

FOUNDING MANIFESTO OF US THE PEOPLE



USthe**PEOPLE**

Founding Manifesto of Us the People

Adopted by Us the People, Students and Workers on 25 January 2020.

“The Africanists take the view that there is only one race to which we all belong, and that is the human race,” - Robert Sobukwe

PREAMBLE:

Since the inception of human life on Earth, human beings have always strived to achieve freedom, giving rise to libertarian currents throughout history, as well as struggles for individual freedom. This remains an important part of humankind's heritage as it challenges the contemporary view that human nature is inherently greedy or capitalist. Such views have been maintained by historical institutions of domination, from monarchs, to modern-day capitalist States. The principle and fact of government gave rise to misery among human beings, however this has only prevailed because mankind has allowed itself to be governed for too long. Customs that are beneficial to humanity have been replaced by laws. These laws have been enforced by terror, to protect the privilege of the ruling minority at the expense of the masses.

Since the landing of colonialists on the shores of Africa, Africans have participated in resistance against domination, oppression and exploitation. Various social systems have been applied: slavery, apartheid and representative democracy, however the conditions of the masses have always remained essentially the same. Having noticed that the freedoms achieved by the oppressed have been replacements of one domination by another, most Africans have given up on resistance. While the conditions of the masses make revolution desirable, it is evident from political participation among South Africans that there is a need for an alternative and futuristic thinking, in our quest to achieve freedom from all forms of domination.

Political freedom achieved by African States in the 1900s was largely based on ideas that maintain systems of dominance, however as a generation we ought to strive to achieve equal freedom of all. Advancements in science and technology have provided Us with a better understanding of human relations with nature, as well as the realisation of the necessity to oppose the State and all forms of monopolies, not for our sake, but for the sake of the future of humanity. Humans minds are locked in a complex matrix, and our decision is to unplug all minds from the need to dominate and addiction to be dominated.

IMPORTANT TERMS

The following have been identified as important terms and they will be used in this Manifesto with the following meaning:

FREEDOM: This is not a subjective, but an objective and quite exactly definable concept when we are dealing with freedom in a social context. Either my freedom is greater than that of another person, by occurring at his or their expense (in which case they are not free) or it is less than that of another person or group, at my expense (in which case I am not free). In either case there is no state of freedom. Freedom can, therefore, mean nothing other than equal freedom (not equality!) for all — which is essentially identical with non-domination.

DOMINATION: is a state of unequal freedom. Here the freedom of some is greater than the freedom of others and occurs at their expense and against their will. Thus a condition of unequal freedom which exists with the consent of the disadvantaged is not domination.

FORCE: is the physical or mental coercion exercised in an aggressive way, e.g. by injuring the equal freedom sphere of others. Defence against such aggression, including physical means, should thus not be considered as force.

METAPHYSICS: This comprises all concepts and doctrines which go beyond the realm of sensibly and logically graspable experienced reality and which, therefore, cannot be proven either true or false. Here one may leave open the question as to whether these concepts and doctrines expressing a subjective reality of experience and transcendent reality also represent an actual reality, perhaps even the true reality, or whether they are merely vacuous games of thought. When something cannot be proven with the standards of experienced reality then one can just as easily assert its opposite.

IDEOLOGIES: are statements which — like metaphysical statements — are, in essence or subject, beyond empirical proof or refutation because they contain at least some elements which go beyond experienced reality.

DEMOCRACY: is an ideology which submits the interests of individuals to the pretended interest of a majority, or of the abstractions "people" or "state." It is a system of domination which, to be sure, lets the representatives of the new gods "people," "state," and "humanity" be elected by individuals, but expressly exempts them from any contractual obligation towards their voters. Democracy pre-supposes and aims at a state of unequal freedom.

INTRODUCTION

This manifesto offers an alternative way of thinking, which is necessary for Us the People to destroy all oppressive and exploitative structures, laying the basis for new social order, devoid of from ancient ideologies. It presents the reader with an inevitable challenge, either to submit to aggressive forces or fight for a society with non-domination and equal freedom!

We come before you, Us the People, to pronounce our principles. The human race has travelled far since, those antique days, through all historical struggles, to modern society. Human beings are the only species to have expressed any form of aggression towards their own, and throughout modern history, there have always existed social groups, divided into those who worked for others, and the privileged few. The uprisings have succeeded the uprisings, the social institutions have changed, the form of denomination (money) has changed, some minimal fractions of the exploited and suppressed humans have succeeded in emancipating themselves and being welcomed among the ruling classes, but the conditions of the mass have always remained essentially the same with the ruling classes enjoying more freedom at the expense of the freedom of others.

A clever Frenchman once said: In the future there will be only two groups of people — those who want to live by their own work, and those who want to live by the work of others. More appropriately and inclusively one could say: A line is to be drawn between those who want to enlarge their own sphere of freedom by force, at the expense of the freedom of others, or wish to maintain a state which already ensures such an imbalance of freedom, and those whose goal is the equal freedom of everyone, and who, therefore, do not require additional freedom for themselves at the expense of the freedom of others.

Human beings, especially primitive ones, create a vast number of social concepts which do not correspond to reality at all but are superstitions. Furthermore, there exists a mass not only of superstitious concepts, which have manifested themselves in insufficient logic, hallucinations, insecurity of judgment and fear of thought. Besides such superstitions, humans are also enslaved by prejudices. Often even highly intelligent people succumb to prejudices. The way a prejudiced person understands something is already essentially determined before he receives any information on a subject. His personal experience of the subject plays a part only insofar as it supports the already-given tendency to judge the matter. Opposite experiences are simply ignored. There is no desire to include something new in one's faith but, on the contrary, an inclination to continue believing whatever one has begun to believe, regardless of facts and logic.

The superstitious person easily becomes a fanatic against those who see reality too clearly to see wonderful or dreadful things where he imagines them to be. "The socially prejudiced person does not judge his own material and cultural situation or that of his fellow creatures according to truly realistic and rigorous standards, but according to a systematically distorted image of the social conditions, an image whose origin he can scarcely explain but which he defends against critics as one of his holiest and most untouchable possessions. Things have remained generally the same, compared with the beginning of human thinking and judgment, since no clear distinction is made between reality and mere thoughts, between matters provable and unprovable.

Through appeals to "reason" — but always one's own reason, never that of others — very contrary opinions have often been uttered. Reviewing world history or merely daily experience, it becomes evident that only a small minority really have and use reason in their individual initiative. As the misery around us is increasing year by year, the prevalence of reason leads Us to inevitable determination that, beyond the tasks to which the individual initiative is sufficient, there are those that demand the participation of several individuals and common means; and considering that total freedom for all needs the participation of all of Us the People organised and agreed, organisation becomes necessary. Organisation arises from the consciousness that, for a certain purpose, the co-operation of several forces is necessary. When this purpose is achieved the necessity for co-operation has ceased, and each force reassumes its previous independence ready for other co-operation and combination if necessary. This is the necessary revolutionary organisation which Us the People envisage in the struggle for equal freedom for all.

There can be no true humanity, no true self-respect, without self-reliance. No one can help Us if you do not help ourselves. We do not promise to do anything for anyone, we do not want anything from anyone, we only appeal to you all to co-operate with us to bring about a state of society which will make freedom, well-being possible for all.

The Manifesto of Us the People launches a critical attack upon prevalent stereotyped ideas about the nature of the modern State and the system of monopoly capitalism together with proposed alternatives. The Manifesto goes on to present new thought processes and ways of relating which are necessary for emancipation, as well as concrete suggestions for the realization of equal freedom for all.

CHAPTER 1

THE STATE

What is the State?

A number of people declare a piece of the earth's surface - a certain area - including all that exists above and beneath to be their property and give it the name of a State. The inhabitants of this area are called 'nation' or 'people' and it surrounds them with its borders, making a 'nationality.'

All people living within these borders, i.e. the citizens or subjects, are subordinated to whatever laws are, for the time being, applied in this State. Whoever does not respect these laws voluntarily, is compelled to do so through the use of force. Accordingly, the State is based on force.

The State is not the only form of human association. There are others which can be summed up under the name 'society.'

What is 'society?'

As its name already expresses, it is an 'association,' the union of a smaller or larger number of people for a certain purpose — basically nothing other than a club. Where two people come together, even if simply for a conversation, they form a society. The forms of these societies and associations are as different as their purposes can be.

But what is the difference between State and society?

It is this: that the society is a free association while the State is not.

A society includes those people who want to belong to it and who are accepted by it — wherever they come from. A State confines all people living within a certain area, even when they do not want to belong to it. It 'accepts them' even against their will. Indeed, it encloses all those people but it is not a society of 'all' the people.

In the State a minority is always opposed to a majority: a society remains associated only as long as it wants to stay together.

If in a society an individual or some members are opposed to it, both the individual and this minority are free — free at any time — to leave it, i.e. to discontinue their membership while staying wherever they live. The State, however, only allows withdrawal when its 'subjects' do not remain where they are, when they leave its area. They are left with only one choice, that of settling in another State and thus of submitting to another majority.

By leaving, the individual dissolves the society for himself: the State, however, dissolves the individual in itself. When in a society the minority submits to the will of the majority they do so voluntarily: in the State they do so under compulsion because no other possibility is left open to them.

The State is an association of some people against others. State and society are therefore not similar and equal but completely different concepts which exclude each other. To mistake them to be alike is to confuse the basis of human social life altogether. They are natural enemies and, consequently, they fight each other constantly. The victory of one means the fall of the other and vice versa.

Society is a free association, it knows only free and equal members. The State, however, is a forced association, it knows only dominators and dominated, unfree and unequal subjects.

The State stands above the individual. It is their master. The Society stands beneath the individual. It is their servant.

The essence of the State is thus compulsion; the essence of society is freedom.

To repeat once more: The one is a compulsory association, the other a free one."

In addition to the state, there exists another form of oppression and exploitation which

The most dangerous means of exploitation is, firstly, the oligopoly of land ownership which is protected by the State. (The State in its state-socialist form and as sole proprietor of land does not eliminate this monopoly, but rather crowns it). Secondly, there is the money monopoly of the State. Any privilege and monopoly or oligopoly that does not have the voluntary consent of all, means a restriction of the equal freedom of all, for the privileged person or the monopolist has, like the ruler, an excess of freedom at the expense of the equal freedom of all.

Not every property constitutes at the same time a monopoly. One must especially distinguish between property in goods which can be multiplied (even if not without limit) and property which, like land and natural resources, is available only in limited quantities. One must especially differentiate between property in the product of one's labour (or in what was exchanged for the product of one's own work) and property in what nature offers free to all, without labour, such as land and natural resources. In this, the basic substance offered by nature must, again, be distinguished from property which is acquired by improving land and by the mining and processing of natural resources.

Land (which is in limited supply and is becoming continuously more valuable as population increases. It also varies greatly according to the quality of soil, resources and especially location) is one of the so-called natural monopoly goods. As a source of food and raw materials, and the site for any production, land is a necessary foundation for the existence of every human being, not different from air. One need only imagine air - similar to land today-being the property of a relatively small minority. Then the great majority would be subject to tributes, e.g. in such a way that each man would have to walk about with a measuring device in front of his nose and would have to pay for his air consumption! This idea is no more absurd than the contemporary "right" of land ownership.

Its essence lies in the fact that the landowner may not only use a piece of land for his personal cultivation or habitation but may also exclude others from utilizing an area far greater than they themselves need. It allows the landowner to impose tributes upon others which they must continuously pay. These appear not only openly in rent and lease contracts, but are hidden in the prices of all goods and amount, fundamentally, to nothing other than a modern kind of slavery.

The State as criminal

It is only too characteristic for the State that any crime, if only it comes within the law, becomes "legal" i.e. from the State's perspective this crime becomes a tolerated and even praiseworthy act. All acts which are prohibited by the criminal laws of a particular state are punished, but those committed by the State. The State works as murderer and killer in the activities of its secret services, by capital punishment, and in war it even compels those within its power to commit murder themselves in case of war or to help in the murdering of others. The State acts as a highway robber by charging custom duties and taxes at borders and within the country itself. It acts as a robber when, by means of the tax office and foreclosures, it expropriates immense sums from the working incomes and the property of all within its sphere of power.

In war, the State not only decides about the property but also about the life of the individual. Even during peace, an individual's possessions and liberties are always, so to speak, only on lease from the State and may be diminished and restricted by it at any time. The State engages in spying and maintains a considerable apparatus of spies and secret agents, in its own territories as well as in foreign countries. However it punishes spies investigating its own State secrets. The State demands for itself the right of self-determination. But when some section of its population claims the same right for itself, then it shouts about "high treason" and moves against them with brute force.

Is the state a necessary evil?

Whoever considers the State necessary, believes aggressive force to be necessary too (without being aware of the consequences), and confuses an aggressive organisation with a purely defensive one. We cannot overemphasise that there are things that cannot be regulated by each individual himself but only in community with others. But for all such arrangements there are always two possibilities: on the one hand, aggressive force which forces an arbitrary solution on opponents; and on the other hand, a voluntary settlement which seeks a solution based on the equal freedom of all. The latter means, at the same time, the outlawing of aggressive force and the establishment of defensive organisations against it.

People also mistakenly believe that agreed upon (i.e. genuine) rights are not possible without the guarantee of a superior and dominating force. In this case, international law offers an evident counter example, although not a model one. Above "sovereign" States there is no superior authority comparable to the State in its internal effects. Nevertheless, international law largely functions as contractual law. It works imperfectly because the "sovereignty" of the State is based on its ultimate principle, the law of the big fist. The sovereignty of the individual is of a quite different kind. It is based on the outlawry of the law of the big fist or the sword (i.e. of aggressive force) and rests, instead, on the common interest, in the equal freedom of all and in its defence.

With the principle of equal freedom for all, something quite new opposes the dominating system so far based on antique ideologies, something based on the criteria of experienced reality. The new system relies exclusively on the criteria of experienced reality which is in the long run possible only on the basis of equal freedom for all.

There are many people who proudly speak of "our State," and they are by no means only those privileged by it. They cannot at all imagine an existence without the State." Why? — Because those who are interested in their own predominance fear non-domination as the end of their own hegemony and privilege. Thus they have falsified the concept of statelessness by equating it with chaos and disorder.

Humans who neither rule others nor want to be ruled by others —do not think at all of hindering the worshippers of the State from submitting themselves even to the most absurd measures of manipulation or exploitation and from "enjoying" all alleged or actual advantages which a "State," i.e. an organization of domination, may offer. Only one thing will not be allowed for such a "State": to subject others who are unwilling to its rule; to claim, for those willing and their State, an increased sphere of freedom at the expense of others, i.e. any monopolies; and to infringe the sphere of the equal freedom of all non-members either by itself or by any of its members. If these conditions are fulfilled then such a "State" is only State in name, and actually is a free protective and social community which one may enter freely, instead of being forced into it. One may also leave it again of one's own free will — after giving due notice — or one may be excluded when violating accepted obligations. But this exclusion will not lead to discrimination in any form or to a limitation of one's equal sphere of freedom.

It is nothing but a fixed idea of the State-worshippers when they claim that it has to mind the business of more and more people without their being asked. This quite naturally ends in a conditions where all the affairs of all people are put into the hands of a few, i.e. it ends in domination instead of leadership.

CHAPTER 2

CONTRADICTIONS OF BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY AND LIMITATIONS OF MARXISM

The most prevailing political system today is representative democracy, in which every few years or so, the electorate vote to determine who will control them. This system legitimises the capitalist system, by giving the illusion that somehow the votes are in charge of running the system. middle class politicians are prepared to humble themselves before the electorate issuing all sorts of promises. But this levelling of candidates before the populace disappears the day after the election, once they are transformed into members of the Parliament. The workers continue to go to work, while public representative their legislating -mere mockery and hypocrisy,-, having no other object but to make the people believe that something is being done for them, and that the public interest is well looked after. The people obey all these laws, whilst the State, in the alleged interest of all, in reality in the interest of the property owners and of its own power, violates them all and commits numberless crimes—which are glorified as deeds in the interest of humanity.

You believed in freedom; for freedom you conspired and fought and freedom proved bitter irony, which only leaves you free to starve. You believed and still believe in charlatans who, under the pretext of doing your good, ask you to support your vote or your arm; and The Charlatans make a stool of you and go up to the top oppress you, irritate you, exploit you.

Sometimes the power of a class of denominators was defeated; but, always lasting the struggle between men, the new victors replaced the Ancients and the people had only changed their masters.

Us the People desire the cessation of representative democracy as the prevalent political system because of it is an expression of the inequality of power which exists in society. While the constitutions guarantees the rights of citizens and equality before the law, the reality is that the capitalist class is in permanent control. So long as people are economically exploited by capitalism and there are gross inequalities of wealth, there can not be real democracy. It is clear that economic facts are much stronger than political rights, because so long as there is economic privilege there will be political domination by the rich over the poor. In the modern world of western reflection, it is assumed that the people rule. However the reality is that minorities necessarily do the governing. A privileged few who have access to wealth, education and leisure time, clearly are better equipped to govern than ordinary working people, who generally have little free time and only a basic education. This is the case even under socialist governments, because even a government of the proletariat becomes exploiters and oppressors.

Only personal and direct control over our lives will ensure that justice and freedom prevail. To grant political sovereignty to others, whether under the mantle of democracy, republicanism, the people's state, or whatever, is to give others control and therefore domination over our lives. The democratic state is a contradiction since the state is essentially about force, authority and domination and is necessarily based upon an inequality of wealth and power. Democracy, in the sense of self rule for all, means that no one is ruled. If no one rules, there can be no state.

Some of the predictions that followed from Marx's apparent strict scientific observations have been explicitly refuted by developments that are observable within modern history. The theory of pauperization, according to which the proletariat in a capitalistic society is continuously kept at subsistence level, is wrong. Although a changed capitalism has not brought general affluence, it is quite obvious that in capitalistic countries a much higher standard of living has been achieved, especially for the mass of the workers, than under the State socialism, and the realization of the Communist paradise has not occurred even after decades of existence of socialist States.

In the 21st Century, we ought to discredit the central thesis of the Marxist theory, because with the rationalisation and automation of production, the number of manual labourers is continuously decreasing, diminishing the prospects of a majority made up of proletarians. Also, If the central point of Marx's theory had been correct (i.e. that the collapse of capitalism conforms to economic laws and is inevitable), then developers of Marxist theory would not lack precision and clear thinking in the face of the development of capitalism into imperialism. Most importantly, it is untrue that all previous history consisted only of class struggles and that these struggles effected all historical changes, particularly in Africa. The multitude of historical African struggles against oppressors have been much more effective in changing history than the so-called class wars- or attempts thereof.

Us the People believed that the application of the Marxist system would necessarily lead to the replacement of one repression (capitalist) by another (state socialist), as exemplified in various socialist States that have existed in throughout history. We oppose the Marxist idea of dictatorship of the proletariat which was, in effect, a transitional state on the way to stateless communism. Marx and Engles, in the Communist Manifesto of 1848, had written of the need for labour armies under state supervision, the need for centralized and directed economy, as well as wide spread nationalization. A proletarian state consisting of millions of people governing on their own behalf is impossible, and as a result, the proletariat entrusts the task of government to a small group of politicians. Once the role of government is taken out of the hands of the masses, a new class of professional politicians arises. They masquerade as the true expression of the people will, while institutionalised political power gives rise to a new group of governors with the same self seeking interests and the same cover-ups of dubious dealings. A command economy, where the state is owner, organiser, director, financier, and distributor of labour and economy- as Marxists envisage- means that decisions flow from top to bottom.

As a program, the Communist Manifesto culminates into absolutist aggressive force, the supreme command over all means of production in the hands of the greatest and most violent monopolist. This monopolist (the State) forces himself upon society and devours its entire productive activity through an absolute monopoly over the public supply of goods, through an absolute monopoly over the demand for labour, and through a monopoly over production planning. This is the most sinister falsification of the concept of Socialism, which aims to eliminate all domination and exploitation.

Us the People, by comparison, do not strive to achieve a new society which will arise only in the far future by means of coercive re-education but, rather, one that is possible in the present

and that does not require a dictatorship or the subjugation of others. Instead, it requires only the elimination of all privileges and monopolies (especially those of the rogue monopolist, the State), as well as a few organizations based upon voluntarism for the guaranty and defence of the equal freedom of all.

CHAPTER 3

EQUAL FREEDOM OF ALL

Historically, the liberties that humans have celebrated have been incomplete parts of freedom. Largely, such liberties are granted by the privileged, who reserved for themselves greater freedom at the expense of others. i.e. liberalism- where freedom and dignity is reserved for the greatest number of individuals, and not for all.

Equal freedom of all involves everyone not being coerced by the will of another, be it an individual or group, either to do or neglect anything, and renouncing oneself from any aggressive attempt to force one's own will upon others. Under such conditions, the external freedom sphere of anyone is never smaller than that of another individual (unless voluntarily consented by the individual) and there is no excess of freedom for some at the expense and against the will of others. It also means the absence of any oligopoly or monopoly, and of any privilege for an individual or group. For this would be an excess of freedom at the expense of all others. If someone voluntarily limits his *own* freedom of action in favour of another person and grants him a privilege or monopoly towards *himself*, then we have no infringement of the equal freedom of all.

Much of what is accepted as morality results from the principle of equal freedom for all. For example, a murderer or killer presumes a greater freedom of action for themselves at the expense of the victim, whom he deprives of life, thus limiting the victim's freedom in the most ultimate way. This applies to any act of aggression against the will and at the expense of a victim who is deprived of their property. Thus, equal freedom of all means mutual freedom from aggressive intervention by another, self-determination within mutuality, and the inviolability of the non-aggressive individual. Within a condition of the equal freedom of all, no one can give orders to anyone unless the one ordered about first authorizes the commander. Force is permissible only insofar as it serves as a defence against aggressive intervention.

Any form of laws, customs, or practices which limit a person's sphere of freedom against his will, in favour of excessive freedom for others, are nothing but aggressive force. Ideological and moral articles of faith have been used historically to justify groups obtaining excessive freedom for themselves at the expense of others.

Voluntary agreement is fundamental to equal freedom of all, for example, authorising a surgeon to interfere with one's physical being. This is within the framework of the equal freedom of all, because while in the process, the sphere of action of the authorized person is larger than that of the one giving his approval, it is by voluntary agreement. It is clear that one may only limit one's own freedom by a contract in favour of another person.

Economic exploitation - the result of the monopolisation of the land, raw materials and means of production by the capitalists and landlords- is at the bottom of the present misery. But the system which produces it would have long ago broken down if it were not upheld on one hand by the State, with its armies of officials, soldiers and police - the whole machinery of government, in one word; and on the other hand by the oppressed themselves, who tamely submit to their own spoliation and degradation, If we want to be free, if we want to enjoy the

fruits of your sweat, if you want to live a life worthy of men, count only on your own strength. People who live on your job can't be friends with you. You suffer hunger and cold because you have nothing, and you must beg the labour of those who have taken over the land and capital, and suffer the harsh conditions. Take the land and the capital, which belongs to everyone, and work on your own.

Belief in and submission to authority is the root cause of all our misery. The remedy we recommend and are in pursuit of is: struggle unto death against all authority, whether it be that of physical force identical with the State or that of doctrine and theories, the product of ages of ignorance and superstition inculcated into the human minds from their childhood - such as patriotism, obedience to the law, belief in the State, submission to the rich and titled, etc., generally speaking, the absence of any critical spirit in face of all the baloneys who oppress and exploit others.

In land

The equal freedom of all includes, in principle, the equal claim of every individual to the whole Earth. The Earth's surface (including rivers, dams and oceans) with its natural resources, as the primary and basic prerequisite for every human existence, and essential for food, shelter and a working place, is available only in limited quantity, and the quality of the land, as well as its site, also play an important part. Land and natural resources are means of production and capital, but means of production and capital that are *given* by nature which need not — as with produced means of production — be worked for. Thus everybody has an equal claim to use land, and no one has a privilege over it that can be substantiated.

If anybody prevents the use of this gift of nature or makes it dependent on the payment of any tribute (rent) resulting in unearned income for them then they are claiming a privilege that cannot be justified and committing an aggressive act — even if this is legalised by some law.

"Property (ownership)" in land means, among other things, that all who are born later are fundamentally disadvantaged, since, due to increasing demand, pieces of land become more and more expensive and "owners" are also less and less willing to sell. In any case, it means the "right" to exclude all others from the use of the piece of land concerned, although they are absolutely dependent upon such land, at least as a place to live and work, while they may raise exactly the same claim to its use as the "proprietor. "Property" in land means especially the "right" to extort tribute and unearned income from others, based upon a claimed but unjustifiable privilege.

The achievement of equal freedom for all in land and natural resources requires the equal access for everyone to land and everyone's equal share in the use of this means of production, but at the same time excludes any privilege, monopoly and oligopoly of individuals, groups or institutions over land and its resources. For this purpose today's land "owners" need only be stripped of their privilege or oligopoly, but they need not be deprived of the value of their genuine possessions, which they may continue to utilize within the new framework, with rights completely equal to those of all others.

In respect the state taking custody of land, no nationalization of land is justifiable, as it only amounts to the replacement of many oligopolists and privileged people by one single monopolist. Afterall, it is the State that protects and maintains "property" in land, as well as other monopolies, oligopolies and privileges. State officials do not represent the interests of all citizens equally, instead, they are primarily functionaries of domination over all subjects. Moreover, seeing that State functionaries are controlled by economic and political lobbies, outside of the State, they one-sidedly represent the interests of some against the interests of others, at the expense of others.

The money monopoly and credit oligopoly have even greater consequences than the oligopoly of land property. Here the State monopolizes the issue of exchange media (money) by transferring it to a central note-issuing bank, which thus obtains the "right" to issue bank notes as legal tender, and instead of paying interest, it demands interest payments for these. Moreover, this interest lies *far* above the cost of the production and administration of this means of exchange. Thus, we have here, in the first place, a typically monopolistic exploitation through exclusion of competition, and this directly emanates from the State. Furthermore, the State manipulates the business of banks, which can to a limited extent create so-called book money (out of nothing), for which they charge the monopoly interest of the central note-issuing bank besides their own interest charges.

Equal freedom of all in the exchange of products of labour

Observation of the development of capitalism is resulting in great changes in payment methods. Cash will soon become unnecessary, as well as today's cheque payments and bank transfers, in favour of computerized and cashless clearing system

It is most important that through the simple measure of repealing the money monopoly and the credit monopoly, the function of the extortionist monopoly interest rate should be abolished as a barrier, for again and again it stops productivity and production in general and keeps them far beneath technical possibilities and demand. In the same way, there will be an end to the continually repeated destruction of the capital of small savers through inflation. This has kept them in permanent dependence upon the monopolists and oligopolists and exposed them to exploitation by them. For without compulsory acceptance of a means of exchange falsified by inflation, and against free competition, their issuers could not exist.

Any child can grasp what the inevitable consequences are when, through the money monopoly and credit oligopoly (and also the land oligopoly), huge amounts of increased income are continually flowing into the pockets of a minority — after being withdrawn from a majority which thus becomes permanently dependent on that minority. All the unpleasant effects arise which one has called "capitalism" without being aware of its real essence, domination, instead of the equal freedom of all. The abolition of all monopolies and oligopolies is not by itself sufficient to establish the equal freedom of all, at least not as long as the enormous differences in property exist which arose through the previous privileges and monopolies. Thus it needs to be supplemented by a measure which on the one hand will eliminate all *actual* monopolies and oligopolies, and on the other will make it possible for all people without a fortune to invest their labour power rationally and competitively,

Us the People want equal freedom of all. Humans are to provide for their own affairs by voluntary arrangements amongst themselves. Everybody has different faculties and abilities for work, and different wants and desires for the various necessities of life and leisure. These inclinations and wants require full satisfaction, but can only receive it in a state of freedom.

Rules and regulations would hinder and make him a fettered, incomplete being who necessarily finds no pleasure in work forced upon him. But under freedom of all he would associate voluntarily with others to do the work he is best fitted to do, and would satisfy his wants in proportion to his needs from the common stock, the result of their common labor. Cut-throat competition for the bare necessities of life would be done away with, to-day work is viewed with disfavour and neglected by all who can possibly exist without it because it has to be carried on under the most disadvantageous conditions and is, moreover, looked upon as degrading. The worker earning his food by hard labor and ceaseless toil is a pariah, the outcast of society, while the idler who never does an hour's hours work in his life is admired and glorified, and spends his days in luxurious ease amongst pleasant surroundings. We believe that under the freedom which we envision everybody would be willing to work; work being freed from the badge of dishonor now associated with it will have become a labor of love. The wealth producers, knew that there is enough and to spare of food and of the necessities of life for all, if all would work. But now, in order to keep the rich in idleness and luxury, all the workers must lead a life of perpetual misery and exploitation.

Our societies shall consist of a great number of groups devoted each to the production of certain commodities free of access to all, and in local and interlocal contact with other groups to agree and make arrangements for purposes of exchange. With regard to the first necessities of life, food, clothes, shelter, education, Free collectivism shall be carried out thoroughly. All secondary matters would be left to a mutual agreement in the most varied ways. There would remain in such a society full freedom for the Individualist as long as he did not develop any monopolistic tendencies.

CHAPTER 4

US THE PEOPLE: OUR AIMS

Us the People stand for non-domination either by a man, organization, government or the state. Parasitic political organisation and agents of the current establishment striving for or practicing domination should equate a condition of non-domination with disorder or even chaos, because, in this way, they try to justify their own domination. However, this is nothing but inuendo. For there has never been any period in human history, not even in its earliest beginnings and in pre-history, where a condition of genuine equal freedom existed. This results from the fact that Us the People of this age given our historical analysis presumes a certain maturity of civilization, of insight and of experience.

The believe and assertion that Humans are chaotic therefore cannot govern themselves with domination and live in harmony is totally unfounded due to lack of experience. However, more than enough experience has been had with its opposite, domination, which has almost always gone hand in hand with exploitation and genocide. Against this, people have rebelled again and again, in all ages, since it has always brought disorder into social relationships and has created chaotic conditions by wars and civil wars.

Freedom (real freedom, the equal freedom of all) is identical with nondomination. It is not the daughter, but the mother of order (as Proudhon said). Disorder is always the consequence of dispute, and dispute arises unavoidably whenever someone attempts to dominate, i.e. to oppress another person.

The condition of non-domination of the equal freedom of all, also offers everyone the greatest possible extension of freedom for his own aspirations, and by this fact alone the differences that remain possible are already very limited.

If nobody ruled, nobody was subjected to anyone else. The side-by-side existence of non-subordinated people presupposed order. Thus, if statelessness meant order, it could also become a concept of law, since law is only a special form of order. Indeed, examples showed that this was possible.

It meant an equality of all, the model of the round table around which all sit as equal partners. Road traffic regulations ("neither more horse power nor anything else can grant privileges") and modern marriage law (with its principle of the equal rights of marriage partners — "nobody is subjected, nobody dominates") were further examples.

Lastly, even the most essential requirements of a constitutional society, such as freedom, equality, control of violence, and lawfulness, were the goals towards which society without domination was striving. Therefore, wherever domination was aspired to which would endanger the anarchistic order of equal rights, the lawfulness of the State was in danger and so-called dissatisfaction with the establishment was quite justified.

The criterion for genuine Us the People member.

The standard of whether someone is genuine as Us the People or not lies in whether he condemns domination over others or not, i.e. whether he voluntarily and on principle respects the limit of the equal freedom of all (with all its consequences), abstains from aggressive violation of this limit, and is prepared to offer compensation in case of unintentional or negligent offences against it.

Us the People member on principle, places the freedom of others before his personal freedom, by equating his own freedom with theirs. Doesn't this really constitute a model for what is called "democratic behaviour"? This is a badly chosen expression, but it is at least heading in the direction of what one means by it.

Domination, i.e. the claim to determine the conduct of others, against their will, in such a way that one's own freedom is increased at the expense of the freedom of others, does not always arise only from conscious personal arbitrariness. Far more often, it takes the form of a claim for domination based on one's obsession with an idea or concept. The person concerned is himself so dominated by it that he never doubts its reality or whether all others recognize it. This becomes especially hideous when the "ideal" is one intended to make mankind happy and when the person concerned, asserting his good intentions and his better insight, compared with the alleged ignorance or foolishness of the others, becomes aggressive against the others. However, whether aggressive force is practiced for the purpose of oppression or to make people happy, it always amounts to the same. There is always one person intending to hold others in tutelage, and who wants to determine, against the will of others, what they should do, and who thus claims an excessive freedom for himself at the expense of the others.

The response to this by Us the People should not be aggression. Any compulsion is admissible only insofar as it defends the limit of the equal freedom of all. By exceeding this limit, it becomes aggression.

Us the People believe that equal freedom does not require an "ideal person" but only human beings, as they are. The equal freedom of all is a purely external relationship of mutual nonaggression, and solidarity (though it may be desired and though it does lie in everyone's interest) does not represent a "conditio sine qua non."

Members of Us the People must be prepared to respect neutral arbitration courts in all disputes and to submit to their judgment, even when it runs against him, i.e. that he must not make himself a judge in his own case. It is self-evident that such arbitration courts have to decide according to the principle of equal freedom which, like a set of scales, offers a clear standard for any concrete situation.

Us the People **is different from any other political formation for the following features.**

Contrary to all abstractly or ideologically founded systems — it is based in experienced reality.

Us the People does not state:

Things ought to be this way (since a "revelation" or "my conscience" or a "moral" or "nature" or a "development law" or "justice" determined it this way).

Significantly, even followers of the same principle - not to speak of people with different principles - do not agree about its consequences, nor can they ever agree.

Instead, Us the People state:

Things are this way (and in such a way as can be proved by means of our cognitive abilities).

For there are just two options for conduct between which one has to decide: between the law of the jungle (whereby one intends only to succeed oneself, at the expense of others, rejecting any agreement) and the will to come to an understanding with one's fellow beings, because one rejects the law of the jungle.

This understanding can last only when based on the equal freedom of all. For any solution giving excessive freedom to some at the expense of the equal freedom of others must lead ever and again to the rebellion of the disadvantaged and so inevitably to fighting. The far-reaching consequences of the principle of the equal freedom of all has been explained in the previous chapter.

Within the framework of the equal freedom of all, it allows any world view, any other system of social order, any unrestricted opportunity to develop — without a corresponding autonomous protective and social community, i.e. without attempting to bring all into a unified scheme. The principle of the equal freedom of all, which is to be respected here, is not a theme (among many others) but the necessary precondition for this variety.

Us the People: Axis

All these attempting to persuade the individual that "actually" he does not have an independent existence of his own, that he is rather part of an "organism," or merely the member of a "greater whole" and subject to its laws - indeed that he altogether exists only in his fancy and that "true reality" lies in ideas - all these theses are never advanced by the alleged "superior beings" themselves, but always only by some of the very "negligible" individuals. Such an individual, however, can deliver proof neither for the actual existence of those "superior beings" merely asserted by him, nor, if one assumes their existence, proof of his authority to speak for those beings and to interpret their will correctly.

Us the People believe that society is "not an organism but a co-operation. From this point of view, society is no longer a collective in which each member is only an industrious prisoner, but a community of free and responsible persons whose independence is to be as large as possible.

The "liberated working class" is by no means the sum of finally liberated individual workers, but a scourge and a falsification dreamed up by those who (although they are mostly not workers but intellectuals) presume to determine by themselves and dictatorially what corresponds to the "class interest," what "right consciousness" contains, and what has to be eliminated from it

The total subordination and total dependence of those "liberated" — more total than occurred under an absolute rule — is not substantially mitigated either by some material improvements, since these are as nothing compared with those (withheld from them by a wardship based partly on an imperfect and partly on a completely false theory) which can only be offered by

the equal freedom of all. But this very freedom is denied them by those concept-jugglers in the name of a religious dogma, allegedly the only one which can make people happy. The most grotesque distortion, however, lies in the pretence that this religious dogma is the result of objective science.

Remember, attempts to advance beyond our experienced reality into possibly existing (even though unprovable) "superior realities" will not come to an end under Us the People. Thus, neither religious nor ideological ideas will cease. There will be no end to faith. On the contrary: all religions and ideologies will now find a permanently secured backing in the principle of the equal freedom of all and will, within its limits, also enjoy the free exercise of their creeds.

But the delusion will end that one's own "sacred beliefs," unprovable assertions, give one a "right" to subject all others to one's own opinion, to push into their freedom sphere and to enlarge one's own freedom at their expense.

There will be ones who declare themselves for the right of the jungle but now will have to make do without the previous covers of "superior norms" and "higher things" in general, like, e.g. "class interest." For what today is common knowledge to only a tiny minority of sociologists and theorists of cognition, and of anarchists who have partly built upon these insights and partly lived in accordance with them in a purely instinctive way, will (once the breakthrough of this basically simple recognition is achieved) soon become quite clear even to any child. Then everyone will have a reliable, concrete criterion of behaviour for any situation.

For those people declaring themselves openly for aggressive force probably form only a small minority under today's conditions and thus can be quickly dealt with if, in spite of warnings, they continue to act as disturbers of the peace.

Of course, there will always be interference with the freedom of others, some impulsive, some due to folly, some even undertaken in good faith. There will be border-line cases in which a conscious violation of the principle occurs — for instance, in order to prevent someone from committing suicide — with the intention of preserving the well- understood interest (from the viewpoint of the judging person!) of someone who is, apparently and temporarily, not clear on this. If such offenders against the principle are prepared to acknowledge their violation and, if necessary, to pay indemnification, even when they acted with "the best intentions" (for no matter how good an intention, even it cannot justify aggressive intervention into the freedom sphere of another), then they are, nevertheless, consistent members of Us the People.

Only if one proceeds from the specific individual, as a provable reality, will one avoid the dangers which result from collective concepts through substituting for reality an ideology or, perhaps, a personified abstraction, i.e. a thought game which finds no support in experienced reality. This substitution occurred with Marx also. To be sure, he claimed to proceed from real, specific human beings, but then he defined them as the "product of social conditions," i.e. as a bloodless abstraction without individual characteristics. Moreover, he even made himself a judge of the specific individual's "wrong consciousness," setting him the "ideal," in his opinion, of the "right" man as a goal. Then he wanted dictatorially to enforce the fulfillment of this goal since he believed himself (like any other prophet) to be enlightened and infallible. But in doing so, he only followed faithfully the trail of German idealist philosophy, for the "materialism" of his concept of history lies only in the name, since a purposeful "law of development" means nothing other than a divine will — or Hegel's "world spirit" in a new disguise.

Quite apart from Marx's at best defective substantiation of this alleged law of development (for which he has only chosen those facts which fitted his theory and neglected any opposing ones), any assignment of "goals" limiting the self-determination and will of the individual, as well as the equal freedom of all, goes beyond the framework of experienced reality, i.e. beyond what can be scientifically comprehended, and so belongs in the category of ideologies (which are unprovable as to their true character) and of mere propaganda for a subjective ideal.

Us the People holds the scientifically established, unshakable and realistic point of view that any alien will intent upon bending one's own will by referring to a "goal" (as a human being, a member of a nation, a citizen, a class comrade or anything else) or by referring to any divine, ethical, moral, natural or other law while thereby exceeding the limit of the equal freedom of all, simply exercises aggressive force which tries to hide behind untenable "justifications." As long as an individual's own will and actions move within the borders drawn by the fact that he is not alone in the world but lives together with others who claim a freedom sphere and freedom of action equal to his own, his actions must remain free from alien forceful intervention (even if his actions appear to others to be "objectively" unreasonable and dangerous to himself). This naturally applies especially where such an intervention takes place in order to adapt him to the ideal imagined by the aggressor or to a concept which the aggressor has of alleged "rights and duties," i.e. those not based on voluntary agreements. Concretely expressed: the anarchist rejects, on principle, not only the State as a compulsory organization and the main aggressor, but also any compulsory organization which wants to establish itself within or without the State as its successor, especially any dictatorship — a foreign one as well as one in one's own country.

Thus communities, communes or any other such groupings have no right to restrict the equal freedom of all in any way except with the consent of those concerned. Compulsory insurances and compulsory corporations of any kind must end, in the same way as all privileges, monopolies, and oligopolies.

Yet not only those laws which contradict the equal freedom of all must be removed, but also all customs and habits which do the same, and often more severely than any law. Likewise, in families any remnants of domination, any handicapping of women or of children, must disappear.

Of course, not all laws aim to restrict the equal freedom of all. Indeed, some particular ones, at least according to their intentions, aim at its protection, even though often inappropriately. Laws with this tendency could well remain in force by being subscribed to by the autonomous protective and social communities which replace the State.

Senseless misunderstandings of the abolition of the State is to think that state abolition will take place precisely because of its criminal aggressiveness, for Us the People is directed against any aggressive force. But this abolition does not at all mean that, at the same time, also those limitations on criminal acts (like, for instance, murder, manslaughter, bodily injury, rape, robbery, theft, fraud, etc.) have to be dropped which have been achieved up to now as part of the functions of the State. (Most are mistaken in seeing this as its main function). Equal Freedom or non-domination does not mean a condemnation of the organized defense of life, freedom and rightful property, but has exactly this organized defense - on a voluntary basis - as a self-evident precondition. In other words: the existing States would be at once acceptable to Us the People if they were to remove from their constitutions and practices all privileges, monopolies and oligopolies and accepted the equal freedom of all as their basic law.

The Us the People principle of equal freedom of all applies not only to institutions but, without exception, to all relationships, even the most private ones between human beings. It condemns, for instance, in the same way, the molestation and impairment of the health of others by excessive noise by poisoning of the air, by pollution of the water and by contamination of the land, and it fosters corresponding measures for the protection of the environment.

All attempts to create "general happiness" or the "greatest possible happiness for the greatest possible number" have resulted only in pretentiousness and have at the same time demonstrated that it is impossible for someone to determine what makes or should make other people happy. Equal freedom for all begins with the fact that neither the concepts that individuals have of happiness, nor their feelings, wishes and wills can be reduced to a common denominator. Consequently, with respect for the total diversity between all individual human beings (whose absolute uniqueness was rightly stressed by Stirner and has also been confirmed by modern anthropology), the decisive point can only be to assure each individual as large a freedom of sphere as possible, one in accordance with his will, his feelings, and his wishes, no matter how misguided he may appear to be to others. The only limitation is the equal freedom sphere of all others. Thus, no one may claim for himself an excess at the expense of others. This means at the same time that no one may use force against others, except in defense against aggressive acts from their side.

The equal freedom of all is highly concrete, for it can be determined in each particular case whether the freedom of action claimed by one is greater than that of another and is against his will and at his expense. There are people who assert that they can only be "really free" when all are free, meaning by this that all others must obtain inner freedom like them, and even liberate themselves from any self-chosen dependency. This is a Utopian - although quite understandable - wish, but one that leads to the dangerous intention of wanting to "liberate" even those who do not want to be "liberated" (made happy) at all because, for instance, security may seem more desirable to them than freedom. The equal freedom of all also includes the freedom to be a slave, or at least to remain in voluntary dependence upon others.

It is falsification of the concept of freedom in social relations when, for instance, "true freedom" is seen in freeing people from material cares, which amounts to unrestricted consumption, i.e. the ideal of communism. This means, in practice, the exploitation of the capable by the incapable, of the industrious by the lazy, and the strong by the weak. In any case, total control of the means of production and thus decisive control over the most important manifestations of human life are usurped by superior authorities, whether they call themselves "the State" or something else.

In all these cases of falsified freedom concept, so-called "freedom" is turned into an ideology, rising as a "goal" above individual and requiring them to adapt to it. But equal freedom rejects any domination including also that of such a "freedom."

"Nothing is more wonderful than the man who breaks his chains and strikes his oppressors with them," - John Henry Mackay.

Us the People believe that there is no absolute freedom. There is only an equal freedom of all. The equal freedom of all limits your freedom. As soon as you come in touch with others — it is no longer absolute (as it would be if you were alone). You cannot exist by yourself. You need others. Us the People understand "Even someone who acts merely defensively against

aggression thereby 'compels' the aggressor to abstain from this act. Concept clarity and precision of terms distinguish statelessness from other systems of social order, also."

Moreover, Us the People must begin with the specific individual and place him in the centre of its system of references, because every collective which asserts "rights" over the individual which the individual did not concede to it appears with an unprovable claim for domination. One must also take into consideration the fact that a collective as such cannot "appear" by itself. Instead, again and again, there are only individuals who claim to act in the name of the collective and as its representatives. However, to recognize their legitimacy would mean nothing other than recognizing the domination of individuals over other individuals.

Us the People: Social Order.

Above all, the individual must be economically independent — every individual. Thus, he must also be able to possess a means of production by himself if he prefers this to 192 collaboration with others. Equal access to land for everyone, the elimination of all privileges and monopolies and "open productive associations" will see to it that the private ownership of the means of production can no longer be abused as is done at present.

Marxism sees the real evil in economic exploitation by private capitalists. But it misconstrues the historical role of the State, which not only institutionalized this exploitation but - as its main task - also defends it constantly and even has added another exploitation too, that by the apparatus of State for itself. Marxism equates nationalization of the means of production with the abolition of classes (which were never exactly defined by Marx) and expects from this the automatic disappearance of the State. This is a theory which is self-contradictory and has been clearly proven wrong by the peoples' democracies with their new class divisions and their totalitarian State system. Marxism's primitive theory of surplus value has especially contributed to its wrong conclusions. It explains only one factor of exploitation and this only within the sphere of production. It has overlooked the much more important role of interest and land rent and also exploitation in other economic and social spheres, as for example in commerce.

In contrast to this, Us the People proves that economic exploitation, political oppression and mental subjugation are only different outward manifestations commonly originating a condition of domination. With the abolition of all domination, not only economic exploitation will cease but also political and mental suppression. To achieve this, no dictatorship is needed, but merely a defensive organization against new attempts at aggression.

Equal freedom for all is the only social system which does not aim at oppression, since mere defence against aggression, i.e. against attempts to oppress, cannot be rightly called oppression. It struggles to achieve a situation in which even the previous dominators and profiteers will enjoy the benefits of the equal freedom of all in the new social order. But it is not tolerant towards intolerance.

Us the People does not rely upon the enlightened self-restraint of the previous oppressors and beneficiaries of monopoly capitalism and of those defending the concept of domination for other motives, especially does not believe in the self-restraint of those believing in ideologies or addicted to guardianship and to enforced felicity. To protect the individual, who is often weak in the face of assaults by drunks, rowdies and psychopaths and also from any

aggression (like, for instance, one-sided breach of contract), a non-aggressive and purely defensive "police" and system of arbitration courts are necessary. These will be among the most important institutions of autonomous protective and social communities.

In most such communities, if States of the present kind still exist, a militia will be considered necessary for defense against those addicted to power.

The present States must disappear entirely, since their existence is not only directed against their own "State members" (nationals) but against everybody in the whole world. With their monopoly claim to a certain piece of the Earth's surface, they restrict the equal claim of everyone to the whole Earth. They also discriminate against "aliens" within their territories and commit aggressions which have effects beyond their frontiers through numerous measures such as custom duties, dumping prices, and export subsidies financed with stolen money.

These autonomous protective and social communities will differ from States only in the following points, which are, however, decisive.

1. They do not have any territorial monopoly, i.e. no "sovereignty" in the present sense, within a separate section of the Earth's surface. Their members can live dispersed all over the world, like members of a church or a private association.
2. There is no compulsory membership in these autonomous protective and social communities. Instead, membership is voluntary, similar to that in a private insurance company. Notice periods of approximately six months or a year can be agreed upon.
3. As a basic law of all such autonomous protective and social communities, the equal freedom of all must be applied, especially externally towards non-members. Internally, i.e. for relations among their own members only, constitutions can place restrictions upon the freedom of action of individual members — whose general approval has been given by their voluntary enrolment. But such restrictions can also be legislated according to the majority principle — if a particular constitution provides for this. Those dissenting could be granted a special claim to be exempted from the law concerned — and this quite apart from their fundamental right to secede individually, after due notice has been given. The voluntary limitation of the equal freedom of all for oneself does not contradict this principle. Only the restriction of the equal freedom of all against their will and at their expense does this.
4. While the settlement of differences among members of the same autonomous protective and social community is, whenever necessary, arranged in accordance with its special rules, it would be advisable to establish in the constitutions of all autonomous protective and social communities that, in the interest of objectivity, none of their members may settle his disputes with the members of other autonomous protective and social communities by force, but must have them settled by an arbitration court consisting of representatives of the autonomous protective and social communities concerned, under a neutral chairman.
5. For world-wide relationships, a supreme arbitration and appeals court can also be arranged to replace the present UN, whose faults result from being established on the "principle of sovereignty," i.e. on the law of the big fist of today's States.
6. Us the People will thus abolish only imposed laws, but not those which members of autonomous protective and social communities have given themselves for internal application only and to which they submit voluntarily.

Under the condition of equal freedom for all, in the absence of domination, there is thus true justice, based upon contracts of the most varied kinds. Arbitration courts with executive powers will see to the observance of these contracts, since every one-sided breach of a contract constitutes an infringement of the basic principle by claiming excessive freedom of action for one at the expense and against the will of others. If two people dispute an object or behaviour for which there is no contractual arrangement between them, then the principle of the equal freedom of all offers, in all cases, a criterion for the decision by a neutral arbitration court. Should one of the parties concerned not belong to any autonomous protective and social community, or, on principle, deny the equal freedom of all by claiming a privilege for himself, or should he admit to being an adherent of the law of the jungle, then he will get into conflict with the whole autonomous protective and social community of which his opponent is a member and will not get support from anyone. It is thus merely a question of expediency and power how he will be treated. If he does not agree to a peaceful settlement by a neutral arbitration court, then one can limit oneself at first to a strictly defensive reaction against his aggression and leave the door open for final agreement with him. This should be the rule. However, this defensive reaction will generally also include forceful recovery of damages and of the defence costs caused by the aggression. Should the troublemaker repeat his aggression or continue openly to insist upon the law of the jungle, then the defenders of the equal freedom of all can also reverse the spear and regard the law of the jungle as a contract offer of the aggressor and make use of it against him — and this with all suitable means, which may go as far as the destruction of an aggressor who is not open to reasoning.

Us the People believe that only compulsory organisations are to disappear, those to which one has to belong nowadays against one's will, organizations which practice aggressive force. Equal freedom is the most confirmed opponent of aggressive force and thus, on principle, also of terrorism.

In a condition without domination, there will be no lack of organisations or institutions considered useful and necessary by a number of participants — as long as they are prepared to pay the costs themselves and do not impose them upon others against their will.

Then there will be far more freedom of action for all, i.e. opportunities to live according to one's special wishes, than is the case today even in the most advanced democracy. For in his own special autonomous protective and social community, no one will any longer be subjected to the manifold obstructions, compromises and restrictions which are today forced upon us, in the compulsory organization State, by those who think differently from us.

Us the People: a socialistic system

For under present conditions, not only the worker, dependent upon wages, is subjected to exploitation, since the rule of monopolies and privileges (and the exploitation resulting from these) extend - even though to a different degree - to all consumers, i.e. to all professions, all people. Even monopolists and privileged persons of one kind are in their turn subject to monopolists and privileged people of other types - whereby one need only to remember the main monopolist, the State.

The abolition of economic exploitation is certainly a very important task, but not at all the decisive one - because it is just one of the consequences of domination. Although exploitation is far more varied and comprehensive than the Marxist delusion has realized, the actual extent

of what is taken from the working people in so-called surplus value, interest and land rent is relatively unimportant - compared with the disproportionately greater quantity of goods which cannot be produced at all, even though the preconditions are given, in the form of working power and technology, particularly because of the barrier function of monopoly interest, but also because of other effects of the domination system. This is a loss which affects not only the exploited but the exploiters themselves, although they are unaware of its extent and effects.

In many countries, millions of unemployed people are thus condemned to inactivity, existing industrial capacities can only be partly utilized and the creation of new products and services, in itself quite possible, remains unrealized even though an enormous quantity of unsatisfied demand, already among those condemned to unemployment against their will, could ensure their full employment.

It's important to note that Marxism mixes up cause and effect by considering political as well as mental domination as a result and mere superstructure of economic exploitation, while in reality, the contrary is true. Domination is the precondition and cause of economic exploitation. Believers in peoples' "democracies" are of the mistaken opinion that by this "democracy" the "rule of man over man" is eliminated. In fact, domination is only taken over by the State, i.e. by the party which commands the State functionaries. But do not the functionaries of the State, and party members standing above them, practice domination also, and aren't they people as well?

Those who enjoy so many hidden privileges, and in the hands of those dominating in the peoples' democracies there is also such an enormous amount of power and prestige, that this means more for most people than the amount of their income. Above all, there is an immense difference between the freedom of the one group and the freedom of the others - and at the expense of the latter. Anarchists hold that this condition, maintained only by aggressive force, has to be eliminated, as well as any other domination altogether.

Us the People are socialists in that we reject not only economic exploitation, but also any other oppression, not only oppression exercised against themselves, but especially oppression or exploitation exercised by themselves against others. Us the People's principle, not to want to dominate anyone (which precedes their refusal to become dominated themselves) and not to want to practice any aggression against the limit of the equal freedom of all, is a social one, (i.e. one that applies with regard to their fellow human beings and society) and at the same time rational (since it is based on indisputable facts and is nonideological). But we are socialists free of dogmas and are always prepared to revise our point of view if any errors can be demonstrated.

The concept of socialism has been wrongly assumed and monopolized by the State socialists, who have at the same time raised untenable ideological assertions. But even long before Marx there were socialist thinkers without State-socialist coverings although they were not always free of ideology either.

The principle of the equal freedom of all as a divine order or as identical with "the moral law in itself," one which would speak equally and unmistakably to everyone, can be an exemplary Us the People member in his practical behaviour. But then he condemns the strongest argument with which he can lead dissenting people to recognize that, once one penetrates all

errors, finally there can be no enduring solution to the problem of social order other than equal freedom for all.

Us the People: Two Socialisms.

One is communistic, **the other solidarization.**

One is dictatorial, **the other libertarian.** One is metaphysical, **the other positive.**

The first wishes to take everything from everybody. **The second wishes to leave each in possession of its own.**

One is dogmatic, **the other scientific.**

One is emotional, **the other reflective.**

One is destructive, **the other constructive.**

Both are in pursuit of the greatest possible welfare for all. One aims to establish happiness for all, **the other to enable each to be happy in his own way.**

The first regards the State as a society sui generis, of an especial essence, the product of a sort of divine right outside of and above all society, with special rights and able to exact special obedience; **the second considers the State as an association like any other, generally managed worse than others.**

One wishes all monopolies to be held by the State; **the other wishes the abolition of all monopolies.**

One wishes the governed class to become the governing class; **the other wishes the disappearance of classes.**

Both declare that the existing state of things cannot last.

The first considers revolution as the indispensable agent of evolution; **the second teaches that repression alone turns evolution into revolution.**

The one wishes to expropriate everybody. **The other wishes everybody to be a proprietor.**

The former makes the citizen the subject of the State. **The latter makes the State the employee of the citizen.**

One proclaims that labor pains will be necessary to the birth of the new world. **The other declares that real progress will not cause suffering to anyone.**

The first has confidence in social war. **The other believes only in the works of peace.**

One aspires to command, to regulate, to legislate. **The other wishes to attain the minimum of command, of regulation, of legislation.**

One would be followed by the most atrocious of reactions. **The other opens unlimited horizons to progress.**

The first will fail; **the other will succeed.**

One is intolerant, **the other tolerant**. One frightens, **the other reassures**. The first wishes to instruct everybody. **The second wishes to enable everybody to instruct himself.**

One says: "The land to the State. 'The mine to the State. 'The tool to the State. 'The product to the State. **The other says: 'The land to the cultivator. 'The mine to the miner. 'The tool to the laborer. 'The product to the producer.**

One is the infancy of Socialism; **the other is advanced**. One is already the past; **the other is the future.**

CHAPTER 5

THE ROAD TO EQUAL FREEDOM FOR ALL- TO A SOCIETY WITHOUT CLASSES AND WITHOUT DOMINATION.

Us the People stand opposed to terrorism. Whoever on his own - and not merely compulsorily renounces any intention to dominate others or to over-extend his own freedom at the expense of others is already on principle no terrorist - even if he defends himself with physical means against others who want to expand their freedom sphere forcefully and at his expense.

The defence must always strike only the actual aggressor. It must neither strike nor endanger any outsider. In dictatorships, which make any efforts at enlightenment by the spoken or written word, as well as any evolutionary development, practically impossible, even assassination attempts against leading representatives would fall under the concept of defence, provided only that any harm to innocent persons be avoided.

Us the People reject defence with physical means (although this would, of course, be justified in itself) in the democratic State as well as in relations between individuals, and they also reject any general revolutionary movement.

This is because:

1. Individual action is senseless, seeing that the minor success (at best) which can be achieved will not outweigh the risk to the life or freedom of a human being.
2. An armed mass rising in order to change the States into non-aggressive autonomous protective and social communities must fail from the outset because the pre-requisite is missing: a mass of convinced and consistent anarchists. Even if one objects that relatively small but determined minorities have organized successful revolutions in special situations before this, it must be borne in mind that is always the question of giving a new command center to an elaborate machinery for domination, the old apparatus continuing to operate on principle. Armed revolutionary organizations would probably be smashed even in their early beginnings by the far superior police and military power of the State.
3. What is missing is a revolutionary situation which would make it possible for a small minority to sweep along a dissatisfied mass towards revolutionary and, at the same time, sensible actions. Only a military insurrection is possible but questionable in its chance for success, since it encounters insufficient resonance among a population unaccustomed to thinking and acting with self-responsibility and drilled, moreover, in the dominant ideology.
4. Above all, any overthrow by force or even sudden destruction of the State apparatus would not solve those problems which face society after the aggressive force of the State is eliminated. Even the acceptance of a forceful overthrow into its platform and the propaganda for this, would unnecessarily arouse millions of opponents who would fight desperately for their existence. Means of production, except for land, can indeed be produced according to demand (within the limits set by existing raw materials and existing but still to be opened up energy sources) when, after the abolition of the money monopoly, exchange becomes unhindered and the cheapest credit becomes possible. Thus, Us the People envision expropriation without reimbursement, neither for land nor for any other productive capital, least of all for the funds of consumers and for

savings. Excessive accumulations of wealth will dissolve automatically, once they are no longer able to increase by themselves without work.

Us the People: Preparation for the liquidation of the state.

First, enlightenment must be spread on what freedom means in a social context, what it can and what it cannot be, what aggressive force is and what defense against such force means, what the difference is between the compulsory organization of the State and the voluntary organizations of a free society.

Movements towards "democratization," especially for emancipation and pluralism, also aim in the same direction as equal freedom for all, which is only the last consequence of genuine and not merely formal democracy and Protestantism, but without the dogmatism of the latter.

The effect of all privileges and monopolies (from those established or at least promoted and maintained by the State, up to that super-monopoly of the coercive regulation of all social relationships which denies the equal freedom of all and is claimed by the State for itself) can be explained even to a child.

Us the People is based on quite simple, verifiable and incontestable statements and conclusions which in the long run must win, irresistibly, even against all deep-rooted prejudices, in the same way as truth finally triumphs over lies, even though it can be suppressed temporarily. Due to the backlash of media towards equal freedom for all and the collapse of the state due to its weaknesses - a decisive affirmation of non-violence is necessary. Also, defense against aggressive forces such as the parliamentarians and other political parties must not be confused with "violence" (force), even when it uses physical means or arms in a defensive act. Instead, consistently as well as decisively, we must renounce any defense (no matter how justified it is by itself) that uses weapons, and not only weapons, but even any physical means of power at all.

For Us the People Non-violence should be a wise strategy, no matter how hard, to persist in non-violence even in defense against the oppressor out of the realization that non-violence is in the long run protects our members and more effective than any defense with physical means, no matter how justified violence as a form of defense may seem, even if it asks for no less serious sacrifices than forceful defense. Non-violence actions are the most effective defense mechanism especially against an opponent who is far superior in power such as the state together with its parliamentarians and political parties. Whoever finds it difficult to understand this, must at least admit that even justified physical defense against aggressive force such as criminals, state apparatus such as police during peaceful direct action makes sense only where at least a strong minority approves of it, to avoid any harm to Us.

For Us the People, the reason for decisive call for non-violence can and should at the same time be accompanied with the proclamation that the defense against aggressive forces is quite justified but that for well-considered reasons physical defense is condemned, this is because we are of an understanding that Us the People are peaceful beings but aggresses only to domination and exploitation. Throughout history non-violence has been proven to be the most effective method to achieving equal freedom for all.

Us the People believe that step-by-step passive resistance means not passivity but resistance and has to go hand in hand with an emancipation from the State and its members whom are

hell bent in defending the state which allows for oppression of the masses by political party members. Such emancipation will allow for establishment of autonomous protective and social communities apart from the State. The people must expropriate not the state.

Us the People are informed by the historical events thus believe in the restitution for the wrongs of the past and most importantly in attaining sensible conditions and true rights for the future of all Humans as soon as possible, also with the fundamental task of the abolition of all privileges, monopolies and oligopolies. This abolition demands a uniform and rapidly realizable solution and not prolonged examination of every case.

In order to prevent the beneficiaries of present conditions from malevolently delaying the new settlement, one should give them a time limit, starting at a still- to-be-determined moment. For each year of delay, the reparation for the people concerned would then be reduced by 5%, and after the time limit has expired, any appropriate means of defense could be used against them. From fines accumulating from obstinate people, fines justified by the continuing harm done to all people, indemnifications could then be paid to those who had to make sacrifices in the struggle for the new settlement or who were disadvantaged.

the proposal for Open Productive Associations possesses so far unused appeal, especially since, in combination with the settlement of the land question, it would abolish unemployment forever. Both could really be proclaimed in such a way that they would fit into the party platform of nearly any of the existing parties.

They can also be realized within the existing State constitutions. The same applies to the abolition of the money monopoly. Certainly, its effects are so manifold and far-reaching that they cannot always be explained sufficiently to the average man. But the normal consequences of any monopoly are evident, and thus all monopolies must be eliminated or rendered ineffective. It is not enough merely to "proceed" against their "abuse" (which is hard to prove in most cases).

Limited benefit could also be derived from Us the People "party" and its participation in election campaigns, which are not to be rejected on principle, for such participation offers propagandists possibilities (otherwise unused) for the publication of Us the People program of action as an alternative.

Also, since due to permanent and comprehensive aggression by the State the opportunities to resist it are quite limited, one should also use the possibility at least to limit aggression by the State by gaining votes, if not to abolish it altogether in this way. This could well be accompanied by a continuous protest against the majority principle within a compulsory community and against the State principle altogether.

Us the People deputies, while strictly bound to the instructions given them by their voters, should collaborate only with measures to reduce privileges and monopolies and the monopolistic character of the State itself and should abstain from all activities which would amount to "co-rule."

These deputies, who could at the same time also represent the autonomous protective and social communities formed apart from the State, could, finally, supervise, or even administer themselves, the procedure for the liquidation of the State.

Of course, the above-mentioned option is only one of the possibilities for emancipation from the State, Us the People shall by no means have to confined itself to gathering votes and to

working towards a liquidation of the State by parliament. Instead, its main task would be to do what all parties have so far failed to do, and what should result in the rapid growth of that new party: offer immediate concrete advantages and not only promises, of what will happen after political power is gained. In this respect much more can already be done today than is generally considered possible.

Us the People: Emancipation from the state

It is of fundamental importance but at the same time especially difficult under present circumstances, to protect youth from the stupefying influence of the State-directed schools which drill them into obedient State subjects.

Since school costs are covered by compulsorily levied State taxes, only a relatively insignificant number of parents are financially able to afford the additional costs for private schools. Therefore, the "democratic" and self-evident right has to be realized of having all corresponding tax amounts refunded, thus making the financing of genuinely free schools possible. The States also intervene in a quite intolerable way with the curriculum planning of the small number of already existing private schools, thus eliminating the greatest advantage of such schools, of running their teaching programs in a fraction of the time required by State schools. Even a teacher certified by the State who wants to instruct his children by himself in order to prepare them for the so-called "external examinations," even if he is a pedagogic genius, is held in tutelage by bureaucrats regarding the arrangement of his curriculum, i.e. by the same people whose self-admitted failure has become evident in today's "educational catastrophe." This tutelage has to disappear, and only performance should be tested. Then even a small number of pupils who, in a fraction of the usual school period, have acquired a more comprehensive general knowledge within free schools, operating rationally according to the newest findings, would completely revolutionize the present school system. The ingenious Japanese Obara, already mentioned, has supplied striking proofs for this.

Moreover, pupils themselves could contribute to the cost of their education through the time saved by rational teaching methods naturally adapted to their capabilities. Here the solution proposed for the land question could be of great help. Finally, education costs, already much reduced by time savings, could be contractually pre-financed in such a way that the pupil could repay them in installments after he entered his profession. This would be a way for poverty-stricken gifted pupils to acquire any knowledge they considered necessary for themselves. But here again the State intervenes to the disadvantage of those it cares for, by declaring younger people to be minors and incapable of accepting contractual responsibilities.

Much simpler and immediately productive is the emancipation from the State in quite another field, namely that of law. Far too little use is made of the possibilities for arbitration that already exist today, at a time when civil proceedings before formal courts often last for years and are correspondingly expensive. By comparison, arbitration courts manned by experienced lawyers could decide much more rapidly, cheaply, objectively and correctly, at least in the field of civil and commercial law. For this purpose, and in every particular case, the contracting parties could agree (because of the advantages of this system) to recognize the decision of such a court. Alternatively, as members of an autonomous protective and social community, they could already have obliged themselves to recognize the arbitration avenues provided by it.

The Italian lawyer Internoscia has drafted a code of civil law in three languages — Italian, French and English — which represents, in particularly clear and precise formulations, an extract from the civil legislation of the most important European States. This work, for example, could be a basic reference work for reconciliation procedures by one or more or even all autonomous protective and social communities — and this for all cases in which the private arrangements of the contracting partners show gaps which must be filled. Otherwise, the contracting partners could, of course, agree to use any appropriate paragraphs of any State laws, with the provision that these must not contradict the principle of the equal freedom of all. Even particular acts regulated by penal law could be settled by arbitration courts, provided the principle of punishment is replaced by that of restitution. When the State is liquidated, a high percentage of all penal clauses will be repealed because they contradict the principle of the equal freedom of all.

However, a special offence follows from just this principle, though it is an act that so far has been often considered even praiseworthy: aggression committed out of "idealism," in the service of a fixed ideological idea. Here, the strength of the offender's convictions must no longer be considered mitigating, but especially reprehensible. For the induced insanity which is today almost cherished and fostered cannot be eradicated except by seizing the evil by its roots and making examples of any act of ideologically based aggression.

The most urgent task, however, is the abolition of the money monopoly. Even during its existence, some decisive steps can be taken in this direction. A new and quite simple institution, we may call it "the progressive bank," makes it possible for a person to withdraw gradually from the effects of the money monopoly. At the same time, this new institution (which becomes possible with the participation of even a relatively small number) can become the most effective and, in its further, automatic development, almost irresistible lever to lift the whole system of privileges and monopolies out of its hinges.

By a simple measure, this "progressive bank" will make any payment more advantageous (for the payer as well as for the payee) than any previous cash, coequal or bank-transfer transaction, without exception. For this reason alone it will attract a rapidly increasing circle of customers. But it offers in addition, an astonishing new credit system, which again is very simple and, in rapidly increasing volume, can offer credits which are reduced down to 3% and can become still cheaper later on. Even in the field of finance, there are unexpected solutions which can compete with the most surprising achievements in natural science and technology.

However, freedom will not be granted but must be fought for. Initiative and every individual's own purposeful activity are required, not merely a wait-and-see attitude in the hope that others will do one's job. Here too one must also mention the establishment of Open Productive Associations, which should be immediately tackled. For "dependence on wages" cannot be eliminated merely by transforming monopolies, oligopolies and market-dominating enterprises into such associations. Beyond these, a considerable number of other Open Productive Associations has to be established so that everyone who does not freely decide to work only for a fixed wage has the opportunity to enter such an "open" association as a worker without having to make a capital contribution in advance.

Firstly, one can collaborate with those employers who even today are ready to transfer their productive capital wholly or partly to their employees, although mostly in an imperfect way. (By the way, this only replaces one master by a group of people and does not eliminate the monopoly character which some enterprises have. In particular, it cannot ensure really free

competition and full utilization of labour and its full proceeds without a tribute to land, rent and capital interest). Such employers could be appropriate initiators of Open Productive Associations and would continue to act as their managers. On the other hand, the initiative can also be taken by an association of workers and clerks in an enterprise or by outsiders, either for the purpose of taking over that enterprise or by the foundation of a completely new enterprise. These associations need only look for suitable organizers and leading specialists (if they do not already have enough such people among the own members). Of course, these will have to be paid accordingly, but that regulates itself under free competition. Special knowledge in the type of enterprise concerned is only needed by these leading members. For the normal workers and employees, who then become co-owners, it will be sufficient to know the average hourly earnings in an enterprise and how these compare with the usual local earnings per hour, whether in the form of a wage or of a profit share.

Until the interest rate for credit has been reduced to 1-2% (after the abolition of the money monopoly and with subsequent competition between banks), such Open Productive Associations will depend on the cheap credit made possible by the above-mentioned "progressive bank." They will also depend on it for guarantees to allow them to take over existing enterprises or for equipping with the necessary means of production those enterprises still to be established, to the extent that the members of the new Open Productive Associations have not enough savings of their own for this purpose. Here one may recall how high the average savings of workers and employees are nowadays; without a doubt, personal credit would be at their disposal. Of course, guarantees by the State must first be considered, and then by those entrusted with its liquidation, since Open Productive Associations offer a much more sensible settlement than e.g. nationalization, and should therefore prove to have a strong attraction. The trade unions could also provide guarantees, since more could be obtained by furthering such Open Productive Associations than by the usual struggle for wages, which by the way would also benefit from this transformation. For when all who want to do so will have the option to become free from the dependency on wages and to secure for themselves the full return from their labour (and this not under the highly unequal conditions of today, of competition against superior capital power, but under truly equal starting positions for all), then those, too, who prefer a fixed wage to profit-and-risk-sharing in a co-operative will be in a quite different negotiating position vis-à-vis their employers than they are today.

The risk for the banks providing credit and for those who may stand as guarantors will be all the more reduced the larger the number associated in such an Open Productive Association. For this reason, these Open Productive Associations will be preferred to individual entrepreneurs. Any losses will be kept within narrow limits in such enterprises. Firstly, they are less burdened with high fixed costs for land. Secondly, even if its co-owners should leave the enterprise (taking only their valuable labour power with them, which they may use at any time otherwise, in any of many Open Productive Associations), the means of production acquired by credit, and serving as security until creditors and guarantors are satisfied, naturally remain with the enterprise as its means of production. Thirdly, at the first sign that losses might occur, many members would leave the enterprise (thereby stopping at least further losses), since the self-interest of all members induces them not to let their own liabilities become too high.

Accordingly, we strive first and foremost not to abolish the State by itself but to liberate from State intervention all those who do not want to be dominated. This means, for instance, supporting the right of everyone to leave (ignore, secede or withdraw from) the State as one may leave a religious community, without being placed under discriminating laws against aliens or being expelled. Self-evidently, their already acquired claims, e.g. social insurance claims, should either continue or be refunded.

This would mean full freedom for the persons concerned (primarily of course through tax exemption) from all claims which the State makes against its citizens (with the exception of those resting on the principle of the equal freedom of all): The State has to treat them as if they lived outside of its sphere of influence, i.e. in a different country, although they would enjoy full freedom of movement within its territory. It is evident, of course, that the people concerned would then no longer have any claim to the free public services of the State they withdrew from. If they wanted them, they would have to be prepared to pay for them.

The land question could be provisionally regulated in such a way that the State would place land at the disposal of the secessionists corresponding to their number in relation to the total population and territory of the State. These pieces of land need not be adjacent to each other but should be equivalent (regarding quality and site) to the land of the remaining State citizens. This land — as well as that already belonging to the secessionists (the latter taking into account the per-head claim) — will then become extraterritorial, like all institutions of the secessionists, who as a rule will combine into autonomous protective and social communities (one or several of them) in order to protect their interests. An approximate model for this is given by the members of the corps diplomatiques who are, for instance, not subject to the jurisdiction of the State in which they reside. Disputes between State members and secessionists should be decided by an arbitration court composed of representatives from the autonomous protective and social community to which the secessionist now belongs and also from the State concerned — under neutral chairmanship.

Of course, no citizen must be prevented from using extraterritorial installations created by the secessionists, like, for example, banks which issue their own means of exchange and provide cheap credit. (Otherwise this could result in an unjustified boycott).

We are demanding no privileges, neither over you nor over "your" State (which we do not want to take away from you). We only want to be left alone and undisturbed. If you are of the opinion that the State is necessary and useful, then you must consider our renunciation of any claims upon its services as a renunciation of advantages — and not the other way around.

CHAPTER 6

TECHNOLOGY OVER MONEY

For thousands of years of human existence when technologies were simple or non-existent. Each generation of hunters and gatherers, then ploughmen and pioneers, passed on tools to the next generation to help them survive. Change from one generation to the next was slow and hardly noticeable. During those days there was little understanding of science and how things worked, and explanations were not scientific. However, this is no longer the case in today's high-tech world where a change that affects millions may happen in a matter of seconds. The application of scientific principles, for better or worse, accounts for every single advance that has improved people's lives. Important documents and proclamations have been issued granting rights and privileges to members of societies, but at the heart of human progress – or destruction – is the rock-solid foundation of science.

Now satellites circle the globe beaming down information in fractions of a second about everything that impacts our lives. This information is very valuable for projecting weather patterns, high and low points, geological hot and cold spots, where people live, and the warming of the planet. This has given us, for the first time, the ability to monitor the health of the planet, which many scientists see as in serious, if not critical, condition.

Given advances in our technology, human beings should be able to eliminate most social ills. Surely modern technology can supply enough food, clothing, shelter, and material goods for all if used intelligently. This is relegated to mere ambition because, while technology is racing forward, our societies are still based on concepts and methods devised centuries ago. We still have a society based on scarcity and the use of money. We are trying to adjust to the rapid advances in technology with obsolete values that are inapplicable in today's world. We are still faced with many of the same problems our ancestors had when our technological capabilities so surpass theirs.

With the observable fact that scientific knowledge makes our lives better when applied with concern for human welfare and environmental protection, there is no question that science and technology can produce abundance so that no one has to go without. But the misuse and abuse of technology seems to make things worse. The problems we face in the world today are mostly of our own making. We must accept that our future depends on us. The future of the world is our responsibility and it depends upon decisions we make today. This Manifesto continues to provide possible alternatives for striving toward a better world. It arrives at decisions using the scientific method. Like any new approach, it requires some imagination and a willingness to consider the unconventional in order to be appreciated.

Until scientific inquiry came of age, human beings could not comprehend their relationship to the physical world, so they invented their own explanations. These explanations tended to be simplistic and in many cases harmful. The scientific method helps to diminish biases, prejudices, and preconceived notions. The method requires that statements be verified and that researchers find out through experimentation just what works and what doesn't.

In our dynamic universe all things change, from the farthest reaches of outer space to the movement of continents. Change occurs in all living and non-living systems. The history of civilization is the story of change from the simple to the more complex. Human ingenuity and invention bear witness to this fact. No system can remain static for long; most of the monarchies have been replaced by other forms of government and societies based on the will of the people. Unfortunately, such changes have not always been for the best.

It is conventional and acceptable in our society to go for the scientific way when it comes to surgery, building structures like skyscrapers, bridges, and transport. Over the centuries, we seem to have developed a consensus that when it comes to matters of personal safety, we will go with the science rather than superstitions. This is because it works, and everybody can see that it does. Given the above, it is clear that we also need to do that when it comes to planning our societies: our cities, transportation systems, agriculture, health care, and so on?

Surely we need to consider how we currently obtain and distribute the goods that we need. Which is done by “earning” money, either by exchanging one’s time, skills, and efforts, or by “investing” in the financial system with the thought of getting more money in return, and exchanging that money for goods and services. This may have been a good method in the past when goods were scarce and technology was in its infancy, but today our advanced technologies could be the tools for a very different situation.

From a scientific point of view, there is more than enough food and material goods on Earth to take care of all people’s needs, if managed correctly. There is enough to enable everyone to have a very high standard of living with the intelligent use of technology, resources, and technical personnel. By the use of technology, we mean technology that is not harmful to people or the environment and doesn’t waste time and energy.

The existence of money today is hardly ever questioned or examined. Money itself does not have any value. It is just a picture on a cheap piece of paper with an agreement among people as to what it can buy. If it rained hundred rand notes tomorrow, everyone would be happy except the bankers.

Money is just an interference between what one needs and what one can get. It is not money that people need, it is access to resources. The use of money results in social stratification and elitism based primarily on economic disparity. People can never be equal without equal purchasing power. Most people are slaves to jobs they do not like because they need the money. There is tremendous corruption, greed, crime, embezzlement, and more caused by the need for money. Those who control purchasing power have greater influence. Money is used to control the behaviour of those with limited purchasing power. Goods such as foods are sometimes destroyed to keep prices up; when things are scarce prices increase. There is tremendous environmental degradation due to the high cost of better methods of waste disposal and the Earth is being plundered for profit. The benefits of technology are only distributed to those with sufficient purchasing power. When a corporation’s bottom line is profit, decisions in all areas are made not for the benefit of people and the environment, but primarily for the acquisition of wealth, property, and power.

Given such conditions, it is important to understand where our priorities should lie? All nations and people, regardless of political philosophy, religious beliefs, or social customs, depend upon natural resources. We all need clean air and water, arable land for food, and the necessary technology and personnel to maintain a high standard of living. We should update the way society works so everyone on earth can take advantage of our technological ability to maintain a clean environment and a high standard of living. There is not enough money to begin to pay for this type of change, but there are more than enough resources on Earth to create it.

The Earth has abundant resources and our practice of controlling these resources through the use of money is an outdated method which causes much suffering. It is not money that we need but the intelligent management of the earth’s resources for the benefit of everyone. We could best work towards achieving this by using a resource-based economy, as conceptualised by Jacque Fresco.

Recourse-Based Economy

A resource-based economy uses resources rather than money, and people have access to whatever they need without the use of money, credits, barter, or any other form of debt or servitude. Even if all the money in the world suddenly disappeared, as long as topsoil, factories, and other resources still remained, we could build anything we chose to build and fulfill our material needs. The bottom line is that money is not what people really need; rather, it is access to the necessities of life.

In a resource-based economy, resources are used directly to enhance the lives of our total population. In an economy based on resources rather than money, we can easily produce all the necessities of life and provide a very high standard of living for everyone.

The amount of housing, food, water, health care, transportation, education, and such needed, must be compared to the available resources the planet has to offer. This must be balanced with the needs of other species that make up the web of life on Earth. The main objective is to overcome scarcity and provide for the needs of all the world's people. In order to create a workable and sustainable civilization, we need vast amounts of energy. What is desperately needed is an energy development strategy on a global scale.

The resource-based economy works on clean sources of energy. This will be possible when there are no more monetary limitations in the way of accomplishing or providing what's needed. With the restrictions of profit, property, and scarcity eliminated, scientific and technological information shared freely, there would be no need for patents or proprietary information since the end goal is not to make money in order to continue working, but to achieve results that are freely and quickly available to the planet's entire population.

Vast sources of energy will be explored and developed. These include wind, wave and tidal action, ocean currents, temperature differentials, falling water, geothermal, electrostatic, hydrogen, natural gas, algae, biomass, bacteria, phase transformation, but mainly fusion energy. Fusion energy is the same energy that drives the cosmos and the stars. When we learn how to harness it, we would have solved the world's energy problems forever, without any detrimental effects or dangerous toxic materials as waste. The only residue would be the clean ash of helium. A key element in the design of cities in the resource-based economy is the embedding of all necessary energy harnessing within the structures of the cities.

In our resource-based economy, there are comprehensive studies of the environmental and human impact before starting any large projects. The major concern is to protect and restore the environment for the benefit of all living creatures in the community of life. The purpose of the construction and development of these power projects is to free human beings from unnecessary laborious tasks. In order to achieve this society, we will need to automate most jobs as quickly as possible.

Governments and municipalities spend lots of time and resources attempting to update our current cities, roads, and transportation systems. The cost of operation and maintenance and overall inefficiency is high. It is less expensive to build newer cities from the ground up than to restore and maintain old ones. New cities shall combine the most sophisticated resources and construction techniques available.

Some cities can be circular while others may be linear, underground, or constructed as floating cities in the sea. They would contain residences, theatres, parks, recreation, entertainment centres, health care and educational facilities, and all the requirements and amenities for a total living environment. In planning the cities, computers will help determine the design based on the most comprehensive analysis of data about the environment and human needs.

Structures used to build these cities shall require a type of construction that suffers little or no damage from earthquakes, hurricanes, termites, and fires. Windows will be controlled electronically to shade or darken external illumination and come equipped with computer-controlled, automatic cleaning systems that require no human labor. These cities coordinate production and distribution, operating a balanced-load economy so there is no over or under production.

The intelligent use of resources incorporated into structures considerably simplifies our lifestyle and reduces waste and maintenance. These new cities would provide for the needs of the inhabitants through an efficient allocation of resources and materials, in an energy-conscious and pollution-free environment.

Machine Intelligence and Automation

The key to achieving abundance and a high standard of living for every person on the planet is to automate as much as possible in the shortest period of time. By replacing human labour with machines and implementing a global resource-based economy, everyone lives better than the wealthiest of today. A future without locks on the doors, and no fear of someone hitting you over the head to steal your goods or money is possible, because everyone has free access to all that is available. And there can be much available by automating and using resources wisely

Cybernation can be regarded as the only significant emancipation proclamation for humankind when used humanely and intelligently. It enables people to have the highest conceivable standard of living with practically no labour. It frees people for the first time from the routine of repetitive day-by-day activity. When we use automation and cybernation more extensively, not only industrial workers, but also most professionals can be replaced by machines.

Machines can easily replace humans in government and in the management of world affairs. This does not represent a take-over by machines, as some people might fear. Instead, the gradual transfer of decision-making to machine intelligence is the next phase of social evolution.

During the transition from a monetary society to a resource-based society, teams of systems engineers, computer programmers, systems analysts, researchers, and other experts will be needed to help supervise, manage, and analyse the flow of goods and services. But as the resource-based society moves toward a more cybernated world, most people are no longer needed to manage and operate this emerging civilization. Computers will eventually be able to design their own programs, improve and repair their own circuitry, and update information about social needs

In an advanced cybernated global economy, mega-machines, directed by sophisticated Artificial Intelligence, excavate canals, dig tunnels, and construct bridges, viaducts, and dams without the need for human involvement. Human participation consists of selecting the desired ends. Massive self-erecting structures are most efficient in the construction of the entire global infrastructure. Factories can be designed by robots for robots; cybernated systems are self-programming by means of environmental feedback. Machines of the future are capable of self-replication and improvement, and can repair themselves and update their own circuitry

While people may suffer from the fear of the unknown, there is no evidence of machines acting against human beings on their own, except in science fiction stories. Humans program machines and direct their use. It is not machines that are to be feared; it is the misuse and

misdirection of these machines that threaten humankind. Machines are not the danger. Humans are. If we do not take responsibility for our relationship with fellow human beings and the intelligent management of our planetary resources, we are the greatest danger to the planet.

Science and technology create none of our problems. Our problems arise from human abuse and misuse of other people, the environment, and technology. In a more humane civilization, machines are used to shorten the workday, increase the availability of goods and services, and lengthen vacation time. New technology is used to raise the standard of living for everyone, and in this way, increasing the use of machine technology serves to benefit all people.

CONCLUSION

As pronounced in this Manifesto, Us the People do not preach anything contrary to the principles which have always inspired humans to strive for freedom and right. It would indeed be absurd to try and impose something new upon mankind. No! Us the People only acknowledge the realisation of the principle that freedom is at the origin of sound natural development. Nature knows no outside laws, no external powers, and only follows her own inward forces of attraction or repulsion. Everything is the result of the existing forces and tendencies, and this result becomes again in turn the cause of the next thing following. In its early ages, humanity suffered from ignorance of this cause, and suffers still by being trodden under the heel of imaginary human authority arising ignorance and the fear of the unknown. All progress has been made by fighting and defying aggressive force.

This is our last chance! We cannot complain about the monopolies and privileges of others as long as we want to maintain our own privileges. We cannot practice a double oral standard by wanting to restrict the freedom sphere of others in our favour and then complain when others attempt to enlarge theirs at our expense. After conceptual confusions have been revealed and false foundations have been exposed, we must either openly declare ourselves followers of aggressive force, or , alternatively, strive for the only basis upon which agreement is possible in the long run: the equal freedom of all.

This freedom is even in the interest of those who will now have to abandon their unjustified privileges, monopolies and oligopolies. For they will not only retain the value of their present possessions but will also save them from certain loss in the near future. The aim is not at all to reverse the situation by oppressing or exploiting anyone, not even the previous exploiters and oppressors. The principle of the equal freedom of all applies to them in the same way as to everyone. We do not intend to deprive anyone off their property without compensation. We are not at all against property as such, but only against monopoly property. Our proposals to end its privileges. In any case, according to our proposals, no one will any longer have a privileged claim to nature's gift of land and natural resources and everyone will have an equal share in its yield. From birth, everyone will receive a certain, though modest amount to secure their existence. Nature offers this to any of its creatures. Also, there will be neither unemployment nor exploitation of tenants, lease holders, or wage earners.

We look at the world around Us and we understand how serious our situation is. During the last 25 years it has continuously and rapidly deteriorated. Only a fraction of humanity enjoy the questionable so-called freedom imposed by the West. It is becoming more and more evident that even this democracy cannot solve the problem of unemployment and numerous other problems of internal discord with their old methods.

Equal freedom for all shall be the determinant between the past and future, Us the People do not begin with abstractions either, instead, with the specific mortal individual. This individual shall no longer bow before any allegedly "superior" laws, nor subordinate themselves to domination by any group, but shall share all of life's goods with any other individual with whom they have fully equal rights and under full respect for their equal freedom.