eastern Europe were sometimes, if not often, empty. However, commodities were available on the black market, proving the need for a market economy. The result of the socialist economy was poor.

Finally, socialism did not destroy classes as Marx desired. Political leaders were high-class citizens. They did not need salaries much because they were privileged and got most of what they needed for free. People did not fight to earn more money but tried to get as close as possible to the political elite because it gave them privileged power in society. This brought corruption with all its negative phenomena, which damaged socialism.

The USSR and China accepted the centrally planned economy. As a result, their economies had lower productivity than capitalist economies. The USSR collapsed due to people's dissatisfaction with the inefficiency of the centrally planned economy. China has learned from its mistakes, abandoned the Marxist planned economy in 1978, and accepted the regulated market economy. From that moment, it has become the fastest-growing economy globally, threatening to take the number one place. This should prove the shortcomings of the Marxian economy.

Socialism was created as a noble attempt to form human society, but it did not work. Karl Marx did not have enough data to build socialism and communism, so he wrote almost nothing about it. However, his followers have created socialism by oppressing people, making them unable to bring favourable results. No science could fix problems originating from a lack of human rights. As a result, socialism failed.

The main question of the Marxist economy is why Marx did not insist on shorter work hours to increase the workers' salaries and reduce or eliminate the exploitation of workers? Marx most likely gave up on it because he witnessed how hard it was to make any agreement between employers and workers. However, reducing or eliminating the exploitation through shorter work hours should have been revealed and well disseminated no matter how hard it was to implement. Today, striving for shorter work hours is incomparably simpler and more rational than igniting violent revolutions and completely changing the socio-economic system.

Karl Marx suggested that alienation in production processes should be eliminated through workers' cooperation and control of production processes, and he was correct. Still, no method to achieve such a goal has been successfully created. The political Left has tried to challenge capitalism by developing cooperatives that practice the collaboration of workers in decision-making processes. Realizing this idea is problematic because workers are different and have different needs, so reaching agreements about production matters is difficult. Successful cooperatives are rather an exception than a type of production that might replace capitalism. Only a more productive economy can replace capitalism, and this paper intends to define it.

\*\*\*

People generally do not think that the problems of the market economy are primarily based on the underdevelopment of the market economy. However, the author of this paper argues that the main problem of today’s market economy is not too much market, but rather, not enough market.

Workers in capitalism have jobs protected by laws and unions; jobs in capitalism are privileged, though to a lesser extent than in socialism. A more productive worker cannot apply for a work position already occupied by another worker. That is why the division of work in capitalism cannot efficiently allocate labour and achieve maximum productivity. One should protect the existence of workers, not jobs. A better future for humankind requires that workers become subjects with equal rights in production. This will be achieved when all the workers have equal opportunities to choose any job they want in public companies. Society needs to establish a standard for selecting workers. History has already presented that there is no more socially justified employment principle than hiring the best available worker at each work post.

Capitalism taught people to love competition and that being the winner brings enormous satisfaction. As a result, people do not hesitate to exert any effort to express themselves. So why would society not open competitions for every public workplace at any time? It sounds impossible because such a division of labour never existed. However, its realization is just a technical problem and will bring enormous benefits to society. To achieve such an economic system, people need to find an efficient way to evaluate work productivity, define job responsibilities, and harmonize rewards for work at any time. In summary, the workers who offer the highest productivity and accountability and demand the lowest salary should get any public job at any time. It would be nothing else but a developed market of work. However, the work market will require time to develop enough and be accepted by people.

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

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

Permanently open work competition among workers has never existed because nobody believed it was possible and did not invest any effort into developing such an idea. However, the author of this paper has contemplated the potential problems that an open work competition might bring to society and formed solutions to solve such problems. Once people consider such a division of labour will open the possibility for significant economic and social improvement.

Of course, such a division of work will relate only to public companies because if it applies to private enterprises, that would practically mean a seizure of private property. Private companies will continue their businesses as they do today. It will be necessary to regulate and democratically accept a new division of labour in public companies by law. One day, the proposed division of work will be accepted because the principles of such a division of labour are natural, just, and the most productive.

A worker who offers the highest productivity for any workplace at any time immediately becomes a prime candidate for that position, regardless of whether the position is occupied or not. If there are already employed workers at such workplaces who do not want to leave their jobs, they would have to accept the competitors’ productivity, and in that case, they would continue to hold their work positions. If they cannot take on the new responsibilities or would not want it, they will immediately vacate the workplace and leave it to the competitor.

The existential security of workers is necessary as a condition of stability for society, and therefore, society will guarantee it. In the proposed system, all workers will automatically be economically secure after leaving any job. Losing a job will not create income stress because workers can quickly find new work in a full-employment environment. Such security will remove the great fear of unemployment that is prevalent around the world. Capitalism finds the primary motivation for work from the fear of the workers’ economic survival, so it does not provide enough financial security to the people. Socialism will build inspiration for work from the free choice of choosing jobs and from work satisfaction.

The advantages of such a division of work will be enormous. The best worker in every workplace ensures maximum productivity for companies, satisfying consumers’ needs most efficiently. Thus, such a division of labour will find its justification. The labour market will allow people to choose jobs they love more. They will enjoy work far more than they do today. Work will become a direct value for itself.

Furthermore, the open labour market will eliminate privileges. Today, people might experience a loss of privileges as a significant disadvantage. However, it should be said that privileges are one of the leading causes of societal problems. Eliminating privileges means increasing productivity and reducing, if not removing, corruption and immorality in the community. With time, people will realize that the loss of privileges would considerably increase the possibility of finding work that enhances workers’ productive power. The power of being develops creativity and brings great and stable satisfaction that privileges could not achieve. The proposed socialist labour market would bring significant benefits to society**.**

\*\*\*

The author of this paper has developed Marx’s simplified labour theory of values by expanding workers’ compensation in production processes with necessary functions capable of defining values that will increase productivity and justice in the economy. Every produced good consists of the values of past and current work. Therefore, workers’ compensation should be based on their past and current contribution to the production processes.

The value of current work should present how many advantages and disadvantages the work brings to a worker compared to other jobs. Let’s say the average value and cost of the current work is 1. For example, a worker 10% more interested in a position than in the average job may request a value of 0.9 for the current work price to be more competitive. It will make him earn 10% less than in an average job. However, a better chance of getting a job will have a worker who demands the lowest price for the current work. The justification for accepting the lowest bid is that the job is most convenient for the worker and cheapest for society. The cost of ongoing work will be one of the factors that determine the salaries of workers. In this regard, the work market will make suitable jobs achieve relatively lower wages, and inconvenient positions will be compensated with higher payments. A developed work market will form an objective price of current work the same way the market of goods does, and workers will be satisfied with the earnings. Unions as mediators in determining incomes will no longer be required.

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

Assigning the value of past work to human beings will allow people to receive basic income right from birth. Everything people do from birth should be accepted as work. The price of the current work of unemployed people should be adjusted to let everyone receive a minimum income as a warranty for a secure existence. It will be automatically created from the taxes of employed people. Such an idea has already been propagated by the name Universal Basic Income.

The value of past work will also include human and social improvements people create. It will motivate people to build upon these values more, bringing more benefits to their societies. On the other hand, people will also pay responsibility for any damage they produce to society with the value of their past work. For example, every crime may be re-evaluated by the past work value of people. The criminal law will need to recalculate criminals' prison sentences by deducting their past work values proportionally to the crimes they have committed. It would be more effective for criminals to lose past work values than to serve prison sentences, and the punishment will be much more humane.

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

Let’s assume that the average past work value is 100,000 points while the average current work value is 1. The multiplication of these amounts will establish objective workers’ labour value or labour cost. That means the average salary of workers will have 100,000 money units. The average value of past work may be adjusted to GBP per capita, while the average value of current work may be adjusted to 1, adjusting salaries to the values of produced goods and services.

However, only the market can establish objective prices of commodities. If a company achieves a higher revenue on the market than its workers demand by their labour values, it will present a surplus value. As a result, the workers in those companies would earn more money than they requested. Conversely, in companies that accomplish a deficit in making money on the market, workers would receive lower wages than they asked for, even though they achieve offered productivity. To avoid competition for work in more profitable public companies, the more profitable public companies will surrender the surplus values they received to those public companies that achieve shortage values on the market.

The overflow of public companies’ surplus values to those that realize the market shortage would prevent a disturbance of equilibrium in the work division. As a result, everyone will earn as much as they desire to realize offered productivity. Thus, the work market will balance employment in all public companies, regardless of the companies’ revenues coming from market inconsistencies. The market is the best gift Mother Nature gives to the economy, capable of bringing justice and stability to the production processes. Economic development will come from people's conscious decisions to allocate their tax money for investments in production.

The system would have no meaning without efficiently regulating workers’ responsibilities in production processes. In the developed work market, workers may unrealistically increase their productivity offers to get their desired jobs. Such irresponsibility may result in the collapse of the economic system. Today, for example, politicians do precisely that, which is one of the leading causes of people’s disappointment and immorality in society.

The proposed socialist economy will use the workers’ past work values to establish workers’ responsibility in the production processes. This is what socialism has not had, causing insufficient responsible and efficient production. Workers would guarantee the productivity they propose by the value of their past work. If workers do not meet the proposed productivity, they will bear responsibility by losing their past work values.

The workers will numerically determine the scope of their responsibilities in the production processes of public companies. Let’s say the average responsibility has a value of 1. The higher accountabilities the workers offer for the desired workplaces, the greater their right to work in the desired workplaces. If the company’s revenue increases, the workers in publicly owned companies will share the profit proportionally to the predetermined responsibilities they propose for their work. The such gain will be expressed in the value of the past work. And vice versa, if a company loses money, workers who propose greater responsibility for their work will realize more significant losses in their past work values.

Once the profit or loss of the company is identified, and the responsibilities of workers are numerically determined, awarding and punishing workers with the values of presenting the past work is automatic. In addition, workers will be held accountable for their performance through democratic anarchy. One can guess how powerful democratic anarchy will be when people get equal authority to award and punish others with a tiny value that presents their past work.

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

Establishing work competition for workers may be challenging because comparing different production values may sometimes make choosing the best work offer demanding. Then the work productivity of a new baker should be evaluated, which would require the assessment of the quantity and quality of the produced bread. If the offered productivity is not realized, disputes are possible and finding solutions may be problematic. For example, if the supplied ingredients of bread are not satisfactory, it may affect the realized productivity of the baker, for which he might not be responsible. Finally, since the job description is usually more complex than presented in this example, the workers might spend a lot of time resolving such issues, reducing the time to work. Nobel laureate Ronald Coase stated that resolving such an issue would require a higher cost than economically justified (Coase, 1937). He may be correct, but open competition among workers might still bring superior productivity than capitalism.

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

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

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

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

In practice, work replacements would hardly exist without agreements among workers. When workers take jobs from previous workers, the previous workers would be considered to have performed the needed productivity and would profit from it even when they are replaced and do not contribute to such productivity. The new workers who force previous ones to leave will have to maintain the productivity of their predecessors but will profit only from the increased productivity. Besides, one should expect that replacing workers without an agreement would probably make the replaced workers dissatisfied. They will be able to retaliate by negatively evaluating their replacements through democratic anarchy. Their coworkers and friends may support them. Therefore, workers who want to replace existing ones would most likely negotiate conditions to get the jobs. Thus, one may expect the replacement of workers without negotiations only if the new workers bring noticeably higher productivity.

Leaders will have great operational power, but people may still control them before making executive decisions. For example, suppose company managers want to increase production through substantial investments. Then, they must be supported by workers because the increase in productivity will bring new responsibilities to the workers. The workers will have the right to change the values of accepted responsibilities based on new managers' proposals. If they reduce their responsibilities, it might mean they are not confident with the changes managers propose, which might postpone or block a new production. Managers will have to persuade workers to accept their proposals by explaining the production risks and benefits.

Substantial responsibility in the production process will teach workers to establish mutual relations more on cooperation than competition. However, every job will still find the best worker on the market the same way every good finds the best purchaser today. Those who know how to improve production and society will no longer be prevented from doing so. And on top of that, workers and people will be satisfied. Thus, the open work market will bring the most outstanding contribution to the development of the economy and society.

Considering that workers will not dare apply for jobs they are not qualified for, there is no need to condition anyone’s employment depending on the possession of diplomas. Firstly, a degree does not guarantee workers' skills or production. Secondly, conditioning work with diplomas unnecessarily reduces the freedom of access to desired jobs. The limitation of employment possibilities with the possession of degrees has evolved to the absurdity that bureaucratically restricts the freedom of choosing work to a vast extent. Besides, the enormous knowledge the education system imposes on students usually has no connection with people’s professions. It serves authorities to ensure the survival of an authoritarian system and presents an unnecessary burden that alienates students from objective reality. Besides, alienated people cannot solve social problems and improve society. In this regard, it is necessary to remove education as a bureaucratic requirement for having the right to work. This still means that professional education will be unquestionably necessary and welcome but not required for employment because knowledge can be acquired independently as well as through practice.

\*\*\*

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

Given that the saturated market does not provide substantial profits, which is the final result of every production, the owners of private companies will likely join public companies. Companies’ owners will get the equivalent value of past work in exchange for their firms. It will proportionately increase their incomes in public companies.

With time, one can expect all regional companies to merge into one public company, operating similarly to big corporations. The company will have a central leadership that will effectively coordinate work. Managers will have to remain the best option for organizing the production of public companies, and the new system will make them highly responsible for making decisions, guaranteeing efficient production. Managers will open job positions where they are most needed and close off those not needed enough. Such an organization of the economy will decrease market competition between companies. Still, it will ensure high production efficiency by lowering the competition level from the companies to the level of jobs.

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

Democratic anarchy is all the social power that may remain in socialism. Once equal rights are fully established, people will have no reason to commit crimes. Crime will be eliminated. Minor offences may remain and be resolved through democratic anarchy. Once equal human rights are established, police, courts, and prisons as symbols of authoritarian government will become obsolete and go down in history. This will make states go down in history as well.

The complete implementation of equal human rights in the economy should be called socialism. Nothing else deserves this name. Socialism will come spontaneously as the final result of equal human rights. It will not replace capitalism as Karl Marx believed; it will upgrade it.

Building socialism is a much more complicated task than reforming capitalism. The author of this paper does not claim that his socialist solution is final because his ideas open up a spectrum of possibilities. It is hard to choose the best solutions without practice. However, he is confident that social scientists will further develop the best socialist choices through their experience based on the theory of equal human rights. The author believes that the development of socialism will eliminate social evil and create a bright future beyond the wildest dreams of today.

1. **Communism Should Be Considered the Best Social System**

Karl Marx established the term communism. It presents a political and economic system in which society owns the means of production and produces for the benefit of the people. He defined communism as “From each according to their ability, *to each according to their needs*” (Marx, 1970). According to Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, communism is the final stage of socialism. Communism should provide all goods and services free of charge to all people, which socialism could not. This is the only difference. Karl Marx and his most prominent students: Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin, Mao Zedong, Josip Broz Tito, Fidel Castro, and now Kim Jong-un, have ultimately failed to build communism even in theory. Even though their work was based on a noble ideology, they could not find a successful method to improve society, and the final result was disappointment.

The prime condition for building socialism and communism must be the equal rights of people. Karl Marx thought the same but failed to define them. Vladimir Ilyich Lenin initially intended to build socialism and communism based on equal human rights, but he did not because all people could hardly agree on anything. Democratic anarchy is the solution, but the technology required was unavailable in Marx’s and Lenin’s time. Lenin’s attempt to establish equal human rights experienced such difficulties that he gave up on them and took control over people (Lenin, 2017). The rest of the socialist leaders followed suit. It was precisely where everything went wrong with socialism and communism.

\*\*\*

Hopefully, this paper has convincingly presented the third natural law of society: Establishing equal human rights creates constructive and harmonious social relations, making people satisfied with their lives. If so, people would be willing to build socialism. To reach communism, people must allocate all their incomes to taxes of their free will. Then all of the goods and services will be available free of charge to all people. Technically speaking, if some people refuse to allocate all their gross salaries for taxes, they will still receive some income, and some goods and services will be charged. This would still be socialism and not communism.

Most people believe that communism is not possible to realize due to the weaknesses of human nature. This is false. Money is a real need in a scarcely supplied society. The wealthy elite have increased the value of money much more than it objectively deserves because by having money, while people do not, they achieve power over people.

Socialism will significantly change this. It will increase production and workers’ salaries, bringing abundant production and consumption available to everyone. It will give stability and justice to the process of production and distribution. Each work position will be theoretically available to everyone at any time. The market of work will make all jobs equally desirable, contributing to building harmony in society. People will have equal rights to represent their interests everywhere. By implementing equal human rights, people will become genuinely equal**.** Then they should realize the second natural law of society: equal power among people builds harmonious social relations. The proposed socio-economic system should create a harmonious society.

The history of humankind is a history of imposed knowledge by authorities that has alienated people from their nature. People should not uncritically accept the influences of other people. They are not even supposed to compare themselves with others because it may alienate them from their own nature instead of letting themselves embrace it. Alienation has put people on the wrong path on which they cannot satisfy their needs, bringing harmful consequences. As a result, people today live in alienated societies, facing dissatisfaction, antagonism, and destructive relationships.

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

The responsibility the system requires from people will teach people to set their needs according to their ability to satisfy them. Therefore, they should realize the first natural law of society: people who permanently satisfy their needs create constructivesocial relations. Such people are not destructive. Once people accept the natural laws of society, they will contribute to building a natural, harmonious and highly prosperous society.

By accepting society’s natural laws, people should understand that work itself is a great value; individual to individual is a prime value, while goods will lose their alienated value. Values of work and production abundance will reduce the importance of money. One day, getting good evaluations from other people may become more important than earning money. Having desired jobs should also become more important than earning money. Today, some jobs are more attractive to people than money, but this is an exception. A developed work market will make all jobs equally attractive, and the process of disalienation might make jobs more desirable than earning money.

People would also understand that collective consumption is the most rational consumption. As a result, one day, people will most likely allocate all their incomes directly towards taxes, making all goods and services available free of charge while establishing the most efficient, stable, and rational democratically planned economy. This is communism, most likely the best social system possible, which Karl Marx desired but could not define—a flourishing society. In communism, people will be free to do what they love and indulge in work, science, philosophy, culture, arts, sports, entertainment, and relaxation through fun.

Once people recognize the natural laws of humanity, they will not have to go anywhere in search for what they need because all they need will be in their immediate environment or even closer—in themselves. The most critical point of an individual’s creation is themselves. The more people get to know themselves, the more freedom, peace, joy, wisdom, and love they can achieve. In communism, people will have the best chances to realize a long and good quality of life.

1. **Conclusion**

History teaches that authoritarian social systems produce social problems, while social systems where people have more rights create better societies. This should be enough to conclude that the full implementation of equal human rights would create the best social system possible. Nevertheless, authorities prevent the knowledge of equal human rights to keep their social privileges. Social life was always based on generating individual power over people instead of on equal human rights. As a result, people cannot reach social prosperity.

According to the author of this paper, equal human rights may solve social problems and provide the best life possible for all. Teachers will not need to teach people how to create a good society; equal human rights will spontaneously do it, and people will like the result. This paper tries to convince readers that people cannot create more significant societal progress than by implementing equal human rights. Nothing more is needed to build a bright future for humankind, and nothing less can make it. Equal human rights are the greatest invention of all time. Opening a public discussion about equal human rights is essential for building a bright future for humankind.
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