

Moth?r t?r?s? vs business

Business



On? d? y Moth? r T? r? s?, th? f? mous Rom? n C? tholic nun who work? d in Kolk? t?, Indi? onc? s? id th? following: “ If w? h? v? no p?? c?, it is b? c? us? w? h? v? forgott? n th? t w? b? long to ?? ch oth? r”. Th? m? in qu? stion of this writing is und? rst? nding ? nd ? xpl? ining th? ? bility to us? Moth? r T? r? s?’s principl? in cont? mpor? ry busin? ss world.

First of ? ll, it is n?? d? d to r? m? mb? r th? cultur? l diff? r? nc? b? tw?? n Indi? ? nd th? W? st. It is h? rd to find two ? s diff? r? nt countri? s ? s th? y ? r?. Indi? n Individu? lism is ? l? g? nd. Th? y h? v? th? ? bsolut? ly diff? r? nt w? y of thinking comp? ring with p? opl? from oth? r n? tions. Th? y b? li? v? in r? inc? rn? tion ? nd immort? l soul; th? y don’t c? r? ? bout such things ? s pov? rty or rich? s ? s th? y ? r? sur? to b? b? tt? r in th? n?? r? st lif?. On th? oth? r h? nd, ? m? ric? n Individu? lism c? n b? ? xpl? in? d by ? lot of things ? s this country h? s mix? d ? lot of diff? r? nt r? c? s ? nd n? tions within its? If – it mix? d th? ir cultur? s ? nd b? li? fs, ? s w? ll ? s both knowl? dg? ? nd souls. ? m? ric? ns ? r? not st? nd? rd, ?? ch r? pr? s? nt? tiv? of this country h? s chos? n th? own w? y of s? lf-d? v? lopm? nt, th? own cultur? ? nd cult figur? s. ? b? li? f in individu? lism is, ? ctu? lly, ? s old ? s th? ? m? ric? n n? tion its? lf. ? Iso, it is n?? d? d to r? m? mb? r th? t Indi? n p? opl? ? r? not ? bl? to s? y “ No”. How? v? r, th? ir “ Y? s” do? s not m?? n promising to do som? thing. Th? y try to liv? ? s ?? sy ? s it is possibl? without ? ny ? xtr? r? sponsibility. ? Iso, th? y do not lik? to think ? bout “ tomorrow”.

This cont? xt c? n h? lp to und? rst? nd th? n? tur? of Indi? n p? opl? ? nd th? r?? son why th? words of Moth? r T? r? s? ? r? so usu? l for th? m. ? s for th? W? st sid? of th? pl? n? t, it is not possibl? to s? y th? s? p? opl? do c? r? ? bout such things ? s “ b? longing ?? ch to oth? r”. Th? s? p? opl? ? r? ori? nt?

d to busin? ss, s? lf-improv? m? nt, s? lf-growth go? ls ? chi? v? m? nt. N? v? rth? l? ss, l? t's try to find out if th? words of Moth? r T? r? s? ? r? ? ctu? l for th? s? p? opl?.

M? yb?, th? und? rst? nding th? n? tur? of cont? mpor? ry ? m? ric? n p? opl? could h? lp in this qu? stion. W? ll, U. S. cultur? or, ? m? ric? n Individu? lism, is ? p? r? doxic? l th? ory b? c? us? it c? n b? both myth ? nd r?? lity. For ? x? mpl?, looking through th? m? n-n? tur?, it is ?? sy to r? m? mb? r th? words of on? writ? r: “ Th? M? rlboro M? n from th? w? ll-known ? dv? rtis? m? nt ? xists, ? v? n if nobody c? n im? gin? him s? nding flow? rs to his moth? r or ? nt? ring ? voting booth. Wh? n th? youths run ? w? y from hom?, th? y don't run ? w? y to b? com? f? rm? rs” (St? gn? r, 64). This M? n b? c? m? ? n ? m? ric? n M? n prototyp? for th? whol? world ? nd this f? ct r? j? cts th? id?? of individu? lism ? xisting ? mong ? m? ric? ns.

Wh? t ? bout ? ctivity, it could b? s? id th? t U. S. n? tion h? s ? r?? lly pow? rful ? n? rgy r?? ching it go? ls. Y? s, th? s? p? opl? ? r? not usu? lly int? r? sting in not prof? ssion? l things but th? y ? lw? ys h? v? str? ngth ? nd d? sir? to b? ? ctiv? ? nd m? k? own job in b? tt? r w? y. Th? s? m? is ? bout tim?. Th? y don't lik? to w? st? th? ir tim? ? nd don't mind to sp? nd th? tim? for th? m? in go? l or with good fri? nds in th? good comp? ny.

S? ying ? bout hum? n n? tur?, it is difficult to ignor? th? op? nn? ss of th? n? tion, ? sp? ci? lly, consid? ring ? bout high priv? cy l? v? l norm? l for th? s? p? opl?. Th? y ? r? ? lw? ys op? n s? ying “ hi” in th? c? nt? r of city of n?? r th? ? l? v? tor. But nobody h? s ? right to cross th? bord? rs of th? p? rson? l priv? cy. Th? r? l? tionships norm? l for th? n? tion ? r? usu? lly c? lm, op? n ? nd

h?? rty ? nd usu? lly quit? sup? rfici? l, not ? llowing to s?? th? insid? world of th? p? rson.

In g? n? r? l, th? U. S. cultur? is ? ph? nom? non of individu? lism ? nd commonn? ss th? t m? k? s th? n? tur? succ? ssful.

Coming b? ck to th? m? in qu? stion of this writing, it s?? ms th? t th? ? nsw? r could b? divid? d into two positions: th? position th? t ? gr?? s with Moth? r T? r? s?'s words ? nd th? position th? t do? s not ? gr?? with th? m.

To support th? first position of th? ? nsw? r, it is possibl? to s? y th? t no on? busin? ss c? n ? xist without oth? r busin? ss? s. ?? ch busin? ss d? p? nds on oth? r on? s b? c? us? of corpor? t? s? l? s, v? ndors, contr? ctors, m? di? ? tc. ? ll contiguous busin? ss? s h? lp to h? v? th? m? in busin? ss. ? ll th? s? br? nch? s ? r? not comp? titors - th? y just h? lp to ? xist ?? ch to oth? r. S? ying with th? h? lp of Moth? r T? r? s? words, th? y h? v? p?? c? b? c? us? th? y b? long to ?? ch oth? r. So, h? r? th? ? nsw? r - y? s, busin? ss comp? tition c? n co-? xist with th? p?? c? ful hum? nity th? t Moth? r T? r? s? do? s ? dvoc? t?.

On th? oth? r h? nd, ? v? n th? busin? ss? s from th? s? m? br? nch c? n b? us? ful for ?? ch oth? r. ?? ch of th? m c? n support th? custom? r of its l? v? l - for ? x? mpl? " th? sh? rks of busin? ss" will work with th? hug? corpor? tions ? nd th? l? ss busin? ss? s with custom? rs whos? comp? ni? s ? r? not so big.

? Iso, such coop? r? tion could h? lp to ? void struggl? s th? t ? r? usu? l in th? oth? r c? s?. For ? x? mpl?, St? rbucks d? cid? d to ? limin? t? comp? tition through buy-outs, " clust? r bombing" t? ctics, ? nd m? rk? t c? nnib? liz? tion.

Th? Oc?? n B?? ch Gr? ssroots Org? niz? tion, in support of th? loc? l m? rch? nts of Oc?? n B?? ch, d? cl? r? s ? s p? rt of ? boycott th? t, " St? rbucks ? mploys unf? ir t? ctics ? g? inst loc? l coff?? shops. If St? rbucks finds ? succ? ssful coff?? ? st? blishm? nt th? y build on? or mor? loc? tions to t? k? th? ir busin? ss. Th? y l?? s? buildings to k?? p out comp? tition, s? nd ? g? nts ? round to t? k? not? s ? nd pictur? s (? s w? h? v? witn? ss? d in Oc?? n B?? ch)" (obgo. org). Oc?? n B?? ch is ? community loc? t? d in S? n Di? go, C? liforni?. It h? s r? c? ntly b?? n th? sit? of num? rous prot? sts ? g? inst th? St? rbucks Corpor? tion's ? tt? mpt to op? n fr? nchis? s th? r?. Th? Oc?? n B?? ch pl? nning bo? rd is working on ? b? n c? ll? d Proposition ? th? t b? ns " Formul? R? t? il" r? st? ur? nts ? nd stor? s from ? ncro? ching on Oc?? n B?? ch. In J? p? n, Kinzo Niw?, m? n? ging dir? ctor of Pokk? Corp., which runs th? C? f? d? Cri? ch? in, ? riv? l of St? rbucks, ? xpl? ins, " Our s? l? s don't drop ? v? n if St? rbucks op? ns ? shop n?? r ours, but if w? simult? n? ously ? pply to ? l? ndlord to r? nt sp? c? in th? s? m? building, th? l? ndlord choos? s our oppon? nt" (Th? J? p? n Tim? s). St? rbucks's m? rk? t-? ntry str? t? gy involv? s first finding ? m? rk? t's l?? ding ind? p? nd? nt coff?? shop, ? nd th? n going to th? l? ndlord of th? t coff?? shop ? nd buying th? l?? s? out from und? r th? m, r? pl? cing th? shop with ? St? rbucks. ? s is common in Oc?? n B?? ch ? nd J? p? n, th? ? xisting coff?? shop is forc? d to mov? or go out of busin? ss. If St? rbucks c? nnot buy th? l?? s?, St? rbucks will op? n s? v? r? l fr? nchis? s ? round th? shop (n?? rly on? on ?? ch corn? r) ? nd h?? vily promot? to dr? w th? crowd. This b? gins ? " clust? r bombing" c? mp? ign wh? r? St? rbucks op? ns so m? ny fr? nchis? s in on? ? r?? th? t th? y b? com? unsust? in? bl?. ? ft? r driving out ind? p? nd? ntly own? d coff?? shops, th? St? rbucks fr? nchis? s th? n h? v? to st? rt comp? ting with th? ms? lv? s, c? nnib? lizing ??

<https://assignbuster.com/mothr-trs-vs-business/>

ch oth? r's s? l? s. St? rbucks, th? p? r? nt comp? ny, is b? sic? lly promoting D? rwinism ? s th? ir busin? ss mod? l, ? busin? ss mod? l th? t is b? coming unb?? t? bl?. In St? rbucks's 2002 10-K R? port fil? d with th? S? curiti? s ? nd ? xch? ng? Commission, it is r? port? d, "? s ? r? sult of its ? xp? nsion str? t? gy of clust? ring stor? s in ? xisting m? rk? ts, St? rbucks h? s ? xp? ri? nc? d ? c? rt? in l? v? l of c? nnib? liz? tion of s? l? s of ? xisting stor? s by n? w stor? s ? s stor? conc? ntr? tion h? s incr?? s? d." D? spit? this c? nnib? liz? tion, St? rbucks's n? t r? v? nu? growth incr?? s? d 24% th? t y?? r.

Th? s? cond position of ? nsw? r in n? g? tiv?, it is support? d by f? cts th? t busin? ss comp? tition will not ? xist with p?? c? ful hum? nity ? nd just strict rul? s could h? lp to ? xist to th? busin? ss.

W? ll, this position could b? ? lso support? d by ? lot of f? cts. Th? n? tur? of th? " comp? tition" word is th? following: " Comp? tition is th? ? ct of striving ? g? inst oth? rs for th? purpos? of ? chi? ving domin? nc? or ? tt? ining ? go? l. It is ? t? rm th? t is commonly us? d in num? rous fi? lds, including busin? ss, ? cology, ? conomics, music, politics, ? nd sports. Comp? tition m? y b? b? tw?? n two or mor? forc? s, org? nisms, syst? ms, individu? ls, or groups, d? p? nding on th? cont? xt in which th? t? rm is us? d.

Comp? tition m? y yi? ld v? rious r? sults to th? p? rticip? nts, including both intrinsic ? nd ? xtrinsic r? w? rds. Som? r? sults, such ? s r? sourc? s or t? rritory, m? y b? biologic? lly motiv? t? d b? c? us? th? y provid? surviv? l ? dv? nt? g? s. Oth? rs, such ? s comp? tition in busin? ss ? nd politics, ? r? l?? rn? d ? sp? cts of hum? n cultur?. ? ddition? lly, ? xtrinsic symbols such ? s trophi? s, pl? qu? s, ribbons, priz? s, or l? ud? tions m? y b? giv? n to th?

winn? r. Such symbolic r? w? rds ? r? commonly us? d in hum? n sporting ?
nd ? c? d? mic comp? titions.

So, looking ? t ? conomics ? nd busin? ss comp? tition, it is us? ful to know
th? t M? rri? m-W? bst? r d? fin? s comp? tition in busin? ss ? s " th? ? ffort of
two or mor? p? rti? s ? cting ind? p? nd? ntly to s? cur? th? busin? ss of ? third
p? rty by off? ring th? most f? vor? bl? t? rms." S?? n ? s th? pill? r of c? pit?
lism in th? t it m? y stimul? t? innov? tion, ? ncour? g? ? ffici? ncy, or driv?
down pric? s, comp? tition is tout? d ? s th? found? tion upon which c? pit?
lism is justifi? d. ? ccording to micro? conomic th? ory, no syst? m of r?
sourc? ? lloc? tion is mor? ? ffici? nt th? n pur? comp? tition. Comp? tition, ?
ccording to th? th? ory, c? us? s comm? rci? l firms to d? v? lop n? w
products, s? rvic? s, ? nd t? chnologi? s. This giv? s consum? rs gr?? t? r s? l?
ction ? nd b? tt? r products. Th? gr?? t? r s? l? ction typic? lly c? us? s low? r
pric? s for th? products comp? r? d to wh? t th? pric? would b? if th? r? w? s
no comp? tition (monopoly) or littl? comp? tition (oligopoly).

So, from this th? ory comp? tition do? s not work ? g? inst hum? nity if it is
not ? monopoly. In th? c? s? of monopoly it is impossibl? to sp?? k ? bout p??
c? ful hum? nity ? s th? l?? d? r is just on? ? nd ? ll oth? r busin? ss? s do not ?
xist lik? diff? r? nt comp? ni? s ? ny mor?. But if w? b? ck to Moth? r T? r? s?
words, w? would s?? th? t it is not ? p?? c? – it is just ? l?? d? rsip.

? ctu? lly, comp? tition m? y ? lso l?? d to w? st? d (duplic? t? d) ? ffort ? nd to
incr?? s? d costs (? nd pric? s) in som? circumst? nc? s. For ? x? mpl?, th? int?
ns? comp? tition for th? sm? ll numb? r of top jobs in music ? nd movi? ? cting
l?? ds m? ny ? spiring musici? ns ? nd ? ctors to m? k? subst? nti? l inv? stm?

nts in tr?ining th? t?r? not r? coup? d, b? c? us? only ? fr? ction b? com?
succ? ssful. Simil? rly, th? psycholog?c? l? ff? cts of comp? tition m? y r? sult
in h? rm to thos? involv? d.

Comp? tition do? s not n? c? ss? rily h? v? to b? b? tw?? n comp? ni? s. For ?
x? mpl?, busin? ss writ? rs som? tim? s r? f? r to " int? rn? l comp? tition". This
is comp? tition within comp? ni? s. Th? id?? w? s first introduc? d by ? lfr? d
Slo? n ? t G? n? r? l Motors in th? 1920s. Slo? n d? lib? r? t? ly cr?? t? d ? r?? s
of ov? rl? p b? tw?? n divisions of th? comp? ny so th? t?? ch division would
b? comp? ting with th? oth? r divisions. For ? x? mpl?, th? Ch? vy division
would comp? t? with th? Ponti? c division for som? m? rk? t s? gm? nts. ? Iso,
in 1931, Proct? r & G? mbl? initi? t? d ? d? lib? r? t? syst? m of int? rn? l br?
nd v? rsus br? nd riv? lry. Th? comp? ny w? s org? niz? d ? round diff? r? nt
br? nds, with ?? ch br? nd ? lloc? t? d r? sourc? s, including ? d? dic? t? d
group of ? mploy?? s willing to ch? mpion th? br? nd. ?? ch br? nd m? n? g? r
w? s giv? n r? sponsibility for th? succ? ss or f? ilur? of th? br? nd ? nd w? s
comp? ns? t? d ? ccordingly. This form of comp? tition thus pitt? d ? br? nd ?
g? inst ? noth? r br? nd. Fin? lly, most busin? ss? s ? Iso ? ncour? g? comp?
tition b? tw?? n individu? l ? mploy?? s. ? n ? x? mpl? of this is ? cont? st b?
tw?? n s? l? s r? pr? s? nt? tiv? s. Th? s? l? s r? pr? s? nt? tiv? with th? high? st
s? l? s (or th? b? st improv? m? nt in s? l? s) ov? r th? ? p? riod of tim? would
g? in b? n? fits from th? ? mploy? r. It should ? Iso b? not? d th? t busin? ss ?
nd ? conomic? l comp? tition in most countri? s is oft? n limit? d or r? strict?
d. Comp? tition oft? n is subj? ct to l? g? l r? strictions. For ? x? mpl?, comp?
tition m? y b? l? g? lly prohibit? d ? s in th? c? s? with ? gov? rnm? nt
monopoly or ? gov? rnm? nt-gr? nt? d monopoly. Or t? riffs, subsidi? s or oth?

r prot? ctionist m?? sur? s m? y b? institut? d by gov? rnm? nt in ord? r to pr?
 v? nt or r? duc? comp? tition. D? p? nding on th? r? sp? ctiv? ? conomic
 policy, th? pur? comp? tition is to ? gr?? t? r or l? ss? r ? xt? nt r? gul? t? d by
 comp? tition policy ? nd comp? tition l? w. Comp? tition b? tw?? n countri? s
 is quit? subtl? to d? t? ct, but is quit? ? vid? nt in th? World ? conomy, wh? r?
 countri? s lik? th? US, J? p? n, th? ? urop?? n Union ? nd th? ?? st ? si? n Tig?
 rs ?? ch try to outdo th? oth? r in th? qu? st for ? conomic supr? m? cy in th?
 glob? l m? rk? t, h? rk? ning to th? conc? pt of Ki? suism. Such comp? tition
 is ? vid? nt by th? polici? s und? rt? k? n by th? s? countri? s to ? duc? t? th?
 futur? workforc?. For ? x? mpl?, ?? st ? si? n ? conomi? s lik? Sing? por?, J? p?
 n ? nd South Kor?? t? nd to ? mph? siz? ? duc? tion by ? lloc? ting ? l? rg?
 portion of th? budg? t to this s? ctor, ? nd by impl? m? nting progr? mm? s
 such ? s gift? d ? duc? tion, which som? d? tr? ctors criticis? ? s indic? tiv? of ?
 c? d? mic ? litism.

? s ? conclusion I would lik? to choos? on? from two positions of th? ? nsw? r.
 I would pr? f? r th? first th? t busin? ss c? n co-? xist with th? principl? s of p??
 c? ful hum? nity. Busin? ss is just ? g? m? for ? dults. It do? s not forgiv? mist?
 k? s but it do? s not d? m? nd victims to b? succ? ssful. Th? b? st id?? is to
 divid? m? rk? t b? tw?? n ? ll p? rticip? nt ? nd ?? ch of th? m should h? v? th?
 own pl? c?. It is not conv? ni? nt for hug? corpor? tions to s? rv? sm? ll comp?
 ni? s - th? t is why ? sm? ll comp? ni? s ? r? ? Iso n?? d? d to s? rv? ?? ch oth?
 r. Thus, th? bigg? st is th? most succ? ssful - this is ? l? w of th? n? tur? so th?
 r? is no n?? d to liv? without p?? c? ? nd hum? nity - th? hon? st comp? tition
 will h? lp both to b? com? ? m? rk? t l?? d? r ? nd to s? v? th? p?? c? insid? th?
 busin? ss.

Bibliography

Br? y, M., D?? ry, S., W? lsh, J., ? nd W? ring, P., (2005) Industri? I R? l?

tions: ? Cont? mpor? ry

? n? lysis (3rd ? d.). Sydn? y: McGr? w Hill.

N? nk? rvis, ?. , Compton, R. ? nd B? ird, M. (2004) Hum? n R? sourc? M? n? g?

m? nt: Str? t? gi? s ? nd

Proc? ss? s (5 th ? d.). Sydn? y: P?? rson ? duc? tion.

T? ich? r, J., Holl? nd, P. ? nd Gough, R. (2003) ? mploy?? R? l? tions M? n? g?

m? nt Sydn? y: P?? rson

? duc? tion.

Host? tl? r, (1988) Nonl? wy? r ? ssist? nc? to Individu? ls in M? ss Justic? ? g?

nci? s: Th? N?? d for

Improv? d Guid? lin? s, 2 ? dmin. L. R? v. 85.

Johnston, (1955) Th? Un? uthoriz? d Pr? ctic? Controv? rsy: ? Struggl? ? mong

Pow? r Groups, 4

U. K? n. L. R? v. 1.

Justic?, K? thl?? n ? l?? nor, (J? nu? ry 1991) Th? r? Go? s Th? Monopoly: Th?

C? liforni? Propos? l

to ? llow Nonl? wy? rs to Pr? ctic? L? w, 44 V? nd. L. R? v. 179.

Michelman, (1984) The Invisible Hand, The Consumer Protection Function of Unauthorized

Practitioner Regulation, 12 Pepperdine L. Rev. v. 1.