Open Source vs Centralised Corporate Power

by zeno *Tuesday, Jan 24 2017, 12:59am*
international / prose / post

> I come from an IT background hence the title, allow me to expand on it for the benefit of those outside the IT community.

Open source simply means EVERYONE, the world, particularly those that CONTRIBUTE to the development of an idea/product outcome. Now some facts. Open source development now leads the IT industry, private corporations like Google and other large players soon realised they were at a huge disadvantage, re: limited in-house staff as opposed to the WORLD of development outside, which FREE products were/are vastly superior. That situation forced the private sector to dump the dunderheads in their employ and seek cutting edge talent outside corporate structures. It is now common practice to head-hunt talent from everywhere and offer the last enticement corporations have, money, and huge amounts of it to those that out-perform their peers -- so go for it people, demand fair payment for your worth or leave for better conditions, overpaid executives do not create anything but misery for workers. It is a simple matter of a little organisation to become one global community of specialised developers in any field of endeavour WORLD-WIDE; executives are able to exploit due to a divide and conquer strategy, workers are never encouraged to form communities outside their particular company, now imagine an International IT workers/coders guild. A horrific prospect for the likes of Google's Eric Schmidt and other corporate executives that produce NOTHING.

Some people take offers, others don't for ethical reasons -- corporations continue to be viewed as soul-destroying, idea and product appropriating THIEVES, but its all in the outrageous contracts some people choose to sign; I would add you do not need to sign anything in the Open Source WORLD. Those that choose to sign their lives away to private entities soon regret it. It doesn't take long to realise that corporations ENSLAVE their employees, that is why OS remains the strongest player, it has no need to centralise power or own anyone.

This model has proven to be supremely successful, in other words a (proven) model that produces more talent, including the world's most elite and devastating hackers, as everyone assists each other to become better and improve product development and and coding skills, and of course that produces vastly superior outcomes than those produced by the dead-head, stifling, over-controlled environments of corporations.

Corporations are primarily concerned with the bottom line, PROFIT, and so where do humans fit in? A poor tenth or fifteenth down the scale of priorities, notwithstanding that elite management pay themselves handsomely for exploiting their enslaved workers. So it is understandable that Open Source maintains its status as the leader in the field, regardless of field of endeavour, as the FREE world is a more competitive player than enslaved and uninspired, executive oppressed, workers.

Furthermore, Open Source is FREE by nature as the world contributed to the product.

Immediately it is appreciated that the APPEAL of Open Source far exceeds that of closed, jailed, corporate communities, though no-one is forced to remain in these stifling environments and I would add again, few do remain, which creates a constant panic to locate willing replacements with

sufficient skills. What I am saying indirectly is that existing (antiquated) corporate structures are a failed model if quality and efficiency are desired. The failing private model, including government institutions and agencies, are today forced to farm-out work as their in-house staff have proven ill-equipped, non-competitive, even incapable.

So why is this free world resource MODEL not adopted by nations internationally, bear in mind that most leading databases and apps have all had open source origins, as did the mysterious development of the digital currency, known as Bitcoin, which continues to remain in public hands, though commercial banks are adopting a centralised version in order to financially enslave the world with digital money, be aware of this very real possibility and REJECT it vigorously, digital currency MUST remain in public hands if the world is to remain free, but I digress for very good reason.

Now note that corporations exist for the express purpose to rake in vast amounts of income for the very few, while the Open Source model BENEFITS EVERYONE without charge, though people contribute freely in gratitude for the service others provide. So the answer to the obvious question, 'why haven't nations adopted the superior model,' is explained above, because it benefits all not just a few selfish, avaricious executives.

Now whether we like it or not (few do not), the Open Source model applied in every field of endeavour produces superior solutions and outcomes. So, private interests clearly have a use-by date, which I would add, has already EXPIRED.

A truly viable free world is NOT an ideal, it approaches at speed as I write; this world would be able to solve all our current man-made problems including senseless corporate wars for profit and world-destroying corporate pollution, 'there is no man-made problem another man cannot remedy,' this is the reverse of a famous hacker adage, 'anything one man makes (code) another man can break.' But never forget the proven superior model of Open Source and free products which has endured and grown for decades and will continue to gain strength into the future is the vastly superior model.

So if you're looking for a paradigm shift, you now have it, though the above brief article lends itself to further expansion by anyone who has something constructive and of value to add.

Centralised power and centralised organisations are in fact already dead, unless you foolishly choose to prolong their terminal existence.

Jungle Drum Prose/Poetry. http://jungledrum.lingama.net/news/story-2505.html