

8. States are natural to humans

‘There are these two young fish swimming along and they happen to meet an older fish swimming the other way, who nods at them and says “Morning, boys. How’s the water?” And the two young fish swim on for a bit, and then eventually one of them looks over at the other and goes “What the hell is water?”’

David Foster Wallace

Synopsis: States were formed naturally, automatically and immediately at the moment when humans gained self-consciousness and started to communicate using language, and are the only universal and natural human individualisation mechanism (1–2); There is no distinction between modern and ancient states (3); States are the first organisation humans are acquainted with immediately at birth (4); Society (5); The relationship between a state and its citizens is unchangeable and unbreakable (6); Do wolves (or dogs) have a state? (7).

1. *

States were formed naturally, automatically and immediately at the moment when humans gained self-consciousness and started to communicate using language.

In essence, states are informational individualisation infrastructures that turn humans into individuals,³¹⁴ the only universal and natural human individualisation mechanism. States also create the processing environment necessary for (their) humans to live in,³¹⁵ making it possible for them to live a meaningful³¹⁶ life. Individualisation is natural to humans, and necessary for them to satisfy their need to augment their information processing.³¹⁷ States are a necessary part of human existence, in the sense that without them human life as we know it or as has ever been known, would be impossible.

314 Through a name and a citizenship, see Chap. 7, par. 4.

315 See Chap. 11, par. 3.

316 See Chap. 7, par. 3.

317 See Chap. 5.1.

States are neither artificially created by humans (under, for example, social contract or any other theory) nor the result of a gradual development within human history. There was no state (or society³¹⁸) before individuals, and no individuals before the(-ir) state(s); both were formed simultaneously, at the very same time.

2. *

States have been information platforms for their citizens since the day any type of human group (be it an extended family or tribe or any other type of prehistoric organisation) was formed. Adherence to a group and the provision of a name for each individual within it have accompanied humans since their beginning (or, at least, since the day they acquired consciousness).

Why did states individualise humans in this way? Why did humans individualise themselves at all? Why did humans not remain humans, yet another animal in Nature, forever? Why did humans choose to form ever larger groups, leaving the confines, and limitations, of families or small tribes, and creating the states in which we still live today? After all, dinosaurs ruled the planet before humans without having any use for states.

As has been seen,³¹⁹ this is due to human nature. Humans need to augment their information processing, to continue processing new information for as long as they live, and they need to do this individually, for their own sake, not cumulatively (i.e. for a hive). They do not process information for the sake of the group but for themselves. Hence individuality, and states as the sole natural mechanism to accomplish this process of individualisation, are natural to humans.³²⁰

3. **There is no distinction between modern and ancient states***

There is no distinction between modern and ancient states. Whichever means and methods were available to humanity in any given period of time, they were invariably used by humans to carry out their information

318 See par. 5.

319 In Chap. 5.1 par. 7.

320 Natural rights theory or religion notwithstanding, because individuality of the human is necessary regardless of which (human rights or sin) applies; see also Chap. 8.1, par. 1.

8. *States are natural to humans*

processing, shaping their states in the process. After all, it was usually for state purposes that these information processing tools were invented (for example, in the case of writing or the Internet).

Any increase in the information processing capabilities of humans within their states led to the identification of new needs, in an ever-expanding process (most likely, a virtuous one, but in any case one that demonstrated historical progress³²¹) that has continued until today and shows no signs of abating.

4. *

States are therefore the first organisation humans are acquainted with immediately at birth.³²² They are also the only organisation that remains necessary for humans' (meaningful) existence throughout their lives.³²³

5. Society*

Society is a group of individuals that are individualised by a specific state.

However, society and state are not the same thing, because the state is an information processing platform and society is a group of individuals. One cannot exist without the other, they are inseparable, but they are not the same thing.

6. The relationship between a state and its citizens is unchangeable and unbreakable

The bond between a state and its citizens by birth is an unchangeable one. Although change may come from both directions (state succession on the state's part³²⁴ and change³²⁵ of citizenship by the individual), the original bond remains, because it is a natural one.

321 To no known end, or destination, however.

322 Together with their family, see Chap. 2, par. 9.

323 Unlike their family (see previous footnote).

324 See Chap 15.

325 Replacement (not merely addition); see also Chap. 17, par. 5.

In practical terms, the personal information of any individual is never deleted or altered by the individuals' state of birth.³²⁶ Regardless of the state or personal circumstances (which may differ throughout human history), that information remains. This is a natural creation, one that human will or regulation or a change in government or state cannot affect.³²⁷

7. Do wolves (or dogs) have a state? *

Are states natural only to humans? If they are natural individualisation mechanisms, do animals (which, like humans, have been biologically created and are not artificial³²⁸) also have states?

From an informational point of view, all pack animals have states: their pack is their state. Within it each individual can be uniquely identified by the others, and the pack itself is also distinguishable from any other.

While individualisation tasks are performed, for instance, within a wolf state, what is important to note is the method of individualisation. In this case it is by smell or the other natural characteristics of each wolf, and not by language, that is, a name, as is the case for humans. Natural characteristics, however, are an inadequate means of individualisation in view of their limitations: first, we are not certain that they are actually unique (for each of the thousands of wolves on earth, not to mention the billions that have walked the planet). Second, each individual in the pack (i.e. each wolf) can presumably only remember so many (i.e. packs are composed of only a few dozen individuals at most), so it may, for example, know that another wolf does not belong to its pack but it cannot know to which pack it belongs (or, to go further, identify it individually within that other pack). Similarly, communication is certainly possible among wolves, but only on rudimentary, survival-related topics.

Language, therefore, is the critical part of human, and state, development. Because humans developed language, identification and individuali-

326 See Chap. 15, par. 6, on state succession.

327 Evidently, when we travel to another state we carry with us the individualisation of our own state and the two states, through bilateral agreement recognise this and exchange the necessary information (see also Chap. 17, par. 5, as well as Chap. 19, par. 13).

328 See Chap. 2, par. 2. As far as non-biological Beings are concerned, organisations are individualised by humans after they have been created (for example, in business registries or government gazettes etc.) but, for the moment at least, artificial Beings (specifically, computer programs; different is the case with money and language) are not.

sation became not only possible but also necessary for everyone, and hence states came to be.

What is also important is that humans accomplished this themselves, by their own means. For example, dogs have names and recently have been registered with states. This has led to their individualisation, in the sense that they are now uniquely identifiable in space and time, like any human. However, this has not led (for the moment, at least) to any dog increasing its information processing compared to in the past. Individualisation does not seem to lead to a dog culture. The new possibilities enabled by the individualisation of each dog have not been used by them. Why is that? It may be that not enough time has passed; humans have created states and processed information for thousands of years. However there is another difference: humans have individualised dogs to suit their own (human) nature, that is, it was done by humans for dogs. As far as we can tell, dogs have no internal need to individualise themselves uniquely in space and time.

This example, in spite of its oversimplification and arbitrariness,³²⁹ is used for illustration purposes only: humans' individualisation of animals or other Beings is only humans' way of understanding them, of better processing their information within the human need to augment their own information processing. It does not serve the need of the Beings on the receiving end of the humans' individualisation process.

Similarly, awarding legal personality or other rights to Beings (including, significantly, computer programs) does not change their own processing conditions, only those of humans. If they ever need it, these Beings will have to develop information processing mechanisms (individualisation or any other) of their own, to serve their own needs.

329 It should be clear that this example only relates to domesticated dogs that live outside of their packs (or, that have formed packs with their humans), to name just one of the countless limitations of this example.