

# Sovereignty as a Maxim of Life

A *personally independent individual* is defined as *autonomous, superior, and capable of mastering a special situation or task at any time*. Politically speaking a *sovereign* is an (absolute) ruler and/or prince of a country, and *sovereignty* defines the supreme political power of a nation, namely its highest authority, supremacy, and independence (from the influence of other political powers).

What is it that constitutes the *sovereignty* of a nation? An what *extent of sovereignty* is actually granted to the individual components of a nation – the citizens on the one hand, and their next-higher congregations (family, community, company, and associations, schools, universities, etc.) on the other.

Is such personal independence – *sovereignty* – a basic human right, or even an immanent basic need? Can such personal independence be divided, delegated, or withdrawn (by decree)?

Generally speaking a personally independent (*sovereign*) individual is considered *prevalent*, hardly to be upset, and as facing his/her environment thoughtfully, intelligently weighing, and with relatively little emotion.

The concept goes back to the Latin word "*super*" (*above, "upon", "over"*). It came over to Germany as an adjective during the 17th century from the French "*souverain*". As a noun ("*sovereign*" and "*prince*") it has again been used since the early 18th century as a synonym for *national sovereignty*. In this latter meaning "*sovereign*", this only seemingly clear and unmistakable concept was adopted by nearly all European languages. In the course of colonisation it even found its way into Asian and African languages, and to South America.

**There is no professional group showing as many psycho-social aberrations as you will find among politicians. However, the problem is that the price for their defects has to be paid by so many victims – us, the citizens.**

**J.-L. Earl**

This concept and its only seemingly unequivocal definition have been spooking through nearly all works of philosophy and constitutional law. Politicians and parties love it, and it is used to adorn constitutions, peace treaties, and intra-national agreements. But due to its unquestioned usage this concept, like many others, suffers the fate of many concepts: Hardly anybody takes the trouble to investigate its linguistic content and intrinsic effects more closely. Its everyday effect and political quality is never clarified, and it is never really related to a person's own life. The various effects of this concept are even less illuminated, and hardly anybody will contemplate developing and protecting his/her own personal independence (*sovereignty*).

Thus it is no wonder that the concept is used by the representatives of parties, unions, and other congregations to establish postulations, pronounce judgements, justify prohibitions, to interfere with third parties' rights, to enact laws, wage wars, to take and justify measures, which often aim at exactly the opposite of what they pretend. Thereby, such concepts most corruptly serve to curtail or even eliminate the personal independence (*sovereignty*) of individual citizens and associations, or even of complete nations.

## Freedom and Dignity

*Freedom* and *dignity* of the individual are essential components of theoretical and also of actually practised personal freedom (*sovereignty*), and *any and all national sovereignty* is committed to their inviolability, respect, and protection (Article 1 of the German Constitution).

The German Constitution, enacted on May 23, 1949, expressly points out in its preamble that "*all German people are forever invited to consummate Germany's unity and freedom in free self-determination.*"

How much of this has remained in November 1989, or later in the German Reunification Treaty, subsequently under *Helmut Kohl*, and later in the current German Government's Coalition Agreement<sup>1</sup>, is known to all contemporaries able to think for themselves.

Also Sections 2 and 3 of Article 1 of the German Constitution were and are continually violated in all conscience and unpunished by the political parties and even by the law. No wonder: Hardly any German citizen knows the German Constitution, and no Court would advance any judicial hearing in that matter; it would be passed on to the Federal Constitutional Court. Although to this very day Germany has no real *constitution* at all, we have a *Federal Constitutional Court*, whose respective senates are nominated by proportional party representation, and their actions and judgements are thus adjudged in forced dependence.

In reference to "*superior rights*" - a fine means of annulling the individual's *rights to freedom* - or to a suspected violation of the *constitutional order or of moral law* (Article 2 of the German Constitution), and/or referring to an appropriate other law, dozens of the altogether 146 Articles of the German Constitution are continually violated in all conscience. Yet the representatives of the (as yet) highest German *Sovereign*, the nation, never tire of praising the German Constitution as the perhaps best possible basis for a constitutional state. This may be absolutely true theoretically (disregarding the typically Teutonic thoroughness), but it is not applied in practice. Thus the state will decree which types of *belief and confession* are to be considered *religion*. The state also arrogates for itself the right to furnish various religions with certain privileges<sup>2</sup>, to grant them tax relief and/or even to finance their administrative deeds out of the Public Purse<sup>3</sup>. All these facts are clearly in violation of Article 4 of the German Constitution, whereby other religions are discriminated - in violation of the principle of equality.

It is true that Article 5 of the German Constitution guarantees *general freedom of opinion and of the press*. It also guarantees the possibility of "*being provided with*

---

1 Violation of Article 38, German Constitution in writing: Forced Alliance of Parliamentary Parties!

2 The two Christian churches as the only non-national organisations dispose of their own *jurisdiction over social matters*, they collect untaxed "tips" (offerings), and they have their university facilities - including the professors' remunerations - paid by the state and enjoy many kinds of tax privileges. Furthermore, nearly all Catholic and Protestant facilities (e.g. hospitals, kindergartens, etc.) are fed by considerable grants from the public purse (to which also non-members of the "club" are forced to contribute).

3 The state's expenses for collecting church taxes, for dividing and passing them on, is remunerated out of the collected church tax only by a fraction of the actual cost.

*unchecked information from generally available sources*". However, the meaning of "generally" is again regulated by the parties being *the arms of the system* and high priests of a "Constitution" which they themselves, however, will only observe in their own way opportune for the respective given situation.

Article 6 of the German Constitution remains generally trivial and nondescript; it is limited to the "*maintenance and education of the children*", it regulates facultative equality for children born out of wedlock, and then leaves it at "*the conditions for their creature comforts and emotional development*". It goes without saying that the German Constitution will not set minimum intellectual standards for children's education at home - which responsibility is shifted off to the schools under state sovereignty. Nor will the German Constitution set such standards for the qualification of parents in order to provide spiritual and emotional development for their children, which would enable them to develop real personal independence (*sovereignty*).

The whole school system has been *brought under state control* in accordance with Article 7 of the German Constitution. The authority to decide with regard to the content of the curriculum is conceded to the parents and legal guardians only with regard to "*a child's participation in religion classes*" (Section 2) - again referring exclusively to the two Christian churches. True the state will permit the installation of private schools. These private schools, however, have to comply with the curriculum under public law, because the state and/or the ministries of education and cultural affairs hold the power of attestation for generally ("*state-*") attested diplomas and/or leaving certificates.

The *freedom of assembly* (Article 8, Section 1) is qualified immediately in the following Section (Section 2), and it goes on like this throughout the other 138 Articles.

Why this Digression?

A little reflectiveness is to be invoked regarding the concept of a citizen's *freedom* and *dignity*, regarding also the way it is generously granted on the one hand and restricted on the other, thereby regulating most of an individual's personal freedom (*sovereignty*).

**No wonder that party careerists will not stand for direct elections and referendums. It would mean that they then had to actually pay attention to the people and their concerns - which they neither want nor are able to do.**

**J.-L. Earl**

Even here the suspicion arises that no great value is attached to the individual's *dignity* and *freedom*, meaning that true personal freedom (*sovereignty*), which an individual would like to carry out and integrate into his/her way of life, could obviously disturb and compromise the respective superior *sovereignities* enough as to challenge, restrict, or handicap the absolute power of disposition of the respective "rulers" of superior systems.

Here a dialectic conflict arises, whose roots reach back to the days when human beings for the first time had a presentiment of their own *individuality*, and tried to develop and defend the same increasingly.

This conflict - the human being as part of a "herd" or as an individual striving for autonomy and fulfilment of his/her own potential - can be followed like Ariadne's

thread throughout the history of humanity. It leads back through two and a half thousand years of philosophy, from *Heraklit* and the wise men of Greek antiquity up to *Kant, Hegel, Sartre, Popper, and Gaddamer*; jurisprudence and constitutional law from *Hammurabi* up to today's omnipotentials in *Brussels, The Hague, and New York*. The history of religion starting with the *Veda* or *Upanishads*, through *Augustine* and *Erasmus of Rotterdam*, up to the current ecumenical movements, the various schools of science and the question as to what may still be maintained or *ethically* claimed today as pragmatically ethical ("politically correct").

## The Ethics of true personal Freedom (Sovereignty)

A human being - like any other form of organic life - is neither *good* nor *bad* by birth. Dominated physically by his/her genetic heritage, he/she will begin during an early prenatal phase to emotionally perceive his/her environment that is yet visually withheld. Furthermore, his/her condition (physical and emotional) depends on the maternal "supplies" (nutrients, but also hormones), which even during this prenatal phase leads to dispositions of different quality.

However, even immediately after his/her birth the little human being, after having satisfied his/her vital needs, will try to experience him-/herself and his/her environment curiously and will absorb like a dry sponge everything happening around and with him/her.

The observation and experience, and the understanding developed through them will form the little being's *self-awareness*. The interaction of the own feeling and expression, the resulting reactions from the environment, from the continuing observation and scrutiny (as yet relatively) free from fear, leads the little human being to slowly feeling out his/her own personality. He/she will feel comfortable and joyful, but also resistance and pain. All these are parameters of a development towards a highly natural and self-centred motivation towards personal freedom (*sovereignty*).

As yet morally unspoilt, uncategorized, and straightforward the small human being follows his/her instincts and feelings. He/she takes part in the pleasure and in the sadness of the environment, which becomes increasingly familiar; he/she is capable of sulking and cuddling, of defiance and even rejection. He/she also shows his/her readiness and ability to socially integrate, because on the one hand he/she feels his/her dependence, but on the other hand - just as naturally - tries to conquer his/her place in his/her social network. In this context one may speak of the development of natural ethics as the basis for an instinctively aspired natural personal freedom (*sovereignty*).

There is some similarity between sovereignty and authority: both are natural on the one hand, and institutional on the other. The former is based on genetic disposition and instinct - a human being naturally tries to take possession of his/her habitat, to experience and fathom it with interest (reason) and curiosity (emotion). It may remain undisputed that this urge is subject to certain boundaries in the context of what you call social integration ("*An individual's freedom ends where the freedom of others is impaired*"). *Institutional sovereignty*, however, is a human artefact and considers the liberties of other society members only to the extent as (and when) they are intelligent and courageous enough to defend themselves against an impairment of their realm of personal freedom (*sovereignty*). Thus natural personal freedom ("*sovereignty*") is a basic human need that arises and grows out of the readiness for natural social behaviour, which means both learning and teaching.

*Institutional sovereignty*, however, uses all available instruments of power in order to control and subdue their environment in order to benefit from their achievements. In this context, the *institutional sovereignty* is based on parameters of an arrogated sovereignty, which it tries to create for itself and which it will ferociously defend against any challenge - by highly authoritarian means (laws, enforcement, and punishment), in doing so referring to (highly unnatural) rights and using clandestine connections with like-minded or dependent, subordinate and already sufficiently adapted helpers. In this process the supporters of such unnatural "sovereignty" make use of the manifold fictitious fears developed by human beings in the course of their socialization while growing into the surrounding system. By pretending to the individual to be providing protection from all imminent dangers and at the same time - with feigned "benevolence" - offering him/her to guarantee the quality of life, comfort, and security, the *institutional sovereign* will gradually take the individual's natural personal independence (sovereignty) and, thereby, constantly increase his/hr own *institutional sovereignty*.

**Insofar state sovereignty basically corresponds really amazingly with the extortion of protection money in the framework of organized crime, which is denounced as damnable and liable to prosecution.**

Thus we are dealing with different sovereignties on the one hand - namely that of the individual and also at a higher level (family, community, and eventually the state) - and on the other hand we are repeatedly faced with conflict potential arising from the different motivations and requirements, objectives, and the methods used accordingly.

In this context let us look at the development of human awareness and consider the way in which the development from the *family* and the *clan* went up to our current concept of a state.

## **From the Leader of the Pack to the Head of State**

Wherever animals live as a herd, a pack, or in a school in social communities, the respective strongest and most experienced animal will take the lead. This natural automatic order of events will continue by means of biological instincts until a new leader of the pack has grown up and the days of the formerly most important leader of the pack have come to an end. Such *natural sovereignty* of the leader of the pack serves for the protection and conservation of the species for the complete pack.

Only humans sometimes use rather unnatural and corrupt means for taking over leadership<sup>4</sup>. True, also the more sophisticated animals are very well able to adopt *manipulation*, namely to cheat the members of their kin and, thereby, to get the better of them - e.g. during forage or mating. But only humans are capable of pragmatically developing mechanisms and systems that will enable them - regardless of qualification and natural suitability - to exert long-term and sustained power over their fellow-humans. This "capability" was given to humans thanks to an evolutionary quantum leap - the development of *consciousness* - dated by anthropologists to the time about 10.000 years ago.

---

4 *Corruption - Decoding a universal Phenomenon*, **Hans-Wolff Graf**, Fouqué-Verlag, 1999

We often call fellow-humans *charismatic* whom we would rather not deal with any more closely.

J.-L. Earl

It is around this time that the gap between our cerebral hemispheres was bridged (corpus callosum), by which humans became capable of planning their future and to perceive and think in abstract categories. It was about this time when humans - as opposed to all animals - began to ponder about the reasons for natural phenomena and about the sense of events. They began to reflect their past and to make plans for their future. You could compare this with the biblical picture of "*Expulsion from Paradise*", the loss of innocence. It was only after this moment that humans were able to differentiate their environment by quality and quantity. Only after this time humans were able to think of ways and means to act against biological nature, to consciously breast circumstances, to meet dangers and to look for answers to questions that no other form of organic life is able to ask at all. One of the parameters of such submission of the environment - of nature, but also of fellow-humans - was *knowledge* on the one hand, and *mysticism* on the other, which is based on *faith*. Due to the increasing differentiation of labour and the shorter routes of information, the intellectual concern with nature and its phenomena naturally developed faster in the first emerging cities (Ur, Thebes, Jericho, Memphis) than in the country and/or among the nomadic clans. It was in the cities that teaching and training took place. Here dealers and manufacturers would meet, and what we mainly call *culture* and *civilization* started to develop. It was among these larger societies in the cities that art started to develop, paths were secured, bridges were built, architecture and trade developed, and communication was eagerly developed (even if the languages formed at that time were still without any grammar).

Humans very quickly found out that *more knowledge* also meant *more power, influence, and chances*. There were initial communities of interest contesting to attain rivalling leadership and gathering in groups to form physical and intellectual "combat groups". The natal hour of *institutional sovereignty* thus goes back about 10,000 years, and we may suspect its birthplaces were the first larger gatherings of people in the cities, where people of various cultures, languages, and manifold knowledge would meet.

The second main pillar of *institutional sovereignty* is concerned with emotional and spiritual (mysticism) questions asked by humans who reflected their environment. In the dialogue with their erratically developing brains they also brought forth the concepts of supernatural phenomena and the world of gods. The people in those days helped themselves with "superhumans" (gods) who acted most humanly, but were endowed with supernatural powers, in order to rationalize what they could not explain by the knowledge of their days (the natural phenomena, their environment, and the wandering starts).

He, who acquired additional knowledge about the correlation between phenomena and/or knew about the mysticism of the natural environment of humans, would win power over his environment and his fellow-humans. This was the natal hour of responsible education in the sense of passing on knowledge and skills, but also of concealment, separation, and conscious disinformation - all for the purpose of exercising and retaining power. Through fantasy, reserved to humans alone (which

is only possible through the human brain and awareness), individual people in the course of human history had thoughts and ideas by which they could explain interrelationships and disclose secrets that up to that time had been hidden to their fellow-humans. Through this they gained respect, prestige and power over others (druids, mystics, visionaries).

This is exactly the way all religions, ideologies, and theories originated and formed the basis for humans to follow their development, to shape and design their environment, their various cultures and civilizations, but also their claim to sovereignty - in various forms.

## **Democracy - the People as the Sovereign**

The claim to sovereignty in the early days of humanity was as yet based on physical and intellectual superiority and upon greater experience. In the course of millennia the methods of subjugating fellow-humans under the rule of a closely restricted group of persons became more sophisticated regarding the systems and underlying structures. In this context science and research, ever more refined techniques of war and defence - meaning the actual and the artificial physical and mental superiority - have always played a leading role. But it was just as important to get peoples' inner lives under control. This was accomplished by developing various gods and myths describing the evolution of races and peoples in the individual cultural environments and in order to codify the laws under which humans had to live.

In the course of the armed conflicts among tribes and peoples everything was done by the victorious party to either partially take over the existing *culture* and *civilization* of the defeated people (as far as opportune), or to completely destroy it and introduce the own paragons by force. This mostly also included the destruction of the existing community of gods (and, thereby, of the mystic- and emotional basis) of the respective defeated people. Wherever the knowledge of the defeated people contradicted that of the conquerors, their language and literature were eradicated and destroyed. This applied particularly to libraries, convents, and churches or temples. Many of the spiritual treasure chests in the history of mankind were even destroyed and plundered several times, as e.g. the legendary library in *Alexandria*, which had been founded in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C. and was set on fire or dismantled at least a dozen times. "*Knowledge is more valuable than money, sharper than a sword and more powerful than a canon*", says a Georgian proverb, and it was just this which made particularly libraries switch points of intellectual superiority. Be it in 1814 the *American Library of Congress*, 1914 and 1940 the Library of the Catholic University in *Louvain (Belgium)*, in 1945 the National Library in Berlin, in 1994 the library of the Jewish Cultural Centre in *Buenos Aires*, or in 1993 the National Library of *Bosnia-Herzegovina*, in which Arabian scientific and mathematic manuscripts were kept in large numbers - the point was always to destroy the previous cultural treasures and thereby the spiritual-cultural basis of the respective vanquished people. Inestimable knowledge and most precious findings of human intelligence were thus forever lost to humanity, partly forever.

There are two other important items that go with the claim to sovereignty, to the establishment of *institutional sovereignty*:

1. An understandable *legitimation* - a body of laws as comprehensive as possible including a resulting system of punishments and rewards, and
2. A *theory of sovereignty* in order to authorise per se and substantiate the claim to sovereignty.

The catalogue ad 1. goes without any further explanation; Its task was always only to register everything that might be questioned in the respective realm and could be conveniently punished, because it might possibly disturb the order of the ruling system. The winners always dictated their conditions for the vanquished. They would formulate the legal catalogue, installed claims and required tribute. Theirs was the law; they took whatever appeared useful and pleased them. They always dictated the respective new order; they would falsify history and its course at their own discretion, they would exculpate their own crimes and punished the vanquished for the same actions.

In the course of human history, the *theories of sovereignty* took an almost breathtaking development. Thus, the pharaohs could still claim their descent from the gods, which as early as during *Heraclites'* days would not have found much applause and approval any more. True, hereditary aristocracy and in some cases also service aristocracy could survive to this day. However, the certainly most sophisticated theory of sovereignty - a true quantum leap of human intelligence - was the theory of *democracy*<sup>5</sup> which emerged in the 7<sup>th</sup> century B.C. in the *Attic* part of *Greece* and spread all over the world within two and a half millenia as the (allegedly) ideal form of sovereignty. At that time the forefathers of democracy had the idealistic and sublime expectation that each human being (free and born in freedom) would be intent upon bestowing the exercise of power based on free self-determination, *natural personal freedom (sovereignty)* and readiness for responsibility on those individuals that were particularly qualified for the task. The problem is that we are faced here with a similar phenomenon as in criminalistics on the one hand and the history of legislation on the other. Criminals and criminalistics are constantly competing, and each new law passed will within short time generate new methods by those who intend to avoid it. You will see a similar phenomenon - throughout the history of humanity - in the conduct of war: New weapons will spawn an even superior class of still more modern weapons by which the opponent's weapons can be eliminated.

What may still have been a matter of course in the eyes of the fathers of democracy - namely the readiness of human beings to actively take a political part in the democratic process of intentions and decisions -, was maliciously perverted within short time by those who under the pledge of democracy actually do not even think of letting the *demos* (the common members of a people or community) participate in the political decision-making process. In their endeavours, those who pretend to support the noble ideal of democracy, will take advantage of people's laziness on the one hand, and people's ignorance on the other to assert their own claims to sovereignty, while they in no way comply with the required intellectual, professional, and - above all - ethical qualities (and mostly not even intended to comply with them).

To reach their goals they use functional parameters (smaller subsystems for collecting partial sovereignties for themselves), which were then delegated to the next higher *sovereignties* most devotedly serving the system. For establishing, developing, and maintaining their claims to sovereignty they would use a perfidious system of intellectual, emotional, material, and immaterial corruption (please see the diagram). For this purpose secular and clerical elites would use the advantages of

---

<sup>5</sup> Greek: people's rule

the language, of carefully protected advanced knowledge, of science, of their power over learning and education, of their coinage prerogatives, the army, and the legal system.

These facts will explain why the rat-catchers in history succeeded over and over again in misleading the human masses by euphonious ideologies, quixotic enticements, and promises to heave them into positions for which they were neither professionally, nor ethically qualified in the least. The only thing that counted for them was to present the suitable concept of an enemy and simultaneously to promise beneficial redemption in order to overwhelm them with euphoric rapture and force them into dependence that would leave no room for doubts. In such moments and through their subjectively and collectively felt helplessness, individuals would unscrupulously sacrifice their personal independence (*sovereignty*), sometimes even their complete property, their brains, their souls, and even their lives to the superior *sovereignty* of a ruler.

Against this type of background it was and is possible that individuals are brought to sacrifice their natural basic values, their ethics and their natural character for the yoke of a *sovereignty*, whose only endeavour was and is (up to this very day) to secure and expand their own realm, to satisfy their pathological greed for power, and to force their name into the book of history.

In doing so these rulers referred (and refer) to the highest ideals and noblest objectives; they would (will) swear to the Holy Scriptures and their benevolent gods - today this may also be constitutions and basic laws, if necessary - through which even the most atrocious actions can (could) be dignified. That such rulers have (had) no scruples to sacrifice and misuse the masses who celebrate(d) them, that they cast a spell over them, is one of the most difficult chapters of human psychology. It becomes/became tragic, when these pathological rulers then actually succeed(ed) in winning; then there was no end to the jubilation by the masses under this "victorious" ruler. The winner has always won the hearts, the love, affection, and admiration of the people - and just as readily they sacrifice (sacrificed) him their reason.

This also explains how the medieval popes succeeded in summoning hundred thousands of people to embark upon crusades, and - 500 years later - to let hundred thousands of persons be burned alive at the stakes as witches and heretics possessed by the devil. It was under the same auspices (and wilful misrepresentations) that peoples are/were set on one another, and that secular and clerical dictators could ascend their respective thrones. In a state of ideological and religious blindness millions of people were/are benighted and emotionally strangled and/or stimulated to slaughter and eradicate one another - committing black treachery against humanity and reason.

We find on this stage the unscrupulous and insane seducers through thousands of years of human history - arrayed like a string of pearls reaching up to the present day.

In former days these corrupters of world history would use mostly their hosts of officials, serfs, slaves, vassals, and helots: as seen from today these were rather primitive weapons. They also used incomprehensible notions of God and of ideologies. However, today the ruling sovereigns will use much more modern means: Multi-tiered hierarchies of officials, party systems with meticulous organisations, ideologized combat groups (e.g. *unions* and *secret services*), a cleverly thought out

information system (the media<sup>6</sup>) and a state-controlled school- and education system.

Who controls the *mind* (teaching, schools, science, and research) and the *soul* (religion) of the people and, thereby, who is in control of people's intellect, emotions, of their rationality and emotionality, can use these as the basis for almost any claim to sovereignty. He must only take care that opposing ideologies that could question his claim to sovereignty, will not get in his way. For this purpose he will use the legislative-, the judiciary-, and the executive powers, whereby the question is answered why over 70% of all German parliamentarians are state officials and/or members of the public services

On the other hand - I know that this may sound cynical - a certain amount of danger - crime and extremism (be it from the left or right) - may even be useful; it will rouse the fears of the masses and will permit the sovereign to curtail the individual's freedom even further through laws and ordinances - and this (allegedly) only serves for the protection and weal of the people - in order to force the masses, placed under disability as they are, even more strictly under guardianship.

The most perfidious means for a ruler to use is the *language*, to be more precise, the constant twisting of concepts and meanings. An example today is the concept pair of (erroneously) synonyms *manager* and *leader*, *moral* and *ethics*, *socialist* and *social*, and *freedom* and *equality of chances*<sup>7</sup> (please see the illustration).

## The Anatomy of institutional Sovereignty

Having had a concise overview of the history of *Institutional Sovereignty* we may summarize as follows:

The development of system-related, completely unnatural *sovereignities* is a gigantic misperformance of human thinking and consciousness;

It is not the *quality* of the power holders and managers of institutional *sovereignty* that makes the difference; the problem is rather to be in complete control of the systemic keyboard of such unnatural *sovereignty* as best as possible, and to devote oneself to them for the better or for worse, regardless of any *ethical* considerations. The differentiation between moral (today you call this political correctness) and ethics that has never been clearly formulated even by such lucid minds as *Descartes*, *Rousseau*, *Leibniz* and, *Kant* (as a category of thinking and acting genetically and instinctively innate in the human mind) has most successfully helped and continues to help the beneficiaries of institutional *sovereignities*;

The supporters of this systemic-institutional *sovereignty* are corrupt scientists, concepts of deity exaggerated to the extent of becoming state religions, an exacting police- and legal system, the domination of the educational system; the defenders of the system towards the outside and internally (armies and secret services), and an army of officials and public-/(il)legal servants supporting the claim to sovereignty;

Most of the population are unable to get organized in the chaos of various concepts and subjects, the language and the contents used remain unclear to them and their opinions are, therefore, served and presented easily packed in the form of ideologies.

---

<sup>6</sup> Who knows at all that *dpa* (*Deutsche Presse-Agentur*) is for the most part an organization regulated by public law?

<sup>7</sup> *The Power of Information*, **DBSFS e.V.**, Munich 2000, and *Leadership instead of Management*, Munich, 1997

Thereby they also accept to be degraded to mere followers, and thus no lasting resistance will be put up by the population (*demos*) - an aspect clearly included in the calculation of those claiming the sovereignty<sup>8</sup>.

The only disturbance for the respective heads of the various *sovereignties* in parties and unions, among the representatives of science and education, research and technology, science and administration, the legislative- and the judiciary system, is only the occasionally appearing singular or collective opposition by criminal individuals or organisations, radical groups, and the fathers of new ideologies. In addition there are the "interfering forces" - people who are not willing to be subjected to the yoke of pseudo-sovereignties, and who will defend their personal freedom (sovereignty), who want to have their own self-sufficient thoughts, emotions, and activities.

Radicalism always originates from a feeling of helplessness and a lack of appropriate alternatives. The less knowledge and education are available, the more readily will ideologies be seized as lifebelts - which actually is much more comfortable than to take the trouble to acquire additional knowledge and understanding. However, ideologies cannot replace personal thinking: they will place people under disability!

The individual of our days is not (yet) mature enough for Democracy. He/she rather will replace their own thinking by prefabricated ideologies, or will simply stay away from any democratic responsibility altogether.

**They actually exist: Executives in politics and in the economy, in science and research, teaching and education, and also as parents and educators, who influence and form their environment in a responsible process through their natural personal freedom (sovereignty) and authenticity. You only have to look for them long enough.**

**J.-L. Earl**

After all, as I already mentioned, radical zealots and criminal elements have quite a helpful effect in the sense of the *institutional sovereignties*: They increase people's fear from the related danger for their physical existence, their lives and property; and the promise of the respective holders of power to enact additional laws against them (by which the individual's personal scope will be restricted even more) will all the more easily be heard and believed.

This makes you think of a screw which by each turn only allows an ongoing fastening by means of a barrier in the thread that makes it impossible to loosen the screw.

Through the lack and increasing loss of personal freedom (sovereignty) - self-determined independence of the individual - the individual becomes increasingly dissatisfied and, in the long run, even ill. This fact, however, is of hardly any interest for the holders of power and *institutional sovereignty*. They have committed themselves to a system originating from deeply rooted inferiority complexes, where really social relationships, honour and dignity, charity, and love of humans will not have any room.

---

<sup>8</sup> *The Utopia of Democracy*, **DBSFS e.V.**, Munich, 1998

## Summary

Theoretically there would always be a possibility that the state will rally the sum of *natural sovereignties* from the population by which it is formed and represent them to the outer world in a responsible manner.

However, that would require that the representatives of such *state sovereignty* understand the meaning of their functions and tasks, and that they exercise them, as already defined by Heraclites, Plato, and Democritus and attributed to the state rulers as maxims for their actions.

However, reality as it is lived today, looks completely different: The secular and clerical *sovereigns* of almost all states (including those that call themselves *democracies*, thereby completely upsetting that concept) sustain their claim to sovereignty, i.e. their *functional sovereignty* by the circumstance that they by all rules exploit and/or minimize the only rudimentary *sovereignties* of the individuals who (in reality) have taken shelter with them - "dominance" of nationalized education and the consequence of standardized general education of the people -, and then heave them to a higher level and distribute them again in the form of sinecures. The *sovereignties* of the individual parts of the population are thus withdrawn by force and put in "interim storage" at a fully dependent level. These "deposits" of the people's partial sovereignties are then named e.g. *parties, unions, offices, and administrations*, or the *clergy* [Literate individuals - bishops, cardinals, imams, or rabbis), who by order of the respective divine representatives provide for public peace and explain to the rest of humanity how they have to live in a godly manner.] He, who best masters the "rules of the game", of this perversion of *sovereignty*, and who appears most suited to the fellow-humans living at these interim levels enjoying their parasitic existence and security to safeguard their power and privileges, will get a chance to get to the very top. He must only once in his life have resolved to shove aside everything getting in his way unscrupulously, corrupt<sup>9</sup>, and regardless of human considerations. He must only take the official course through the given instances, he must become a member of the pseudo-sovereign caste (which may be orders and lodges, in France this is the ENA, in Germany it is the parties and the unions) and he must learn to find his way through the cocoon of intrigues and clandestine wangling.

To get to the top of the *hierarchy of institutional sovereignty* just the opposite is required of what characterises a responsible *sovereign* with experience of life, intelligence, and high ethical values.

This cognition may shock you, dear reader, but it is the sad truth. And we, bereaved as we are of our personal freedom (*sovereignty*) and responsibility, permit this to happen, faithfully and without objection. Much worse even: We even legitimize the hustle and bustle of these individuals who corrupt our sovereignty - and this is what you call a "*democratic*" election!

Yet, the incapacitation of the people - who for a long time have not been personally free (*sovereign*) any more - has developed so far that the intermediaries in *state sovereignty*, the parties above all, in the meantime help themselves to the state and its functionally subordinate units with ever less scruples, they mug, undermine, and destroy the moral purity of the constitution at their convenience, and they have handed over the increasingly less sovereign people to the totally arbitrary (and illegal) actions of the organs under public law, the authorities and parties.

---

<sup>9</sup> **H.-W. Graf:** *Corruption - Decoding a universal Phenomenon*, Fouqué-Verlag, 1999

They do this without any scruples, in a cheerfully impertinent language, with unrestrained mendacity and in the absolute certainty that the increasingly lethargic resignation of the citizens is no longer capable of any resistance. This is truly "excellent" work, my very dishonourable ladies and gentlemen "representatives of the people"

## The EU – the Finale

As seen from the currently ruling sovereigns (particularly those of the Western world) the process of incapacitation has been extremely successful; the people of the rich industrial nations have been forced into an increasingly apolitical attitude. The peoples of the developing countries and of the countries on the verge of development have been led into clearly inescapable dependence by the instruments of economic supremacy. Nearly all domains of life have been gagged by laws and choking taxes. And now in December the *sovereignty* of the European nations - which these days actually exists only on paper any more - is to be sacrificed to the juggernaut of a European super-state. This has been decided a long time ago by the *institutional sovereigns* of the strongest European states. Up to this day these highly dangerous and actually ridiculous "sovereigns" in their ignorance and greed for power have not understood that in this process they themselves are kept in leading-strings like marionettes by a far more powerful *sovereign* - the international capital and its owners, a group of financial oligarchies consisting of only a few dozen families, who control them at their discretion.

We as "Europeans" make great efforts to reach a finale, which apparently cannot be halted any more. The people of the individual European nations have long ago rendered and sacrificed their personal freedom (*sovereignty*) to the ruling parties and politicians and also to a huge number of subsystems of *institutional sovereignty*. Thus we are now - without any democratic and constitutional legitimation - about to be collected by a new monster: **The super-state of Europe**. We must expect that - regardless of all differences in the languages and cultures - all legal areas and the contents of our lives will in the future be determined by one central government. The architects of this super-state are not in the least interested in any democratic participation of the individual peoples and nation. They are only interested to play an appropriately important (and highly paid) part in the concert of the European oligarchy of power. Any means, any sacrifice regarding the sense of personal and ethical responsibility, any promise and even the most brazen lies are welcomed by them in order to enforce their objectives.

In December 2000 the topping out for the United States of Europe is to be celebrated, and the criteria for initially 10 additional participating candidates (up to 2006), and for another 15 states (between 2010 and 2015) are to be officially agreed upon.

## Is it already too late for Alternatives?

"Hope dies last!" says an old Russian proverb. In fact, humanity has rarely succeeded in evading or preventing catastrophes, but people have always survived them - although mostly under great sacrifices and very bitter experiences.

**Streamers allowed to go with the wind will sooner be worn off than individuals who run up their own flag.**

**J.-L. Earl**

This time again we will not be spared enormous disputes and painful experiences, because we cannot build our hopes on the insight by the defendants of institutional sovereignties, nor may we hope that the majority of the lethargic masses, who are just waiting in resignation and praying to St. Florian hoping that the threatening consequences of their own inactivity and political apathy showing up at the horizon, will hit their neighbour and spare themselves.

On the other hand, it is encouraging to see that the number of those who are no longer willing to just look on and do nothing about the inhuman goings-on of our modern rulers that are constantly becoming more overpowering. In this process there is one circumstance by which these people benefit: The rulers exercising *institutional sovereignty* in their greedy blindness are incapable of seeing or understanding that each *institutional* (and thereby unnatural) *sovereign* will sooner or later get entangled in the system, which it has knitted in order to retain its power. These systems shut themselves off from the outer world; they are unable and unwilling to learn and thus have no change of evolution and will sooner or later suffocate in their own fortresses.<sup>10</sup>

Considering this fact the individuals caught in such systems should encourage one another; they should raise their voices at every possible occasion and brace themselves with all their force to develop ethically clean and responsible alternatives for the time after the inevitable breakdown of the system.

We can only wish that the Austrians will have enough vision to accomplish their withdrawal from the association of the Euro. Equally, also Sweden and Switzerland, the Danes and Great Britain should withstand the siren calls and not submit themselves to the Euro. EU Commissioner Verheugen's slip - ominous, and perhaps the only reasonable sentence of his political career - should be burning in the ears of millions of people; he made us surmise a truth that should wake up all thinking individuals and make them act.

**The cultural position of a people, the degree of its authenticity and sovereignty can be deducted from the quality of their politicians.  
Get well soon, Europe!**

**J.-L. Earl**

The extent to which people in Europe will still be drawn into the maelstrom of megalomaniac and overbearing heads of states and - governments will depend, among other things, on the readiness of those, who not only read this article, but will also act accordingly.

*Hope dies last!*

---

<sup>10</sup> *The power of Information, DBSFS e.V.*, München 2000 – „System und Schema, Pragma und Praxis“