

BASICS OF SOCIETY FOR UNIVERSAL USE

PHILIPPE LANDEUX

Translated from French by Thomas Curelea

UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES
OF THE SOCIAL ORDER
OR
BASICS OF SOCIETY FOR
UNIVERSAL USE

Extras

WHAT IS MONY?

WHAT IS CIVISM?

UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

" Smuggle the truth through all the obstacles its enemies oppose; multiply, spread by all possible means the instructions that can make it triumph; throw by zeal and activity of citizenship the influence of the treasures and machinations lavished to propagate imposture, that, in my opinion, is the most useful occupation and the most sacred duty of pure patriotism; weapons against tyrants, books against intriguers; strength to repel foreign robbers, light to recognize domestic thieves, that is the secret to triumph over all your enemies at once."

Robespierre

Speech on the influence of slander on the Revolution,
Delivered to the Jacobins on October 28, 1792

SUMMARY

Universal Principles of the social order	1
What is Mony ?	41
What is Civism ?	55

**UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES
OF THE SOCIAL ORDER
OR
BASICS OF SOCIETY FOR UNIVERSAL USE**

I.	Society	2
II.	Security and universalism	5
III.	Equality	6
IV.	Freedom	12
V.	Participating in the life of the City / Enjoying the benefits of the City	14
VI.	Property	17
VII.	Laws and Democracy	21
VIII.	Citizenship/Nationality	24
IX.	Government & political system	27
X.	Definitions & conclusion	35

All the Principles of social order are being trampled. This is inevitable in a monetary system (1). But today, the disorder is further *aggravated* by the loss of simple common sense, that common sense found in timeless sayings. Some people swear only by money, others by virtual or disembodied humanity. That the average person lacks objectivity is one thing, but to find this nonsense in laws themselves is outrageous!

It's about time we put some common sense back in the minds, starting with the basics: What is a Society? What is a Citizen? What is a right? A duty? What are the fundamental Principles of the social order? What is a law? A legislator without mastery of these notions would be a tyrannical impostor: not satisfied with his constant blather, he would condemn

(1)One only has to think about the fundamental Principles of a Society worthy of the name and the profound nature of money, its assumptions, its intrinsic mechanisms (or laws) and its natural effects to see that they are in total opposition to each other, and to understand that a "society" cannot be harmonious with an antisocial heart.

UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

others to follow him in his delirium and to be the instruments of their loss whatever social subject we deal with, we must recognize that these notions are as essential as numbers, letters, notes or colors to calculate, write, make music or paint, and that anyone who presents conclusions in this matter that imply their ignorance or negation, conclusions that are therefore based on fallacies and not on the Principles, is equally hypocritical as it is stupid, in all cases a social scourge.

I. Society

What is a Society worthy of the name? (It is necessary to specify "worthy of the name" in order for it not to be mistaken for what we nowadays sometimes call "individualistic society.")

The best way to understand what a Society is starts with looking at what its opposite is: the absence of a Society, the reign of loneliness, every man for himself with the strongest on top, what philosophers have called the state of Nature. Whatever a Society is, it goes without saying that individuals who do not form one in any respect live independently, assume responsibility for themselves, can only rely on their own strength to feed and defend themselves, are unaccountable to anyone, are not protected from anything, can do everything that a superior force does not prevent them from, in other words not much; they have many obligations, but no insurance, no rights; the price of their illusory freedom is to be permanently in danger and constantly on the look-out. The reasons that drive individuals to unite to escape the state of Nature are therefore as obvious as the benefits they seek to obtain from the Societies they form.

First observation: if individuals decide to form a Society, Societies are therefore only constituted by individuals who have made the choice to unite. Then, when a Society is formed, it can only be integrated by individuals who wish to do so and who are accepted by those who are already members. Thus, a Society is made up of individuals of the same animal species (see the second observation) but does not necessarily include all individuals of that species. Moreover, the more numerous, scattered and inevitably different the individuals of this species are in various aspects, the less likely is the case of a unified Society, and it can even be said that, without a universal common enemy from an external

BASICS OF SOCIETY FOR UNIVERSAL USE

space, it is impossible, for union is less the fruit of will than that of necessity. A group is defined by opposition; without opposition, without superior reason to ignore differences, it is divided. It can even, when selfishness prevails over intelligence, be divided when union is required.

Second observation: Society prohibits some relationships between its members, but it cannot bring together individuals who are too different and have conflicting interests. A predator cannot be united with its prey, and vice versa. Yet individuals of one species are naturally and inevitably in one or the other of these positions vis-à-vis individuals of other species. At best, there is only indifference between them as long as they are not in competition. Conversely, Society forces its members to collaborate to satisfy their vital needs: feeding and defending themselves. Union therefore only makes sense between individuals who feed on the same things and are exposed to the same dangers. If we add the need to reproduce, which can only be met by individuals of the same species (genetically compatible), or even of the same race (living nearby and equipped with the right seduction baits), and if we consider that the family is the smallest form of Society, it is indisputable that Societies can only be constituted, in the beginning, by individuals of the same race and, in all cases, belonging to the same species. (2)

Third observation: in the state of Nature, survival of the fittest prevails. It is thus in order to be less weak that individuals join forces. A Society is a collective force designed to support power relations with the rest of the world. This collective force can be used rightly or wrongly, out of

(2) All living species are divided into subsets which, in turn, can be further subdivided. In truth, it's the same for all things. Each living species, each kind of thing contains units of various types that can form several major categories and form particular classes within these categories. Thus, the human species is subdivided into races, themselves into ethnic groups. We aren't trying to figure out the how here, just acknowledging the fact. It must also be noted that human races correspond to well-defined geographical areas, often far from each other and sometimes separated by natural borders that are almost impassable for primitive man. If it is therefore not unlikely that today's "Societies" include individuals from all over the world, it is obvious that this racial mixture could not exist in primitive Societies, since the different races then had no contact with each other, unlike ethnic groups. It follows that the present Societies which are the development of primitive Societies were built by individuals of the same race and that the racial dimension is part of their identity. The fact that people nowadays have the means to move around and join the most open Societies (because not all of them are, and the most criticized are often the least deserving of criticism from this point of view) doesn't alter the fact that the societies that welcome them, like those they've left, have a racial dimension that can be nuanced but mustn't disappear or be denied as doing so would destroy them.

UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

objective interest or miscalculation, to defend or attack, to build or destroy; it can be contained, overpowered or crushed, but it is pointless for the weak to denounce it instead of strengthening themselves and fighting it, and for the strong to condemn it after defeating it, since only force is law and victory has already decided.

Forth observation: individuals form a Society to escape the state of Nature. New relationships are therefore established between them, but they and their Society are always in the state of Nature regarding everything that surrounds them. Thus, as long as individuals of the same species do not form a single Society, the various Societies are among themselves in the state of Nature: the weak act with caution in the absence of anything better, the strong, and those who believe they are, act as masters, good or bad. Even a single Society would still be in the state of Nature in relation to the rest of nature. The relationships that men establish between themselves only involve themselves! Societies and belonging to a Society does not stop isolated or massive attacks by other animals and does not prevent storms to blow.

Fifth observation: the biggest inconvenient of the state of Nature is the permanent danger of death, which, for living beings, is far from ideal. Therefore, the greatest benefit that individuals seek in forming a Society is not immortality, but increased safety. It is thus safe to say that individuals are driven to form a Society by an instinct for self-preservation.

Sixth observation: in the state of Nature, survival of the fittest prevails. It follows that relationships between individuals belonging to the same Society are not based on force, but on what is commonly known as the law, that is, on at least tacit agreements that all members of the Society acknowledge, respect and guarantee. The state of law is the opposite of the state of Nature. However, we have seen that a Society is in the state of Nature in relation to everything that surrounds it. International law is therefore but an illusion: it's a beautiful fiction that can't withstand much pressure. What's bred in the bone...

These observations make it possible to identify what a Society is, but not to define it properly. It is the mistake of 18th century philosophers, particularly Rousseau, to have followed this approach then stopped at this stage. To do this, we need to think further, read between the lines and draw all the logical conclusions from the vital union, that is, from political association.

BASICS OF SOCIETY FOR UNIVERSAL USE

II. Security & universalism

If individuals form a Society to increase their safety, the Society has a duty to protect them so that Security is guaranteed to them as a right. This Security, consisting in not being attacked by other members and being protected against external enemies is up to the level of the Society's capabilities.

Consequences:

- 1) Security is a fundamental right and the first of all rights.
- 2) Basic rights derive from the act of political association and are constant from one Society to the other (it is only in that sense that they are universal), since all Societies have the same *raison d'être*.
- 3) It is the responsibility of each Society to guarantee and extend the range of its members' rights.
- 4) The range of a right - its guarantee and its variations - depends on the species of the individuals and the capacities of the Society, therefore also on the time period for humanity.
- 5) The Principles of Social Order are universal, but their application is local, national.
- 6) The recognized and guaranteed rights within a Society are null and void outside it, or at the very least illusory.
- 7) Rights only exist within a Society, no other entity being able to recognize and guarantee them.

III. Equality

Now, since the Society must guarantee the Security of its members, and since it merges with them, it is ultimately up to them, the members, the Citizens, to guarantee it.

Consequences:

- 8) A Citizen's Security is the result, not of his personal means of defense, but of the protection that his fellow Citizens provide him.
- 9) Citizens have a duty to protect only those individuals who feel the same obligation to them.

UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

10) Individual and collective Security is a consequence of the Citizens's duty to protect each other.

11) "Defending the City and its Citizens" is the first Citizen's duty.

12) "To stand in solidarity with one's fellow Citizens to the fullest extent of one's means" is another way of defining this first duty by giving it a broader meaning.

13) There are duties only in reciprocity, which results in the same rights for all.

14) Only in Equality are there duties and rights.

15) Equality (in duties and rights) is the fundamental Principle of the social order.

16) There is equality in Nature only in the face of death; there are rights and equality in rights only in Society; there are no *natural* rights.

17) *Natural, innate, human rights*, also called *people's rights*, are a fiction invented by civilized beings and require a society to recognize and guarantee them (to individuals within its reach), proof that they do not exist by themselves.

18) Only individuals who fulfill their duties towards the City are and remain Citizens; those who do not fulfill them, either because they are not or stopped being in a position to do so, or because they do not want to or fulfill them towards another City, have no rights in the City, at least they cannot have the Citizen's rights; if they are still granted rights, it is only through the City's grace, based on its capacities and in accordance with its humanity (3).

(3)According to the Principles of Social Order taken literally, the children, anyone who's inactive, lazy, sick, old or foreign, who doesn't participate in the life of the City, or even is a burden on it, is not or is no longer a citizen and therefore has no rights in the City. The capacities and mentality of the City may evolve to the point where it would be possible to recognize the rights of individuals belonging to these categories, or even to push to the extreme the duty of solidarity and no longer deny citizenship to some of them. Nevertheless, as far as children are concerned, they will never be Citizens, will never be considered as such and will not enjoy the rights attached to this status, they won't be granted all the rights due to their youth and their inability to exercise them, to admit that Citizens can be unequal would be to destroy Equality and Society in the name of individuals who are not even Citizens. It is therefore important not to mix up the rights that the City recognizes out of humanity to individuals unable to support themselves with those of the Citizen based on their own merit; the two are called "rights", but they do not have

BASICS OF SOCIETY FOR UNIVERSAL USE

19) Citizenship is acquired through duties and is preserved through the permanent fulfillment of these duties and respect for the rights of others; it is not innate, it can therefore be withdrawn; any Citizen who fails to fulfill his obligations violates or even breaks the social pact, compromises Equality and is exposed to sanctions that may even lead to the loss of Citizenship.

20) The right of Citizens to be protected by the City does not deprive them of the right to defend themselves and their property (cf. § 44) by all means in their power when they are alone in the face of an aggressor and thus forced back, because of him, into the state of Nature. — A Citizen couldn't be less secure than having to respect the laws of the City facing an aggressor who has freed himself from them all. In the state of Nature, although no law protects him, since there aren't any, none prevents him from defending himself as well as he can. The City that once failed in its duty cannot fail a second time by prosecuting a Citizen who was lucky enough to have the upper hand over his aggressor under the pretense that the latter also has rights. Laws are made to empower, protect and avenge those who respect them, not to provide power, impunity and revenge to outlaws.

These observations may lead to some confusion and raise questions. Being unable to guess all the potential questions and objections, here is at least four points that it is important to clarify.

First of all, it's been shown that there is a direct link between duties and rights, the latter resulting from the former. It is true that a right is generated by a specific duty. However, this conclusion is wrong from an individual point of view. A Citizen doesn't generate his own rights since he owes them to the duties that his fellow citizens fulfill towards him. Of course, he has the same obligations towards them. He therefore fulfills the duties that generate the rights of the same nature as those he enjoys, but he isn't the direct author of the rights he personally enjoys. But we would still be wrong to think that a Citizen wishing to enjoy only certain rights could simply fulfill the corresponding duties a priori. Being a member of the Society, belonging to the City, confers a set of obligations. There are no discounted Citizens; there are only full-fledged Citizens, equal in duties and rights, or foreigners. In other words, the

the same origin and are not of the same nature. Humanity can complete the Principles; it must under no circumstances undermine them, as that would mean cutting off the branch it is sitting on.

UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

rights of the Citizen are the prerogative of Citizenship, which is obtained and preserved through the fulfillment of a set of duties.

In line with this reflection, it should be noted that duties precede rights and that a Society perfectly fulfills its role when it guarantees to all its Citizens all the rights that their duties generate. Equality is no more and no less than that. Therefore, acts that fall within the scope of the law should not be confused with those that don't concern it as long as they don't jeopardize the rights of others. Nor should we believe that a society is unequal or unfair because, due to lack of individual or collective capacity, the rights of its citizens are less extensive than those of another society: Equality and justice are not measured by comparison between societies, but by the duties fulfilled and the rights that must consequently be enjoyed by Citizens of the same society. These remarks make it clear that all animal Societies apply the Principles to the letter and are egalitarian (4), unlike the human concentrations bearing the same name, which, always with the right word in their mouths, are all unequal and ignore the fundamentals of Equality.

The most common objection against Equality (in rights) is that it would be inconceivable because everything is different, nothing is equal in nature. Those who make such statements to support their privileges or accept their oppression all speak of rights, of society. However, the notion of right is inseparable from that of duty, which makes no sense when there's no equality. As established before, rights come from reciprocity in duties. Being equal in duties, grants both parties the same rights. Equality is mathematical! This is obvious if we reason with two individuals and remains true when Society counts millions of them, since Citizens, as many as they may be, always have the same duties towards each other and, consequently, guarantee the same rights. We can also say that, if a Citizen has duties towards the City, which is all of its fellow Citizens, the latter, therefore all of its fellow Citizens, has the same duties towards him, each having the same rights. Whether a Citizen has a single fellow Citizen or a multitude of them represented by the City, the scheme is basically the same, as are its consequences. (The question here is not why or how, inequality has entered human societies, thus giving birth to an unprecedented state, an intermediate state between

(4)The issue of dominance in social animals often distorts human judgment, forgetting that in animal societies, their members have only one right, the right to be safe (which is generally limited to being safe and, in carnivores, to be able to eat). The priorities or perks that the dominant ones may have in certain areas do not compromise the other individuals' Safety and are therefore not an infringement of the Principle of Equality.

BASICS OF SOCIETY FOR UNIVERSAL USE

that of Nature and Society, namely the state of Oppression which, from a distance, has the appearance of a Society but, if you look closely enough, survival of the fittest rules.)

However, it is true that individuals are naturally different. But do differences prevent associations? Is the idea that we find strength through unity a fallacy? Associations and unions do exist. It must therefore be admitted that they exist despite the inevitable natural differences between individuals, because each individual, man or woman, strong or weak, both gives and gets something out of them. Far from being an obstacle to union, differences in skills and talents, which guarantee complementarity between individuals, are an asset to the group; they are even essential to the completion of all tasks and the existence of the Society. In short, we cannot speak of rights, Citizens, or Equality, as if always in the state of Nature in which none of those exist, for these subjects clearly concern the state of Society in which all these notions are consubstantial. A Citizen is more than an individual, more than a man, more than a natural being reduced to his own forces; he's a moral being endowed with rights, the fruit of Society and its laws based on Equality. Equality is the very nature of Society; it is what distinguishes it from the state of Nature (which is not even unequal since the notions of Equality and rights do not exist there). Natural differences are therefore not an acceptable argument against social equality; they are invoked, to maintain the status quo, only by the ignorant, the tyrants and their servants.

Finally, to wrap up the question of Equality, which we say applies to duties and rights, it is imperative to introduce nuances without which applications give rise to aberrations and therefore to misinterpretations of what Equality is. In reality, there are several levels of duties and rights, three exactly: fundamental, indirect and particular. Equality applies of course to fundamental rights and duties, and also to indirect rights; it does not apply to indirect duties or to particular rights and duties. To understand this, it is first necessary to understand why there are by nature different levels of duties and rights.

The reason is simple: with regard to duties, a fundamental duty is purely theoretical and is expressed in several ways from a practical point of view, so that fulfilling a fundamental duty in a certain way is an indirect duty that confers particular obligations; with regard to rights, a fundamental right is also theoretical and refers in one word to all the rights that contribute to the benefit of that fundamental right and whose

UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

individual exercise may, in certain cases, generate particular rights. (Particular rights can also be the counterpart of particular duties.) It is therefore clear that some duties derive from others and that, by definition, not all are on the same level. The same goes for rights. The big difference between duties and rights is that it is sufficient for Citizens to fulfill an indirect duty arising from a fundamental duty to fulfill each in their own way the said fundamental duty (5), while all Citizens must be granted all the indirect rights attached to a fundamental right to be truly equal in the exercise of this fundamental right. Equality in indirect duties is meaningless, because it is impossible and unnecessary for Citizens to be equal in fundamental duties (all people who work, whatever their profession, work), whereas, conversely, equality in a fundamental right is meaningless unless Citizens are also equal in all indirect rights that are the result of this fundamental right (people cannot be equally free without truly having the same liberties). On the other hand, equality in particular rights is as senseless as it is impossible since these rights derive either from the free exercise of indirect rights in which Citizens must be equal, or from the fulfillment of particular duties that not all Citizens are required to fulfill.

Without over-anticipating, it should be noted that Property or the right to own exists (through Society) and must be recognized, but is a particular right to which, according to what we have just said, Equality does not apply. Property, from an individual point of view, is about goods produced for oneself or acquired for personal use. In the case of individual production for personal use, it is obvious that productions - on which the right of ownership is not based on the work provided, but on the uncontested or previously recognized possession of the materials used - vary in nature, quality and quantity from one individual to another, so the concept of Equality is meaningless. The same is true when individuals exchange property among them and thus transfer ownership rights that do not eventually change anything. In the case of

(5) Citizens who fulfill an indirect duty arising from a fundamental duty each perform that fundamental duty in their own way, and are therefore Citizens on the same level and must be granted the same rights. In other words, the rights of Citizens do not vary according to their function, since all the functions they perform in the interest of the City are gates to Citizenship that open to the same rights. Whatever his function in the City, a Citizen is a Citizen. Although the functions are by nature different and "hierarchical", this does not justify that Citizens should be unequal in rights, which would deny their very Citizenship and exempt them from any duty. It is therefore absurd to believe that the inevitable and necessary hierarchy implies inequality in the rights of Citizens and that Equality proscribes the hierarchy of functions and people. Equality and hierarchy are perfectly compatible. The current cause of inequality "in rights" is fundamentally outside the hierarchy.

BASICS OF SOCIETY FOR UNIVERSAL USE

acquisitions, the right of ownership of goods results from the exercise of another right, an indirect right (market access), and is therefore a particular right to which Equality does not apply by definition. Not only is equality in rights not equality in property, but Freedom even condemns its principle as much as the nature of things makes it forever impossible. Thus, Property is not a fundamental right as claimed by the bourgeoisie, nor is it likely to be equalized as the communists would like.

IV. Freedom

We have mentioned the notion of Freedom several times. This notion, like that of Security, is intrinsic to the act of political association.

Reasons:

21) Individuals who associate to protect each other can only associate freely, i.e. without constraint (6),

22) Just as individuals must freely and voluntarily join an association, individuals who are already members are free to welcome, refuse and exclude anyone they wish

23) It is up to the association to set the non-negotiable requirements that each individual must meet in order to be able to integrate it if he or she so wishes, requirements that, even if satisfied, do not oblige the association to welcome him or her, which would otherwise allow foreigners to force his or her hand and place their wants above those of the Citizens they claim to become

(6) Individuals "associated" against their will do not form an association since they are more in a master/slave relationship, therefore in a balance of power, as in the state of Nature. For the weak, this "association" is in itself a danger to be averted either by flight or by murder. For the strong, the presence of the weak, who are supposed to protect them, is illusory and dangerous because those they oppress are entitled to kill them at the first opportunity and have no reason to help them repel an external enemy, to whom they are even likely to lend a helping hand. Forced union is thus in no one's interest.

UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

24) As no one can freely join a group that would require more from him than from other members, partners cannot require more from a newcomer than from themselves

25) As no one can be forced into slavery without coercion, partners in a position of strength cannot grant a newcomer advantages that they deprive themselves of

26) As no one can deliberately renounce one state for another less advantageous one, partners who have renounced a certain liberty must find within the association, despite its constraints, an even greater liberty, in other words, more liberties

27) Free political association excludes slavery, oppression, exploitation and tyranny, and implies equality in duties and rights for both old and new citizens. 28) Freedom is the complement and even an extension of Security; without Security, Freedom is a privilege for some, a short-lived illusion for all others; without Freedom, Security is a permanent oppression and therefore a danger in itself.

29) Freedom, which is a right only in Society, cannot consist in doing everything we want or can as in the state of Nature (which individuals have fled), but in enjoying the same liberties, that is to say the same rights (fundamental and indirect) as our fellow citizens and in being able to do everything that is not contrary to our duties, the rights of others and legitimate laws (cf. § 61).

30) Freedom being all the known and recognized liberties in a Society, liberties coming from said Society, in other words the fruit of the duties that Citizens fulfill towards it, a liberty in a domain consists in enjoying on an equal footing with its Citizens all the possibilities that the City offers in this domain, and not simply to exercise its natural faculties.

Freedom, which is a fundamental right, like Security, is subordinated to Equality, which is the fundamental Principle of the social order. Far from being contradictory, there can't be one without the other. Without Equality, there are no more Citizens, no more Society, and " Freedom " is only the law of the strongest in one form or another: without Freedom, Society is no longer a free association but a prison for the masses, a livestock for the privileged, and " Equality " on any level is at best a slogan.

V. Participating in the life of the City / Enjoying the benefits of the City

BASICS OF SOCIETY FOR UNIVERSAL USE

The more Citizens there are, the more powerful a Society is, the greater the Security, the less external attacks are to be feared, the less the Citizens have the opportunity to fulfill their first duty which is to defend the City and their fellow Citizens. Citizenship can therefore no longer be based on the fulfillment of this duty alone; it must be conferred by something else.

Let us already note that *defending the City and its Citizens* is not the only duty. Citizens also have the duty to be in solidarity with each other, a duty that contains the first one. Solidarity takes some forms in terms of physical protection, defense in the literal sense, but the forms it can take are much more numerous. Security itself is not limited to being protected from external attacks, but concerns all forms of dangers against which the Society can intervene and which it must not itself create. These dangers may be natural or external, such as hunger, disease, cold, wind, climate in general, which leads the Society to recognize and guarantee, if it can, indirect rights such as the right to be fed, sheltered, clothed, cared for, et cetera, and, upstream, to establish or recognize as indirect duties all activities that overcome these dangers and generate or guarantee such rights. These dangers can also arise from internal disturbances when the pretensions and prevarications of some, instead of being condemned, have free rein at the expense of the Security and Freedom of others, when they destroy Equality between Citizens and are therefore the bearers of oppression and exploitation. Society must therefore proscribe anything that undermines what it recognizes as rights, even the most insignificant rights in appearance, because small inequalities are a precursor to large ones. Thus, duties and rights can, take various forms and their scope of application can be extended as far as the capacities of the species and the Society at a given time allow it.

Consequences:

31) When a Society develops, when its activities multiply, when the tasks to be carried out in the general interest are more and more numerous, when Citizens can no longer be united by the mere fact of defending each other and ensuring their security in the literal sense, because they rarely have the opportunity anymore, Citizenship must be conferred by the performance of a broader duty than the previous ones, it must reside in the performance of daily acts useful directly or indirectly to the City, in a word, it must consist in "participating in the life of the City" in a form recognized by it.

UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

32) All tasks whose social utility is recognized by the City, even indirectly, all tasks which exempt other Citizens from performing them in order to devote themselves to other equally useful tasks are a duty to the City: whoever fulfills them by satisfying the requirements of the City participates in the life of the City, is a Citizen, and must be equal in rights with his fellow Citizens (7).

33) The City doesn't assign tasks; Citizens distribute them freely, i.e. according to their desires, capacities and possibilities.

34) Citizens can fulfill their duty to Participate in the life of the City individually or in groups; when they do so in groups, they form a legal person whose duty is to the extent of its potential, a person whom all the Citizens who compose it are equally representing before the City and who are therefore in solidarity in rewards and sanctions, a person who is the only party accountable to the City and who is the sole responsible for its internal management.

35) The City defines its requirements according to its interests and according to the number of Citizens concerned, it is up to the Citizens or groups of Citizens to satisfy them. Participation in the life of the City

(7) This conception of Citizenship - whoever participates in the life of the City is a Citizen and must be equal in rights to his fellow citizens - condemns by nature the slavery that raged in ancient cities. In these cities, citizenship was the prerogative of professional or occasional warriors and corresponded to what we call here Nationality (cf. VIII. Citizenship / *Nationality*), a term that did not then exist. Moreover, what we call Citizenship did not exist as a status, so those who were Citizens according to the present criteria (participating in the life of the City), but not according to the old criteria (defending the City), were nothing (women, free foreigners called *metoikoi* among the Greeks, slaves). Today, things are reversed but fundamentally similar: citizenship and nationality are confused, terms are used interchangeably, and what the elders called *citizenship* corresponds to what we generally call *nationality*. As a result, non-naturalized immigrant workers are still not considered citizens. But the confusion between nationality and citizenship means that the former, which today does not imply any duty of loyalty to the nation although it confers political rights, is granted on the basis of both the broader, inconsistent, and, in a word, insipid, criteria of the current notion of citizenship. That is why self-proclaimed "world citizens" and naturalized but not assimilated immigrants who, at best, should not be more than mere Citizens are misled when they brandish their nationality as a sesame, because it objectively has no value, which does not fool nationals who are truly attached to the nation. Worse! While Citizenship and Nationality are deserved and can be withdrawn, their current confusion makes them almost inalienable, insofar as the justified forfeiture of one would sometimes lead to the abusive forfeiture of the other, so that, to prevent abuse, scandal is accepted. Thus, the confusion of notions weakens them mutually and leads to the deterioration of things.

BASICS OF SOCIETY FOR UNIVERSAL USE

provides the rights of the Citizens to the interested parties but *above all* aims to provide for the needs of the City that decides what the optimal course of action is.

36) When a form of participation generates production, the City's interest is not so much in the quantities produced as in the quantities sold: the City does not only require production, it requires above all that this production be judged useful by a significant number of Citizens. (Needless to say that the same goes for services, without demand, a service offer doesn't create any real service and therefore constitutes a null activity in the eyes of the City.)

37) The fruit of a duty towards the City is by definition intended for the City and therefore belongs to the latter, at least in the first place: producing as part of a duty doesn't have as a counterpart, for the producer, the ownership of the production in question, but Citizenship, i.e. the rights of the Citizen. (Owning what you produce is like producing for yourself, which cannot be a duty to the City.)

38) When all Citizens have the duty to participate in the life of the City in a form recognized by it, they have in return the right to enjoy all its benefits, the result of their global efforts.

39) Enjoying the benefits of the City is a fundamental right, just like the Security and Freedom it actually contains; without it or in inequality, Citizenship makes no sense and is of much less appeal.

40) The right to enjoy the benefits of the City applied to material production (because not all benefits are material) consists either in sharing the general or collective product, if not in equal parts, then at least in appropriate parts, or in recognizing the right of Citizens to access it, that is, to freely access the market because of their Citizenship, which is the perfection of Equality.

41) The equitable sharing of the general or collective product is appropriate for small non-productive Societies that can't do otherwise; the distribution of the collective product through the exercise of the right to access the market is only possible in developed, industrialized and computerized Societies.

42) The right to access the market derives from the fundamental right to enjoy the benefits of the City; it is therefore an indirect right, a right conferred by Citizenship that all Citizens must enjoy equally, a right that has no limits other than the needs, tastes and desires of the Citizen who

Thank You for previewing this eBook

You can read the full version of this eBook in different formats:

- HTML (Free /Available to everyone)
- PDF / TXT (Available to V.I.P. members. Free Standard members can access up to 5 PDF/TXT eBooks per month each month)
- Epub & Mobipocket (Exclusive to V.I.P. members)

To download this full book, simply select the format you desire below

