

THREE ECONOMIC-SOCIAL SYSTEMS AND FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Algis Mickunas

E-mail: amuali@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1601-8331>

Affiliation: Vilnius Gediminas Technical
University, Lithuania

ROR: <https://ror.org/02x3e4q36>

Tomas Kacerauskas

E-mail: tomas.kacerauskas@vilniustech.lt

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2761-5913>

Affiliation: Vilnius Gediminas Technical
University, Lithuania

ROR: <https://ror.org/02x3e4q36>

Annotation. The paper deals with the interconnection between economic wealth, the socio-economic system, and freedom of speech. The different socio-economic systems, including plutocracy, autocracy, and democracy, are investigated. Three theses are developed as follows. 1. Only democracy ensures both freedom of speech and economic well-being. 2. Plutocratic orientation toward wealth does not ensure social well-being if it does not play in concert with freedom of speech. 3. Despite promoting some philosophers (such as Plato), the aristocratic state order cannot ensure social well-being because of restrictions on freedom of speech and tends to totalitarianism. The methods of classification, comparison, and philosophical reflection are used. The findings are as follows. The comparison of three politico-economic systems shows interconnections between political order, freedom of speech and actions, and economic development. Although plutocracy is oriented toward economic profit and prosperity, it has no public arena for public issues in an open dialogue, and the economy works for the few winners. In autocracy, both political rights and freedom of speech are restricted. Only economic freedom is allowed if it does not contradict the ruler's pronouncements. Finally, this system works again in economic prosperity. There is a correlation between democracy, freedom of speech, and well-being. Finally, this system leads to economic prosperity. However, democracy is inseparable from public debates and discussions that make society stronger and wiser.

Keywords: economic system, wealth, freedom of speech, democracy.

JEL classification: A10, A12.

Introduction

State of affairs, aim and originality. During the ages, we face different political, social, and economic orders. In antiquity, Plato (2016) and Aristotle (2000) describe several pole-states organised differently. Usually, a freer society also presupposes more free economic relations and freedom of speech. Moreover, vice versa, the freedom of speech leads to a more or less democratic society with free actions, including economic ones. In the contemporary world, we face a similar situation. Even

in terms of democracy, we have different variations of freedom of speech in concert with freedom of economic actions.

Table 1. Definitions of Well-Being Concepts

Field	Description	Source
Philosophy	Values-related being based on general justice and human flourishing	Hart, 2009; Symons and Vanderweele, 2024; Kobayashi 2022
Sociology	Dignified life in the community	Nobre, 2019
Politics	Encouraging political environment	Ingle, 2021; Kobayashi, 2022
Education	Success in a personal project	Bedford-Petersen <i>et al.</i> , 2019
Law	Legal environment, distributive justice, and citizenship	Braun <i>et al.</i> , 2022; Kobayashi, 2022
Psychology	Happiness-related being	Intelisano <i>et al.</i> , 2020
	Non-conflicting values	De Young and Tiberius, 2023
Medicine	Health-related being	Yarcheski <i>et al.</i> , 2004; Bloodworth and McNamee, 2007
Biology	Coexistence with animals	Bruckner, 2019
Ecology	Harmony with the environment	Ingle, 2021
Economy	Economic welfare	Martins, 2006

Source: created by the authors.

Scholars analyse the relationship between the economic system and freedom of speech from different perspectives. Charemza et al. (2023) investigate the relationship between economic policy and press freedom in countries with different degrees of speech freedom. Cely (2022) analyses the correlation between economic growth in the digital environment and the freedom of speech, having in mind the copyrights. Charney (2021) presents three conceptions of media pluralism, including the democratic, the liberal, and the critical conception, and their impact on the economic transformation of a democratic society. Seyidov (2020) pays attention to the role of the media in economic transformations, as well as the fragile condition of freedom of speech and independent media in post-Soviet countries. McCann et al. (2020) show autocratic tendencies in concert with marketisation in the management of U.S. universities. Using the case of Hong Kong, Lui (2020) analyses the relationship between the socio-economic system, well-being, and freedom of speech. Analysing the case of private online platforms, Klonick (2018) investigates the correlation between free speech, the responsibility of corporations, and the economic environment. Berggren and Nilsson (2016) analyse the impact of economic policy on economic freedom and tolerance in such market-oriented countries as the United States. Bauer and Obar (2014) show the relationship between freedom of speech, investment, innovation, and political participation.

Table 1 shows the concepts of well-being in different fields, including philosophy, sociology, politics, education, law, economy, psychology, medicine, biology, and ecology. As a result, the concept of well-being is not only an economic term. On the one hand, it shows the multiple nature of the phenomenon. On the other hand, it shows no economic background or economic life. If so, is the key to economic problems beyond economics? Should we improve our lives first from social, political, psychological, legal, ecological, and medical points of view before economic ones? Moreover, vice

versa, does it put into the shade other essential aspects of our life that focus only on economic prosperity? We shall have in mind these research questions in our paper.

Table 1 includes relevant sources, primarily the recent articles in the Web of Science journals. However, they also presuppose classical philosophical sources dealing with the mentioned questions. For instance, the socio-political being based on the idea of justice and human flourishing was analysed by Plato (2016), Aristotle (2000), Saint Augustine (2003), and other philosophers. The aspects of education were analysed by different scholars during the ages (Plato, 2016; Aristotle, 2000; Kant, 2003, among others). Since antiquity, various issues of happiness including *harmonia* (Plato, 2017; Aristotle, 2017), *eudaimonia* (Plato, 2016; Aristotle, 2011), *hēdonē* (Epicurus, 1994), and *makarioi* (Aristotle, 2011) have been studied by different philosophers.

Hypotheses are presented as follows. 1. Only democracy ensures both freedom of speech and economic well-being. 2. Plutocratic orientation toward wealth does not ensure social well-being if it does not play in concert with freedom of speech. 3. Despite promoting by some philosophers (such as Plato), the aristocratic state order cannot ensure social well-being because of restrictions on freedom of speech and tends to totalitarianism.

Methodology. Methods of classification, comparison, and philosophical reflection are applied.

Structure. The paper consists of three parts, each dealing with different economic-social systems and freedom of speech within it.

1. Plutocracy: More Money

It is usually assumed that life is one's time. How we spend our time is how we fulfil our lives. This broad conception is reduced by modern capitalism to one claim: time is money. Money is a means to make more money, and the more means one acquires, the more money one can make: no other reason to live, even if some psychological invention might be used to "justify" such continuous accumulation, such as power. The latter also becomes a means to make more money. There is a background for this drive, which, for modern thinking, assumes that everyone is an enemy of everyone. Those with greater economic power will make sure that the public rules will favour them, while the less "fortunate" will have to organise themselves against the "powerful" in order to fight for their survival. Even the less fortunate individual is exposed to competition for survival with his peers in the economic arena: while he is independent, he is also completely insignificant. Being released from feudal bondage, he is given one "property" as his first possession: his body. As an owner of this property, he can sell it to any enterprise as a "labour power". In this domain, he is "free" to make contracts for such power for a price and is exposed to competition with others who might sell their labour power for a lower price. And this constitutes the arena of war of all against all. Each still has the freedom of speech and expression, but they are reduced to and compelled by interests for survival.

It should be noted that in this striving for profit, there are no laws, ethics, murder, or "rights" apart from winning at any price. If one can eliminate competition and take over someone's wealth, then one is a winner. The "law" is that even the winner must strive to win more since someone else might gain an advantage and become a winner. Winning also means using others for work – after all, the capitalist is not the one who works for himself but makes others work for him at minimal expenditure. The latter means minimal pay and minimal security. If the workplace is unsafe – a mine – then the only

question is whether making it safe will be more profitable; if not, the injured worker can be replaced by another.

While competing, the highest winners are also the rulers of society. Most certainly, they will be owners of the press not as a challenge to the rulers but as an advertisement of their interests, including those of the media owners. "Freedom of speech" means competing against other media for the quantity of circulation and printing "what sells". Here, we encounter gossip, sports, and weather, but there are no such things as questions about what is "good" for society or debates about laws, rights, equality, freedoms, or responsibility. There is no debate since there is no public arena where citizens come to decide public issues in open dialogue. Even if some mass media begin to talk about rights, equality, and safety, they do so not because their talk is designed to promote such rights but as a ploy to sell more newspapers. Moreover, such media is in danger of losing support from advertisers, and hence, the talk of rights will not be identical to public dialogue. In addition, the winners who rule over everything are not citizens of a political society with rights, duties, and responsibilities to the citizens – the latter is the "labour force" to be bought any place in the world for a lower price. For the winners, there is no allegiance to a country. The masses of the poor are a good source of cheap and dispensable labour power, and people with low incomes are found everywhere: colonialism. Since everyone must struggle against all others, no one can be accused of exploiting others, robbing or selling fake medicine; those who fail are the losers in the battle for survival: dog-eat-dog. The poor are there because they failed in the war against others.

No doubt, the masses of the poor posed a question of how to improve their lot. While answers can be most diverse, one standard solution was (and at times still is) that the poor are at fault for their condition. They are by nature lazy, unable to control their desires and tend to produce large families, which increases the pool of the poor and also creates an advantage for the rich as extra labour power competing for wages and thus diminishing their income. One added justification for their poverty was religious, in the form of predestination. The creator of humanity has decided that some persons are destined to go to paradise, and others are doomed to hell. The sign as to who will enter the kingdom of heaven is wealth – a blessing from heaven. Being poor is a sign that a person is not being blessed and thus is destined to eternal fire. In short, there is nothing one can do to help the poor because the creator himself has condemned them to poverty. While voices were calling for improvement of the conditions of the poor, such voices were also proposing that suffering in this world is a sign of rewards in paradise. "Blessed are the poor..." The press is not in the hands of the poor and cannot defend the labour-power. If everything is premised on acquiring wealth, then even the "free press" is not free but must compete for survival in the "market of ideas". Print what the economic powers want to read.

2. Autocracy: Spread of Territory and Finances

Initial autocracy emerges when a group of well-armed marauders find an opportunity to take over a territory and subject the inhabitants to servitude. The inhabitants and their land become the "property" of this group, usually with a strong leader who becomes the "king" or, upon expansion of the territory, an "emperor". He rules by military power and depends on various followers and their talents to manage the power position of the ruler. In brief, autocracy usually arises, which is legitimated by elevating the autocrat to a supreme being or being a representative of such a being. He has the divine right of kings, or himself become divine – king of kings or god of gods. Yet those who serve him or are

members of his family, also want to become rulers; the result is a constant “palace” intrigue among the family members and even the “higher” officials in the service of the ruler. Here, the higher officers, who are closest to the ruler, could be trusted the least since they knew the ruler’s weaknesses and resources. They are, therefore, always on the lookout for mobility and are constantly exposed to royal disfavour. The ministers who served the ruler had to demonstrate their efficiency and, at the same time, secure their position against the ruler they served. Thus, if the Defence minister is to maintain his position, there must be spies everywhere, as well as some support for the ruler’s opposition. In other words, there must be enemies if there is to be the power of the police, and even if the enemies win, one should not expect the result to be anything else but another despotic ruler favouring his clan – for the moment. These struggles and even murders are known as intrigues of the palace and the royal court. Every member of the ruling family is watching for the opportunity to become the sole ruler by any means.

If one reads the biographies of the Roman emperors or the accounts of ancient Persia, Muslim records of the caliphates at Baghdad and Cairo, and the histories of the Ottoman power, one concludes that power, for its own sake, has this logic. Everyone is always endangered, exposed to expected, although unsuspected, attacks, even when one is armed to the teeth: fratricide, poison, and the dagger comprise the order of social power. In principle, the media are what the ruler and his officials say to maintain their power. The edicts are pronounced not for debate but for submission. Every “royal” pronouncement is equivalent to law. However, other opportunists are waiting for a chance to overthrow the ruling house and become the sole owners of the empire. The opportunist, not made secure in his position by any tradition, must accumulate some signs of his prestige and standing. Such an accumulation requires not only plundering the population but a warlike attitude against all. Since the opportunist acquired power through cunning and the use of any possible means, he is fully aware that others like him regard his position as “fair game” and attainable by the same cunning and devious means. Hence, ruthless power struggles and constant changes of such rulers emerge. The only relationship that the latter have to their populations is that of extreme exploitation to acquire all that one can get to maintain power against other opportunists and, in a more or less certain probability of losing power, to be able to escape with a sufficient fortune to some remote corner for some comfortable years. According to these arguments, the opportunist must strike at a moment’s notice since he has nothing to start with and nothing to lose. His only way is “up” at any cost. The depictions above were required for the understanding of the modern empire of Russian communism.

We come to the Russian and Byzantine empires, which were purely autocratic, where the head of the empire was also the head of the church. In brief, when he speaks – God speaks. As just mentioned, his pronouncements are the law, and any other media allowed to have a voice (newspapers, printed materials, or speeches) that might contest the pronouncements of the Tsar are immediately closed, and the “journalists” or even book printers and writers, eliminated or banished. The Tsar was also the head of a family and a ruler of aristocracy; the latter swore allegiance to the Tsar, and he appointed them to serve in various posts of the state. Some are charged to ensure that any printed materials serve the purposes of the emperor and the empire. As in all autocracies, those closest to the emperor were most dangerous – they knew the weaknesses of their Lord. Besides, as in all autocratic empires, there were family murders and ascent to the throne by another family member – it was simply a

tradition. The emperor spread his power and territory as much as his finances and cunning could bear. After all, the Russian empire expanded both east and west (incorporating the Baltic States).

All is well, but the Tsar should have studied the traditional royal houses and the ways of opportunists. They came until Lenin concentrated them under his domination and total discipline, allowing him to overthrow the Tsar, his family, and aristocracy and become an autocrat of the same empire. The first task is to eliminate all the vestiges of claims to the throne by the old aristocracy, by the educated, the talented, the productive, and hand the reins of power to the dull, illiterate and allow them the pretence that they are “the people” in whose name the new autocracy is empowered to be masters and lords over everything. As a dictator, Lenin and his cohorts appropriated all the wealth of the entire empire, subjected the population to total control by his opportunists, creating a system of suspicion where everyone might be a spy for the new autocracy. The so-called “collectivisation” for economic equality and benefit was a veil; in reality, collectivisation was the best means to herd the “people” (those who survived mass murder) so they could be watched, controlled, punished, and become completely subservient and docile. There was no Russian revolution: in principle, a traditional autocracy was overthrown by opportunistic autocracy without any essential changes for the population. The opportunistic autocracy was more ruthless and arbitrary.

A brief reminder of the ways an opportunist functions in relationship to his gang of supporters and conspirators. Beginning with Lenin, any of his supporters who showed any deviation from his momentary edicts as a challenge to his authority were eliminated – the case is with the sailors who won military battles for Lenin and who requested participation in public decisions were destroyed – as were millions of peasants. After Lenin’s death, Stalin had trials to condemn just about all the leading party members for “betrayal” and, of course, as a possible threat to his total rule. Poor Trotsky, who escaped to Mexico, could not avoid Stalin’s axe. After all, Trotsky was one of the leading members of the party and thus a threat to Stalin. Hitler and his “party” were extremely adept at finding opportunities to take over Germany and then destroy all “enemies” internal and external. In the Russian Empire (Soviet Union) and Germany (The Third Reich), there were purges and elimination of any sign, which would threaten the “leader” and his absolute power. There is no need to go into the cunning of forming “alliances” or even treatises as somehow valid; valid yes – for momentary convenience to lull the “enemies”.

Autocracies usually allied with and supported by the theocratic elite, have one basic enemy: free thinking and its propagation through various social means, specifically education and the press. These two are the “enemies of the people” and must be suppressed and controlled. This means that education must serve the preservation of the autocratic position, and the press must print views which extol the great deeds of the leader and his followers. What is printed in such media is not propaganda or manipulation but a simple “truth” pronounced by the power needs of the ruling elite. After all, propaganda would mean that the population has access to the facts, but in autocracy and theocracy, there is no alternative; the only facts are what the autocratic rulers say. For example, in Soviet Russia, the annual production of commodities was identical to what the rulers claimed and printed. The superiority of Soviet Russia was “obvious” from the mass media depiction of the “decadent” West, where the exploited workers lived in extreme poverty and under police brutality. Any stirring by some members of this autocratic world was immediately explained and denounced by the press. The local “revisionists” or the remnants of the “bourgeoisie” had a “false” view and had to

be eliminated as the enemies of the people. As the saying goes, a surviving remnant of the enemy is like a remnant of smouldering fire or unpaid debt; all are bound to increase with time. Hence, the best policy is total annihilation. This includes “inconvenient” party operatives, generals, and trusted officials of one's group. Spies, revisionists, wrong thinking, remnants of the past are everywhere, and thus, there must be the power of the police, secret monitoring of the entire population, and above all, an indoctrination of the public by a vast mass media which includes “correct” education. It is no wonder that the Soviet autocracy closed all borders so that the citizens would not be able to travel and get “corrupted” by the decadent and “false” way of life of other nations.

3. Democracy: Public Space for Participation

In the depiction of autocratic society, it was mentioned that the justification of one group (even one person) possessing an empire was always accompanied by some form of “legitimation” – usually under the guise of “divine rights of kings”, where the head of the state is also the head of the church or, finally, legitimation by secularised theology such as “dialectical reason” used by Marxists: the fallen man moving toward a redemption in a utopian paradise, led by infallible elite. Democracy was born in principle with the challenge of mythological Greek “theology” and autocracy. In Greek mythology, humans are depicted as being dominated by divine forces. Since the forces are at odds with each other, humans become “playthings” of such forces, and such play is tragic: the divinities demand a blood vengeance for any spilt blood. Tragedy, as a battle between divinities, cannot be resolved by such divinities. Each is omniscient and omnipotent, and humans must obey their demands for vengeance. The law of blood vengeance, whether demanded by Mother Earth or the will and honour of the sky god, became helpless in solving this human problem and thus must surrender its unworkable and destructive solution.

The solution is the creation of a public domain, a *polis*, where every decision concerning important matters *res publicum*, matters of the public, will be decided by a gathering of social members for a common dialogue. The reason for such a dialogue is the recognition that humans are essentially fallible. This open public space for the participation of every citizen in discussion, debate, and contestation of every issue, including the proposals by any thinker to be considered for validity, is essential for preventing anyone from claiming to be the final truth. The latter must be articulated for its validity and veracity. This open domain, the polis, is to be maintained as the dialogical arena insofar as we accept human fallibility, and responsibility for every statement and fully understand that if mistaken, we are duty-bound to correct our mistakes in dialogue with others. This is also the essence of philosophy – open to exploration and daring to speak unconditionally – without any pressures from interests or psychological whims, and thus accept the very notion that what is said is free, responsible, and even limited. Democracy, in this sense, is an arena of free pursuit of truth, thus identical to philosophy. It should be immediately obvious that the notion of philosophy is not some singular position, but a constant quest and contestation – even of one's claims. No dogmas are left unexamined, and no proclamations by some shaman, inspired by his divinity, can become the ruling dogma of the polis. The Greeks built images of their divinities not so much as to worship them, but as a reminder that if they call divinities to rule their society, tragedy will follow. This open world is also identical to free speech and freedom to speak about any subject matter by the use of any media, from theatre to propagating theories in education.

Apart from separating administrative, legislative, and judicial powers, this society distinguishes between public and private domains. Yet, what is public and private is based on public decisions. Thus, we have a “political economy” in which economic activities can be designated as private, while activities such as education can be allotted to the public. Obviously, the line is not strict, and a new line can be drawn. If some private economic activity becomes harmful, the public can establish a rule prohibiting such activity. The free press is designed to monitor the public domain and the activities of those who are selected to run public affairs. During a selection process, persons offer to serve in the public arena as managers, judges, and legislators and offer their views on various issues. Those who get elected have agreed to carry out their views in public and thus formed a “covenant” with the public. They become public servants, and their duty is to adhere to the covenant.

In a political, herewith democratic, and public society, the press has a duty to report various events as they occur. One may argue that reporting events without some interpretive mediation is impossible, specifically due to the numerous ideological prejudgments or traditional prejudices. The public dialogue is a process of permanent self-maintenance of democracy and requires an informed public; the latter can act responsibly and freely if it is well-informed.

We have argued that in a political society, there is a separation of the public and the private, such that laws are established that allow various activities to be private, such as economic, religious, or artistic (literature, architecture, etc.). One glaring way that the private domain enters the public is the demand by the public for the “creation of jobs”. This would seem ridiculous: after all, the elected officials are not owners of the means of production and cannot offer any jobs. Yet any campaign by any political party or ideology focuses attention on how it can create jobs for the private needs of the population. If the jobs are not created, then the public officials have no legitimacy to be in power and must be replaced by others who will create jobs.

This context presents a problem for a free press and its role in informing the public as to its private needs and their fulfilment. In brief, which political ideology must be extolled as the most capable of fulfilling the private “needs” of a specific segment of society? The issue is not the much-lauded post-truth, post-democracy, post-communication, but multi-ideological promises of the fulfilment of private wants by the public. This means which private enterprises are to be supported and what sort of technical training must be promoted in public educational institutions for the needs of such enterprises – good and profitable jobs. The public education of an autonomous citizen participating in the public arena is closed, and any “participation” is a demand for private fulfilment and security. Mass media is an arena of selecting ideological sides in which one can do a better job in the privatised public arena.

No one can force a person to be an autonomous, responsible and equal participant in the public domain and thus possess universal human rights. What is at issue is the establishment of these conditions wherein if we want to have human rights, then we should treat ourselves and others in terms of such conditions.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Results

In a plutocracy, freedom of speech is used to compete against other media for profit. Here we do not encounter ethical questions or debate about laws, rights, equality, freedoms, or responsibility. Plutocracy has no public arena for public issues in an open dialogue. It is the economy for the few winners, which must grow to keep making more profit.

In autocracy, the media belongs to the ruler and his officials to maintain their power. The edicts instead of laws are pronounced not for debate but for submission. On the one hand, there is no actual law since it does not presuppose any public discussions and compromises. On the other, every “royal” pronouncement is equivalent to the law because of its mandatory nature. In this system, the ruler spreads his power and territory as much as his finances and cunning could bear.

In a democracy, humans are free if they develop being together in an adequate way and become zoon politicians. In this case, the power of rulers and other justifications for violence are rejected, and all concerns become a subject matter of open public discussion and adjudication. Classical democracy presupposes egalitarianism since a free life for any person requires strict adherence to the law, and any issue is to be decided by the majority vote. As a result, the freedom is inseparable from the commitment to the law. This condition circumscribes and determines any human activity including economic. On the one hand, the press is free to report and to inform; on the other, participants of the press are obliged to defend the public arena, including the free market, wherein uncompelled and open debates are carried out.

4.2. Discussion

Instead of the three economic-social orders investigated in the paper, we could analyse them more. For instance, Plato's (2016) classification covers at least five systems, including aristocracy, timocracy, oligarchy, democracy, and tyranny. On the other hand, many scholars follow Karl Marx (2010) and apply the dichotomy of capitalism and socialism. Another dichotomy is democracy and totalitarianism. According to this dichotomy, only a minority of states around the world are democratic, while the majority of them are totalitarian. However, the biggest financial resources (as well as well-being) are concentrated, namely in the democratic states. Even in the case of democracy, we do not have one model. We face the democracy of two main political parties (in the USA) and of many parties (in the EU). Besides, there is a combination of democracy and kingdom (UK, Denmark, Sweden among others). Even speaking of democratic countries, we have different degrees of freedom of speech.

However, the questions arise as follows. Is economic welfare the main purpose of the governments in states with different economic systems? What reflects the gross domestic product if the social exclusion is high? Does the richness of some people necessarily presuppose the poverty of other people? Does the primacy of social welfare not lead to autocracy? Does and how does democracy with the freedom of speech limit the pursuit of wealth at all costs, instrumental approach, and even crimes? Does freedom of speech exist, and how is it used against public welfare?

Conclusions

The comparison of three politico-economic systems shows interconnections between political order, freedom of speech and actions, and economic development. Although plutocracy is oriented to economic profit and prosperity and freedom of speech is not denied, it has no public arena for public issues in an open dialogue, and the economy works for the few winners, which are making more and more profit. In autocracy, both political rights and freedom of speech are limited. Only economic freedom is real if it does not contradict to ruler's pronouncements. In this system, any media allowed to have a voice that might contest the pronouncements of the ruler is immediately closed, and the "journalists" or even book printers and writers are eliminated or banished. Finally, this system works against economic prosperity. Despite the differences and not the homogeneous character of democracy, there is a correlation between democracy, freedom of speech, and well-being. In democracy, public being with freedoms and responsibilities was a catalyst to establish a public court, involving the public appointment of trusted citizens. Finally, this system leads to economic prosperity. However, democracy is inseparable from public debates, discussions and even "wars".

Literature

- Aristotle. (2017), *On the soul*, Oxford, At the Clarendon Press.
- Aristotle. (2011), *Nicomachean ethics*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Aristotle. (2000), *Politics*, Mineola, New York: Dover Publications.
- Augustine, St. (2003), *The city of God*, London: Penguin Classics.
- Bauer, J.M., Obar, J.A. (2014), "Reconciling political and economic goals in the net neutrality debate", *Information Society*, Vol. 30, No 1, pp.1-19, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01972243.2013.856362>.
- Bedford-Petersen, C., De Young, C.G., Tiberius, V., Syed, M. (2019), "Integrating philosophical and psychological approaches to well-being: The role of success in personal projects", *Journal of Moral Education*, Vol. 48, No 1, pp.84-97, <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2018.1463203>.
- Berggren, N., Nilsson, T. (2016), "Tolerance in the United States: Does economic freedom transform racial, religious, political and sexual attitudes?", *European Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 45, Supplement, pp.53-70, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2016.06.001>.
- Bloodworth, A., McNamee, M. (2007), "Conceptions of well-being in psychology and exercise psychology research: A philosophical critique", *Health Care Analysis*, Vol. 15, No 2, pp.107-121, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10728-007-0048-6>.
- Braun, E., Gather, J., Henking, T., Vollmann, J., Scholten, M. (2022), "The understanding of well-being in German guardianship law – an analysis on the occasion of the term's removal from the reformed law", *Ethik in der Medizin*, Vol. 34, No 4, pp.515-528.
- Bruckner, D.W. (2019), "Philosophy and animal welfare science", *Philosophy Compass*, Vol. 14, No 10, e12626, <https://doi.org/10.1111/phc3.12626>.
- Cely, A.M.P. (2022), "Impacts of indirect liability regulation of intermediaries in copyright-infringing content on the internet", *Revista la Propiedad Inmaterial*, Vol. 33, pp.169-203, <https://doi.org/10.18601/16571959.n33.07>.

- Charemza, W., Makarova, S., Rybinski, K. (2023), "Anti-pandemic restrictions, uncertainty and sentiment in seven countries", *Economic Change and Restructuring*, Vol. 56, No 1, pp.1-27, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10644-022-09447-8>.
- Charney, J. (2021), "Three conceptions of media pluralism", *Revista Chilena de Derecho y Tecnologia*, Vol. 10, No 2, pp.69-102, <https://doi.org/10.1080/17577632.2024.2305419>.
- De Young, C.G., Tiberius, V. (2023), "Value fulfillment from a cybernetic perspective: A new psychological theory of well-being", *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, Vol. 27, No 1, pp.3-27, <https://doi.org/10.1177/10888683221083777>.
- Epicurus (1994), *The Epicurus reader. Selected writings and testimonia*, Indianapolis: Hackett.
- Hart, C.S. (2009), "Quo vadis? The capability space and new directions for the philosophy of educational research", *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, Vol. 28, No 5, pp.391-402, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-009-9128-4>.
- Ingle, M. (2021), "Western individualism and psychotherapy: Exploring the edges of ecological being", *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, Vol. 61, No 6, pp.925-938, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022167818817181>.
- Intelisano, S., Krasko, J., Luhmann, M. (2020), „Integrating philosophical and psychological accounts of happiness and well-being", *Journal of Happiness Studies*, Vol. 21, No 1, pp.161-200, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-019-00078-x>
- Kant, I. (2003), *On education*. Trans. A. Churton. New York: Dover Books.
- Kobayashi, M. (2022), "Psychological examination of political philosophies: Interrelationship among citizenship, justice, and well-being in Japan", *Frontiers in Psychology*, Vol. 12, 790671, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.790671>.
- Klonick, K. (2018), "The new governors: The people, rules, and processes governing online speech", *Harvard Law Review*, Vol. 131, No 6, pp.598-670.
- Malthus, T. (2023), *An essay principle on the of population*, Zinc Read.
- Marx, K. (2010), *Capital: A critique of political economy*, New York: Pacific Publishing Studio.
- Martins, N. (2006), "Capabilities as causal powers", *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, Vol. 30, No 5, pp.671-685, <https://doi.org/10.1093/cje/bel012>.
- McCann, L., Granter, E., Hyde, P., Aroles, J. (2020), ""Upon the gears and upon the wheels": Terror convergence and total administration in the neoliberal university", *Management Learning*, Vol. 51, No 4, pp.431-451, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507620924162>.
- Nobre, J.A. (2019), "Theology, ethics and society: reflections on the well-living from the philosophical-theological anthropology of Paul Ricoeur", *Revista Pistis & Praxis-teologia e Pastoral*, Vol. 11, No 1, pp.251-269.
- Plato (2017), *Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo*, Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Plato (2016), *The republic*, California: Enhanced Media Publishing.
- Seyidov, I. (2020), "As quiet as a mouse': Media use in Azerbaijan", *Communications –European Journal of Communication Research*, Vol. 45, No 893-911, <https://doi.org/10.1515/commun-2020-0021>.

Symons, X., Vanderweele, T. (2024), "Aristotelian flourishing and contemporary philosophical theories of wellbeing", *Journal of Happiness Studies*, Vol. 25, No 1-2, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-024-00723-0>.

Lui, T.L. (2020), "The unfinished chapter of Hong Kong's long political transition", *Critique of Anthropology*, Vol. 40, No 2, pp.270-276, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308275X20908>.

Mandeville, B. (1989), *The fable of the bees: Or private vices, public benefits*, London: Penguin Classics.

Yarcheski, A., Mahon, N.E., Yarcheski, T.J. (2004), "Health and well-being in early adolescents using Rogers' science of unitary human beings", *Nursing Science Quarterly*, Vol. 17, No 1, pp.72-77, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894318403260473>.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the Center of Excellence project "Civil Engineering Research Centre" (Grant No. S-A-UEI-23-5).

RINKOS EKONOMIKA SEKA IŠ ŽODŽIO LAISVĖS AR ATVIRKŠČIAI?

Algis Mickūnas, Tomas Kačerauskas

Santrauka. Straipsnyje nagrinėjamos ekonominės gerovės, socioekonominės sistemos ir žodžio laisvės sąsajos. Tiriamos įvairios ekonominės ir socialinės sistemos, įtraukiant plutokratiją, autokratiją ir demokratiją. Iškeliama trys tezės. 1) Vien demokratija užtikrina tiek žodžio laisvę, tiek ekonominę gerovę. 2) Plutokratinė orientacija į turtus neužtikrina socialinės gerovės, jei ji nedera su žodžio laisve. 3) Nepaisant kai kurių filosofų (pvz., Platono) nuostatos, aristokratinė valstybės santvarka negali užtikrinti socialinės gerovės dėl žodžio laisvės apribojimų ir yra linkusi į totalitarizmą. Taikomi klasifikavimo, palyginimo ir filosofinės refleksijos metodai. Trijų politinių ir ekonominių sistemų palyginimas atskleidžia politinės santvarkos, žodžio ir veiksmų laisvės bei ekonominės plėtros sąsajas. Nors plutokratija yra orientuota į ekonominį pelną ir klestėjimą, ji neturi viešos erdvės atvirai diskutuojamiems klausimams, o ekonomika tarnauja nedaugeliui. Autokratiijoje ribojamos tiek politinės teisės, tiek žodžio laisvė, čia leidžiama vien ekonominė laisvė, jei ji neprieštarauja valdovo pareiškimams. Galiausiai ši sistema neigiamai veikia ekonominę gerovę. Teigiama, kad yra ryšys tarp demokratijos, žodžio laisvės ir gerovės. Demokratija veda į ekonominį klestėjimą, tačiau ji neatsiejama nuo viešų debatų ir diskusijų, kurios daro visuomenę stipresnę ir išmintingesnę.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: ekonominė sistema; gerovė; žodžio laisvė; demokratija.