

1. Table of Content:

6.4.a Minimum conditions

(Minimum-wage removed, Amendment 23) [240+]

6.4.a-2 Worker safety

6.4.a-3 Environmental safety

6.4.a-4 Public safety

Articles 6.5: Anti Monopoly

6.5.a Anti monopoly

6.5.a-1 Nationalization

6.5.a-2 Break up

6.5.a-3 Maximum Company Size

2. Laws

(...)

6.4.a Minimum conditions

The Government establishes minimum working conditions.

(Amendment 23)

6.4.a-2 Worker safety

The People or in their absence the Government establish minimum (...)

(...) competition.

6.5.a-3 Maximum company size

***A maximum company size is established by law, not larger than:
..[2 000]. (two thousand) people.***

Articles 6.6: Open markets (...)

3. Remove minimum wage

Amendment 23: toc

--- Removing minimum wage ---

constitution.html#minimum.wage

As had been noted already, the minimum wage law does not belong in this Constitution: ./post/005/DV_coops/minimum_wage

Quote: 'Perhaps this law does not belong in this Constitution, and was added as a knee-jerk reaction to the dangers of historical laissez faire capitalism ('capitalism').'

After hearing more arguments about it, such as that minimum-wage endangers entry level jobs that do not earn the company almost anything (or could even cause losses), it seems that it is best after all not just scrap this law. It is a tenuous law in this power distribution system, which causes the State to have another difficult to do job,

putting their fingers into private contracts where they do not belong. It cuts against the freedom of the market, not just for employers but also for employees. Even if there might be a reason to have a minimum-wage law, it is not strictly necessary in a DAVID system (contrary to a Capitalist system), and thus does not belong in a Constitution. It is already heavyhanded to put the economic system into the Constitution. A regular law, if necessary, would have to do. Secondly there is a whole new problem created with this law, in the area of volunteer work, services between friends for no payment, work done in such low quality that it merits virtually no payment or even payment of damages, and so on. These troubles are already solved by distributing power, rather than Wealth. Indeed on third thought it seems that this article distributes *wealth* (or triesto), which is contrary to the philosophy of this system, which is to distribute *power*.

The other labor protections do seem worthwhile, for example if conditions for a certain work are unsafe, then the company or employer has an interest in deceiving a new employee about these dangers. Then when the employee becomes sick or permanently damaged, the costs will have to be shouldered by the public, while the deceiver walks away with the profit. It is not easy for a random employee to judge the dangers in some kind of specialist job, or the exact circumstances that exist in a new company. Furthermore this is probably not so difficult to police, because when there are accidents the one hurt has a reason to complain (alert the police), and the situation can be addressed. If the standards are not overly chocking but more in line with common sense and what is reasonable, then there should not be a problem. It could however be argued that these laws are also better off as regular laws. Then again to establish the absolute minimum of worker safety law, such as establishing a reasonable responsibility for those who know for those who do not yet know the dangers, would already satisfy this Constitutional requirement. After all, we all know what has happened in the past with abusing the labor force, which is an ongoing problem in the world. Similar arguments are the case for the other safety articles.

Personal note: I consider having added the minimum wage as a mistake, already before mentioned as such. The way of re-interpreting minimum wage law as a way of hurting dictatorial businesses, is also tenuous, and is a bit mean spirited toward such businesses. It is also a little bit of an unfair reading of the literal wording of the law, which is not a good thing to start from when proposing a Constitution.

This law read originally as follows:

6.4.a-1 Minimum wage

The Government establishes a minimum wage, expressed relative to the average income.

There is still a minor issue that could be resolved for people who do not own land in the nation: underaged, children and immigrants. The technical protection by which a minimum wage is not necessary, is after all their share of resources. What if they do not have it, does the system revert to wild capitalism again in which protections are needed? You could argue however that immigrants will have to prove themselves working, while children are protected by their land owning parents and also have to prove themselves working. If the bulk of the economy is free and people in general have options, wages in general will have to be higher, and this positively affects the labor market for people without land as well.

Last changes:

Fri Jan 9 10:20:21 UTC 2015

Amendment 23 Minimum Wage Removed

Wed Dec 10 10:09:15 UTC 2014

Amendment 17 RETRACTED AMENDMENT

Fri Oct 31 10:13:30 UTC 2014

Amendment 22, Referendum Representative weighted (...)

4. Maximum company size, expanded amendment reasoning

general, and also the way Sovereign Countries in principle ought to deal with each other (as opposed to subjugating themselves under an third power.)

{Integrated in above Constitution: your job ?}

Lucky you: Sun Jan 11 10:03:39 UTC 2015, undersigned is having to do it for you. The minimum-wage law was scratched by amendment, but also scratched from the other smaller versions. This brings the article to 238 in the '239' model, which is getting messy and hence this law is put in the 239-law Constitution. A second reason is that this law should have been there from the start. This principle of limiting company size was even mentioned before the 239-law Constitution was developed. It is an important issue for the economy, similar to the wealth maximum and nation-size limitations, with similarities to soil distribution. It is no accident that this is the first amendment, and has been the reason to start the amendment series.

It brings confidence to the society, knowing that there is a clear upper limit so that society will not again be destroyed by the super-large companies. The measure is hardly a radical leftist idea, but puts teeth into the principle that even Adam Smith has mentioned about the dangers of cartels and monopolies. Notice how you will likely see conglomerates emerging anyway, consisting of multiple such companies working very closely together. However the Conglomerate will be broken to a degree, by the democratization law: the workers in one of the companies will eventually take control there, and when the time comes they will choose their own self interest. It is also not necessarily a problem if companies work very closely together, except when control is held by a tiny clique.

Here a worst case theoretical scenario of a 2 000 person limit: /post/005/DV_coops/2000_size_simulation.html The following law is proposed in the Anti-monopoly article: **6.5.a-3 Maximum Company Size** It is a useful addition, because there can be a complicated factory production process requiring tens of thousands of workers, who could just manage it all in a setup of multiple 1000 to 2000 person businesses.

There could be a single 1500 person business, who produces for international markets with heavy competition for far away, producing expensive goods for which the transport cost is small. Mining is sometimes such a type of business, which is concentrated in one place due to circumstances. Such businesses do not necessarily constitute a monopoly, even when they are the only production facility of the kind around. For such businesses this size limit can sometimes be a hindrance. Screwing it too low could at some point make it intolerable.

However there could be rural villages of merely a few thousand inhabitants, in a wider network of such villages, where if one business contained 2 000 persons it would already become a totalitarian plan economy. To have a hard limit on size gives clarity, and does not allow the politicians to ruin the system because of their "wisdom." At the same time a hard limit is not enough of a solution, hence the other two articles are necessary. Because the situation is difficult to predict, and hard to put in short Constitutional law, only a responsibility is created for the law maker, to maintain the free markets and do something against the threat of monopolies. This establishes the markets to a degree as a field of crops that a farmer is responsible for to keep it healthy, rather than a wilderness where the biggest group is allowed to dominate all others, and seen as therefore the winner who takes all.

{Integrated in above Constitution: yes }

5. Amendment 17 Retracted

(Note for the casual reader: the Death Penalty was already forbidden in this Constitution; this Amendment was only an allowance for under conditions of (civil)war. This allowance is being retracted also.)

Amendment 17: toc

This Amendment 17 (Death Penalty) is retracted

Although this amendment (see below) was inspired by practical reality of a civil war that was ongoing, and statements by those waging it, on second thought this does not seem to be a worthy addition to this Constitution. It should be possible to detain people. When it occurs in large numbers, they are prisoners of war and not to be executed anyway. Criminals can likewise still be imprisoned, since the war probably needs to be capable of large scale imprisonment. If it is not capable of large scale imprisonment, it may still be capable of small scale imprisonment, which is for example for crimes such as this Death Penalty article would be for. If it is not capable even of small scale imprisonment, then perhaps it can not win in any case.

It may be the case that the Constitution can be dishonored if it doesn't work during a civil war, but the risk of it being dishonored by people using or abusing this Death Penalty article are even greater. It also does go against the article on Harm, and the basic principle behind it. Giving a group the power of the Death Penalty makes the situation more menacing and less likely to be resolved peacefully at some point in the future. It gives a platform to people who argue for the execution of prisoners, which will harden both sides against each other if it were to occur. It is also a personal burden on the home front if it is engaging in the Death Penalty, that can lead to sadness and demoralization. If the home front just imprisons everyone and not kills when killing is not absolutely necessary when an enemy is assaulting with murderous force, and people know that all prisoners of war and even captured alive criminals are still alive and awaiting some sort of resolution of their situation (but not their execution), then this is likely to bolster their confidence in the situation, and their faith in the fact that they are fighting for a just cause ~ and have not done more harm than was absolutely necessary in the face of being murdered (injustly) directly at that point of combat.

So behaving, without the Death Penalty, will also give the home front a propaganda advantage against the other side, and is likely to inspire confidence in those who are on the fence. Because on what side of the fence does one want to be: where they do not murder people whom they have in their power, or where they do? The case is easy. (The original amendment 17 is left in the document (below), because having made it and then retracted it makes the case even stronger against it. Date: 10 December 2014, some 3 and a half months after making Amendment 17. This is the usual way this Constitution is written: adding, changing and/or removing.)

~~--- Death Penalty ---~~

This Amendment 17 (Death Penalty) is retracted

~~Common Militia: Death Penalty~~

~~When it is necessary to effectuate the Death Penalty during a period of war, the Representative Government or the closest thing thereto that can be achieved - that is loyal to the people and represents the general will - must be asked to create a law for it.~~

~~There must be actual fighting between units of a size at least as large as mentioned under article 'Common Militia: General, Minimum armed size.'~~

~~Reasoning. There are articles in the Constitution that prohibit the death penalty. 2.1.a No Harm Since a (civil) war to establish the minimum political freedoms for justice and life to flourish will tend to imply mortal combat, an article creating a defined allowance for the Death Penalty seems to not be out of place.~~

~~(. . .)~~

~~prisoners of war well. Keep in mind that any excessive bloodshed in service to this Constitution, is doing it a disservice in the long term, because it dishonors it. The peaceful methods of this overall system are quite strong, try to stretch those methods to the breaking point and beyond first, perhaps even twice or three times, before thinking of the most horrible thing that exists: war.~~

{ Integrated in above Constitution: RETRACTED }

This Amendment 17 (Death Penalty) is retracted