

Ladonia, Wazooland, Nobinobi, Riesenguthland-Ellermark, Rubezahlia, Kugel-Mugel, Misurate, Isonomia, Wogastisburg-Schlampenbüttel, Kingdom of Talossa... are these the fairylands of childhood memory? Kingdoms of despotic power, where only fantasy limits your actions? These names are just a selection of a vast number of small nations and model states which have appeared over the last 30 years.

The emergence of such states has increased apace with the advent of the World Wide Web. The Internet is also the main source of information about them. Reading the history of these miniature states, kingdoms and micronations, you are usually reminded of a fairytale world. In fact, many of these projects are variations of fantasy role-playing games which take place in invented kingdoms or cybertopias. An example is the Society for Creative Anachronism: it is dedicated to life set in the Middle Ages in a vast imaginary empire. But if you leave the world of role-playing games behind and enter the big boys' playground, you will find a number of rather amazing and very divergent versions of the theme of »how to build your own state«. This is evidently uncertain terrain. If you delve further, you will not only encounter utopian thinkers, creative legislators and dreamers, but also a bunch of neo-nazis, racists, shady businessmen, weapon freaks and tax evaders.

Some of the projects clearly play with the provocative aspects of subverting the existing state order. I myself was shocked when I learned, for example, about the plans of the World Power Organisation: it seeks to co-ordinate military, economical and political operations to disrupt and destroy as much of the existing state system as possible in order to build a new sovereign state in Latin America with neo-nazi ideology. Erwin S. Strauss, the notorious promoter of New Country projects (as he calls them) is the author of *How to Start Your Own Country*. Completely

serious, he suggests that anyone interested in creating a sovereign state can only achieve their goal by acquiring weapons of mass destruction and by having the will to use them. He further proposes to install them in major US cities, to be able to play the military muscle in case it is needed.

In his book, Strauss provides an ample list of New Country projects of the 60s and 70s. In his view, the basic inspiration for these projects derives from the writings of Ayn Rand, especially from her novel *Atlas Shrugged*, in which a group of key people retreat from the world to a secret enclave, wait for the collapse of society and then return to rebuild on the ruins. The underlying ideology of most of these New Country projects is based on libertarian ideas mingled with the biologically deterministic assumptions widespread in the 60s and 70s. These notions upheld territorial behaviour, private property, aggression and selfishness as perpetrated by humans and they promulgated a Darwinistic approach to society. (Strauss draws on this ideology in the introduction to his book. He argues that a community of apes will split up if it becomes too large, but humans have forgot to obey the same biological law. The wish to secede is seen as natural.)

So anyone who wishes to get involved in any form of state-building has to be aware of such unpleasant company. But should this be reason enough to discredit the idea of micronational projects altogether? I (still) have a rather optimistic view of activities which aim to achieve more than fulfil the selfish interests of an individual or a minor group. I am interested in projects which are reminders that nationality and state are rather mental and social-historical constructs, which should be in constant flux and which can be created and re-created. I want to support attempts to build model states which incorporate visionary ambitions for how a state could look

several decades from now. It is clearly the interplay of everyday politics with an utopian vision – the former failing so often to inspire the latter in us – which fascinates me most about such model states.

Inevitably, the question of where these states are located arises. What territory do they claim control of? A look in a school atlas will bring no further answers. These states are not marked on any map of the world. Most of them exist in the realm of the Internet and are organised by means of electronic communication. Though some of them do possess territory (albeit very little) or lay claim to an area of land, none of these states are recognized by the United Nations or any other comparable body. But what makes them interesting is the very fact that they claim independence and the right to international recognition despite the obvious refusal to give it to them. They are constructions which straddle the divide between a state which really exists and a pure fantasy, a utopia. The phenomenon of micronations and model states can be viewed as something between being a joke and a serious vision of the future. »To become a citizen of a state which does not have a territory – this would make it possible to develop allegiances which would transcend borders and linguistic barriers. It would be rather original, carrying hope for humanity« writes Frédéric Lasserre, a researcher associated with the faculty of strategic and diplomatic studies at the University of Quebec and Montreal.

If the first wave of micronational projects in the 60s and 70s was based on a highly developed libertarian ideology blended with notions derived from biological determinism, the recent proliferation of such undertakings might have two major causes, both closely linked to each other. The first can be traced to the effects of globalisation. By this, I mean the increasing distance between policy making and the local

communities affected by these policies. Decisions which affect the life of people in a particular district are made by people who have no idea what life is like there. (A good example is the funny but significant way in which EU fire safety regulations currently pose a significant threat to the traditional Finnish smoke sauna, beloved by many Finns. By its very nature, this type of sauna cannot comply with EU standards. The Finnish Sauna Association took action and managed to get some of its members elected to the EU parliament. I have not heard about the latest developments in this story, but I fear that the smoke sauna will survive only in open air museums.) Another effect of globalisation might be described as the way in which corporate capitalism has permeated all layers of life in almost every part of the world. This view styles global corporations as bodies which behave like trans-national superpowers that hinder the influence of the traditional nation states.

Looking at the motivation of all the evolving micronations and model states, we can establish a linear order; the extremes at either end are trying to resist one of the aforementioned effects of globalisation. At one end of the spectrum are a number of projects characterised by a small community seeking solutions to problems within its own locality. Here, establishing borders and boundaries is employed as a means to resist power (the small Gallic village of Asterix and Obelix is a good fictional representation of this type of micronations). These undertakings can be seen as a continuation of the New Country projects of the 60s and 70s, but with a shift in their ideological approach. At the other end of the imagined spectrum we will find attempts at creating states operating on transnational levels comparable to global companies – that is, to assert power on the same scale as these companies. Their struggle is to define global civil rights and try to defend them. The transnational state is not based on territorial claims but is rather

bound to an electronic infrastructure. It expresses the desire for a new kind of political community detached from territory. Both camps share the belief that the »real existing« nation state has a problem both with dealing with its individual citizens and with transnational corporations. The second major reason for the latest almost excessive increase in the number of micronational projects can be traced to a rather technological development, i.e. the rapid spread of electronic communication, epitomised by the Internet. The World Wide Web seems to be the perfect medium to build and run a state which is not bound to a geographical location and which can act on a transnational scale. It allows smooth communication between the organisational bodies of the state and between its citizens. It co-ordinates the legislative, judicial, administrative and executive tasks of the state. It is a parliament, an archive, a forum, a newspaper, a propaganda machine... And it is a perfect means of reaching like-minded people.

To avoid any misunderstandings, I would like to point out that I do not regard micronational projects as a threat to the nation state (with only few exceptions), but rather as a playful way to engage people in a political debate from which they might otherwise be excluded. These projects provide a good platform for discussion as they are located at the intersection of some of the more important questions posed by modern society: the future of the nation state, the effects of global corporate capitalism and how both topics are influenced by the spread of electronic telecommunications (and the access to it).

Furthermore, one can see micronations and model states as hybrids which combine literary utopias, utopian communities and a spirit of adventure. In doing so, they interweave many threads of references, derived from everything from Campanella's »Sonnenstaat« to notorious Cyrus Reed Teed's »Hollow Earth« community, from the myth of Atlantis to self-declared emperors like William Lyon Mackenzie and all the Robin Hoods of the world. And this is surely a

good source of inspiration for our imagination. From 29th to 31st of August the first »Summit of Micronations« will take place in Helsinki. What can we expect from this event? All of the essays in this publication contain a good deal of speculation concerning the phenomenon of micronations. I hope that most of it has to be revised after the summit. Are micronations »experiments in international law, politics, diplomacy and governance« as we have claimed? What is the common ground of secessionist new country projects and transnational model-states? Is the establishment of borders out of step with an era when we should be focussing on developing cultural diversity in a »border-crossing« society? Are micronations a way to boost participatory democracy?

It would be premature to agree on a fixed agenda for the summit at this stage. It is difficult to predict the dynamics of the interactions of the participating micronations. It is nevertheless one goal of the summit to draft a paper with a list of shared objectives of the amorph!03 participants, which could be a base for further collaboration. In the end of august we will see, how long or how short this list will be.

Oliver Kochta

Revised text from the »Journal for North-East Issues«, No.2 / 2003

## REFERENCES

Frédéric Lasserre *Les hommes qui voulaient être rois - Principautés et nations sur internet* Analyses et perspectives, Groupe de recherche en économie et sécurité, No 1, 2000

Erwin S. Strauss *How to start your own country: how you can profit from the coming decline of the nation state* 2nd edition, Loompanics Unlimited, Port Townsend, 1984

## GLOSSARY

**Anarchism** This term has a Greek derivation meaning »no rule«, and is sometimes associated with chaos. Yet anarchists claim that it does not necessarily mean absence of order, as is generally supposed, but rather an absence of hierarchy. This claim implies that all state power is oppressive and unjust and that the abolition of government will produce the greatest individual and collective freedom and prosperity. Therefore, to eliminate the state will result in universal justice and will bring an end to poverty, violence, repression, and war. But opposition to hierarchy is not limited to the state or government exclusively. Anarchism also includes opposition to all authoritarian, economic and social relations as well as political relations; particularly those associated with capitalist private property and wage labour. Anarchists insist on »no more government of man by man, and no more exploitation of man by man« (B. Tucker). Underlying the anarchist's political theory is a view that human beings are naturally peaceful, loving and cooperative. This is contrary to most of Western political thought, which regards humanity as naturally selfish and bigoted. In many western political systems humanity can only be made cooperative through education, political participation, religious ethics, spiritual development, and the threat of legal punishment.

**Authority** We can distinguish between four forms of authority in society. The first category is a traditional authoritarian system, as evinced in monarchical government. In the past this authority was generally accepted by the people governed, because it was perceived to be God-given and therefore natural. The second category, charismatic authority, is based on the extraordinary characteristics which people perceive in their leader. Revolutions are likely to be occasions when charismatic authority win popular support. The third category, rational

or legal authority, is the most familiar form in contemporary structures of democratic representation. Authority is legitimised by recognized rules and constitutional procedures. A fourth type of authority arises from the legitimacy accorded to the expert.

**Autonomy** A term meaning self government. At its root autonomy means »having its own laws« and is therefore sometimes associated with self-organisation and anarchist thought. It can apply to individuals and political communities. The »autonomous individual« is often seen to be in control of her/his life and is free to act independently. For political scientists autonomy has been seen as a sort of half-way stage to full independence for regions and provinces.

**Border** A border is the precise line separating one territory from the next, whereas a frontier is the zone around the border between two adjoining states. Borders are regarded as permanent, but through conflict and negotiation are often subject to change. Sometimes the existence and legitimacy of a border is contested, for example in the conflict resulting from the British government's partition of Ireland into the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland. Territoriality and state power is clearly demarcated by the institution and policing of borders. The *raison d'être* of most micronations is to experiment with the relationship between borders, governance and territory.

**Commune** A group of people who share their social lives, material goods and ideological beliefs. They generally eat, sleep and work together. As Australian scholar Bill Metcalf (1996) stated that »a commune is comprised of individuals whose emotional bonds are to the communal group, rather than to any subset within that group such as a lover or nuclear family unit«. A common form of collective

living in the 60s and 70s, communes were often formed around a charismatic leader.

**Citizenship** The relation between the state as a territorially-based apparatus of power and the people over whom it exercises that power (jurisdiction). Citizenship is conferred by the state. Citizens have duties to the state in return for which they enjoy certain rights. Citizenship is not a static concept, and has shifted over time. In the Greek polis for example citizenship was only conferred on elite men. However in contemporary western societies the more common definition of citizenship is that everyone has equality before the law. This concept of civil citizenship was elaborated during the French bourgeois revolution and the institution of limited democracy. With it came freedom of the individual from arbitrary arrest, freedom of speech and the right to own private property. Secondly came political citizenship reflected in representative state institutions. Universal suffrage and the right of every citizen to be a candidate in elections was instituted in some countries only in the twentieth century. By that time the third stage, the granting of social citizenship, was under way in many democratic social systems. This guaranteed enough social and economic welfare for a decent existence and provided education and social services for the individual. The duties of a citizen in a democracy are to obey the law, to pay one's taxes and, perhaps, to participate. Some people at least hold the view that a passive, uninvolved, or apathetic person is not really regarded as a citizen. A debate centres around the entitlement of full citizenship. Some states have quite rigid citizenship laws. Immigrants may find it difficult to obtain full citizenship rights. Immigration policy is a key mechanism through which states can control access to their territory and thus citizenship.

**Civil Disobedience** Disobeying or breaking a law for moral, religious or other reasons. Examples of civil disobedience include refusing to pay taxes, blocking roads or government offices, striking and marching in demonstrations without state permission. The act may be designed to pressure the government to change laws or policies or just to voice opposition. Acts of civil disobedience often aim to fundamentally question the authority of the state, its laws and what it deems criminal.



**Civil liberty** The fundamental rights and freedoms deemed to be necessary for full human life and political activity; especially liberty of thought, belief, speech, expression and association. These rights are seen as universal and can therefore not be legitimately taken away by a state government.

**Consensus** A decision making process based on deliberation and cooperation. Everyone's views are taken into consideration, all options and objections thoroughly discussed and a decision made on the basis of eventual mutual agreement. The outcome may take a long time to reach and may be a compromise, but will therefore have more chance of acceptance than a simple majority vote. The key is to explore and if possible resolve all important objections to the favoured option.

**Constitution** A set of formal written rules governing states and organizations. The first written constitution was the American one from 1787. This constitution has provided a

model for many others. Constitutions may be categorized as either monarchic or republican, unitary or federal, parliamentary or presidential. A written constitution will have to be interpreted and in many states can only be altered by having a public referendum. This necessitates constitutional courts and constitutional law.



**Libertarianism** Early libertarians believed in human free will and were opposed to determinism. Then the word subsequently became used to describe a belief in unrestricted human thought and action. In the nineteenth century this was associated with free love and opposition to the state. Libertarianism was synonymous anarchism. It was supported by anti-state socialists. In the late twentieth century libertarianism advocated little or no government and absolute individual social, economic and moral freedom. According to this view, it is not legitimate for the state to tax some people (the wealthy) to help other people (the poor) or to outlaw activities (such as drug use and prostitution) that do not harm others. Libertarians would therefore end all taxes except those needed to fund the minimal legitimate state functions (police and defence) and eliminate all laws against victimless crime. An extreme form of libertarianism advocates the right to take drugs and marry one's own sister or brother. The ideal society for libertarians is one of free autonomous individuals relating to each other on a voluntary, consensual basis with minimal interference from the state. Critics assert that libertarian thought is unable to account for the social and collective dimension of human nature, and the corporate and interdependent character of contemporary society. At their worst, libertarian views are regarded as selfish and hedonistic, an ideological

justification for greed, a license for the rich to exploit the poor, and to avoid their social responsibilities.

Sea monsters by Olaus Magnus Gothus, 1539

**Map** Maps are not neutral depictions of geographical realities. They have always been useful weapons in larger political projects such as the claiming of territory or in maintaining control over it. The mapping of territory itself supports and reproduces power and control over territory.

**Micronation** See page 22

**Migration** An immigrant is someone who goes to make a home in another country. Movements of populations are often enforced. Migration remains an important world issue. Many forces in societies want to restrict the movement of people although it is contrary to both purported liberal and free-market principles.

**Nation** There is much difficulty in arriving at a generally accepted definition of the term »nation«. Some consider the meaning of nation to be so complex a metaphysical fiction that it is not capable of scientific definition. They see it as one of those tropical jungles of thought in which politics and journalism flourish and sometimes regard it as an organism, a spiritual entity, and that all attempts to penetrate its secrets by the light of mechanical interpretation break down before the test of experience. In view of this terminological confusion, the editors of several important encyclopedias have omitted the word »nation« altogether. Because the etymology of the term nation is bound up with

ethnos it is often hard to define what a nation is without recourse to racialist thinking. Yet recent anti-racist thinkers such as Stuart Hall and Paul Gilroy have attempted to de-link the two terms: race and nation. There never was a German or American race, but there are German and American nations.

It is largely agreed that a nation is not a race nor is it a state. Language, religion and territory seem to be important factors in the nation, but none of them exclusively determine national identity. Hugh Seton-Watson suggests that »a nation exists when a significant number of people in a community consider themselves to form a nation, or behave as if they formed one«. It follows that, to a large extent the nation is a social and discursive construct as much as a physical reality. Similarly, Benedict Anderson argues that nations are imagined communities which are constructed in and through cultural and political discourses such as fiction, newspapers and television. Anthony D. Smith defines a nation as »a named human population sharing an historic territory, common myths and historical memories, a mass public culture, a common economy and common legal rights and duties for all members«. The last two elements imply the achievement of nation-state status, not something attained by all people claiming to be a nation. Despite discussion of rights to national self-determination, there are many nations which do not have a state (e.g. Kurds). Similarly there are many states which encompass a number of nations (UK, ex-Yugoslavia, ex-USSR). There are also examples of nations which have formed a number of states (Arab nation). There are states where one or more groups wish to secede in order to create their own state to reflect what they see as their right to full nationhood.

**National Identity** Guibernau sees national identity as composed of five key elements: (1) psychological: consciousness of forming a community

(2) cultural: sharing a common culture  
(3) territorial: attachment to a clearly demarcated territory  
(4) historical: possessing a common past  
(5) political: claiming the right to rule itself  
Given the somewhat ephemeral nature of national identity, it is sometimes argued that it is easier to define in terms of who one is not as opposed to who one is. This might allow members of one nation to view themselves as superior to those of another. National identity also shaped a nation's sense of its own role in the world. The power of the nation to induce strong emotional and physical reactions varies from country to country and between individuals within the same nation. Football fans waving the national flag, singing the anthem with tears in their eyes is a powerful reminder of the pervasiveness of national identity.

**Nationalism** Many people identify strongly with the nation to which they feel they belong. This sense of identification is seen to reflect an ideology of nationalism. Nationalism is an ideology in the sense that it encapsulates a set of beliefs and practices which people come to accept as natural. This gives rise to a sense of a »National Will« which unifies all members of the nation. Nationalism is an ideological movement for attaining and maintaining autonomy, unity and identity on behalf of a population deemed by some of its members to constitute an actual or potential nation. A sense of Nationhood is therefore ultimately a tool for achieving political goals. There are two types of nationalism: ethnic and civic nationalism. In the first one national identity is based on ancestry, in the second one, on where one is born. One can also divide nationalism in top down and bottom-up nationalism. The former is the promotion of ethnic images and affinities and their application to the state which serves a political end, namely the maintenance of state hegemony

(eg. patriotism). The second form of nationalism is born of a desire to shake off a particular imposed rule (e.g. Basque nationalism).

**National Anthem** The importance of territory and of specific places is emphasized in many national anthems. These pieces of music are perhaps the most overt means by which the nation is symbolized and quite often contain territorial and military references. These may take the form of generic allusions to soil and land or to particular places or landscape features such as mountains or rivers. In this way, nation's musical signatures often have a strong territorial base which evokes images that are seen as part of the essence of the nation.

**Nation-building** In order to create a strong national consciousness nations require devices and discourses which can be utilized in the process of affirming and building nationhood. There is a need for a national past, which is seen to provide the glue to hold the nation together. In tandem with this national past is a national geography built around particular places. People, events and places can be put into the service of nation-building and affirmation. This means that nations require a history built around these elements in order to sustain their existence and meaning in the eyes of their citizens. A certain tradition of images, cults, costumes, rites, artefacts, myths and values are additional elements in the repertoire of building a national consciousness. National histories tend to present a relatively seamless narrative through which the members of the nation can trace their collective past. A critique of this narrative is not the same as saying that an accurate version of history is possible. Rather, a suitable past is required and »if there is no suitable past, it can always be invented.« (Hobsbawm). Further, given the role and importance of myths in nation building, inaccurate histories are perhaps crucial. »Getting its

history wrong is part of being a nation« (Ernest Renan). Events and people become traditionalised in order to celebrate the nation. In this way it can be said that Nations are constructed through the invention of tradition. Particular customs or events are portrayed as stretching back to a time immemorial, to the primordial origins of the nation. Within the discourse of the construction of the nation, it is obvious that territory is of huge importance. Historical fact and myth concerning particular places are key elements in the national imagination. Certain places within the national territory may acquire significance as the presumed zone of origin of the nation, its original heartland. It is typical in the national imagery that the rural landscape has been presented as embodying the essence of the nation. Urban areas have tended to be regarded as those places most contaminated by foreign influence.

**Nation-State** An independent state recognized by and able to interact with other states, especially one composed of people who are of one, as opposed to several, nationalities. The terms nation and state are often used interchangeably, while contemporary states are often referred to as nation-states. This is misleading. A state is a legal and political organization with power over its citizens. A nation is more nebulous. It is a collection of people bound together by some sense of solidarity, common culture and shared history. Usually this sense of common identity is underpinned by a historical attachment to a particular territory or national homeland. The nation-state is under a range of pressures. Some observers announce the decline of the nation state based on the view that it is in the process of being superseded as a political and territorial formation. The pressures from below are from forms of secessionist nationalism and other forces of fragmentation. The pressures from above can be placed under the broad heading of the impact of globalisation – the world-wide

flows of goods, money, people and culture – which is seen to undermine the sovereignty of the nation state's government and render national differences and state borders less and less relevant. As well as economic globalisation, there are a range of issues which transcend national boundaries. These include environmental concerns as well as the increasing importance of cultural diffusion.

**Participatory democracy** The main criticism of democracy as it operates today is that not enough citizens participate in it. The average citizen is content only to cast a vote at national elections. Some observers argue that it is the non-participation of the vast majority that keeps democracy attainable. On the other hand, there has been since the nineteenth century a tradition in political thought which holds that participation in politics is necessary because it educates the electorate about the procedures, personalities and issues that underwrite democratic government. Various prescriptions have been recommended to secure much wider participation: for example direct democracy, local governments, compulsory voting, enhanced political education...

**Self governance** Opposed to centralized control self-governance maintains the freedom and ability of a community to control their own affairs and determine their own futures by exercising authority in areas ranging from taxation and land management to criminal justice to social programs. An outside authority can only become involved, when certain agreed criteria are satisfied. It is suggested that self-governance plays a central, practical role in the fortunes of societies, nations, and communities. The fact is that societies controlled by outsiders – by members of another society or by those whose culture, self-concept, or aspirations are significantly different – seldom fare well. Wherever local control is usurped by outsiders, wherever outsiders impose their own designs on local communities that have distinct

ideas and traditions of their own, sustained development fails to take root and social and economic problems develop instead. The results typically are poverty, frustration, and hopelessness. This is the lesson of Soviet bureaucratic control over Eastern Europe, of colonial control and its aftermath in Africa, and of other experiences around the world. The assertion of local control over the major decisions that affect people's lives is a crucial step in escaping this pattern. As those communities whose resources and well-being are at stake take over decision-making, the quality of the decisions improves. The result, typically, is better policy, enhanced economic productivity, more effective social programs, and improved welfare in communities. It is nevertheless argued what the appropriate units of self-governance could be.

**Secession** When a part of a state breaks away and declares that it is an independent state, it has seceded.

**Self determination** The self-determination of peoples became a popular demand with the end of World War I. Ethnic groups demanded that they should be allowed to determine where they belong. In 1945 the principle was given legal status in the UN Charter. If applied consistently however, it might lead to the »Balkanizations« of the world. The main question about its application is »Who is the self to be determined?« This question applies to both the complex nature of individual identity (i.e. there is no »pure« identity), and to the issue of how one would go about locating and defining a group of people who could make that demand. For example, in a referendum held on the island of Ireland whether Northern Ireland should be part of the United Kingdom or the Irish Republic, should the vote to determine the province's fate be held only in Northern Ireland, or on the whole island?

**Sovereignty** A claim to authority, originally by sovereign monarchs, but also

by states since the »Treaty of Westphalia« in 1648. A state becomes sovereign when other states recognise it as such. The term cannot be a synonym for complete independence, although states may argue it is.

**State** While nation refers to a social collective, the state refers to a set of political institutions, which have jurisdiction over a specified territory. Usually the presence of states is taken by granted. We have a very state centred view of the world. In 1930 there were only 70, today we have ca. 200 states. The state is an ongoing apparatus of power while governments are the agents who carry out the day-to-day running of the state. States are human creations. The minimal requirements for statehood are population, territory, government and legality. Other requirements often proposed as criteria of statehood are independence, sovereignty, the capacity to enter into relations with other states and international recognition. The classic perception of the state was an abstraction of the ideas of power and authority. Its main concern was the relationship between human beings and political authority. Usually it is Machiavelli (1469-1527) who is credited with the first use of the word state in its modern meaning of a territory with defined borders and a central authority which had to be obeyed.

Later philosopher's thought was much exercised by the relationship between the individual and the state and the problem of political obligation. Questions like »Why should I obey the commands of the state?« or »When can I disobey them, if ever?« were raised. The answer depended upon one's view of the nature of humankind. Hobbes (1588-1679) believed in the essentially aggressive nature of men. In consequence they lived in fear of each other and so they had made a pact and set up a state to ensure that an ordered society was maintained through the exertion of power by unassailable authority. Locke (1632-1704) believed that people were, on

the whole, good and the state existed to ensure that wrongdoers did not disrupt ordered society. Locke also asserted that individuals had basic rights, which should be enshrined in a contract with the state. If the state broke its side of the contract, the right of revolt existed. Rousseau (1712-78) was concerned with the problem of how to obtain a kind of society in which everyone was as free as they once might have been in the state of nature, and while at the same time individual's and their property would be protected. His solution was the social contract, an agreement between people by which they entered into a civil association, giving up their rights to laws prescribed by themselves in order to find true freedom. The old dynastic sovereigns would be overthrown and replaced by the sovereignty of the people.

The most familiar perception of the state sees it as a provider of a legal framework, infrastructure and services to be used for the benefit of its citizens. It regulates the economy (although free-market theories suggest the state should minimize the exercise of this function) and provides public goods such as health care, education and transport services. The contemporary state maintains legal and other frameworks which guide citizens behaviour and it defends its territory and its people against external aggression and internal threats. It is able to do this by redistributing income. Social democratic states tax the better-off to help the worse-off. How much the state should exercise these functions, however is always contested.

There are several theories of the state. Pluralistic theories view the state as neutral; above and separate from any vested interest. It has no interest in the form of society. It is rather an institution shaped according to the citizens will – democratically expressed. Power emanates via elections from the people. Governments act merely as agents of the people. The state guarantees the rights of the individual. The private sphere should be protected

from outside interference. No faction can have total control, the state is always brought into balance by diverse forces. The state is seen in a technical rather than in a political sense. Elite theories claim that there is always a class that rules and a class that is ruled. Self interest will take precedence over any broader concerns. This rests on the distinction between an elite and the mass. Marxist theories are based on the idea that societies are divided along class lines. There is the capitalist, the bourgeoisie and the working class. The profit gained by the capitalist is seen as a result of the exploitative nature of the relation between the two classes. The state is understood as a mechanism which acts in defence of the class structure. Rather than being neutral, the state is an organization that protects that property-owning classes against the non-property owning classes. If the state is biased against the interests of the majority of its own citizens, why don't those citizens oppose its existence? This might be explained by the idea of hegemony. The political, moral, intellectual leadership of a dominant class supports this dominance by exercising two forms of control: the coercive apparatus (police, army and judiciary) and the ideological apparatus. Among the filters embracing a certain way of viewing things are the educational system and the mass media. In helping to shape public opinion they can have a hugely conservative impact, protecting the state against potential oppositions. The dominant ideas in society come to be seen as common sense and alternative ideas are seen to be threatening or unrealistic or impossible or bizarre or unworkable.

**Territory** Territory refers to a portion of geographic space, which is claimed or occupied by a person or group or by an institution. It is an area of bounded space. The process whereby individuals or groups lay claim to such space is referred to as territoriality. In this way, territoriality can be associated with notions of

private property. Territoriality is used as a strategy either to assert power or to resist power of a dominant group. The control of territory became the geographical expression of political power. Territory can be converted into defensible space. It can provide opportunities for the economic organization of space to allow people to pursue a good, protected life.

**Utopia** The term coined by Thomas More in his book »Utopia« (1516). The word has a dual meaning depending on your chosen root derivation: »No place« from the Greek ou (not) and topos (place) or »Good place« from the Greek eu (good, right or well) and topos. It has popularly come to mean an ideal world founded on imaginary perfection. However, Australian communities scholar Bill McCallum argues that the utopian impulse refers to a broad intention to build a better society, not the belief that a perfect world is possible. He cautions against using »utopian« to mean »ideally naive«.

**World Government** There has been at least one attempt to draft a constitution for the world. A world state was suggested by Dante, Proudhon, Rousseau and Kant among others but until the twentieth century it had received little consideration by statesmen. Forms of somewhat democratic world government (such as the UN) already exist as do undemocratic economic and political agents of world governance such as the WTO and the IMF. Advocates of world government can be divided into three camps. The empiricists believe that international co-operation in numerous organizations to which sovereign states relinquish a little power will persuade them in the end that the Nation-State is outdated. Realists argue that coercive force must be organized internationally to uphold international law: the first thing to do is by contract to construct a sort of international Leviathan. Idealists attempt to convert world citizenry to the idea of world government.

## 01. JOTAKIN TAPAHTUU \_sivulta 06

### I. Jotakin tapahtuu

Mitä mikrovaltioksi julistautuminen tarkoittaa? Mitä silloin tapahtuu? Mieleen tulee kuva pienestä maa-alueesta, joka loikkaa iloisesti irti muusta maasta, painovoiman ja logiikan lakeja uhaten. Jokin asetellaan uudelleen, jokin erotetaan: jotakin tapahtuu. Jääkö tapahtumasta maahan jälki, kraateri? Minkälainen asia tämä oikeastaan on? Millä toimilla tapahtuma saadaan liikkeelle?

Voimmeko erottaa spekulatiot siitä, minkälainen asia saattaisi loikata maasta siitä, miten loikka tapahtuu ja mikä on sen kantava voima? Haluaisin toistaiseksi pitää kiinni tietystä amorfisesta tavasta ja supistan termin mikrovaltio yhdeksi, tarkoin rajatuksi käsitteeksi, kunnes pääsemme jonkinlaiseen ymmärrykseen NSK:n, Ladonian, SoS:n, Transnational Republicin, KREV:n ja Sealandin tapahtumista ja taustoitusta. Olisiko mahdollista piirtää kaavio jokaisen itsenäisyysjulistuksen tapahtumista? Näille valtiokokeiluille, kuten tälle konferenssillekin, on keskeistä kysymys muodosta ja muotoilusta: millainen on yhteisön, demokratian ja ehkä jopa tulevaisuuden muoto, ja miten se muotoillaan?<sup>1</sup>

*Amorfinen (s.) Ei omaa tarkkaa muotoa tai rakennetta. Muodoton, epäorganisoitu. Sanasta morphé - muoto*

Sarat Maharaj on kuvaillut demokratiaa muodonmuuttajaksi: elävä, jatkuvasti uusia muotoja etsivä joukko keskenään vertailukelvottomia asioita. Sitä ei voida pelkistää väestönlaskennaksi.<sup>2</sup> Tämän ajatuksen ymmärtäminen edellyttää jännitteiden näkemistä ihmisen materiaalsen elämisen, toimimisen ja liikkumisen sekä erilaisen nimellisten ja tilaa vaativien ryhmämuodostustapahtumien (esimerkiksi valtion, puolueen, yhteisön, hallintoalueen) välillä. Miten Sealandin itsenäisyysjulistusta tai NSK:n valtioksi ajassa julistautumista voitaisiin hyödyntää asian ymmärtämisessä?

Jokainen julistus sisältää toiston, valtion uudelleen määrittelyn tai jopa uudelleen asettelun. Tapahtuman määrittäminen valtion »mikroistamiseksi« ei avaisi kaikkia ovia sille, mitä prosessissa tapahtuu. Mikrovaltio kuvailisi jonkinlaista pienempää versiota valtiosta, ikään kuin se olisi sovitettu tietokoneelle, ehkä joidenkin lisäominaisuuksien tai päivitysten kera.<sup>3</sup> Vaikuttaisi kuitenkin siltä, että ajatuskin näiden tapahtumien toistamisesta, tai edes jäljittelystä, hävittäisi kysymykset kolmiulotteisesta mittakaavasta ja korvaisi ne erilaisilla avaruudellistamis- ja muodollistamisprosesseilla. Kaaviotermeihin mikrovaltiot tarjoavat pikemminkin kokeen, jolla havainnoidaan jännitteitä pisteiden (ihmisten?) ja ympyrämuotojen (hallintoalueet tai valtiot) välillä. Tällä tavoin mikrovaltiot leijuvat substantiivin ja verbin, tekijän ja tekemisen kohteen välillä. Tässä tapauksessa erilaisten muotojen ja tilojen esittäminen johtaa muutoksiin rajojen ja niiden perustavanlaatuisen tärkeyden suhteen.

<sup>1</sup>Tapahtumalle tuokin mielenkiintoisen ulottuvuuden se, että se on nimeltään »Amorph!«.

<sup>2</sup>Maharaj, S. »Xeno-Epistemics: Makeshift Kit for Sounding Visual Art as Knowledge Production and the Retinal Regimes.« Documenta 11, Cantz, 2002. Maharaj antaa esimerkin englantilaisten »oikeudesta vaelteluun«, jonka mukaan joitakin maaseudun polkuja pitkin täytyy kävellä toistuvasti, etteivät ne kasva umpeen. Jos polkua ei käytetä, menettää se merkityksensä ja muuttuu yksityisomaisuudeksi.

<sup>3</sup>Saatamme kuitenkin joutua vielä käyttämään termiä mikrovaltio siinä toivossa, että konferenssin tuloksena syntyy parempi termi.