DOWNLOAD PDF MYTHS OF CAPITALISM

Chapter 1 : The Myth of Capitalism â€“ A Book by Jonathan Tepper â€“ calendrierdelascience.com

Myths of Capitalism is a primer on the capitalist system - its history, current functioning, and future. Written in layman's language and non-polemical, it is a book for every person, eminently accessible to the intelligent reader of any - or no â€"political persuasion, including students of economics and political science.

Western capitalism is likely to decline in the face of competition from China, India and Russia. Not many are written by economists. Ignorant of history, including that of economics itself, most economists not only failed to forecast the crash but, mesmerised by the spurious harmonies of their mathematical models, were blind to the mounting instability of the financial system and failed to grasp that an upheaval of the kind that is currently under way was even possible. After an intellectual failure on this scale, what could economists have to say today that would be of any interest to anyone? Anxiously defending their turf, many have objected that they never claimed to predict the future. But as Ha-Joon Chang writes: The results have been little short of disastrous. As Chang puts it: The Myth of Free Trade and the Secret History of Capitalism, Chang â€" an economist himself, a specialist in the political economy of development â€" mocked one of the central orthodoxies of his profession: But every one of them has a basis in fact and logic, and taken together they present a new view of capitalism. Chang may be our best critic of capitalism, but he is far from being any kind of anti-capitalist. He recognises the failings of centrally planned economies, and rightly describes capitalism as "the worst economic system except for all the others". At the same time he is confident that capitalism can be reformed to prevent crises like the one we have just experienced recurring. Making markets more transparent is not enough. Banning opaque financial products might be a step towards a safer world. Unfortunately it is also politically impossible. Again, Chang urges that we ban financial derivatives, but who are "we"? Reforms of the kind he envisions require a type of global governance that will not exist in any foreseeable future. As he himself recognises, capitalism is not one economic system but many. Free-market capitalism is only one of them â€" and not a very good one at that. There is no one ideal model. They are also competitors, with conflicting needs and goals. Chinese capitalism, Russian capitalism, Indian capitalism and American capitalism are geopolitical rivals as much as they are different ways of organising the marketplace, and they threaten one another in a number of contexts â€" not least when they are struggling to secure control of scarce natural resources. Afghanistan will enjoy nothing like peace when western forces are finally compelled to leave. Economic energy is shifting to the emerging countries, while in the west economies stagnate and politicians continue to worship at the altar of the free market not least in Britain, where the coalition seems bent on pursuing neo-Thatcherite policies more extreme than those of the 80s. Rather than reforming itself, free-market capitalism looks set simply to decline. Selected Writings, is published in paperback by Penguin Topics.

Chapter 2 : Myths of Capitalism: A Guide for the 99% | Thom Hartmann

myth-of-capitalism.

Monday, November 5, Book review: In the interest of full disclosure, I need to state that Jonathan Tepper is a friend of mine and sent me uncorrected proof of the book. Myth of Capitalism follows that format. It surveys the academic literature on economic concentration, citing dozens of academic papers and books that are broadly relevant. But it also has industry-specific case studies and anecdotes, some of them quite illuminating. The basic message When most people think of harmful industry concentration, they think of monopolies: Standard Oil and the like. Myth of Capitalism argues that this emphasis is misplaced, with duopolies and oligopolies being almost as anti-competitive as monopolies and far more common. The book also argues against the prevailing anti-trust philosophy pioneered by Robert Bork and various Chicago School economists. At the risk of oversimplifying, the Chicagoans asserted that mergers are generally good because they lower consumer prices and increase corporate efficiency. The book cites research suggesting that both claims are wrong: Facebook in social networks and Google in internet search. While large, mature businesses enjoy economies of scale, they also innovate far less than smaller companies, adjusting for size. While the book calls for greater anti-trust regulation, it points out that other kinds of regulation frequently reduce competition. In particular, large companies can bear the cost of onerous or complex regulations more easily than their smaller competitors. In , Richard Olney, then a railroad lawyer and later US Attorney General, presciently described how regulation can serve the interests of big corporations: The [Interstate Commerce] Commission, as its functions have now been limited by the courts, is, or can be made, of great use to the railroads. It satisfies the popular clamor for a government supervision of railroads, at the same time that that supervision is almost entirely nominal. Further, the older such a Commission gets to be, the more inclined it will be found to take the business and railroad view of things. It thus becomes a sort of barrier between the railroad corporations and the people and a sort of protection against hasty and crude legislation hostile to railroad interest The book mentions intellectual property law as another way the government suppresses competition. Since , the number of patents issued each year in the United States has surged, even after adjusting for population growth. And copyright terms have been lengthened, thanks in large part to lobbying by Walt Disney Company. Yet another problem is the revolving door between regulators and the companies they regulate. For instance, patent examiners who later move to jobs in the private sector are more likely to approve patents, especially for the companies that ultimately hire them. Highlights for investors Of the many academic papers the book cites, two are particularly relevant for investors: Cartels are more likely to breakup during periods of high real interest rates, presumably because higher interest rates require higher immediate rates of return for collusion. As mentioned, cartels are more likely to form and last longer when real interest rates are low. So economic concentration is cyclical, and we may see a decline in concentration even if anti-trust regulation remains permissive. By focusing on economic concentration and cartels, the book downplays alternative explanations for some of the problems it describes. This coincides with the cartelization of American business, but it also coincides with globalization. On the other hand, there are many oligopolistic industries for which globalization is irrelevant. Health care in the U.

Chapter 3 : Ten myths about capitalism

Thirty years ago, in the face of a serious economic challenge from Japan and Europe, the United States embraced a form of free-market capitalism that was less regulated, less equal, more prone to.

Published by Soul Forum on August 15, Canadians across the political spectrum have realized that something has gone wrong with the economy. Much debate has centered on inequality and the ever-widening gap between rich and poor in many developed nations. The Gini coefficient is a number used to measure how distant a country is from completely equal distribution of incomes. Conference Board of Canada While there is reason to pay attention to these stats and to discuss the merits of more equal societies, inequality should be thought of as a symptom â€" not the disease. In many ways, focusing on inequality is a distraction from the true structural issues which cause this stratification. The real culprit is a fake form of capitalism which has concentrated economic and political power in the hands of a few dominant corporations, leaving workers and consumers with little to no bargaining power. Canada, and to a larger degree â€" the United States, has devolved from free markets ripe with competition, new entrants, and innovation to a monopolistic and oligopolistic system where a few firms control every industry. For more evidence of this, see our blog post here. What we have today is a grotesque, deformed version of capitalism. A major economic puzzle in recent years has been: Workers have created massive gains in productivity that have helped the economy grow yet, unlike previous economic expansions, there has been no big increase in wages. Workers are not sharing in the gains from economic prosperity, and they are feeling the squeeze. Economic Cycle Research Institute Due to industrial concentration, a number of firms now have monopsony power â€" that is, they are the only buyers of labor. A monopoly means there is one seller, and a monopsony means there is only one buyer. In a monopsony, workers have little choice in where they work and have little negotiating power for wages with employers. In a healthy economy, many firms would be competing equally for workers and would be incentivized to entice new hires with higher wages and better benefit packages. But monopsonies make it easier for firms to depress worker wages. Recently, economists looked into the problem of labor market monopsony to find out just how bad the situation is. The evidence is depressing. They found that almost all commuting zones where workers would search for a job were highly concentrated, and this dragged down wages. The results of wage decreases were extremely troubling. The research explains why the average worker feels that the economy is tilted against them. So what can business owners do to play their own part in restoring true capitalism and a better balance for workers? Despite record gains in stock markets in recent years, workers are mostly left out of these capital gains. The unequal distribution of ownership is more pressing than the issue of income. Workers should demand stock ownership. Louis Kelso championed the first employee stock ownership plans ESOPs by concluding that the public has a right to own the gains from industry. When the middle class falls out of an economy, the economy starves itself. Increased employee stock ownership would help restore more equilibrium to the worker vs company power imbalance, and would help ameliorate some of the excesses of income inequality.

Chapter 4 : Learn Liberty | Top Three Common Myths of Capitalism

I wanna talk about three myths about capitalism, the first is that being pro-capitalism is the same as being pro-business. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The point of capitalism is to make sure that businesses have to compete vigorously against each other and that benefits consumers.

I absolutely loved it. The book is about how a lack of competition in the US economy is destroying consumer welfare. We might think that the US is a laissez-faire economy but increasingly, big business are exploiting their market positions to squeeze out competition in virtually every sector of the economy. It happens through price collusion. And it happens by letting mega-mergers go through, restricting competition in virtually every sector the economy. The anti-trust revolution under Reagan bears part of the blame. After Reagan, any merger that promised efficiency and lower prices was allowed. It became easy to game antitrust regulators. And it unleashed the biggest merger wave in US history. Four companies control the entire US beef market. The promises about economic efficiency turned out to be unfounded. According to professor Rodolfo Grullon, there is no clear relation between the efficient use of assets and concentration. The main reason companies made money was because they had market power. And mergers lead to higher prices. Once industries become highly concentrated, raising prices becomes an easy task. There are many ways that large incumbents can maintain high prices and quell competition. Companies can acquire any competitor that offers lower prices, perhaps under the threat of competitive pricing pressure. Standard Oil was a master at this game, and Amazon has used a similar strategy to get rid of competitors such as Diapers. Tepper gives practical advice on what needs to be done. The key is for a government to implement sensible policies that encourage competition. That includes antitrust regulation that stops any merger that materially reduces the number of competitors. Tepper argues that local monopolies should be broken up. He also suggests clear barriers between industry and government. In the United States today, lawmakers often work together with companies to create new regulation, giving them scope to gain unfair advantages. The book is really a call to arms â€" a much needed voice in favour of free market capitalism. The type of capitalism that works on behalf of the broader public, rather than benefitting a select group of vested interests. I spend a lot of time thinking about Chinese asset prices and the environment in which Chinese companies are living in. Politics is about distribution of power in a society, and nowhere is the distribution of power more lopsided than in China. Americans and Europeans should consider themselves lucky to enjoy a balance of power between different interest groups in society. Chinese on the other hand are at the whim of a single powerful party and their interests are not really looked after in any shape or form. The relatively even distribution of power in Western societies comes from legislatures whose representatives depend on public support. In theory, public opposition to oligopolies should render them obsolete. But it takes a lot of effort to effect political change. In my personal view, for more longer-lasting change, we will need to change the powers we grant to legislatures. For example, most people have no idea how fiat currencies redistribute wealth from savers to borrowers, how regulation increases prices they pay for goods, or how government borrowing pushes costs to the next generation. Certain groups inevitably end up hijacking political systems for their own self-interest. What we need is stronger constitutions and broader civil rights that safeguard public interests. Oligopolies can become cash flow machines and lead to amazing returns, as long as capital allocation works in the interest of minority shareholders. The study by Grullon et al found that the more concentrated the industry, the higher the return on assets. Another study by Strategas Asset Management found that companies that lobby extensively have higher returns. A strategy of buying the most highly concentrated industries and shorting the least concentrated industries outperform the market. He debunks the narrative that laissez-faire capitalism will necessarily lead to high consumer welfare. I am hoping that the book will be able to put the spotlight back on some of these issues.

DOWNLOAD PDF MYTHS OF CAPITALISM

Chapter 5 : Myth of Capitalism â€“ SoulForumYYC

Myth #1: Capitalism Was "Created" One of the most pervasive misunderstandings about capitalism is the idea that it was created by someone. Some of this can be attributed to the language used to describe Adam Smith's role in explaining the market process.

Apply to a attend a free seminar this summer and explore ideas in economics, philosophy, history, law, and more. Professor Chris Koopman explains the sharing economy and the consequences of government regulation. Free Market Economics playlist: Learn more about capitalism and free markets. We can have much more of that, and it will have beneficial effects around the world if we step back from the excessive regulation and have a much more capitalistic system. I wanna talk about three myths about capitalism, the first is that being pro-capitalism is the same as being pro-business. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The point of capitalism is to make sure that businesses have to compete vigorously against each other and that benefits consumers. So pro-capitalism is good for consumers. A second myth is that capitalism generates an unfair distribution of income. What true capitalism does is rewards people who are productive, people who work a lot of hours, people who have a lot of talent. The one negative one might be concerned about is that some people are not able to earn very much left on their own, and so very reasonable people support some anti-poverty spending. Regulating prices, limiting quantities, imposing all sorts of things on businesses, those make the economy less productive, give us a smaller pie. And make it even harder for us to operate programs, which help those who are less fortunate. The third myth is that capitalism was responsible for the recent financial crisis and the recession. That, again, is almost exactly the opposite of what is true. First of all, nobody who is being intellectually honest thinks that we had unbridled, serious capitalism before the crisis hit, before the subprime build up occurred, before we had all the housing problem. We had enormous government interventions that subsidized risk, enormous government interventions that encouraged an overinvestment housing. Because what we experienced was directly related to the incentives for excessive risk taking, the incentives for overinvestment housing that were created by government. But in the sense of causing, it is the bad policies that caused it, not what the private sector or capitalism did by itself. Most importantly, whenever government bail out people who took excessive risk, it encouraged people to do more of that in the future. And we unfortunately went a huge way in that direction via the TARP, and via all the Federal Reserve policies, which helped Wall Street and the risk takers not have to pay the true price for all the excessive risk taking they engaged in. Leave a Reply Your email address will not be published.

Chapter 6 : Myths of Capitalism

The Myth of Capitalism is the story of industrial concentration, but it matters to everyone, because the stakes could not be higher. It tackles the big questions of: why is the US becoming a more unequal society, why is economic growth anemic despite trillions of dollars of federal debt and money printing, why the number of start-ups has.

Transcript What Is Regulatory Capture? Susan Dudley explains how regulations actually benefit the regulated industry at the expense of consumers Corporatism and Power to the People [Article]: Steven Horwitz explains how government power often is used to make corporations more powerful. Equality and Capitalism [Article]: Donald Boudreaux provides compelling evidence that suggests that capitalism distributes material wealth far more evenly than most people realize. Steven Horwitz and Peter Boettke demonstrate that the most recent financial crisis was caused by government intervention, not the free market. The Crisis of Credit Visualized Video: Jonathan Jarvis breaks down the complexity of the recent crisis of credit and explains it using everyday language and visuals. Top Three Common Myths of Capitalism If you look at the history of the world, a huge fraction of the improvements in the standard of living have come because private businesses have created new products, have given people jobs, have generated profits that raise people out of poverty and allow them to live fruitful and productive lives with reasonable standards of living. We can have much more of that, and it will have beneficial effects around the world, if we step back from the excessive regulation and have a much more capitalistic system. I want to talk about three myths about capitalism. The first is that being pro-capitalism is the same as being pro-business. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The point of capitalism is to make sure that businesses have to compete vigorously against each other, and that benefits consumers. So many businesses understand this, and they hate capitalism. So pro-capitalism is good for consumers. A second myth is that capitalism generates an unfair distribution of income. The one negative one might be concerned about is that some people have very little skill. They are not able to earn very much left on their own, and so very reasonable people support some antipoverty spending. Those make the economy less productive, give us a smaller pie, and make it even harder for us to operate programs that help those who are less fortunate and because they were unlucky. The third myth is that capitalism was responsible for the recent financial crisis and the recession. That, again, is almost exactly the opposite of what is true. We had enormous government interventions that subsidized risk, enormous government interventions that encouraged an over investment in housing. But in the sense of causing, it was the bad policies that caused it not what the private sector or capitalism did on its own. Most importantly, whenever government bailout people who took excessive risk, they encourage people to do more of that in the future, and we unfortunately went a huge way in that direction via the TARP and via all the federal reserve policies, which helped Wall Street and the risk takers not have to pay the true price for all of the excessive risk taking they engaged in.

Chapter 7 : myth-of-capitalism

Myths of capitalism: the myth of scarcity The truth is that this fallacy is written in the DNA of capitalism. The basis of capitalist economics is the idea that there isn't enough to go.

Capitalism allegedly has failed, has proven itself incapable of solving economic problems, and so mankind has no alternative, if it is to survive, then to make the transition to a planned economy, to socialism. This is hardly a new idea. The socialists have always maintained that economic crises are the inevitable result of the capitalistic method of production and that there is no other means of eliminating economic crises than the transition to socialism. If these assertions are expressed more forcefully these days and evoke greater public response, it is not because the present crisis is greater or longer than its predecessors, but rather primarily because today public opinion is much more strongly influenced by socialist views than it was in previous decades. When there was no economic theory, the belief was that whoever had power and was determined to use it could accomplish anything. In the interest of their spiritual welfare and with a view toward their reward in heaven, rulers were admonished by their priests to exercise moderation in their use of power. Also, it was not a question of what limits the inherent conditions of human life and production set for this power, but rather that they were considered boundless and omnipotent in the sphere of social affairs. The foundation of social sciences, the work of a large number of great intellects, of whom David Hume and Adam Smith are most outstanding, has destroyed this conception. One discovered that social power was a spiritual one and not as was supposed a material and, in the rough sense of the word, a real one. And there was the recognition of a necessary coherence within market phenomena which power is unable to destroy. There was also a realization that something was operative in social affairs that the powerful could not influence and to which they had to accommodate themselves, just as they had to adjust to the laws of nature. In the history of human thought and science there is no greater discovery. If one proceeds from this recognition of the laws of the market, economic theory shows just what kind of situation arises from the interference of force and power in market processes. The isolated intervention cannot reach the end the authorities strive for in enacting it and must result in consequences which are undesirable from the standpoint of the authorities. Even from the point of view of the authorities themselves the intervention is pointless and harmful. Proceeding from this perception, if one wants to arrange market activity according to the conclusions of scientific thought â€” and we give thought to these matters not only because we are seeking knowledge for its own sake, but also because we want to arrange our actions such that we can reach the goals we aspire to â€” one then comes unavoidably to a rejection of such interventions as superfluous, unnecessary, and harmful, a notion which characterizes the liberal teaching. It is not that liberalism wants to carry standards of value over into science; it wants to take from science a compass for market actions. Liberalism uses the results of scientific research in order to construct society in such a way that it will be able to realize as effectively as possible the purposes it is intended to realize. The politico-economic parties do not differ on the end result for which they strive but on the means they should employ to achieve their common goal. The liberal view has found bitter opposition. But the opponents of liberalism have not been successful in undermining its basic theory nor the practical application of this theory. They have not sought to defend themselves against the crushing criticism which the liberals have leveled against their plans by logical refutation; instead they have used evasions. The socialists considered themselves removed from this criticism, because Marxism has declared inquiry about the establishment and the efficacy of a socialist commonwealth heretical; they continued to cherish the socialist state of the future as heaven on earth, but refused to engage in a discussion of the details of their plan. The interventionists chose another path. They argued, on insufficient grounds, against the universal validity of economic theory. Against logic they set moralism, against theory emotional prejudice, against argument the reference to the will of the state. Economic theory predicted the effects of interventionism and state and municipal socialism exactly as they happened. All the warnings were ignored. For 50 or 60 years the politics of European countries has been anticapitalist and antiliberal. More than 40 years ago Sidney Webb Lord Passfield wrote, it can now fairly be claimed that the socialist philosophy of to-day is but the conscious and explicit assertion of principles of social organization which have been already in great part unconsciously adopted. The economic history of the century is an almost continuous record of the progress of Socialism. Since then interventionist policies have made great strides. In general the view today is that we live in an age in which the "hampered economy" reigns â€” as the forerunner of the blessed socialist collective consciousness to come. Now, because indeed that which economic theory predicted has happened, because the fruits of the anticapitalistic economic policies have come to light, a cry is heard from all sides: It was against the nationalization and the bringing under municipal control of projects which now show themselves to be catastrophes for the public sector and a source of filthy corruption; it was against the denial of protection for those willing to work and against placing state power at the disposal of the trade unions, against unemployment compensation, which has made unemployment a permanent and universal phenomenon, against social insurance, which has made those insured into grumblers, malingers, and neurasthenics, against tariffs and thereby implicitly against cartels , against the limitation of freedom to live, to travel, or study where one likes, against excessive taxation and against inflation, against armaments, against colonial acquisitions, against the oppression of minorities, against imperialism and against war. It put up stubborn resistance against the politics of capital consumption. And liberalism did not create the armed party troops who are just waiting for the convenient opportunity to start a civil war. The line of argument that leads to blaming capitalism for at least some of these things is based on the notion that entrepreneurs and capitalists are no longer liberal but interventionist and statist. The fact is correct, but the conclusions people want to draw from it are wrong-headed. These deductions stem from the entirely untenable Marxist view that entrepreneurs and capitalists protected their special class interests through liberalism during the time when capitalism flourished but now, in the late and declining period of capitalism, protect them through interventionism. This is supposed to be proof that the "hampered economy" of interventionism is the historically necessary economics of the phase of capitalism in which we find ourselves today. But the concept of classical political economy and of liberalism as the ideology in the Marxist sense of the word of the bourgeoisie is one of the many distorted techniques of Marxism. If entrepreneurs and capitalists were liberal thinkers around in England and interventionist, statist, and socialist thinkers around in Germany, the reason is that entrepreneurs and capitalists were also captivated by the prevailing ideas of the times. In no less than in entrepreneurs had special interests which were protected by interventionism and hurt by liberalism. Today the great entrepreneurs are often cited as "economic leaders. The custom of citing initiators of great enterprises as economic leaders already gives some indication that these days it is not usually the case that one reaches these positions by economic successes but rather by other means. In the interventionist state it is no longer of crucial importance for the success of an enterprise that operations be run in such a way that the needs of the consumer are satisfied in the best and least expensive way; it is much more important that one has "good relations" with the controlling political factions, that the interventions redound to the advantage and not the disadvantage of the enterprise. An enterprise may be well run, but it will go under if it does not know how to protect its interests in the arrangement of tariff rates, in the wage negotiations before arbitration boards, and in governing bodies of cartels. It is much more important to have "connections" than to produce well and cheaply. Consequently the men who reach the top of such enterprises are not those who know how to organize operations and give production a direction which the market situation demands, but rather men who are in good standing both "above" and "below," men who know how to get along with the press and with all political parties, especially with the radicals, such that their dealings cause no offense. This is that class of general directors who deal more with federal dignitaries and party leaders than with those from whom they buy or to whom they sell. Because many ventures depend on political favors, those who undertake such ventures must repay the politicians with favors. There has been no big venture in recent years which has not had to expend considerable sums for transactions which from the outset were clearly unprofitable but which, despite expected losses, had to be concluded for political reasons. This is not to mention contributions to non-business concerns â€” election funds, public welfare institutions, and the like. Powers working toward the independence of the directors of the large banks, industrial concerns, and joint-stock companies from the stockholders are asserting themselves more strongly. This politically expedited "tendency for big businesses to socialize themselves," that is, for letting interests other than the regard "for the highest possible yield for the stockholders" determine the management of the ventures, has been greeted by statist writers as a sign that we have already vanquished capitalism. With the influence of the state behind them and supported by a thoroughly interventionist public opinion, the leaders of big enterprises today feel so strong in relation to the stockholders that they believe they need not take their interests into account. In their conduct of the businesses of society in those countries in which statism has most strongly come to rule â€” for example in the successor states of the old Austro-Hungarian Empire â€" they are as unconcerned about profitability as the directors of public utilities. The result is ruin. The theory which has been advanced says that these ventures are too large to be run simply with a view toward profit. This concept is extraordinarily opportune whenever the result of conducting business while fundamentally renouncing profitability is the bankruptcy of the enterprise. It is opportune, because at this moment the same theory demands the intervention of the state for support of enterprises which are too big to be allowed to fail. It is true that socialism and interventionism have not yet succeeded in completely eliminating capitalism. If they had, we Europeans, after centuries of prosperity, would rediscover the meaning of hunger on a massive scale. Capitalism is still prominent enough that new industries are coming into existence, and those already established are improving and expanding their equipment and operations. All the economic advances which have been and will be made stem from the persistent remnant of capitalism in our society. But capitalism is always harassed by the intervention of the government and must pay as taxes a considerable part of its profits in order to defray the inferior productivity of public enterprise. The crisis under which the world is presently suffering is the crisis of interventionism and of state and municipal socialism, in short the crisis of anticapitalist policies. Capitalist society is guided by the play of the market mechanism. On that issue there is no difference of opinion. The market prices bring supply and demand into congruence and determine the direction and extent of production. It is from the market that the capitalist economy receives its sense. If the function of the market as regulator of production is always thwarted by economic policies in so far as the latter try to determine prices, wages, and interest rates instead of letting the market determine them, then a crisis will surely develop. Bastiat has not failed, but rather Marx and Schmoller. This essay was translated from the German by Jane E. Sanders, who wishes to gratefully acknowledge the comments and suggestions of Professor John T. Henderson, University of Rochester, in the preparation of the translation. Webb, Fabian Essays in Socialism. The Humboldt Publishing Co.

Chapter 8 : Young Money: Book review: â€œThe Myth of Capitalismâ€• by Jonathan Tepper

Even within the framework of capitalism, there are versions of the South American "democratic socialism" or European "socialist capitalism". This myth is intended to intimidate people, to prevent the discussion of alternatives to capitalism and ensure unanimity.

In philosophy, this kind of argument is called a false binary: In the case of these right-wing talking points, the option no one wants to mention is taxing the rich and cutting corporate subsidies to invest in social welfare, good jobs, and education! They want to make workers think that our only choice is between how and when we pay to keep their profits flowing. They want to hide the real choice between paying and making them pay. We would be wrong to think that this self-serving nonsense is somehow new, a creation of a particularly predatory ruling class or an increasingly fanatical right wing. The truth is that this fallacy is written in the DNA of capitalism. We can see it in the classical definition of economics: We can see it in the way people talk about education, not as a way of forming citizens for a democracy, but as a way of training young people to compete in an increasingly ruthless job market. We, the working class, have had enough of scrimping and scraping and going without. We, as a society, have enough to go around. We are the richest and most productive society in the history of the world. Our labor has generated untold wealth, now concentrated in the hands of the few while the many go without. If we think in terms of Dr. We might look to tiny Cuba, strangled and impoverished by the U. With its limited resources, Cuba provides housing, education, food, and health care to every one of its citizens. This is what the story of loaves and fishes, the feeding of the multitudes by fair distribution, looks like in the modern world. If it is a miracle, it is one that we can work for ourselves. We must break, once and for all, with the myth of scarcity. We are faced with a choice of who will pay to rebuild our infrastructure, educate our children, and transition to a green economy. We will not, cannot, pay, and neither can our children or grandchildren. So make the billionaires pay.

DOWNLOAD PDF MYTHS OF CAPITALISM

Chapter 9 : The Myth of Capitalism â€“ A Book by Jonathan Tepper - The Daily Coin

With rigorous economic research and practical policy solutions, we focus on the issues and institutions that are critical to global development. Explore our core themes and topics to learn more about our work.

The obvious problem with this picture is that when the game is a ladder to safety and the odds are declining and pitch of the slope increasing, you will not be able to grab the ankles of those above you to be pulled to safety with them. Nope, much more likely they will kick at your hands rather than reach down to help. And if they do, when does the weight of all those holding on together break the grips of those on the ladder? The much better image is that of a pyramid and ladder where those who get up the ladder build a base beneath them, and should the ladder break or a gate be put up, they will be able to support each other--and find a much better safety than in Masada or Versailles. In case of disaster, go to a place where people know something about survival and find a friend on the rez. But, seriously, those who live at the bottom of this society do know a lot about how to get by without much from it. They are also far more likely to recognize a fellow human being than in the gated communities. Nope, when the helicopters show up to rescue them, you will be on that same boat without them, going down. I think this matters. We get to blame the poor and those who would waste all that money on social programs as we congratulate ourselves for being such stalwart folks of enterprise and service. And that Exceptionalism Pill really gave a great high that lasts and lasts. We are all struggling to get by and avoid being the next victim of bad luck or bad advice or not watching when we should have. That one disaster from homeless anxiety is not good for financial planning. It is also not attracted to incremental reform when "the greatest story ever sold" is right there for them. Poor people are not organized and are not as "exploited" in some ways as are those with enough money to attract the predators. The Shit Out of Luck are more aware of what they need to do than are those afraid of becoming one of them. Those who cast their human lot with "the least of these," make a very strong bet. If they have some assets to pool, they have people who appreciate value. They have a social glue of love and gratitude that can stand a lot of tests from the "principalities and powers of this world. I am afraid they think these people are beneath them. And so they indict themselves as inhuman and above redemption. They will fall and hit the ground in a Humpty Dumpty splat, instead of having any help or finding a soft landing. They think their Cayman Stash is going to save them when the Shit Hits the Fan, but that is because they look up for their salvation instead of down into the heart of the earth where the real light is shining. The judgment of the poor on the crumby twits of self-satisfaction is backed by the Almighty Reality, and it really kicks. In the revenue scam being pulled off by the rich to avoid paying what they should, it is the relatively rich that take a big hit followed by the more populous. The real wealth escalator begins above the casino where the millionaires play. They get to do things wage slaves cannot dream of doing, but not the dynastic establishment reserved for the top royals. The rest get to scuffle at various levels in "work" where being a Nobel Laureate in Economics might give you a nice Middle Class life, but not a ticket to ride. The only credential is competence. I think we need to scare the shit out of a lot of people in the Faustline, warning them that the Big One is coming!