10. What states need

'The grand, leading principle, towards which every argument unfolded in these pages directly converges, is the absolute and essential importance of human development in its richest diversity.'

Wilhelm von Humboldt

Synopsis: *What states need (1–3); Not a matter of politics (4); States and individuals' (their citizens') interests are aligned, not conflicting (5); A material, not a sentimental relationship (6); States need all of their citizens to augment their information processing (7).*

1. *

What do states need? This question is not unwarranted. All Beings have needs;[367] it is their nature that sets their needs, in an unbreakable bond.[368] States, therefore, because they are Beings, must have needs too. But, what are they?

States are organisations;[369] however, unlike any other organisation they have no specific purpose. Therefore, no need can be derived from that point of view, that is, there is no need to serve a purpose (or any purpose).[370] States do, however, share organisations' other characteristics: they are human-centric and human-dependent, that is, without 'their' individuals (meaning their citizens), states perish.[371] States, therefore, need their humans, meaning their citizens, the same as any other organisation. Their citizens, as humans, need to augment their information processing, this is their need of all needs.[372] Consequently, states need their citizens to do exactly that, to augment their information processing.

---

367 See Chap. 5, pars. 1 and 2.
368 See note 5/2/1.
369 See Chap. 2, par. 9.
370 This is the case in social contract theory.
371 See Chap. 2, par. 7 and Chap. 15, par. 4.
372 See Chap. 5.1, par. 2.

126

As with any other organisation, states need their citizens to augment their information processing through them, that is, to keep using their information platform.[373] The difference between a state's needs and any other organisation's needs is that other organisations need 'their' humans to augment their information processing through them but are constrained by their specific purpose, whereas states, because they have no specific purpose themselves, need exactly the same thing ('their' humans to augment their information processing through them), but this processing can be for any purpose whatsoever.[374]

2. *

Consequently, states need their citizens to augment their information processing through them, through their information platform. They need their citizens to continue living, communicating and creating on their platform.

If citizens cease to process in that manner information made available to them by their states, these states will cease to exist—they will become Things, whereby only the processing of information on them, but no longer by them, is possible.[375]

By contrast, a state does well when its citizens do well in augmenting their information processing, because in this way the information processing possible on the platform that is their state is also augmented (opening up a virtuous circle, whereby this causes these same citizens to further augment their information processing and so on[376]).

---

373 See Chap. 2, par. 7. Theoretically, as is the case for any organisation, it would be enough for states for their citizens simply to keep processing information through them, i.e. not to augment it. However, this is not what humans need. Humans need to augment their information processing, to ever increase it (the use of names, see Chap. 8.1, being an example in this regard), not simply to mechanically process (the same) information each day (see Chap. 5.1, par. 3). Therefore, while in theory simple processing would suffice, in practice this cannot be, and thus augmentation of the information processing is necessary.

374 See also Chap. 2, par. 9.

375 See Chap. 2, par. 3, also keeping in mind that this does not mean that organisations have a need to survive (they do not, see Chap. 2, par. 20). On state succession, see Chap. 15.

376 Assuming the usual, multidimensional mix and spread of their citizens' information processing, i.e. excluding for example single-purpose monastic states.

3.

Augmentation of the information processing carried out by their citizens is a condition for the (continued) existence of states, a need similar to air or food for humans.[377]

4.

If and how states facilitate their citizens' augmentation of information processing is irrelevant. Responses to such questions are political. How best (or if at all) to satisfy a need, once identified, is a matter of politics. In extreme cases, it is possible that a government[378] may choose not to assist a state's citizens at all in the augmentation of their information processing, for example, either by affording them minimal restrictions over their information processing (a non-interventionist approach) or by introducing as many restrictions as possible (a fully interventionist approach).[379] In similarly extreme cases, an aggressive (or oppressive) government may either engage in wars to assist its citizens (because information is finite in the analogue world[380]) or guide them exactly (forcing them) towards the path it considers to be the best one for them to augment their information processing. It is important therefore, at this stage at least, to avoid making any assumptions.

5. States and individuals' (their citizens') interests are aligned, not conflicting*

From this point of view there is no confrontation between individuals (citizens) and their states. The state does not confront its citizens, in fact it lives in them. It is the government that may appear confrontational to some, or even to the majority, of a state's citizens, not the state itself.[381]

---

377 See Chap. 5, par. 3.
378 The issue of which controls are exercisable on any dataset is political anyway (see Chap. 6, par. 1).
379 In cases of anarchical and authoritarian states respectively, the two extremes meeting in this regard, see also Chap. 26, par. 7.
380 See Chap. 1, par. 16.
381 See Chap. 12, par. 8.

6.

A state needs its citizens in a material, not a sentimental or immaterial manner. A state does not reside in the hearts and minds of a certain group of individuals.[382] On the contrary, a state is a Being that processes information in the analogue world—first and foremost it is an identification and individualisation mechanism. In other words, the state performs material acts that produce material results—and it does this and continues to do this for as long as it remains in existence.

7.

Equally important is the clarification that states need all of their citizens to augment their information processing. This is not the same as the need to augment the total information processing carried out on an information platform that is a state by its citizens. The latter implies that systemic inequality is embedded in states: at the extreme, if this were the case, one citizen could carry out almost all of the information processing within a state, leaving all others with very little processing to do (given that information is finite in the analogue world).

While this may be or may have been the case, inequality[383] should not be perceived as condoned systemically within the above reasoning. Instead, the need is for each citizen to augment his or her information processing. Should some (or a few) do so in certain pursuits more successfully than others, the extent to which this is or is not acceptable in any given state is a discussion on the optimal form of government, and thus falls into the political realm.

---

382 A 'sentimental', only dreamt-of state may perhaps be a Thing (at best, if a group of people commonly refer to it) but not a Being, it cannot process information.
383 Although natural to humans, see Chap. 24, par. 12.