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*Technical Note: This paper will be successively elaborated for the WorldSSHnet conferences “Living in a world of nation states” towards a final publication*

**“Living in a world of nation states”- Critiquing a 200 years lasting false critique of the Capitalism**

**The Citizen, their Society and their Nation State**

**Part 1. The political implementation of the rationale of capitalism into the making of citizenship**

**Introduction**

**From votaries towards critics of capitalism, they all share throughout the history the view that the nation state is a subject that is open to be used for any political purposes, including to repair if not abolish capitalism. It is this historical false assumption of the nation state as an open political instrument that shapes the theories about the nation state and in the in the history of critical theories of all sorts of criticism of capitalism:**

* **The most ordinary political theories presenting the nation state as a political means usable by the people populating nation states for their political purposes**
* **commonly implied in the usual complaints of citizens about the state not fulfilling his mission to serve the citizens**

* **More over,**
* **even for theoretically critiquing and practically overcoming capitalism such as**
* **the fatal errors of decolonialisation**
* **the alternative project of anticapitalism in the former SU and their return to capitalism (Latest Cuba)**
* **- and across the world all those critical projects combating against the various results of capitalism, such as the green movements as all those combatting poverty and alike**
* **In all this it is the false conclusion from the freedom citizen do have to understand the nation state as an open political means, open to whatever sorts of political objectives.**

**Not only anti-capitalist critics critique capitalism and the nation state. One could say that the whole social sciences critically reflect on the nation state in various ways, accusing the nation state to not sufficiently domesticate the effects capitalism has on the society and on the nation state. To give an prominent example crosscutting all disciplines, with the critical notion of in-equalities, it argues that the nation state fails its mission to avoid the widening split of the society into increasingly rich and poor people.**

**The contemporary political debates across all nation states, may it be about sports, health, the economy , educations or retirement, housing, in all spheres of the society a dawnting division of the society is critically discussed, all assuming that all these divisions of the society must question the rationale of nation state and that the nation state must act against them and that it is again in most cases the bad effects of the capitalist economy which are responsible for all those dawnting division of the nation. And indeed, the political professionals also support this concern about any division of the society, thus confirming that it was an elementary aim of the nation state to unify the society and that all those dividing forces come from anywhere, mostly from the economy, such as all the “inequalities” , but in any case never from the rationale of the nation state itself.**

**…..**

**…..**

**What all these critical views about the nation state share is the assumption that it is the nation state’s objective to care about the citizens interests protecting them against the capitalist interest, coined in the notion of profit. Profit, though its accepted that it says what the economy is all about, has in all these critical debates almost the connotation of a sin, and in the criticism of profit as a negative synonym of capitalism the nation state is addressed as the instance which must be addressed to diminish, compensate or to protect the society against capitalism, the economy today preferably coined as neo-liberalism, a notion about the capitalist economy, which in this view is even responsible for preventing that nation state from all its originally good missions for the sake of its citizens and thus explaining why all those expected good missions do not happen.**

**Other critics go a step further: They consider capitalism as an incurably false concept of an economy and argue that it is the nation state, which has to shift its capitalist economy towards an economy that overcomes the regime of profit. As the first criticism, considering the nation state as a means to reduce the impact of capitalism on the citizens, shares with the more radical one, that advocates a policy agenda overcoming the capitalist economy, that the nation state is a political subject that can be used for political objectives, which in one or the other way are against the rationale of the capitalist economy.**

**Even the most radical advocates of capitalism also concede that capitalism without the nation state interventions would violate some fundamental rights of the citizens and in their ways also consider the nation state as a political subject that is needed for a sustainable capitalism.**

**From left to right, they thus all share the view that the nation state is or can be made a subject suitable for political objectives, ranging from compensating, via domesticating towards abolishing capitalism.**

**My paper will discuss**

* **the fundamental mistakes of a 200 years lasting false critique of capitalism based on a false separation of the nation state from the capitalist economy and thus an idealisation of the nation state open for all sorts of critical agendas, including those against capitalism**

**False critiques which range from**

* **theories about the state critiquing the state as not improving the live of people,**
* **advocating the state as a means to oppose capitalism**
* **until the state as a means to overcome capitalism.**

**The paper will show, *how the very elementary features of humans who populate the world of nation states, the citizens, are nation state made creatures* and how these politically made features consist of the main features which make capitalism work, thus proving that nation state is not only the creator of capitalism, but the subject that enforces the inhabitants of the nation states to perform their lives as a service for the objectives of capitalism.**

**It will also show where and *how this false critique originates from false conclusions about the nature of the nation state and the nature of its inhabitants,* the citizen.**

**The paper will try**

* to prove that the nation state is no neutral instrument for all sorts of policy agendas, but the maker, maintainer and protector of capitalism
* To prove that social science theories are elementary wrong discussing the state as a response to human’s nature, all naturalizing their features made by the citizen society, the society made for executing the rationale of capitalism
* discuss, how come that the nation state is considered as a means for people and even a neutral instrument for all sorts of political agendas, even opposing capitalism.

*„Article 1*

*All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.“*

*Article 17*

1. *Everyone has the right to own* [*property*](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Property) *alone as well as in association with others.*
2. *No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.*

**1. The inhabitants of the world are citizens – The freedom of a conceded materialism**

Citizens are humans who are free humans. Freedom, it does not mean, that humans simply do what they want to do, but that freedom is a social attribute, freedom contains two subjects, the free human and the donator/attributor of freedom attributing it to humans. Freedom thus is a conceded free will, the free will of citizens, who have the command over their lives and decide about their live agendas, a command over their lives, donated to the citizen by a freedom donator.

Hence, there is one subject among the citizens that attributes the freedom to the citizens and this is telling about this subject as about what this conceded freedom of citizenship is:

It means that, firstly, freedom is not a natural attribute of a citizen, but, secondly, it is attributed by one subject and only one exclusive subject among all citizens is doing this, which therefore thirdly must have an exclusive power over all others to attribute freedom to all citizens, and forthly, this freedom is not a freedom among the citizens, but a freedom in front of the very subject that attributes it. A super subject that promises a free will to humans, thus a fundamentally subordinated free will and a will that is entirely dependent on this subject, conceding their freedom and thus a conditional free will in which it is only one side that decides about the conditions for the conceded free will. Thus the conceded freedom is not even a choice, but attributed without a choice and given the power to attribute freedom also a threat to use in line with the subject it donates freedom, which otherwise also has the power to deny citizens their free will.

Any realisation of the free will of the citizen depends therefore on the question if it finds the support of the will of the freedom donator.

Subserviance and presenting ones will as fulfilling the one and only really counting will of the state to achieve anything is therefore the major way of articulating the conditioned free will. The other way round, discrediting the will of the other as damaging the law, the will of the state, is the same the other way round.

Freedom is what all citizens are equally donated. Donating this freedom equally to the citizens abstains from the means needed to realize the freedom and by doing this hands the execution of this freedom into the hands of those who own these means under their command. Phrasing the offer of freedom equally to the citizens as a strategic calculation, one could say, that the poison hiding behind the generously looking offer of freedom, ignoring the means to perform it, is calculated towards the intention to use the lacking means to perform the freedom to force those, who do not have these means into using their freedom in the very sense the freedom donator wants to use it. And if this lack of means to execute the donated freedom, as one will see from what it abstains, the expropriation from any ownership over these means through the freedom donator, it turns out that freedom and equality are the secret giving birth to the class society, of a society in which one part uses the other part for its purposes.

The donation of freedom without it means, is not only historically the offer given by the ruling people to domesticate their will and to direct the will of the citizens towards the objectives of the freedom donators. The donated freedom is given under the condition that it can be directed towards the donator of freedom, hence followed by all sorts of relativating clarifications assuring that the donator of freedom make the user of freedom use their freedom in the sense the donators want and decide.

The donation of freedom is therefore completed by a set of rights and duties specifying the conditions under which the use of freedom is donated

… the neighbourhood between democracy and fascism

….the elementary form of presenting blackmailing as an offer, The state as helper – the birth of nationalism

Individualism and competition

The elementary form for presenting individual interests as serving the common good

The ideology: The state protects people against violence

With the donation of the free will the donator does not want this or that from the citizens but the entire subordination of the such conditioned will – the totality of regulations of any articulation of what this will is allowed to do and what not is the practice of this conditioned freedom , the conditions are the subject ruling his life are the matter of the ruling subject, the state. There is, hence, nothing in citizens life that is not defined by the ruling freedom donator and thus definer.

((The freedom is guaranteed by the state, the only subject, that is able to question the freedom due the decision power, the guaranteeing subject has taken from the citizen as the price for guaranteeing their freedom.))

The will as “you may”, the art of self-domestication …… Morality, Psychology: the self-domestication of the conceded-free will presented as the conflicting nature of the human will.

1. **How to achieve the life aims of the free citizen – the inequality of equal private property owners and their mutually exclusive objectives**

To achieve any life aims free citizens must get access to what they need, because only what you ***own*** in the society of free citizens can be used and owning things is a tricky thing, because the objective of ownership is an odd relation to what one owns, its objective is *to increase how much one owns* and using it is the opposite.

Owning anything, is not the same as simply possessing or having it. Owning is not a relation of the owner towards what the things is, it is not about having the command over what characterizes the things one owns, its nature. What the nature of what one owns is even irrelevant for the relation of an owner to what he owns. What one can use it for and what the nature of the owned things is, is not what this relation of a private ownership is about. As privately owned things, very different things are the very same things, things which count irrespectively of what their nature is as the quantities of the same, their ability to be exchanged with other owned things. It is strictly speaking not even a relation towards the object of what an owner owns, but a relation to all other owners. This relation is, that all others but the owner are excluded from it. It does not matter if any of the non-owners needs the use of the thing owned by another owner, while the owner does not need what it could be used for. Any non-owners are only interesting for the owner of an owned thing, not if they need what the nature of the things is, but only if they want to exchange it with other things they own. Ownership is thus a relation those, who also own and who exchange the exclusive ownership. This exchange of the ownership constitutes the economic element of the market economy as selling and buying. Not using, selling and buying is what owning things is all about and if one wants to use anything there is not only no way of using anything but via buying it, using it violates owning it, because using it. destroys the owned things.

The only access is to buy, because everything in the citizen society has is *owned*, the private property ship of citizens, and the only way to change the ownership is to buy things.

Buying is to gain the ownership via exchanging the ownership between things via giving money to the owners of the life means. (The owners of the life means do not exchange life means for life means, they want money, no other life means.)

This means, though all citizens are equally owners and they all can only excess any properties owned by others, there are owners who own essentially different things, they must all buy their means for life, but there are others, selling these means and own them for the sake of owning.

The consumption of what one owns contradicts with what it is as a property, the exclusive possession, because it destroys what one owns, it eliminates the object of possessing. Ownership is not to use the nature of what one exclusively owns, ownership is about exclusively possessing for the sake of possessing, therefore measured in *how much* one owns, not what it is; the purpose of ownership is the exchange of ownerships, towards an increased ownership and the nature of what one owns only counts as a means for the exchange of the ownership to increase the ownership. Therefore owning something is to increase how much one owns, is exchangeable things, dependent on how much is owned and what is owned serves the growth of property. Ownership therefore is not about the things one consumes, but about what *produces* an increased ownership, the production of things for owning them. Owning the means of production is *the* means to produce a growing ownership.

Even though it is the case that under the regime of the private ownership that the only way to access the things needed for life is to gain private properties, the conclusion that it is the objective of private property to provide the things needed, is false, rather the opposite is the case, and it is this mistake that constitutes both the appreciation the system of private ownership receives even from those who never gain any real private property as it is the elementary form of the political propaganda advocating private ownership as the way to provide the use of things.

Gaining the ownership over money is the exclusive way to gain the ownership over the means for achieving any life aims, owning money is therefore the only means to achieve any life aims.

This implies that any life aims via accessing the ownership over the life means owned by others via money, that the owners of the life means only selling them in exchange for money, must have also bought the things they sell for money, but buying and selling things for the same amount of money is a useless operation, because then one could also abolish the private ownership over anything and let everybody use what one needs. The private ownership over everything implies thus essentially different owners regarding what they possess and their objectives selling resp. buying things: On the side of those who buy in exchange for money, their objective is to gain what they need to pursue their life agendas, they set up thanks to their freedom and they cannot get money via selling what they bought as the sellers of the life goods do, because they consume them; others use the same freedom to sell things they bought elsewhere and they only sell them - given they get more money, they increase their property, more than they paid for buying them.

Making more money than one owns is therefore the objective and condition of those who own the means of live under which those who must buy them as their life means.

Hence, the fact that all citizens are private property owners, the equal owners of private properties do not only own very different things, dividing the citizen society into two types of citizens pursuing not only different, but exclusive and opposing objectives and are though both dependent on each other to pursue these exclusive and opposing life aims:

While those citizens, who own the means for life sell them to increase the money they own and only sell them if they increase the money they own, anything in this society of private property owners is only sold by the owners of the life means to others who need them for living, if selling them increases their ownership via increasing their money allowing them to increase their ownership over the life means of the citizen society – and this not only within a nation state, but everywhere, where this private ownership of the life means is the exclusive way to pursue the freedom of citizens;

the other private property owners, who consume what they buy and thus always destroy the means to access what they need for getting access, do not get to an increased ownership through buying but thanks to destruction of what they own thanks to its consumption ever come back to the same necessity to buy things via money - given not only the sellers of the life means sell these things to make increase their wealth. Thus, while the owners of the life means increase the wealth they own, while the others private property owners reproduce via the same buying and selling their growing exclusion from this wealth.

What these private property owners own and sell is essentially different from those who sell the life means they own. They own basically nothing they could sell to gain money, not to mention to increase the money they own via buying and selling. What they buy is what they need to exist and thus consume, i.e. destroy it. They only own something potentially, they only really own, if the owners of the life means aiming at increasing their wealth buy it, their *ability* to provide services they cannot use for them, because they even lack the means to use them for themselves, but services for those who also own not only the live means, but also the means to use such services; without the demand for these services, their services are no services for themselves and they are only services if they make their contributions to increase the wealth of the buyers of these services.

Because their private property only counts as a private property if it is a service for those who use their services to increaser their wealth, only they decide and set the criteria if and when they buy these services. With the consequence that this lacking sovreignity when and how their pure ability to become their private property for them or not, forces these private property owners into competition against each other about the attractivity of their only potential services, which constitutes for this private property a particular section of the economy, the labour market. …..Education

The major parts of the world’s citizens are such private property owners who in reality do not own anything, because or if there are no private property owners, who are interested in buying their services. Which means, those private property owners not only own what reproduces their exclusion from the wealth owned by the others, their private property has only any value if those other owners need them. And: using what they own, their abilities to provide any services, is also not possible without those owners owning the wealth, because they also own without which the abilities remain abilities for services: The land and the means to make the abilities for services a real service are also owned by those who – might – buy their services. These are the world’s citizens moving across the world towards parts of the world, where their ability for services might be made services by any buyer – because living in a world of citizens, there is no other access to what citizens need to simply exist than buying things private property owners possess.

(Citizens, finding themselves in any disasters, the first thing the state is doing with its power means is to protect the private ownership against the need to access things to survive, protecting the system of private ownership as the fundament of the existence of the world of citizens.)

The private property owners buy and use the services of those who do not own any property to produce things they sell to increase their wealth measured in money. The things produced by those, who sold their services to the private property owners, are owned by those, who bought these services, and must be therefore bought by those, who produced them for those, who bought their services.

The things they produce are the private properties of those who bought their services, so that selling their services produces the things they need for their lives are produced as the increasing wealth in the hands of the private property owners, who buy services from those who do not own any private properties and thus reproduce the increased properties on one side and the exclusion from owning any properties on the other side, their poverty.

As a consequence: The reproduction of the exclusion from the wealth they produce for others results for these property owners in a life consisting of work, of work, not for them, but for others. This is why they are called workers.

Besides: Offering these services for prices that make them attractive for their buyers, decreases the objectives for why the offer them, what they get for selling their services, because those buyers are the exclusive buyers who offer money for them and since these services cannot be used without being sold to them, it is the only way for these private property owners who own nothing but these abilities for services, to gain the money they need to get access to the means they need to exist.

The reproduction of the exclusion from what they produce because the producers of the wealth are strictly speaking are those who bought the services and who therefore also own what these services do, reveals what the private property ownership essentially is all about: Under the regime of private ownership the producers of what is produced are not the real producers, the producers are those who own the services bought from those who own nothing but these services though in reality they are not the factual producers. There is nothing in the society that is not factually produced by those who own nothing and therefore socially defined produced by those who own private property and who therefore own everything though it is produced by the non-owners.

They are only the producers thanks to the definition of what ownership is thanks to how this is defined by what private ownership means. This meaning is the expropriation and the reproduction of the expropriation of those who factually produce from what they produce. No owner of the production means of a society of property owners has of course also ever produced these productions means with his own work and only therefore build the property he owns. The creation of private ownership over what a society of private property ownership produces is based on the expropriation of what the people produced and produce. Private property and the protection of private property is therefore in a strict sense the fundamental violation of what it pretends to do: It creates and guarantees the expropriation of those who produce the wealth appropriated by the those who do not produce anything thanks to the power of the state protecting the private ownership over everything in a citizen society. The private property ownership therefore is nothing but the permanent expropriation of the majority of the citizens and via this expropriation the making of the citizen society divided into those who own everything and those who own nothing but their services to increase the wealth of those who own.

It is the one of the most absurd lies of the political propaganda to present the protection of private properties as the protection of the property of those, who are expropriated *by* the state and therefore do not own more than they need to offer their services to those to whom the wealth they produce is given via the private property ownership. It is the gigantic lie about the private ownership to present private property ownership as the protection of the things people own, who own nothing and for whom therefore steeling is as appealing as it is a real loss, if only there bicycle is stolen.

(Very practically the life practice of these citizens prove, that their car they need to go to work is stolen and there is nothing the state could care less about. On the other hand, steeling a cent from the cashier by a worker is prosecuted as if it was the robbery of a whole bank.)

The birth of the class society…. and what it means to living in a society of free and equal citizens :

Living in a world of citizens means to live as servants reproducing the expropriation of the world’s people from what they produce. Poverty worldwide is thus the result of the very human right about the protection of private ownership.

The creation of poverty via enforcing citizens to live under the regime of making everything, including the nature, in the world a private property is made by the nation state, not by the capitalists. The private property owners are the beneficiaries of the expropriation of the majority of citizens, it is the fruit of the state given to them, they harvest.

The implementation, reproduction and maintenance of the division of the Citizen Society into owner and non- owners is the product of the state and its political subjects they impose with their power on the free people they rule, because they are committed advocates of this society model as the best for humans responding to the wolfish nature they enforce on humans with their expropriation via the private ownership. The free private property owners in both variations are creatures executing this society model, the maker and maintainer is the nation state.

Thanks to political making of everything as a private property not only the continuous reproduction of the exclusion of the non-owning citizens from owning anything is reproduced and thus their existential compulsion to offer their services to the owners of properties, the private property ownership over everything the society of private property owners produces, also implies that it is only those who own are entitled to decide about what they own. The non-owning citizens, the workers, are therefore not only excluded from the wealth they produce, they also have no say in what this society produces. What the society of private property owners produce is exclusively decided by those who own and they decide about what they own dependent on the question if what is produced helps increasing their wealth. And this implies as well, that they decide what they and thus the citizen society does *not p*roduce. The needs of the non-owners, the majority of working citizens have no say about what the citizen society produces and if the citizen society produces what the working citizens need depends if the things they produce helps to increase their wealth. The satisfaction of any needs of the citizens is not a criterion for the production of wealth in a society in which everything is made a private property.

A society of such private property owners, cannot not be the result of the private property owners. They only buy and sell and one can buy and sell private properties, but not the private property *ownership*. The private property ownership is established by a subject that enforces the private ownership on those who do not own anything they could sell, the obligation to not access the existing means for live other than via buying them, thus their exclusion from owning anything, and the guarantee to those, who possess the means for live, to protect it against any other access than through buying.

The making of those private property owners who possess the means of life is not a matter of selling and buying, it is violating the very rules of the private proper owners merged with the power to appropriate the ownership of the means of live, not only within a nation state but from the societies they denied their holy ideas of a sacrosanct private property ship – the nature of colonialism. The making of the society of private property owners with their division into havers and no-havers is the history and the presence of violence, *the* reason and the birth of the nation state society and its political power with its objectives and the power monopole without which such objectives can neither be established nor maintained.

And, to conclude at this point: it is the existence of those private property owners, who own essentially nothing that conflicts with and serves the main objective of a society consisting of private property owners, that is, to increase a wealth measured in money is the objective ruling this society, the increase of wealth measured in the abstract growth of values, in money which thus represents what a society of private property owners is all about. This is the overall objective certain private properties, capitalists enjoy, it is made and maintained by the nation state.

That the society of private property owners divides the society into those different types of property owners which are both dependent on each other, for one side to exist for the others to question this existence to benefit from their services for the growth of wealth, is not the only elementary conflict imposed into the life of citizens via enforcing them to perform their lives as private property owners. The relations between those private property owners using the non-owners for the growth of the properties is another elementary conflict imposed into the ways these owners of private properties pursue their aims to increase them: the means to increase the property of all owners is to decrease the properties of all others. To make the own wealth grow contesting the growth of the others is the means for growth. Economic “competition” is the neat name for an economic system, in which contesting each others growth is the means for growth, the continuous destruction of properties for their growth, forcing all owners of properties with the threat of being ruined by the others, is the nature of the ways to organize an economic reproduction of a society consisting of the exclusive ownership over parts of an economy , that enforces the main owners, which need the other owners, into a battle against each other, reciprocally challenging their existence as a means to increase their parts.

Deconstructing wealth is the elementary means to construct the growth of wealth, an economy constructed as the anarchy among the economy subjects.

Not only that aiming at the objective of a growth of wealth, the major parts of the citizens society are the producers of this wealth and excluded from using it for their life benefits, is an odd idea that rules the world of citizens. From the view of those citizens which devote their lives to produce an increasing wealth from which they are excluded so that they reproduce their poverty, the aims of the society of private property owners is already odd enough to question what this society of private property owners is all about. Looking at the society as a whole, it is at least as strange that the society of citizens, free to decide about their life projects, holds a power ruling them with a common interest no individual citizens has, that enforces the activities of all society members towards serving an aim their economy sets them. Though it might look from the individual view of a citizen that this society of private property owners is only making it slightly difficult to participate in the wealth the citizens produce, it is not the case in this citizen society, that their economic activities are any complicated way to produce and distribute the wealth it does indeed create as an ever growing wealth; producing and distributing the growing wealth they produce it not even the purpose of their economic activities.

The peak of the oddities of the citizen society is, that it is not even the case that their economy is an economy serving the citizens, in which complicated way ever and with the exclusion from this wealth for the majority of the citizens of this society, the peak of all this is, that it just the other way round, that is that this society holds a political body forcing the society towards serving the economy. The economy of the citizens society it not any badly constructed economic means for the citizens, but the citizens society forces itself via their common interest to serve nothing else but the objectives of their economy, the growth of wealth. And, this growth of wealth as the main objective of the citizen society is an accordingly odd economic objective that is as odd as the economic means to construct this continuously growing wealth via its continuous deconstruction and the exclusion of the produces from the wealth they produce:

Producing ever more than before in itself is an odd idea, because it produces all the things to achieve any life aims but it does not only not aim at achieving any life aims, not even of those who represent it, the owners of the produced wealth. Even for them their consumption of this part of their wealth is a substraction from what the production of a growth of wealth is aiming at.

More than that, ever producing more is, strictly speaking not even the purpose of any individual capitalist. ….The total negation from what the things produced as wealth, a only thus measurable as growing wealth, the entire abstraction from what anything can be used for in order to subsume anything under the same as counting as a part of a more, this view, though the very practiced view of the citizens society, is only the view their representative of their only common view has and it is this representative of their common view, who imposes this view as the final ruling objective into any live agenda any private property owner sets up thanks to his freedom. It is an objective, abstracting from any live objectives, that only coincides with the as abstract objective to rule a society towards this objective, producing a growth of wealth, nothing but this, an ever more, using the world’s citizens for this odd objective. Those, who own private properties do benefit for their life agendas from this wealth, but their luxurious life is not what the growth of wealth is aiming at. Possessing increasingly more is an aim that is as absurd as obviously pregnant with violence due to the totalitarism of an abstractness that can by definition be never satisfied.

No citizen needs to understand this objective of the citizen society, it is enough to keep it going by simply pursuing the live agendas of the free and equal citizens via gaining money to access the things need for live as a private property owner.

It is the idea of a growth of abstract wealth which constitutes the discipline of economics – tautologically- reasoned with its reverse idea of a never ending abstract scarcety: There must be ever more because there is never enough.

.

1. **Practicing the conceded freedom - Decision making – Lawful citizens’s life - Politicians**

*Article 7*

*All are equal before the law and are entitled without any* [*discrimination*](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Discrimination) *to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.*

Citizens, which enjoy their donated freedom to use their private properties, have nothing substantially to decide, this is the privilege of those, who represent the free citizens common will, and who, to do this, are excluded from enjoying the benefits of a private property.

What the private property owners share as what makes them a society is as odd as the objectives they pursue with their free will as private property owners. A society consisting of citizens, who use their free will to pursue their live aims by contesting the conflicting means of private property owners and who at the same time need each other to reach them, share one common interest, which is the only common interest they share, and this is their interest in a power over them, that enforces them with a power monopole over them they succumb to and which decides about what they have to do, to pursue their exclusive interest jointly.

(Sociology: the reproduction of the society into classes and their common interest to relativate their interests to pursue them, is the birth of sociology questioning how this negativity of a common will can be a shared project, a society, not willing to understand that the common interest of this society is this negation of sociality)

It is the mission of these representatives of the common will of the private property owners, to force the citizens to carry out their freedom towards finally serving the growth of wealth and to make all substantial decisions ruling the life of the citizens geared towards this objective. Citizens use their freedom and may decide about the various options the citizen society provides to contribute to the objectives of the citizen society. What these options are, is decided by the decision makers representing the common will of the society of private property owners. The decisions they make, may be debated by the free citizens, but any final decision about what rules the lives of the free citizens are made by their common will representatives. What they decide is binding for the citizens, no matter what their view about these decisions are.

Die Freiheit, die mit ihrer Absehung von allen Mitteln zu ihrer Verwirklichung so generös daherkommt, als stünde dem Bürger die Welt offen, entpuppt sich durch ihre Absehung von Mitteln ihrer Realisierung durch die Gleichsetzung der Besitzer von Eigentum und von Eigentümern ohne Eigentum, diese Freiheit der Bürger entpuppt sich so als Wahl zwischen Lebensprojekten, die der Staat als Alternativen unterschiedlicher Dienste für seine Staatsziele festlegt und vorgibt, allesamt Lebensprojekte,  die in ihren Dienstleistungen für Staat oder Kapital all die Komplikationen der Reproduktion von Privateigentum verkörpern, die sich der freie Bürger als von ihm zu bewältigenden Herausforderungen seiner individuellen Problemlösungsfähigkeiten zu eigen machen darf oder dessen Lösung oder Scheitern er sich als seinen persönlichen Erfolg oder Versagen anrechnen  oder vorhalten lassen darf.

Und diese Freiheit der Nichteigentümer ihr Leben zu gestalten, sorgt dafür, dass ihr einziges Eigentum, das für sie nur dann Zugang zu dem von ihnen produzierten Reichtum gewährt, sofern dieses Eigentum von Besitzern von Eigentum für die Vermehrung seines Eigentums gekauft wird, dass die Verwandlung seiner Dienstbarkeit in das einzige Eigentum, das nur in den Händen derer und nur für die, die es kaufen Früchte trägt, diese dem Eigentümer dieses Eigentums dessen Erhaltung für die Dienste am anderen Eigentümer zuschreiben zu können.

Die Freiheit der Bürger ist also eine Freiheit, die dem Bürger erlaubt zu entscheiden, auf welche individuelle Weise er die vorgegeben Lebensprojekte sich zu eigen macht, die also nichts substantielles zu entscheiden hat, aber in der Freiheit dieser Interpretation zu dem willkommenen Missverständnis verleitet , die vorgegebenen Dienstleistungsprojekte sich als höchst persönliche Lebensprojekte zu eigen zu machen und so diese Dienstleistungen mit dem Engagement als wären sie ein persönlichen Anliegens zu erbringen.

These other elementary inhabitants of the citizen society therefore are citizens, representing and carrying out the only common will all the citizens, resp. private property owners share – politicians, revealing via their mission the odd objectives and the live performance of the citizen society.

Politicians, representing the common will of the free citizens, are people whose mission is to domesticate the free will and to decide instead and on behalf of them. Their view is that individual citizens are a risk for the sustainability of the citizen society and that freedom needs to be controlled by them, for the sake of the citizen society, assuming that the use of freedom without their control ends up in the dissolution of the citizen society, because they are convinced that free citizens are creatures, principally ignoring other citizen’s freedom and tend to violate the freedom of others if their free will is not domesticated by them.

Their life mission is to supervise others citizens and to decide about their substantial rules for living and to decide what and how free citizens must perform their lives and to which ends. Politicians take for granted that the citizen society is principally unable to come to any shared interests, thus admitting that the society consist of elementary exclusive interest, which both use and exclude the interests of the others. Deciding about things concerning the society as a whole, they therefore take for granted that only they are able to decide, because they represent the common interests of the society, the society can never achieve and which must be enforced on the society with the convicting arguments of their power to force the citizens to unquestionably accept what they decide on behalf of the citizen society.

To do this these political Jesuits enjoy being immune against the life aims of individual citizens and to enforce them to accept and follow the decisions only they make – always on behalf of the citizen society as a whole and for their best services. They make their decisions about how to rule the life of the citizens according to how they use their freedom to contribute to the aims of the society as a whole and – from that point of view – know how to distinguish between citizens; between those who support the citizen societies’ objectives and those who need to be supported by the society to exist as society members, serving those who pursue the objectives of the private property ownership. They therefore support the interests of those who own and domesticate the interests of those who do not own, thus making them a fruitful means for the latter.

The representatives of the common will of the citizen society do not devote their lives to serve the citizen society in order to use their power over the individual citizens they force to produce wealth, but not to use for their private life agendas to benefit themselves from this wealth; they devote their lives to their mission, representing the common will of the society of property owners, to sustain the society of private property owners, questioned by their conflicting interests they force the citizens do carry out , because they consider themselves as missionaries of the ideas of a private property ownership, rewarded for as doing a service for mankind.

They are though aware that the power they have, is appealing to be misused for private purposes: to prevent them from being corrupted, they make sure that they are only corrupted by the state they serve via a very decent income and working life and not by any private property owners, a salary and working life, which show in its contrary features, contrary to the features of the people getting their money via selling their labour, how to make this labour attractive via political measures for those who buy their services: high salaries, selfdirected work, short working time, free health and high pension, people who would never be employed by the by the private property owners, but who demonstrate, how to makes a job seeker an attractive offer for others.

These missionary people ruling the citizens society are very much aware that there mission is to sustain the division of the society into citizens who own private properties and those who do not own, thus forcing them to serve the owners for the growth of their properties and to sustain their exclusion from the wealth they produce as a means to sustain their services and that this implies to sustain a society, excluding major parts of this society from pursuing their freedom. They therefore know that it is their mission to oppress all attempts of these citizens, to gain more from the wealth they produce in order to maintain their poverty as a means for the growth of wealth.

Citizens may decide everything regarding their live agendas, as long as what the do is inline with what the freedom donator decides as coinciding what the donator of freedom wants from the citizens as a condition for donating them their freedom. This is what the freedom donator imposes via laws with his exclusive power. Laws induced into the citizen life are not disputable ways ruling the life of how to use their freedom, there are binding, not a matter of the free will, not a matter of any discourse between the citizen and their free will donator, but imposed on them with the same indisputable power that attributes their freedom as the rules excecuting their conceded will as a threat, to otherwise deny any will.

How to get access to this general means of life and how to carry out the life agendas is ruled by the state via law. Setting up rules as laws, binding citizens to carry out their live agendas and decisions in accordance to the laws is the decision monopole of the state.

…. Following a lawful life is ending up in serving the objectives of the state.

Making *all* equally citizens, individual owners of the means for live, irrespectively of what they own, that is if they own or not, and making sure that this ownership over the means of life is enforced across the society, “guaranteeing” private properties, is the elementary objective of the citizen society’s political body, the nation state. It is this very elementary making of the citizen society’s objective enforcing the division of citizens into contradictory, exclusive live aims (not in-equalities, that is falsely gradual differences)

The equal rules for all citizens as individual owners, irrespectively of what they own, that is if they own or not and the very different effects these very equal rules on their live agendas.

It is this irrespect for the real differences, their equality in front of the law, that constitutes the illusion the state was irresponsible for the economic means to perform the freedom of citizens and that constitutes the false reproduction of this division of the political and economic citizen in the false division of social thought in the social sciences into disciplinary knowledge.

The way to enforce performing a citizen life as carrying out live agendas via getting access to money is to set up and to rule this life via laws made by the state is the exclusive decision of the state thanks to his monopole over the rules how the live of citizens must be performed.

The abstract command of citizens over the rules, ruling the life of citizens, deciding over the personal that executes the agenda ruling the live of citizens via their decision monopole the citizens accept via confirming the decision monopolists through their votes.

1. **Living in the citizen society – aims and modes of the citizens society and its state**

The citizen society is constructed by the nation state as the opposing interests of citizens interests in pursuing their freedom to perform their live agendas and the objectives of the wealth the citizen society creates, distinguished into citizens, who do not own anything, getting money for buying things they need to exist for selling their services to produce the increasing wealth for those who bought their services and who own the things those produced who do not own them, to thus reproduce via selling their services to those who own the wealth their own exclusion from this wealth and the wealth in the hands of those who own private properties.

The private ownership, created, maintained and assured by the state, and the distinction in those who own and those who do not own, reproduces the distinction into those who own and those who do not and poverty of those who increase the wealth of those who own properties.

This, achieving the things one needs to pursue the freedom of the citizens and to pursue their individual live agendas conflicts with the objective of the private property ownership of the citizen society as a whole, which is to increase wealth measured in an increased amount of money, measuring against and thus subordinating what the society of private property owners produces, under the command of the increase of money, the substance and benchmark of any private property.

Thanks to the enforced subordination of all life aims under the objectives of the private property ownership, the growth of wealth measured in money, the life agendas of the free citizens are forced to coincide with and to serve this society objective. There individual life agendas are enforced to prioritize gaining money: Since without money no life aims can be reached, money becomes the primary live aim. Buying and selling, the instrumental relations between the private property owners to gain money, using each other for this aim, enforces via this instrumentalism into the social relations of the privates, their vice versa abstractions from what the objectives of what their freedom is aiming at.

The act of selling and buying implies always both: Gaining things for life and giving away option for the free will. The relation of privates property owner is therefore always ignorance, hostility and blackmailing each other as the vice versa means making the other private property owner a lever to gain money, imposed to the free citizens as the nature of theirsocial relations.

All private property owners pursue their live aims disclaiming each other’s means to achieve their life aims performing this hostility via claiming the power monopolized by the nation state. The nation state borrows his power to the private property owners private agendas for reaching those objectives why he established the private property ownership, the growth of the wealth measured in the very money, nobody else but the state established, maintains and assures, to provide the society with the materialisation of what this society is all about, and, last but not least, also as his own economic basis as his major means to rule the life of the society, in which nothing works without money, therefore ruled by the state. Hence the citizenship supervising nation state, prioritizes those private property owners who increase what the private property ownership is about and in which it measures its objectives and success, the increase of wealth measure in nationally supervised money. From this point of view those who only reproduce their non-ownership are a constant failure, a deduction for the growth of wealth, but though an inevitable means for those who do contribute to the growth of wealth. (…welfare state)

The imposition of the state will and via the power of laws and money as the only means to pursue life aims into the social relations of citizens. The only thing you need is power to achieve want you want. The introduction of power as a mean to achieve life aims and the domestication of power of the state – through power.

The allowed will and the citizen society, life agendas constructed via the lawfull will and its supervisor, a society constructing their interrelations via the will of the state, citizens relate to each other via the law, that is via what the state defines as lawful

….Using each other and the lawful hostility, social relation as social instrumentalism.

Everybody with the help of the other at the other’s costs is what constitutes the society of `the citizens the free will pursued as a private property owners, for which they must want a political power relativating their free will and domesticating them all, in order to pursue their conflicting conflicting interests as private property owners.

The only thing private property owners share as their common will is the will to hold this power over them allowing them to practice their free will as private property owners via their domestication through their shared will, to domesticate them – of course, in practice preferably the other, this power uses to direct all privates towards pursuing what the objective of the ownership of wealth measured in money is about , the growth of abstract wealth. Obviously, directing all private property owners towards increasing the growth of what the ownership is about, the exclusive possession of increasing money, the equal treatment of all private towards this aim, implies not only some substantial differences between the privates and how they are treated by their political power, dependent on what it means how their use of what they own contributes to the overall aim to increase the growth of wealth measured in money.

Directed by their common will to pursue via their private properties and what they force them how to achieve their aims via increasing the growth of wealth in money ends up in reproducing the wealth in the hands where it is and the exclusion from it for those who are also private property owners, but who own nothing – at least as long as the accept to use their freedom to pursue their life aims as private property owners, forgetting about their false idea, that this power must serve their live agendas.

It is this communality to domesticate the privates established with the only power to pursue their freedom towards this overall aim, that is the elementary source of the idealisation of the state citizens therefore claim as a service for the citizen’s life aims, ignoring that the service is above all their domestication, directing their will towards what it means to pursue any life aims as a private property owner.

It is the elementary complimentary false idea on the side of the scientific knowledge this society creates, founding theorizing across all social sciences disciplines, and provided by Anthropology and their knowledge about the human nature, to present their common will as private property owners to domesticate them with the power monopole as private property owners, as a reaction of this power on the human nature, therefore transforming the private property ownership as the human nature and the state needed to domesticate this human nature. This is why Antropologiests dig into the “non-civilized” humans (not because they are interested in the colonized prople, they are only interested in their own world of private property owners) to find proofs for this idea, the nation state as a demand of the human natur. Their error is, that the private property ownership is **enforced** on humans as their only way to practice their free will and without the state, nobody would own, that is having the exclusive possession of anything. Nevertheless, all social science disciplines operate with the naturalized state made human as a human nature, provided by Anthropology.

**5. Power, democracy and the human rights (legality of the nation state, freedom of speech etc**)

1. **Fields of politics**

* **political economics**
* **welfare state**
* **laws**

1. **Living in a world of *national* citizens - serving the battles among nation states**

Das größte Problem für nationalstaaten sind – Nationalstaaten. Je erfolgreicher sie Land und Leute für ihrer Ziele zurichten, um so mehr entdecken sie, dass andere Staaten ihnen dasselbe jeneseits ihrer Grenzen verwehren, und zware deswegen, weil dieses dort mit ihren Leuten dasselbe tun, alles daher alles jeneseits der Grenze nach seiner Zurichtung für den andere Staats ruft.

Citizens are inhabitants of nation states.

From a foreigner to a soldier.

The relation of citizens as the made representatives of nation states and their objectives towards others of the same citizens of other states. The world’s people, kept as a hostage of nation states for their political battles about global power, offering their poverty to the global capital for increasing their wealth.

The world’s citizens, hostages of their nation states used for the political affairs of the nation states and for serving the business world.

Some selected conclusions ( to be completed)

* citizens and their conflicting interests are the creatures of nation states and the nation state is the subject setting into force these interests steering them towards its objective, the growth of capitalist wealth; nation state is not an institution responding to the nature of humans, but the citizens societies’s creator, supervisor and maintainer against its very self-destruction he sets into force, thus reproducing the need for his existence
* these nation state made creatures’ objective is the growth of wealth, consisting of humans geared towards this objective, the nation state is not a subject responding to the problems capitalism raises, the nation state is the maker of the societies’s capitalist objectives, steering this society towards this objective and thus the creator of the very problems the society he makes creates and deals with
* Poverty is not a failure of the nation state, but it its purposefully created means for reaching his overall aims, the growth of the capitalist wealth under his regime

1. **Working in the citizen society**
2. **……**