

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' 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

## UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

exercises it, respect for the rights of others, the exercise by other Citizens of the same right, the nature of things and possibly the law, it too, equal for all.

### VI. Property

Animals are physical beings. They have concrete needs that only material things can satisfy. These things, perishable or durable, for individual or collective use, can be found in nature or manufactured by an individual or group. The question is what these various things are from a legal point of view, knowing that, in any case, they can only be objects of law within the context of a Society.

Participating in the life of the City sometimes means producing things, making goods. Enjoying the benefits of the City depends, to a great extent, on access to material things that constitute the collective product.

Consequences:

43) All the material things constituting the collective product, which Citizens need to live or enjoy some of their rights, are inseparable from the rights that the City must guarantee to its Citizens and become, once in the hands of the latter, having been shared or withdrawn from the market for their personal use, their properties.

44) Property - or the right to own - consists, for a natural or legal person, in holding or being able to use personally, freely and exclusively property recognized as his or her own by the City or on which the latter does not contest this right.

45) There is no Property without Society: all property is relative (8) and owes its existence, if not physical, at least moral to Society; it is

(8) All property is relative: it is only really recognized by the Society, which defends it against internal criminals and external enemies. Outside this Society and without its strength, Property does not exist, in the same way as any other right, even if the temporary absence of foreign aggression may create an illusion. Imagine a war occurs against a stronger enemy: the country is invaded, conquered, property is shamelessly destroyed or abducted, inhabitants are killed, hunted, exploited, stripped, expropriated, the rights of which they prided themselves are ignored or, at best, maintained by the victor out of interest or humanity. The same applies to the entire territory that the City considers its Property but which is only one in its own eyes and which is therefore not one in absolute terms. If it doesn't know how to defend and preserve it, this territory will one day belong to someone stronger.

## BASICS OF SOCIETY FOR UNIVERSAL USE

therefore up to the City to indicate which goods may or may not be owned, by whom, under what conditions and possibly in what quantities, at least for goods whose nature does not indicate by itself who owns them (9); the right of ownership, possession and use of properties is limited by the fulfillment of its duties upstream, respect for the rights of others downstream, by the nature of things and if necessary by the law.

46) A good can only be converted into property in three ways: 1) following the acquisition through the exercise of the right of access to the market, 2) following the distribution by the City of the collective product, 3) through recovery or discovery which, unless it is illegal, gives rise to de facto possession, recognized or not contested.

47) A good does not become property in the hands of an individual on the pretext that he has manufactured it personally or obtained it by exchange: it is only considered one if he has manufactured it with materials that were already his property or on which the Property was not contested, his efforts therefore not being taken into account, or if this good was already Property in the hands of the person from whom he received it, who has used his right by assigning it, which would always be the case even if he had given nothing in exchange.

48) Citizens must be equal in the right to freely access the market (cf. § 42); they cannot therefore take away and possess the same things and in the same quantities, even if this is possible in theory, especially since not all their properties come from the market.

49) The rights of Citizens depend on Citizenship, not on what they own; possession of property is a particular right that can be assigned or exchanged but does not itself confer rights, including the right to access the market (indirect right) and thus acquire property, since it is Property that most often derives from it.

(9) A material good doesn't float in space: it inevitably belongs to someone, whether that person is a natural person or a legal person, i.e. a group of people who can range from couples to all Citizens, including all possible subgroups. Moreover, all property is private from the point of view of those who do not own it or who simply don't have the right to use it. The notion of private property therefore makes no sense. We can only distinguish between personal property (which only the individual owner, or perhaps his family, can use), collective property (which all members of a given community can use for personal purposes) and common property (which can only be used collectively or individually but in the interest of the community).

## UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

50) Under no circumstances can immaterial things be property; *intellectual property* is a monstrosity; the City cannot recognize their authors, inventors, discoverers, et cetera, more than paternity, and this is the best case scenario.

51) An individual or collective production produced as part of the duty to participate in the life of the City and intended for the market cannot be the property of the producers. (cf. § 37)

52) Even if acquired individually - any acquisition requires at least tacit authorization from the City - collective or common property isn't, by definition, personal property: it is either the collective or common property of the group of users, or the inalienable property of the City that has allowed access to said property by granting only its use.

53) Earth is in theory the Property of Humanity, it belongs to all men in general and to none in particular; in practice, and until men form a single City, the principle applies to each City installed on a fixed territory and strong enough to preserve it (see note 8): its land belongs to all Citizens collectively and to none personally.

54) The portions of land that the City entrusts to its Citizens for any purpose whatsoever remains its property, even if the users and temporary occupants are considered owners in the eyes of their fellow Citizens. (10).

55) The natural resources of the City's soil and subsoil are also its property and may only be exploited with its agreement and in the general interest: their exploitation does not provide operators with any advantage other than Citizenship, i.e. the rights of the Citizen.

### VII. Laws and Democracy

(10) Under its social appearances, the slogan "La terre aux paysans" (the land belongs to the peasants) is totally antisocial. Land use is the means of feeding the City, i.e. all Citizens. It is for this purpose that the City entrusts portions of it to farmers, herders, etc. The latter cannot therefore use the land as they wish, according to their interests; they must exploit it, fulfill their function and put their production on the market of the City so that all Citizens can access it. Farmers do not and must not own the land or their production because, otherwise, they would have, thanks to the City, the power to starve the Citizens, which, even if they did not use this power, would be an aberration. This doesn't mean that peasants are slaves, that they work for nothing, but that, like their fellow Citizens, their rights do not depend on any property but on their Citizenship.

## BASICS OF SOCIETY FOR UNIVERSAL USE

The City is a free political association (association for the initial purpose of survival) between Citizens who are equal in duties and rights. Equality is the keystone of the social building; Security and Liberty are the cement.

Consequences:

56) The fundamental laws or Principles of the social order derive from the act of political association; they are not invented by Citizens but dictated by the nature of their union: it is less a question of agreeing and expressing them than of acknowledging and respecting them.

57) The Principles of the social order are timeless and universal; they form the basis of any Society, of whatever kind and at whatever time; only laws related to the particular needs of a given Society at a given time are temporary and/or specific.

58) Temporary and/or specific laws, whether general or particular, must be expressed or even written, in contrast to fundamental laws, which may be tacit, and must not contradict the latter when they are not merely an extension thereof.

59) Insofar as laws must be in conformity with the Principles, they must be the same for all Citizens, all must comply to them, so that no one has more or fewer rights than others, that no one is de facto master or slave, that the Security and Freedom of everyone are ensured and reach as far as possible.

60) When laws are equal for all Citizens, when all are equally bound by them, including the legislator, and when Citizens are truly equal in rights, personal interest becomes general interest: everyone desires for himself, therefore for others, all the rights and freedoms that no one can enjoy at the expense of others, not even himself.

61) When the laws are equal for all citizens, they are *just* (11); when they are the work of those they govern, they are *legitimate*, when they

(11) "The laws must be equal for all Citizens. "This formula should not be reduced to "laws must be equal for all", which no longer means anything. The laws concerning Citizens must indeed be equal, but this equality does not extend to foreigners (tourists, passing foreign workers, illegal immigrants, etc.), since they are not Citizens, can and must be subject to particular rules or laws, or the specific nature of each other could be denied, Citizens treated foreigners or foreigners as Citizens, which would be absurd in both cases. Taking into account real differences is not discrimination, which consists in "establishing"

## UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

benefit all or at least the majority of the Citizens, without fundamentally harming the other part, they are *good*; when they benefit only a minority of "Citizens" at the expense of the majority, they are *unequal*, *anti-social* and *unfair*; when they do not objectively benefit anyone or satisfy the purpose that the legislator intended or weaken the City, they are *bad*; when Citizens are subjected to them without their consent, whether good or bad, they are *null* and *void*; when they are *null* and *unfair*, they are *tyrannical*.

62) Ideally, laws should be good, which they cannot be without being fair, which they cannot be without being legitimate.

63) Knowing that legislating is different from governing, we can distinguish three forms of legislative system: 1) democracy, where all Citizens contribute to the creation of laws and are subject only to those they have collectively agreed on, 2) oligarchy (aristocracy, theocracy, plutocracy) where power is monopolized under various pretexts by some and exercised above all for their benefit, 3) despotism, where legislative power belongs to a single person, which is a view of the mind insofar as such authority cannot exist without a foundation in the City and is no longer despotic in the literal sense as soon as it has one (cf. note 21).

64) No legislative system can guarantee good laws; the important thing is therefore that the system is by nature virtuous, that it is capable and has in itself the need to correct its mistakes, which can only be the case if the legislator's interest meets that of the subjects, if the legislator is confused with the Citizens, if all Citizens are truly equal in rights.

65) The rules enacted by an oligarchy are diktats, they are by nature illegitimate and the only thing they have in common with a real law is the name; they are inevitably unequal or have only the appearance of Equality, and are therefore unfair; they are deliberately bad from a general point of view.

66) Only democracy is appropriate for a society worthy of the name: the laws it produces, the works of all Citizens, are naturally legitimate, necessarily egalitarian and quickly rectified or repealed if it is found that they are not good.

artificial differences. Here, the abuse would not be to distinguish but to confuse what is indeed different in terms of status.

## BASICS OF SOCIETY FOR UNIVERSAL USE

67) For laws to be truly the work of Citizens, all Citizens must be able to propose them according to established rules, and all those considered, regardless of who created them, must be ratified by them. A system in which Citizens are not allowed to propose laws, or are cleverly prevented from doing so, and in which they haven't been consulted in one way or another about those to which they are subject is undemocratic. Thus, the exclusively representative regime is a negation of democracy (12): it is in fact an oligarchy.

68) A law is ratified by Citizens when it's submitted to their approval and receives at least a majority of the votes cast. Citizens who don't vote let others decide for them and are not entitled to contest the verdict. Citizens who have spoken differently from the majority must also accept the verdict and respect the law, although they may criticize it.

(12) Theorists of democracy have seen the trap and imposture of the exclusively representative regime where a body of elected representatives, often from the same social class, ends up depriving the People of sovereignty and acting against them, supposedly in their name. First of all, the People can only be represented by themselves. Elected officials are not "representatives", but agents whose function is to do what the People as a whole can't do by themselves and to submit their work for ratification by the People so that it becomes their own. To call "representatives of the People" individuals who are only their agents obviously has the purpose or at least the consequence of abolishing the popular ratification procedure on the pretext that the People have already expressed themselves through their so-called representatives, thus putting the agents in the place of the People. However, the problem is not that there are agents, but that the regime is exclusively "representative". Direct democracy is only possible in Societies where there are very few Citizens, so that very quickly a form of mandate is established. The important thing is not, therefore, to know how the agents are appointed, but whether the laws they imagine are ratified by the People and thus become their work. It is the popular endorsement of laws that characterizes democracy, not the method of appointing legislators who can be elected, drawn by lot, appointed or even self-proclaimed. Ratification is only unnecessary in the case of the imperative mandate, i.e. when elected officials have an express mandate to support a specific bill. Apart from this case, an election is not a referendum. It must even be said that, without systematic ratification of the laws devised by elected officials, elections are nothing more than a democratic charade. Indeed, if elected officials are not required to keep their promises and can do what they want, if they mislead their voters all along the line, their election doesn't in any way legitimize their actions, which oscillate between deception and improvisation. However, it is obvious that elected officials will not keep all their promises and will have to improvise. In short, only one thing is true; their person was elected. The election therefore doesn't legitimize their actions; it simply confers on them the right to hold a position, instituted to serve the People. In other words, the purpose of the mandate is to allow a small number of people, not to substitute their will for that of all citizens, but to do what a multitude would be unable to do, namely deliberate and formulate laws, which does not mean adopting them. The legislative assembly proposes; the People dispose. That is what democracy is all about. "Exclusively representative democracy" is therefore a double imposture.

## UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

69) When it is impossible to submit all laws to all Citizens for approval, an intermediate path must be found between a permanent referendum and the imposture of representation, but one that does not deviate from the Principle.

70) Any society, any egalitarian system is by nature democratic (13) ; any inherently unequal system is incompatible with an authentic democracy. Expecting democracy to bring about Equality is proof that there is no Equality (therefore that the interests of citizens diverge and that some have the power to have their particular interests prevail) and that we are at best in the illusion of democracy.

### VIII. Citizenship / Nationality

The laws must above all satisfy the interests of the City and must be ratified by the Citizens they will govern.

Consequences:

71) The right to contribute to the formation of the City's laws, to its direction and to the management of its most cherished interests, implies living within it, reasoning according to its interests, being unable to leave it by personal convenience and even less to abandon it in adversity, in a word to be viscerally attached to it and ready to defend it at the risk of its life if necessary.

72) When, with few exceptions, people are born and die in the same place, they do not choose their City, they don't imagine belonging to another, their allegiance is natural and total, they are destined to become and remain Citizens, therefore to live forever under the laws of the City, they are bound to their fellow Citizens by blood and spirit, past and future, for better and worse; then the City merges with the Nation, Citizenship is in fact synonymous of Nationality (see. note 7).

73) When people become mobile, when Citizens come from all walks of life and can leave at any time, when they often have in common only their presence in the same place at the same time, when they consider

(13)A Society worthy of the name is by nature egalitarian and democratic. Society, Equality and (authentic) democracy are inseparable concepts; one cannot exist without the others. The terms "egalitarian society" and "democratic society" are pleonasm such as "social justice" or "wooden tree". On the other hand, "unequal society" and "individualistic society" are oxymoron. In these cases, we should not speak of society but of a system or concentration of individuals.



## BASICS OF SOCIETY FOR UNIVERSAL USE

themselves as "citizens of the world", "human beings" or "people from elsewhere" so that their "fellow citizens" are nothing to them, that the City is for many of them only a godsend, a step or a constraint, Citizenship is no longer in itself an unbreakable link with the City which can no longer place its trust and entrust its interests on this basis; it is then necessary to distinguish Nationality and Citizenship and the City in the strict sense (all National Citizens) and the City in the broad sense (all Citizens).

74) The physical and moral existence, honor, culture, future of the City, its laws, the rights it recognizes depend on the Citizens having the city right and the use they make of it; this right cannot therefore be recognized to Citizens of chance or fortune, here today, elsewhere tomorrow, indifferent to the fate of the City or ready to betray it; it cannot be conferred by easily obtainable Citizenship; it must be attached to the Nationality, which must testify to the deep rooting or the will to take root, a deep feeling of belonging to the Nation and a fierce desire to preserve it.

75) Nationality complements Citizenship: Citizenship, obtained by fulfilling the duty to participate in the life of the City from a social or economic point of view, confers the fundamental rights indispensable to the Citizen; Nationality confers the particular right to participate in the political life of the City.

76) Citizenship is independent of Nationality: a Citizen may not have a Nationality, he may even have the Nationality of another City if the latter is stupid enough to give political weight to a deserter, but he may not have several Nationalities that would be as many actual or potential betrayals towards each of the corresponding Cities. (14)

77) All Citizens constitute the City in the broad sense and form part of the population; all National Citizens constitute the City in the strict sense, i.e. the quintessence of the City, the Nation, and the People.

(14) The danger of naturalized individuals who don't have the nation in their hearts, or worse, have another, is perfectly illustrated by the former Minister for the Promotion of Equal Opportunities, Azouz Begag, who, interviewed by the newspaper El-Khabar, said on the 31st of October 2010: "The best way to serve Algeria's interests is to train and support a new generation of politicians from an Algerian immigrant background in France, in order to propel them to the National Assembly where they can pass laws favorable to Algeria! ». Are these words worthy of a former French minister? Are they only worthy of an ordinary Frenchman?

## UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

78) Since the City can only know the feelings of individuals through eloquent signs and acts, Nationality must be deserved individually and constantly; it presupposes, in order to be entitled to it, the satisfaction of preconditions attesting to the state of mind, or even knowledge and abilities (15); it implies, in order to acquire it, the *voluntary* and proper discharge of particular duties which, by their nature, demonstrate loyalty to the City and allegiance to the Nation; it requires, in order to maintain it, to answer all the City's calls and never to dishonor the Nation.

79) Ordinary and national Citizens are equal in rights, since the particular rights that separate them don't enter the balance of Equality, especially since ordinary Citizens do not enjoy them as they didn't want to fulfill the particular duties that grant them.

80) Although not the work of all Citizens, the laws designed by national Citizens alone are nevertheless legitimate insofar as ordinary Citizens, by knowingly refusing Nationality, have tacitly accepted that the former legislate without them and for them.

81) Unless they are iniquitous, laws can only distinguish between National Citizens and Ordinary Citizens for purposes exclusively related to Nationality; they cannot reserve for National Citizens rights that are the counterpart of the Citizen's duties, which are therefore attached to Citizenship and belong by their nature to all Citizens.

### IX. Government & political system

Citizens are individuals who have freely joined forces to increase their chances of survival. They constitute a social body which, like any body, needs a head, a leader, to achieve unity (16) and to lead the collective force in the interest of all, in short, to govern.

(15) The conditions for claiming the Nationality of a City are set by the law which, in turn, is established by the National Citizens. Although certain conditions for belonging to a Nation and fulfilling certain duties are obvious, each City is free to reduce or extend the list, to lower or raise the level of its requirements. However, every Citizen must be able to fulfill these conditions if he or she so wishes and if the City gives him or her the means to do so, since the law must be equal for all Citizens and none must be discriminated against as such. In theory, this excludes natural conditions relating to race, sex, size, etc. In practice, nothing, apart from their ethics, strength and time, can prevent national citizens who are judges and parties from adopting the laws they deem necessary or judicious to constitute and preserve the Nation as they perceive it.

(16) Any Society, any group, needs a head, a leader, a ruler to "achieve unity". A Society is not a juxtaposition of individuals, but a union. The will of all must be one. However, it is

## BASICS OF SOCIETY FOR UNIVERSAL USE

### Consequences:

82) The role of a leader is to lead the City according to the City's laws, in the interest and according to the wishes of the Citizens.

83) The leader is a Citizen like any other; his function is a function like any other and is subject to the common rules of participation (cf. § 32): like any function, it confers particular duties and rights necessary to accomplish the mission but which do not compromise Equality, since the person who occupies it has, as a Citizen, no more or less fundamental and indirect rights than his fellow Citizens. (see note 5)

84) The leader, instituted by the City, for the City, must be consented to as much as his decisions must be approved by the People (all National Citizens) who are the sole source of the legitimacy of the powers and things done in his name. - In other words, the function of leader must be distinguished from the way power is exercised (this is true for any function). A leader is legitimate when his accession to this position and his actions are legitimate. Legitimacy is a package: impostors are no better than tyrants.

85) A leader can be established in several ways: by direct or indirect election, by self-proclamation, by heredity, for a fixed term, indeterminate or lifelong; the Principles condemn certain combinations (in particular life-long power obtained without popular consent and exercised in a tyrannical manner) but prescribe none, all the more so as all have theoretical advantages and disadvantages which, in practice, vary according to circumstances, people and how they exercise power; the best combination is that which at any time most ensures the existence of the City and the rights of its Citizens.

impossible for individual wills to become one if each remains independent of the others, if no individual, at one time or another, serves as a funnel and synthesizes the general will. Its exact attributions may vary, but its function is vital to the group. Whether he has the authority to make decisions alone, whether his decisions are subject to approval before execution, or whether he is the instrument of collective decisions, it is he who, by embodying the group, makes individuals a group. Even in a group that would make all its decisions collectively, even if individuals could be unanimous for each decision to be made, a leader would still be needed to lead the debates, execute the decisions, ensure their follow-up, set the pace, etc. For a group to speak with one voice, only one mouth must speak on its behalf. There's no example of a group without a leader. There is always one, even if it is sometimes unofficial, which is then worse for him and for the group than an official leader.

## UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

86) The official title of the leader is irrelevant (17) as soon as he is elected, acclaimed or tacitly recognized, and his actions and decisions each receive, one by one, not in block (cf. note 12), the approval of the People.

87) Popular recognition in one form or another doesn't confer eternal legitimacy on the leader; his legitimacy is null and void when the People no longer recognize him as such - either because he acts without consulting them, or because his person appears unworthy to hold this office, or because the Citizens no longer believe that his action serves their interests and the general interest as they perceive it -, even more so if they have no legal means to express themselves and replace him.

(17) The title of the leader is irrelevant: only the manner in which he or she has assumed this function and the way in which he or she exercises it matters. The same title may cover powers of a fundamentally different nature. The first leaders were elected and called *kings*, what we would call *presidents* for life or for an *indefinite period*. However, they could be deposed. Later, to prevent succession conflicts, the leaders who until then were often chosen among the children or parents of the former leader were necessarily the son or closest male descendant of the deceased leader: royalty became hereditary. This system had its perks, but it no longer guaranteed the personal value of the leader and even allowed him to abuse of his authority since it was no longer questionable. The title of king no longer had the same meaning at all. The notion of president is closer to that of king in the ancient sense. But it also offers nuances. A president is elected. However, everything changes depending on who votes and the length of the mandate. An election by direct universal suffrage confers legitimacy. But an election or designation by voters, electors or deputies, whether or not they themselves have a mandatory mandate, confers legitimacy that is more or less weak, or even nil, and capacities in proportion. The length of the term of office and whether or not it is possible to be re-elected also affect the President's capacities and priorities. The chief is therefore not defined by his title but by his actual powers, which depend on the method of his designation and his attributions. History is full of examples of leaders who have sometimes retained the prestigious title of their predecessor in order to give the illusion of continuity and benefit from favorable stereotypes when their powers were different, or who have renounced a title that became unpopular while exercising the same powers under a different name. We should be wary of words choices. The position of leader shouldn't either be rejected for fear of its misuse. It's because of this misfortune that France experienced a period without head, from 1792 to 1799, between the overthrow of Louis XVI and the advent of Napoleon. The monarchy had created among the revolutionaries an insurmountable mistrust of the function of leader, whatever the name. But it is a social necessity and it was inevitable that it would reappear quickly and never disappear again. Napoleon was first Consul for ten years, then Consul for life, then Emperor. He was never elected but was always acclaimed. So it was legitimate. But what was he exactly? A King, a president, a dictator? He was all of these at once. In essence, it is not so much the people who decide what form to give the executive power, but historical conditions or temporary circumstances which, by necessity, impose one on them by condemning those who are unsuitable in the short term.

## BASICS OF SOCIETY FOR UNIVERSAL USE

88) When a City is important, a Citizen is no longer sufficient to serve as a leader and must call upon his fellow Citizens to help him in the task: he forms with them the Government.

89) A social system is essentially based on two powers, not to mention that of the People who oversee them all: 1) the executive power, that of the leader and his Government, which is to lead according to the wishes and in the interest of the People, 2) the legislative power, that of the Parliament, composed of deputies, which is to legislate, that is to say to formulate draft laws to be presented to the People (cf. § 67).

90) The function of leader is constitutive of the City (cf. note 16); it exists as long as the City exists, and thus comes well before that of legislator, which is useless as long as there aren't too many Citizens, as they can come up with the laws themselves, without intermediaries. (18)

(18) Any form of participation in the life of the City is a function. Using the word function in its broadest sense is therefore irrelevant, so that this term is used to describe particular activities, those which consist, for Citizens, in embodying the City in the eyes of their fellow Citizens, whether it is for the City to fulfill its duties towards them, to exercise its rights or simply to be an interlocutor. In other words, when Citizens as a whole can no longer, because of their number, collectively and permanently assume some of the City's roles towards them as individuals, these roles must be assigned to Citizens or subsets of Citizens called institutions. (It is important to emphasize that these roles are functions when they are performed on a permanent basis, and not on an occasional basis, i.e. when the Citizens who perform them do not need to participate otherwise in the life of the City.) Functions and institutions can also, when their missions multiply, and they are no longer sufficient or would deviate too much from their primary role, create a new branch and give rise to a new autonomous function or institution. All these functions and institutions constitute the *State*, distinct from the *City*, of which it is only a figuration. (These functions, these offices, these positions, these jobs can be filled in different ways, according to their nature, according to traditions, according to the period, but *who occupy them?* matters less, in the end, than *how they are carried out*, although some ways of filling them are by nature calamitous.) Functions and institutions therefore appear gradually and logically with the increase in the number of Citizens. Of course, they don't originally have the name, meaning, activity, importance and complexity that they later take on. In any case, any new function is the result of one or more pre-existing functions: its purpose is to perform more effectively (organizational matter) or in a more legitimate way (composition matter) one aspect of another function, since the official is no longer up to the task. For this reason, the original functions always retain powers normally relinquished to the functions they have given birth to and that they exercise them in extraordinary cases. It follows that the People and the leader may exceptionally exercise all the powers vested in civil servants whose institution is inevitably derived, directly or indirectly, from one or the other or both at the same time. The same can be said about the various positions created in a function: the one who holds the function, the first public servant, can act on behalf of all those who are under his command as assistants.

## UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

91) The functions of leader and legislator are by nature distinct and must be separated and subordinated to the will of the People - all the more so since leader and legislator tend by nature to take themselves for the People, to consider the City as their thing and to want to concentrate all the powers in their hands, so that, if these functions are confused, if one absorbs the other, the danger is great for one to become power crazed, lose sight of the boundaries to his power and abuses it at the expense of the People he is supposed to serve.

92) When the legislative and executive powers find their counter-power in each other, instead of each having no other master than the People, they are not separated from each other: they are separated from and above the People.

93) Whether strictly separated, openly merged or sneakily intermingled, the executive and legislative powers are inevitably in the same position vis-à-vis the People, in obedience to the powers: either the People are the masters of both, or they are not and then all the combinations that in

According to these considerations, it is logical that after the leader appear police officers (they proceed from the leader, although with evolution they are also under the authority of the judiciary, hence a permanent conflict), then judges (they proceed both from the leader, who until then sometimes acted as such, and the council of elders, whose existence is attested by all primitive societies and which, without being an institution as such, is the embryo of legislative power), then magistrates (they proceed from the leader since they represent him), then soldiers (they do not represent the City in the eyes of their fellow Citizens, but to strangers. Although under the orders of the leader, they proceed from the Citizens who, until then, were all occasional warriors), then from the collectors (They proceed directly from the leader or magistrates). Until then, their task had been carried out by police officers. The professionalization of soldiers requires the establishment of an effective system of levy, which, moreover, is in the interest of all civil servants and, when it is fair, of all Citizens. Their role is perceived negatively, but they represent the City well. And finally the deputies (They come from the People. If they come from the leader or are self-proclaimed, they do not represent anything).

Thinking of the evolution of societies, we think of two important characters who are systematically found under variable names, first confused and then distinct: the priest and the doctor. These characters have a useful purpose, as do all Citizens, but they do not have a function, they do not represent the City in any way. The same can be said of the masters, ancestors of the teachers, who, at the beginning and for a long time, were in fact the same as the priests.

Let us finish with the cases of ministers and mayors. The former aren't an independent function of the leader, but only helpers, or even advisers, in the first place. The latter don't represent the City but only a portion of the Citizens. So it is a function, but of a particular kind, at least when they are elected. If they are appointed, they are only magistrates and represent the leader.

## BASICS OF SOCIETY FOR UNIVERSAL USE

one way or another deprive them of sovereignty are the same and perverse in the eyes of the Principles.

94) The true nature of a political system - the regime of a Society - is defined by the way laws are made, that is, by whom they are actually made (19): the true nature of the legislative power determines that of the relatively neutral judiciary, which applies the laws, and that of the executive power, which is established by law and directs the City in accordance with the laws (20).

(19) When considering a political system, the important thing is not how it is called, but who makes the laws, in the name of what and in whose interest. The reality of the things that words reveal is more important than the words themselves, often hollow or illusory. This remark is reminiscent of that memorable statement: *"Is it in the words republic or monarchy that the solution to the great social problem lies? Are these the definitions invented by diplomats to classify the various forms of government that bring happiness and misfortune to nations or the combination of laws and institutions that constitute their true nature? All political constitutions are made for the People; all those where they are counted for nothing are only attacks against humanity! Eh! What does it matter to me that so-called patriots present me with the prospect of bleeding France to get rid of royalty, if it is not national sovereignty and civil and political equality that they want to establish on its debris? What does it matter to me that people stand up against the faults of the court, far from repressing them, they don't stop tolerating and encouraging them, in order to benefit from them? What does it matter to me that we recognize, with everyone else, the vices of the constitution that concern the extent of royal power, if we destroy the right of petition; if we expect individual freedom, even the freedom of opinion; if we let a barbarism unfold against the alarmed People that contrasts with the eternal impunity of the great conspirators; if we do not stop pursuing and defaming all those who, in all times, defend the cause of the nation against the enterprises of the court and all parties?"* (Robespierre, excerpt from his journal *Le défenseur de la Constitution*, May 17, 1792)

(20) "The true nature of the legislative power determines the nature of the executive power which is established by law and directs the City in accordance with the laws. According to point 90, the executive power predates the legislative power. It therefore seems that there is a contradiction: how can the executive power be established by law and run in accordance with the laws if the legislative power is not itself instituted? It means forgetting that laws, in the true sense of the word, are the expression of the will of the People and that the legislative power, as an institution, is only the People's instrument in the legislative process. Thus, when the legislative power doesn't exist, the executive power is directly established by the People and directs in accordance with their vows which make law; and when the legislative power exists, it is their role to define and limit the powers of the Executive, so that the executive power is established by law, more precisely by the Constitution, and governs rightfully in accordance with the law. When the law is truly the expression of the People's will, *law* is synonymous with the *People* and the principle is always true. But this remains true when the legislative power escapes the People or when the executive power seizes it. What then changes is the true nature of legislative power (cf. § 63). In the first case, the executive power is always subject to the laws enacted by the legislative power without the consent of the People; in the second case, the executive power is the legislative power and is therefore "subjected" to the laws that it gives itself. (In this second case, the nature of the legislative power - which cannot be despotic by itself

## UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

95) Insofar as every individual, anybody, is selfish and acts above all in his own interests and the interests of his own, the one who makes laws makes them above all in his own interest and that of his fellow human beings: only by being truly made by the People are they made for the People, the leader and legislator (the Government and Parliament) need to be submitted to them for the regime to be politically democratic (21).

96) Regardless of the nuances, there are objectively only three types of political systems: *Democracy*, *dictatorship* and *democraship*.

When Citizens are truly equal in rights, the People are truly sovereign, the executive and legislative powers, whatever their forms and relationships, are subordinate to them, and the system is authentically democratic. On the other hand, in inequality, whatever the forms of the executive and legislative powers, the relations between them and the relationship of both to the People, the regime oscillates between dictatorship and democracy, the former being openly anti-democratic, the latter being supposedly democratic.

When the executive power - in the hands of an individual or a party - suffocates, seizes or is vested with the legislative power and dictates its laws to the people, the system is a dictatorship. However, the term dictatorship doesn't indicate the origin or purpose of the Government,

but only oligarchic with nuances - always indicates, through said nuances, the despotic or dictatorial nature of the executive power.) In both cases, the legislative system is no longer democratic but oligarchic in one form or another, the laws are no longer in the interest of the People, and from the point of view of the Principles, it doesn't matter with which sauce the People are eaten, even if some are sweeter or spicier than others.

(21) A system can be *politically democratic* without being an *authentic democracy* (cf. § 70). A system is authentically democratic if it is a democracy from top to bottom. However, an authentic democracy requires an egalitarian economic system, a system in which Citizens are truly equal in rights, including the right to enjoy the benefits of the City, in other words a system in which there are neither rich nor poor, but only Citizens of equal economic and political weight, which is impossible in a monetary system, under Money (belief that the notion of market value is necessary for trade). In a monetary system, which is inherently unequal, the will of men is not enough to establish genuine democracy. The laws of Money always prevail over those of men, and the rich who don't have the same interests as the poor always have more weight than them do to make theirs prevail. In such a context, all that people can do is to strive for democracy in order to have the illusion of it, that is, to follow all the Principles except those that challenge Money, which distorts everything, and to establish a perfectly democratic system from the point of view of political philosophy.



## BASICS OF SOCIETY FOR UNIVERSAL USE

but describes its methods, i.e. the fact that it acts with firmness or violence and without consulting the People, and, although a dictatorship is rarely in the interest of the People, a legitimate and ephemeral dictatorship may sometimes prove necessary for public salvation. Thus, a dictatorial Government can be democratic by virtue of the legitimacy of its origin or purpose, and undemocratic by virtue of its extraordinary methods. In this case, it's the exception that proves the rule, if this observation stands the test of time. (22)

When the legislative power prevails over both the Executive and the People, rightly or wrongly claiming to be their own, which is only possible in inequality and in the middle of classes, the system is a democraship. A democraship is ultimately only a clever oligarchy validated by a naïve People. Whether the so-called representatives of the People are elected, appointed or self-proclaimed, as soon as they speak on their behalf without submitting their decisions to them, it is clear that they are seeking from them a guarantee that they do not deserve. They aren't the People and intend that everyone stays in their place, them and their peers at the top. The most accomplished democraship is of course the strictly representative "democracy" which, by allowing the People to designate both the leader and the deputies who will legally trample on them (they are the ones who make the laws and have the public force to enforce them), gives them the illusion of being important and the desire to defend this system "in the name of democracy". That said, while a system that is exclusively representative is undemocratic, a mixed system (combining elections, draws, automatic referendums and referendums of popular initiative), which doesn't allow the People's representatives to declare themselves as such and substitute their will for the People's (it has always, somehow, the last word), is democratic

(22) A dictatorship is in itself neither good nor bad. Everything depends on the context and the goal set by the leaders of this dictatorship. It's obvious that, in normal times, a permanent dictatorship is "bad", at least unfair, since the government's force is clearly directed against citizens, that it deliberately undermines their freedoms, security and equality, and that it is conceivable only in inequality. On the other hand, facing an extraordinary and urgent peril, threatening to take the Society away, equipping legitimate leaders with dictatorial power, so that they can act quickly and without suffering opposition, is often the only way for the City to escape. This was the meaning of the word *dictatorship* in the ancient Roman republic. This was also, in a way, the unofficial role of the great Public Salvation Committee during the French Revolution, in a country torn apart by civil war, attacked on all its borders and forced to mobilize all its resources, a country all the more politically unstable given the Republic's youth and, consequently, under the shadow of factions' death struggle (small groups embodying both social classes and political views).

## UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

from a political point of view. Yet even a politically democratic system, difficult to achieve in inequality, is not an authentic democracy, but only the softest form of democraship.

### X. Definitions & conclusion

This study, to answer specific questions, took us much further than expected. It appeared that everything was linked and that a simple answer, without being simplistic, would be heavy with innuendo and would expose us to misunderstandings, misinterpretations and all kinds of eccentric and fraudulent interpretations. It was therefore necessary to have a global vision of the social order to correctly identify the specific elements and parameters of Society. But this global vision, in order to be just and escape passions, could not be a simple observation of what is or what was; it could only proceed from a theoretical and rigorous study starting from the most basic form of Society and going ever further in logical developments. That job is done. Going further, all social issues must be addressed in this way, or even directly based on these conclusions, and many, including the most important ones, are already answered in this presentation.

We can now answer the initial questions and define the key concepts of the social order. These definitions are obviously not found, at least not as they stand, in the dictionary or even in "law" books.

**Society, City, Political Association:** a group of individuals called Citizens, freely united for the original purpose of increasing their chances of survival, thus to be safe, and who, as a result, have the same duties towards each other and guarantee each other the same rights (so that their relationship is egalitarian and that Equality is the fundamental principle of the social order). - According to the *Merriam-Webster*. a community, nation, or broad grouping of people having common traditions, institutions, and collective activities and interests.

**Citizen:** an individual who is entitled to be part of the City, recognized as such by the City, who participates effectively in the life of the City and in

## BASICS OF SOCIETY FOR UNIVERSAL USE

accordance with what it considers to be participation, doing in a word what it expects of him/her, defending him/her if necessary, and in return enjoying the same fundamental and indirect rights as its fellow Citizens (including the right to benefit from the City), thereby being their equal in duty and rights. - According to the *Merriam-Webster*: a native or naturalized person who owes allegiance to a government and is entitled to protection from it.

**City:** all Citizens (in a broad sense). See Society / Group of National Citizens, Nation (strict meaning). / Any person or institution representing or charged with legitimately representing, in the eyes of individuals, Citizens or fellow Citizens, the general interest or the national will / Territory on which sedentary Citizens live (in the sense of country, homeland). - According to the *Merriam-Webster*: an inhabited place of greater size, population, or importance than a town or village.

**Duty:** As a counterpart to a right / Obligation in a reciprocal relationship; there is no duty without reciprocity, in the inequality of duties or rights / Obligation towards the City and its citizens to deserve and maintain the Citizenship and the rights that go with it. The City's obligation towards its Citizens in order to guarantee their rights and justify that they have obligations towards it / Duties may be fundamental (dictated by the act of association: defending the City, being in solidarity with its Citizens, participating in the life of the City), indirect (arising from theoretical fundamental duties and translating them into practice) or particular (arising from indirect or independent duties of the Citizenship, such as those related to the Nationality). - According to the *Merriam-Webster*: obligatory tasks, conduct, service, or functions that arise from one's position.

**Right:** as a counterpart to a duty. Liberty, possibility, capacity conferred by Citizenship in return for the fulfillment of the Citizen's duties and guaranteed by law (the City). There are rights in the strict sense only in Society, in Equality between Citizens. / Freedom, possibility, capacity conferred by the dedication and will of Citizens to the City (and its representatives) so that it can fulfill the missions that Citizens have entrusted to it. / Freedom, possibility, capacity recognized by the City by virtue of its humanity to individuals who are not Citizens or independently of their Citizenship. / Rights can be of a fundamental nature (during fundamental duties, immediate consequence, supreme purpose of the act of association for Citizens: Security, Freedom, Enjoying the Benefits of the City), indirect (arising from fundamental rights, such as the right to access the City's market) or private (arising

## UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

from the exercise of an indirect right, such as Property, or during a particular duty). - According to the *Merriam-Webster*: the power or privilege to which one is justly entitled.

**Equality:** fundamental Principle of the social order; it concerns only the Citizens of a given City; it applies to fundamental duties and fundamental and indirect rights, so that Citizens are truly equal in duties and rights, including the right to enjoy the benefits of their City. - According to the *Merriam-Webster*: the quality or state of being equal.

**Law:** A social rule recognizing rights, resulting from the act of political association (then synonymous with the *Principle*) or adopted by (national) Citizens and equal for all Citizens. Any rule formed otherwise, i.e. without the approval of the Citizens, is not a law or has only its name. - According to the *Merriam-Webster*: a binding custom or practice of a community: a rule of conduct or action prescribed or formally recognized as binding or enforced by a controlling authority.

**Principle:** Rule, relationship, duty, right deriving from the act of political association, intrinsic to the social order, based on Equality, and prior to any conceptualization. - No equivalent in the *Merriam-Webster*.

**Democracy:** an economic and political system in which Citizens who are truly equal in duties and rights, including the right to enjoy the benefits of their City, are subject to laws expressly approved by them, making them in a body, that is, the People, the true sovereign. / The only possible regime for a Society worthy of its name. There can be no true democracy in inequality; a Society based on Equality can only be democratic. / The strictly representative "democracy" that *de facto* strikes the People of sovereignty is a negation of democracy. - According to the *Merriam-Webster*: a government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through a system of representation usually involving periodically held free elections.

Such are the true definitions of all these words. All of them involve the notion of Equality. How could it be otherwise when it comes to social concepts, knowing that Equality is the fundamental Principle of the social order? What value would there be in definitions that would make it possible to forget it, that would, for example, talk about law without reminding us that a law in the true sense must be equal for all and is either a consequence of the act of association, or an expression of the Citizens' will; who would speak of Citizens as if some could unequal;

## BASICS OF SOCIETY FOR UNIVERSAL USE

who would talk about equality in rights, without mentioning the right of a Citizen to enjoy the benefits of his City by virtue of his Citizenship; who'd talk about individuals without taking into account their Citizenship and all that it implies; who would define the Citizen as someone who belongs to the City, which is fair, but without saying that belonging implies participation, etc. ? Such definitions would enshrine all abuses or open the door to them; they would in any case prevent them from closing it again. It is with words that we think. These are the empty words that support and make the present unshakable. It is by retaking the words that we start a Revolution.

Philippe Landeux

November 6, 2010



## WHAT IS MONY ?

### WHAT IS MONY?

Origins and consequences  
of Mony, trading and currency.

MONY is the belief that the notion of (market) value is necessary to exchange.

Mony is the heart of our world. It is at the heart of all monetary systems, which in the end are one and the same. But it isn't the currency; it is its *raison d'être*. However, a tree is judged by its fruits.

Currency is an agreement without consent: it is created, guaranteed and imposed by the State (23) which forces individuals to accept it and which accepts or requires it itself as payment. Once it's in circulation, once everyone needs it, it's obtained by selling a good or providing a service (legal or illegal) in exchange for a certain quantity of monetary units to the person who holds them. (At least this is the normal way to obtain it since, being a material thing, it can also be stolen.) The quantity of monetary units exchanged (price, market value) is either defined in advance by one or the other of the parties involved in the exchange, or by mutual agreement at the time of the exchange. It's the quantity of monetary units that have actually changed hands that determines the momentary price of the thing obtained in exchange. As long as a price is not validated by a transaction, it is illusory. An unsold or unsaleable thing doesn't generate anything; its market value is nil regardless of the seller's claims.

CURRENCY is at the same time a unit of value, a standard of value, a property, a representation of property, a means of exchange, payment or purchase - a means of individualistic exchange it should be specified -, a means of appropriation and dispossession, a means of accessing the market and, finally, a portion of all the rights which enjoyment or exercise requires access to said market. But, for all these reasons, it is also and above all a tool of oppression, a tool for the powerful - whether

(23) Currency, as a standard medium of exchange, can also be issued by powerful individuals who are both able to impose this standard and to ensure its value (as a means of establishing their power and making a profit). This is how the first modern currencies appeared in China. This is also how the bonds issued by the Constituent Assembly during the Revolution, secured on the property of the clergy, became bills because they were themselves used to pledge "trust bonds" issued by wealthy individuals. But this is also what independent banks (rich people's cartels) have been doing since they sneakily stripped the States of the right to mint currency and enslaved them with interest rate loans (e. g. in the USA in 1913, in France in 1973, at the level of the European Union in 1992).

## UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

they derive their power from a high social position or from their wealth - to deprive the weak of his rights (first of all those whose enjoyment or exercise requires money, then of all others) and thus to establish their domination.

The market value of a thing is unrelated to the thing itself. Nothing has a market value in itself; nothing has a value in itself. A thing may be of interest, of sentimental value to the one who considers it, but this value - which cannot be measured and is nevertheless the only true value - is already neither universal nor eternal. On the other hand, the market value of a thing is imposed on everyone by the market, derives from the cost of labor and profit margins that producers, carriers, traders and public administration have successively agreed upon and varies according to multiple criteria unrelated to that thing (place, time, circumstances, quantity, appreciation, value of money, et cetera). Even fixed at a time T, it still varies according to the purchasing power of customers since it increases relatively as the purchasing power decreases, and vice versa. In short, market value is a decoy; prices are independent of things; money is only used to pay people. It's the payment of money to people that gives market value to things and makes them believe, on the one hand, that they have an intrinsic market value, and on the other hand, that they need money to measure that value and to trade or access the market, in other words, to buy. Admittedly, the need for money is real in a monetary system, but people themselves create this moral and material need; they lock themselves up in this vicious circle by their own doing; they can only rely on themselves to get out of it.

Currency seems essential because it corresponds to the conception of the exchange it conveys and its use instills in people. This conception is inherited from barter, a mode of exchange that people instinctively and inevitably practice in a context of artisan production. This mode of exchange consists in individuals exchanging with each other goods that they have produced or at least own. By exchanging goods for other goods, equivalence is established between them and the notion of market value appears which is then measured, for one good, in quantity of other goods. This is how it's imposed on people and how the exchange is based on what we call *Mony*, i.e. the belief that the notion of (market) value is necessary to exchange. It's therefore important to note that 1) *Mony* was not imagined and adopted by people but imposed itself on them by necessity, 2) the notion of market value is inseparable from individualistic exchange, 3) *Mony*, the notion of market value and



## WHAT IS MONY ?

individualistic exchange are born and only have meaning in a context of low production. However, direct exchange between two individuals is often impossible, as it's rare for both of them to simultaneously desire an object that the other owns and that he's willing to exchange. It appears that bartering is facilitated if one of them makes a first exchange with a third party and exchanges with the other what he has thus obtained and which has served, in his eyes, only as a unit of value and a means of exchange. Bartering therefore carries as a seed all the principles that, over time, give birth to primitive currencies (objects or goods that can be desired either for themselves or as usual means of exchange) and then modern, standardized currencies (desired only as means of exchange). Thus, all the fundamentals of the monetary system come from bartering. The nature, form and place of money have changed, but not the principles on which it's based. On the other hand, currency highlights the antisocial nature of individualistic exchange and the notion of market value that the private nature of barter can conceal; it also develops new vices.

Before producing and bartering - which dates back only a few thousand years (Man has existed for about 2 million years) -, people lived, like social animals, in communities: everyone participated in collective activities and received a share of the common product in return; everyone enjoyed the benefits of the city; they were equal in duties and in all the rights (security, food, shelter) that their community guaranteed through their contribution. They had little or nothing. They still did not distinguish themselves by their properties when they began to use stones, bones or pieces of wood as tools or weapons or even when they began to manufacture them with techniques within everyone's reach.

But there came a time when the manufacture of certain objects required a certain talent, and the desire that these objects aroused encouraged their production and diverted the manufacturers from collective activities on the product of which they therefore no longer had any rights. The need for manufacturers to make a living from their production and the desire of others to personally own these objects forced both sides to exchange. But how could manufacturers give priority to one over the other when everyone wanted the rare object and none of them, as part of a community, had anything special to offer? To be able to be separated, the latter had to distinguish themselves and therefore work hard on their side to have their own goods likely to interest manufacturers, whose

## UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

interest was obviously to exchange with the highest bidder. Thus, in order to be able to practice barter, then the only possible mode of exchange, community members increasingly abandoned collective activities and ended up devoting themselves exclusively to individual activities. In other words, the duty to participate in the life of the city in return for its benefits fell into obsolescence, as individuals were creating their main "rights" for themselves. The role of the city was now nil on a daily basis. There was already no community left, but only a collection of individuals.

But Man is a sociable being. He needs to live in society and believes that this is the case as long as he has ties with his fellow human beings. However, it's not enough for individuals to have common points (geographical, ethnic, historical, cultural, family) to form a society. The state of society is defined by intangible and universal relationships between its members; belonging to a society is more a question of acts than of origin. Individuals who don't have duties towards each other - as it happens under barter - don't form a community, even if everything else contributes to giving them this illusion. Nevertheless, individuals who believe they form a community believe they have a duty to defend it when it's threatened, so that their illusory community in normal times becomes a reality in extraordinary times. Defending the city is indeed the first duty of the citizen and the last vestige of citizenship after the implosion of society.

Bartering plunges men into a strange and unprecedented state: they're not quite in the state of nature, but they are no longer exactly in the state of society. This mode of exchange dissociates the elements of the social body but without dispersing them; it disrupts social relations, not to say that it establishes anti-social relations, while people still aspire to live in society but no longer know what it should be. Consequently, what serves as a society is ultimately only used to support the consequences of individualistic exchange.

The first of these consequences is the obligation for individuals to own what they trade, and therefore what they privately produce. They therefore demand that the "society" recognize and guarantee them ownership of their production, although said production no longer involves it. But since this requirement is universal, the "society" consents to it. In other words, individuals want to have rights through the protection of "society" without these rights being the counterpart of

## WHAT IS MONY ?

duties towards it. It is the divorce between duties and rights. From now on, rights have no direct link with duties; they are no more than conventions (arbitrary by definition, even if general membership sometimes confers legitimacy on them); it opens the way to all kinds of aberrations and abuses. The very notion of duty no longer makes much sense, since the remaining obligations do not grant the rights they generate or grant rights they do not generate. In the latter case, the rights in question are the result of belonging to the "society" which, in turn, is based less on duties than on criteria.

Another consequence of bartering, and not the least, is the need for farmers and herders to own the land they use in order to own what they get from it. The "society" must, logically, make this new concession. The common territory is therefore divided into private property. In other words, "society" guarantees individuals the right to occupy and use its territory without requiring them to exploit it properly and to devote their production to trade; at least it allows them to give priority to their particular interests over the general interest. When all individuals have a portion of soil, it seems harmless. When not everyone has land, however, it gives some of the "citizens" the opportunity to starve and enslave the other. It is therefore doubly insane for "society" to deprive itself of all or part of its territory and grant individuals the "right" to harm their "fellow citizens".

Exchange between individuals (first by direct barter and then via currency) destroys society in terms of principles. But it develops so slowly that people adapt to it without perceiving change and don't understand the root cause of social unrest when they finally see it. From equal citizens working together, they have become rival individuals operating separately. However, the context favorable to barter reduces rivalries (some mutual assistance remains), especially since exchanges are rare, concern only a few goods or objects and involve only a tiny part of everyone's production. Individuals (families) are almost self-sufficient; they provide for most of their needs themselves. Paradoxically, the era of barter is one of the least exchange.

With the evolution of techniques, the increase in specialization, the multiplication of products and with them needs, exchanges intensify, direct barter reaches its limits and currency appears. The strengthening of interdependence between individuals leads to their geographical grouping. Specialists are concentrated in villages that sometimes grow to become cities exclusively populated by specialized producers, forced

## UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

to provide for their basic and other needs through the daily sale of their production or the payment of their labor.

Civilization then enters the monetary phase, which lasts as long as the conditions of production impose the same mode of exchange, i.e. until a revolution in production makes it possible to design and adopt a new mode of exchange. In the meantime, currency, apart from its supports and forms that vary according to place and time, retains the same operating principles and properties, and therefore always has the same vices and effects.

We have already established what currency is; we will explain here where its features and flaws come from.

People did not conceive bartering; this mode of exchange was imposed on them. On the other hand, they designed the currency according to the logic of barter. In their minds, the exchange could only take place between two individuals; it could only consist in exchanging one thing for another, both things being ultimately assumed to be of equal value. To facilitate trade, some have had the idea of using a good or object as a unit of value, i.e. as a "universal" currency of exchange. Since currency can represent the value of anything, it was now a question of selling one's products or work for that currency in order to have enough of it to buy or pay for the products or work of others. The monetary exchange is never more than two stages barter or two consecutive barter exchanges: it's always barter. In addition to the notion of value and the individualistic nature of monetary exchange, it's also through barter that currency must be a means of exchange that is exchanged, that changes hands. This property of money, which today doesn't offend anyone, is an absolute calamity.

Currency is often considered a neutral object that men would misuse. "It's only a means of exchange", is meant, as if the nature of a means of exchange, the logic it conveys and the way it works were irrelevant! As if a tool was suitable for all uses because it's a tool! It is true that people can worsen the consequences of money (then this aggravation is itself due to the permissiveness of this means of exchange, the needs it creates and the mentalities it shapes), but they cannot prevent it from having effects inherent to its nature and beyond their control (trying to counter these effects is futile and even catastrophic).

The means of exchange that is money works according to two principles: 1) that of communicating vessels, 2) that of attraction.

## WHAT IS MONY ?

Units intended to change hands with each exchange circulate. For there to be any here, it is necessary to take it elsewhere in one way or another: this is the principle of communicating vessels. But these units also embody the right of individuals to access the market, to enjoy the benefits of their "society" and to enjoy the freedoms it offers. Everyone (individuals, workers, the unemployed, companies, associations, administrations, etc.) needs the rights conferred by currency and must obtain them at the expense of others. The end justifies the means in this case, since these rights are not registered; they belong to the person who holds the currency, regardless of the way it was acquired (money has no smell). At least they belong to him as long as he doesn't exercise them, since to enjoy them you have to strip yourself of them (pay). It's therefore in the nature of the monetary system that individuals wage a permanent no holds barred war, a war where rights are the prize.

Units that circulate according to the artificial set of values, that embody and confer rights and that can be accumulated unflinchingly end up forming clots, that is, concentrating in the hands of a few individuals. The latter have more money and more rights than others and hold them in their dependence and power. The rich are in a position of strength; they buy everything, fix the value of things to their advantage, lend with interest and borrow with ease. Money goes to money. It's the principle of attraction. Equality (in duties and rights) is impossible in the monetary system; on the contrary, it's in its nature that inequalities increase over time, that the gap between rich and poor widens inexorably.

These two principles mean that the money supply is never sufficient for all individuals, who are therefore forced to tear each other apart in order to have a share or not to lose the share they hold. It's as if, in extreme cold, a blanket was made available to several individuals without being able to cover them all. Thinking only of his survival, everyone would hold on to it, pull on his side: the weak to get even a ridiculous part of it, the strong not to risk being exposed to the cold at all. All would reason in the same way even though they are in different positions.

Money makes rights a rare thing. The reason is simple: rights are embodied in money, which itself represents objects in terms of value because it comes from barter. However, bartering is a primary mode of exchange, the one used by small producers. Its underlying logic therefore corresponds to a particular context, a context where products are scarce. Money follows the same logic and this makes sense as long as production remains artisanal. But in the industrial era, a means of

## UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

exchange based on this logic is both anachronistic and grotesque. In this new context, money maintains the idea that the mode of exchange is always individualistic, that individuals always practice indirect barter and that they exchange their products or their work for wages of equivalent value. In reality, there is no longer any exchange between individuals since, with a few exceptions, no one produces anything alone, each being only a link in the production chain within a company (it would therefore be impossible to return to barter per se); workers are no longer paid by the piece but by the month and often according to standard scales for all professions; it's no longer the work done that is paid, but the position held; the right to access the market is now a question of status. The current mode of exchange therefore combines two main approaches: that of bartering, which is outdated, and that of the City, in the making.

In a Society (or City) worthy of the name, Citizenship is acquired and preserved by fulfilling the Citizen's Duties, including the duty to participate in the life of the City in accordance with its requirements, and guarantees all Citizens the enjoyment of all its benefits, results of their collective efforts. These benefits include goods and services placed on the market by companies. All Citizens have access to it; it's Citizenship itself that gives them the right to access the market. This Right is therefore indefinite, equal for all and, in theory, unlimited. Although there is no currency, no exchange between individuals and no notion of market value, citizens acquire goods produced by others and benefit from the services of others: the fruits of labor change hands, so there is an exchange. But in this mode of exchange, the circulation of goods is only one consequence. The real exchange takes place between the Citizen and the City: he fulfills his Duties towards it, it guarantees its Rights. Access to the market is in a way a lump sum payment: Citizens no longer pay retail for the things they acquire, nor are they themselves paid individually; by participating in the life of the City, they pay the "price" to freely access the market, they pay globally and in advance for everything they receive from it. As in the current monetary system, market access is linked to a status, with the difference that there's only one status, that of Citizen, that it's this status itself, not units, that confers the right to access the market - this right therefore has no intrinsic limit, it is not external to those who enjoy it, no one can exercise it in their place and it can't be taken from them - and that Citizens are truly equal in rights. (All this undoubtedly makes it possible to understand why and how the currency used to pay for work is above all a means of stealing from workers, of depriving them of the essential of

## WHAT IS MONY ?

their rights as Citizens. And what about the people who participate objectively in the life of the "City" but who, not being economic actors, don't even receive a salary?)

We are at a crossroads. The industrial era has transformed the nature of producers and, consequently, that of the protagonists in trade. Salaried employment is based on currency but invalidates its assumptions. The industrial era has also brought to its climax the interdependence of individuals. Only currency still instills individualism in them. But computer science is hastening the end of the latter (particularly in France) and offers new possibilities. Fundamental changes are underway. One world dies; another is in the making. As always, things have evolved faster than mentalities, but people will soon catch up and achieve the greatest revolution of all time.

The first currencies were rare or imposing goods or objects, having value either by the covetousness of mankind (shells, stones) or by their own utility (animals, jewelry, metals). They proved to be inconvenient (perishable, abundant, cumbersome, heterogeneous) and poor as a standard of value. People therefore renounced it for others who were increasingly more practical, more rare, more uniform and more constant, until they realized that the value of the medium was less important than the value they gave it, that any material medium was useless, that virtual units were just as good, that their mode of exchange was entirely based on trust and the belief that the notion of value was necessary. What remains at the end of the currency is the essence of what was at the beginning, under barter: Mony.

Mony is the belief that the notion of (market) value is necessary to exchange. However, market value means differences in values between things, between products, between jobs, and therefore differences in income and wages, and therefore inequality in rights. Moreover, the notion of market value only makes sense in the context of exchanges between individuals, who must own what they exchange, and therefore their production, so that they must produce and work for them, by economic obligation, no longer for the city, no longer by social obligation. Finally, to believe that the *notion of value is necessary to exchange* is to focus solely on things, to think that they are more important than people, to think in terms of values, not in terms of rights, to forget the social dimension of exchanges, not to consider the protagonists as citizens, and therefore to empty citizenship of all substance. Inequality, individualism, materialism, inhumanity, the

## UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

annihilation of social principles, the destruction of society (in the sense of *community*), the dissociation of the duties of rights and the distortion of each of these notions, these are, among others, the dialectical consequences of Money. Before we even talk about bartering or currency and from any angle, Money turns out to be antisocial by nature. That it governs exchanges and is therefore at the heart of the "society" is questionable at best!

Money manifests itself through bartering and currency, the new consequences of which, always as disastrous, are indirectly its own. Everything that flows from Money refers to it and is therefore part of it in its broadest sense. But using Money in the broad sense is dangerous because it makes you lose sight of its strict definition and doesn't allow those who don't know it to grasp it. They believe Money refers to what they call money, that is, the currency of which they have a naive conception. However, this confusion is good: even if they don't know exactly what Money is, they understand that they should no longer ignore money, that they should be interested in currency, which is the last step before the revolution. Of course, attacking the currency does not necessarily put Money in danger, but taking down Money means eradicating the currency, which still seems like a heresy. In short, denouncing Money breaks a mental lock, an essential condition for imagining going even further than modifying or simply eliminating the medium of exchange that is currency.

Challenging currency is not a first in history. As early as the 16th century, Thomas More imagined his suppression in Utopia. But no theorist or "revolutionary" ever conceived Money. Their reflections on currency and society remained superficial, so that none could propose or implement a viable alternative system in the more or less long term. Four types of solutions were considered: 1) collectivism, 2) donation, 3) rationing, 4) artificial credits (24). Collectivism and donation share the common feature of eliminating all forms of means of exchange by rejecting money, while rationing and artificial credits modify money but retain a means of exchange based on the notion of value since it uses units. All of them have in common that they haven't learned the right lessons from the monetary system, that they've reproduced certain ways of thinking

(24) There is another solution, called L.E.S. (Local Exchange System), which combines barter and virtual credits. This mode of exchange, which is a combination of two systems based on Money, is by no means revolutionary. Its name alone indicates that it is inapplicable on a large scale (this is the whole problem of bartering) and therefore does not meet contemporary requirements.



## WHAT IS MONY ?

and that they are mistaken, by reaction, in new mistakes. The ultimate form of intellectual laziness, however, is donation, a solution that consists in just abolishing money and hoping for the best, relying on providence and humanity. We erase everything, we don't think anymore. No more means of exchange, therefore no more need for society, no more duties, no more constraints, no more realities, no more countries, no more borders: everyone is beautiful, everyone is kind; we are all citizens of the world without even knowing what citizenship is.

All these solutions create vacuums that nature abhors and consider unnatural measures that will be torpedoed by the force of circumstances. They forget the saying: what's bred in the bone will come out in the flesh. When they suppress all means of exchange, they eradicate currency but do not extirpate Mony from the minds, because nothing conveys or instills another conception of exchange and society, so that people are unconsciously always at the same point; when they propose another means of exchange, it's always based on Mony and is only a bastard currency doomed to failure, because it is absurd and disastrous to change the way in which currency works, since the currency as it is and as it functions is the natural consequence of Mony. These conceptual weaknesses stem from the lack of distinction between currency and the principle of means of exchange, from the ignorance that anything based on units is a currency and results from Mony. (25)

Mony has its laws. Currency has its laws. All these laws are imposed on people. They cannot be suppressed. At best, they can be contained for a certain period of time by force, because only force can impose measures

(25) All alternative theories to the monetary system as it is focus on currency but do not distinguish currency from the principle of means of exchange, and seem to ignore that anything unit based means currency and results from Mony. It follows that some reject the principle of means of exchange and its virtues by rejecting currency and its vices, while others, aware of the need for a means of exchange and full of monetary stereotypes, imagine another form of currency. But, as all of them follow their inspiration rather than have deep reflection on currency, none of them attack Mony, none of them attack evil at its roots. In the case of so-called alternative monetary systems, it's obvious that they are still under the influence of Mony and that they can only overcome their inconsistencies by returning to the ordinary currency (unit of value that is exchanged). As for the systems of donation and distribution (collectivism), they did not understand that a means of exchange is the most stable social parameter that, on its own, it inculcates in people the principles that it conveys. By abolishing currency without adopting a new means of exchange, they impose a mode of exchange that, on the one hand, is based on flawed socioeconomic concepts, and on the other hand, is insufficient to instill these concepts in people. Thus, spirits are always under Mony's control and will turn to currency, or even to barter, at the very first sign of difficulty.

## UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

that are contrary to the deep nature of the monetary system. But the will of people can do nothing, in the long run, in the face of circumstance and, sooner or later, Money, born to rule, regains his rights. To dominate Money and tame currency are illusions and even nonsense. How can Money, as a belief, be dominated by people who believe in it without even knowing it? How can currency be used otherwise, "correctly", when it's the currency that, by virtue of its origins and properties, controls the way it is used and also allows perverse and criminal uses? People do not master currency, let alone Money, whose existence they do not know about; they are the ones in their power and will be so until they recognize it and understand the reasons for it.

Philippe Landeux

May 27, 2011

## WHAT IS CIVISM?

### WHAT IS CIVISM?

A reader typed these words into the search engine: "What's the definition of the concept of civism in the broad sense? This blog is indeed dedicated to Civism. Most articles refer to it directly or indirectly. But the essential part is probably confused in this mass of information. It therefore seemed useful to me to briefly outline the main points.

The word "Civism" doesn't refer to the ordinary definition of civism although it doesn't exclude it. It's the name of a political-economic theory in which the words *City*, *Citizen*, *Citizenship*, but also *Equality*, *Duties*, *Rights* are redefined and come back over and over again, which explains this. This theory is the most revolutionary ever conceived. As a social project, it seems similar to others at first glance. However, it doesn't take long to realize that everything in it is radically new, and not just another version of the same thing. Which is both its strength and its weakness.

There's no revolution without revolution. However, revolutions are rare because people are rarely revolutionary. Even the most daring are often unaware of their underlying conformism; they want change without fundamentally changing anything. Most people are slaves to their stereotypes and preconceived ideas, while a revolution involves new and unexpected ideas. Novelty and surprise are certainly not guarantees of truth and accuracy! Suspicion is required. But when it's used less to sort by honesty and common sense than to reject everything out of fear and habit, it becomes a coward's pretext. Unfortunately, courage, whether physical or intellectual, is not the most widespread virtue.

Civism in three points:

- One goal: Equality
- One way: the civic Card
  
- One enemy (or obstacle): Money

#### 1. Equality

The goal of Civism is Equality - and there is no other possible and conceivable equality than that of Citizens in Duties and Rights. It would be just as correct to say Justice. But Justice is a broader concept; it goes beyond the framework of Society, which is by definition the subject of a political theory (from polis, the city, in Greek) and the field of a Revolution. It's therefore preferable to speak of Equality, a term that

## UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

both circumscribes the Revolution to society and indicates the type of social relations desired. The same reasons prescribe to speak of Citizens instead of comrades, an insipid term from a revolutionary point of view.

Equality is the fundamental Principle of the social order. Without it, there's no Society, no Citizens, no Duties, no Rights, no Democracy other than through abuse of language. Equality is the condition for social harmony, just as inequality is the breeding ground for tyranny. Aspiring to Equality is the defining feature of any truly revolutionary movement. To truly establish it, is the dream Civism aims to realize.

But why Equality? Because there's no Right without Duty that generates it; because an action is a Duty only to others; because there is no Duty without reciprocity; because individuals fulfilling the same Duty towards each other generate and guarantee each other the same Rights. No one generates his own Rights, except indirectly. There are Rights only in the context of a Society. Natural rights are a philosophical construction, a view of the mind. Before being conventions, Rights are the consequences of the union - called political association - between individuals, which is aroused by the instinct of self-preservation. Outside the Society, no power recognizes or guarantees any Rights. Within it, individuals are Citizens because they fulfill towards the City, i.e. all their fellow Citizens, the Duties that confer the Citizenship to which the Rights of the Citizen are attached. The Duties and Rights of the Citizen, of all Citizens, are defined by an at least tacit social Contract.

Equality isn't universal. It's not decreed, it's deserved like any right. It doesn't apply to all individuals but only to Citizens. One is not born a Citizen, one becomes one through his or her actions.

### 2. The civic Card

Originally, the first and often only Duty of the Citizen was to defend his fellow Citizens to ensure their Safety and enjoy their protection in return.

## WHAT IS CIVISM?

Security is the first Right of the Citizen; it exists, as a Right, only within the context of a Society.

In a general and simplified way, the ordinary Duty of the Citizen is to participate in the life of the City, according to what it considers to be participation. In return, the Citizen's basic Right is to enjoy the benefits of his City, which are the result of all the Citizens' Duties combined. In other words, the Duty to Participate in the life of the City confers Citizenship, which gives the right to enjoy the benefits of the City.

Many of these benefits are in the form of products and services available on the (national) market. Access to the market is therefore, today, a component of the Right to enjoy the Benefits of the City and Citizenship. A Citizen has the right to access the market by virtue of being a Citizen. To exercise this Right, he only needs to have a means of certifying his Citizenship to merchants: the civic Card.

The civic Card is the evolution of the credit card. It's based on the same technology and used in the same way, with the difference that it is used to verify Citizenship and not to manipulate credits.

Citizenship is not quantifiable. Either you are a Citizen or you're not. Consequently, the Right of access it confers is in theory indefinite and unlimited. However, its natural limits are the desires of the Citizen, the exercise by his fellow Citizens of this same Right, the nature of things (existing and available products) and, if necessary, the law.

### 3. Money

Money isn't an instrument; it's a tyrant. Its reign is one of artifice and instability, arbitrariness and inequality, strength (wealth) and anarchy (individualism).

Money is "the belief that the notion of market value is necessary to exchange". Money, in the strict sense, is therefore not currency, even if it can, in the broad sense, refer to anything related to it.

The notion of market value arises from the practice of barter - an essential individualistic mode of exchange in a context of artisanal production - and is perpetuated by the currency that allows indirect barter. As a standard of original value, currency now embodies the right to access the market and most of the rights that pass through it. In fact, it's used less to access the market than to keep most people in the

## UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

embarrassment and dependence of those who pay them; it is less a means of exchange than an ideal means of exploitation and oppression.

Mony and currency, its extension, are fundamentally unequal and therefore anti-social. Both result from the barter under which individuals, needing to own what they trade, are forced to produce for themselves. Instead of performing a Duty, they activate themselves out of desire or necessity. Instead of having their Rights guaranteed by the City, it's their responsibility to protect them. Instead of being Citizens, they're just individuals. Instead of focusing exclusively or at least primarily on the human being, this system is obsessed with the so-called value of things. Thus, bartering and its logic make Society implode by stripping each of its parameters of any social dimension.

Moreover, Mony - the notion of (market) value - implies differences in value between objects, between products, between productions, between producers, which inevitably results in differences in prices, wages, income and, ultimately, in inequality in "rights". Mony is antisocial from a simple dialectical point of view.

In addition to Mony, there is currency, which operates according to two principles: 1) that of communicating vessels, inherited from bartering, and 2) that of attraction, inherent in the notion of value. Without going into all the details, currency materializes the "rights" that everyone needs, and circulates since it must be exchanged, so that it condemns people to a permanent latent war in order to obtain them by all means at the expense of others. But this circulation according to the interplay of values and power relations inevitably leads to the formation of clots, i.e. points where monetary units, and therefore "rights", are concentrated. As earning money, earning more, always more or not losing more is an obligation, individuals who have much more than others hold the latter in their dependence and have power, which allows them to dictate prices and conditions, easily increase their capital and further extend their power.

Thus, not only is Equality impossible under Mony, but it's in the nature of the monetary system that inequalities are inexorably increasing. It is therefore useless to feel sorry for it and to denounce this or that if you support Mony yourself. It is not the consequences of Mony that must be fought (in vain), nor even the individuals who profit from this unequal, arbitrary and shaky order of things; it is Mony himself that must be destroyed. It is less a question of being *against Mony* than *for Equality*.

## WHAT IS CIVISM?

### CONCLUSION

What is Civism? It is a collection of mostly revolutionary Principles and concepts (set out in the *Patricians' Manifesto*), a new approach to political and economic problems, a redefinition of all terms with a social significance - such as Duties, Rights, Citizenship, Nationality, Democracy, etc. - and a new approach to political and economic problems. -A paradigm shift and a clear vision of the Society, known as the *City*. It is based on two reflections: the first on Money, a term specific to Civism, the second on Equality, as no one has ever seen before. It is based on a proposal, that of a civic Card, both a means of exchange and a vehicle for the Principles of the social order. This Card makes it possible on the one hand to establish and maintain Equality, on the other hand to eliminate Money (and currency with it) and, as a result, to understand what it is - since we only truly know what we lose after we have lost it.

Everything is political, Money like the rest. Money and currency, which, by their nature and functions, are at the center of "society", are political problems par excellence: they must be considered in the light of the Principles of the social order. To make them strictly economic issues and the preserve of experts is to tear the heart and lungs out of the social body and entrust the health of the moribund to charlatans.

The notion of market value (Money) is justified only by itself and by a fait accompli; it's totally foreign and contrary to the Principles of Social Order. Its appearance is certainly inevitable in a context of artisanal production, but it's no longer necessary in a context of industrial production. It is then aberrant and anachronistic. Continued violation of the Principles can only be explained by habit, persistent bias and ignorance of the Principles themselves.

The basic Principles are: 1) Citizens are equal in Duties and Rights, 2) An individual is a Citizen when he participates in the life of the City, according to what it considers to be participation, 3) Citizenship confers the same Rights on all Citizens, including the one to freely access the market.

Without freedom for all Citizens to access the market, Equality has no reality. A real Equality is actually not Equality per se. Equality in Rights is not equality in all things (egalitarianism) which, in addition to being a view of the mind, implies a deprivation of liberty and a tyrannical power.

## UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

There is no middle ground. Less inequality is not equality. Equality is or is not. Money is or is not. Whoever does not adhere to Civism endorses capitalism. Who is not revolutionary is willingly, unwillingly, a counter-revolutionary.

The utopia isn't to attack Money to change the "world", but to believe that we can change the "world" without attacking Money.

Philippe Landeux

December 05, 2011



## WHAT IS CIVISM?

# UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

## FROM THE SAME AUTHOR

### Published

- **Mony ou l'Égalité: il faut choisir (La révolution nécessaire, laquelle ? Éditions Golias, June 2009)**

### Available upon request (The Book Edition)

- **Principes universels de l'ordre social ou bases de la Société à usage universel (2011)**
- **Réquisitoire contre Mony ou théorie de l'Égalité (2011)**
- **Le Civisme ou théorie de la Cité (2011)**
- **Le Civisme illustré (2011)**
- **Robespierre parle aux Français (2013)**
- **Le Civisme, la Révolution du XXI<sup>e</sup> siècle (2013)**
- **La Guerre de l'Ouest dite de Vendée (2014)**
- **Vive la Nation ! (2014)**

Contact :  
[phil.ppe@live.fr](mailto:phil.ppe@live.fr)

Blog :  
<http://philippelandex.hautefort.com>



**ISBN n° 979-10-90965-02-7**  
**Completed printing in January 2015**  
**by TheBookEdition.com**  
**in Lille (Nord-Pas-de-Calais)**  
**Translated from French by Thomas Curelea tcurele@gmail.com**  
**Printed in France**