MONEY

What it is that rules us

Preliminary remark (or perhaps more advance warning)

In this book, I have to state in all modesty, it will be correctly determined for the first time:

I how it came to money historically
II what money is
III and what money thereby specifically effects and compels.
That the conclusions that I come to for these questions are at least new is apparent at first glance. That they apply is, overall, also historically verifiable.

Ad I

The familiar explanations to date for how money historically arose go astray in that they transfer certain conditions specifically shaped by money today involuntarily back to all times, then wrongly presuppose and in a circular manner deduce what money is. In fact:
Money does not arise as soon as something is merely exchanged, bought or traded or as soon as there is something like coins. In none of the early empires, not in antiquity and not even in the European Middle Ages was there a concept of money or the notion of value and equivalence with which money is necessarily associated. Money, and with it this idea of value and equivalence only and exclusively comes about where an entire community no longer deals only peripherally with buying and selling, but lives from buying and selling. Only *such a society* is dependent on the *continuous* use of a medium of exchange and is dependent on its circulation. This alone separates the *one* medium of exchange, which is now continuously required from all things that can be bought with it. Detached from the goods, it stands opposite to them as a *pure* medium of exchange that serves nothing more than an *exchange* for these goods: *Money*.

Thus money arises as a *social relationship*, not in fact something that people invented as a thing. It arises on the basis of historical changes that take place blindly in that they create such a society and result in money as the *pure medium*

of exchange in an equally blind necessity. Changes of this kind historically worldwide occur *uniquely* in Europe in the later Middle Ages. Very particular conditions there weaken the feudalistic connection with its redistributive provisioning of the people, in which buying and selling – as everywhere in the world until then – only played a secondary role. In the "free cities" of Europe, on the other hand, which in contrast fall out of this interrelationship, this provisioning must be replaced by one that is no longer mediated through personal dependencies, a provisioning that thus predominantly takes place *only* through purchase and sale. The historical transition whereby *an entire society lives* from buying and selling occurs in a period towards the end of the "long" 16th century. This at the same time marks the beginning of the *modern era* – and not by chance: for the *societal innovation* from which money results forces further historically highly significant phenomena. To them belongs the modern state.
Also, as to why a phenomenon like the state arose at that time and initially only in Europe, to date no valid explanation has been found: Without knowledge of the historical genesis of money, it could not be recognized as the decisive historical prerequisite.

Ad II

Money is thus not just a general medium of exchange; *money is a pure medium of exchange*. Before the social necessity of its circulation gives rise to money, only things and goods are used for exchange. These can at best at a short distance be represented by paper, but remain, even in the form of coins, without exception, things among things: They can not only be exchanged, but according to their properties can always be used as such. Money, on the other hand, as the pure medium of exchange, exists in *nothing*, can be used for nothing but exchange, for buying and selling. And that applies from its very beginning, even if the necessary forms of communication only develop in the course of the global implementation of the monetary system. Money no longer consists of *something* that can in addition be exchanged, but consists of *nothing* but that which can be *exchanged for something*. This is overtly shown in that we hold money in accounts in mere numbers, which are only assigned additional purchasing power, that is, he exchangeability for goods.

Money is therefore *pure quantum*. Unlike any kind of commodity and good, it itself no more bears qualitative determination, while at the same time it can be exchanged for any kind of qualitatively determined good. Money *must* therefore continuously be exchanged for such goods in order to remain money at all:

because it otherwise consists of nothing. Money is the only thing, no, un-thing, that requires its continual and repeated transformation into things (or services, in general: *something*): in order to function as that determining comestible upon which a society living from purchase and sale first and foremost depends. Just to be able to function as a medium of exchange, *only* money forces us to consume the world continuously and again and again in *accordance with its quantity* – to the *consumption* that is therefore constantly stimulated and has to be stimulated.

Thereby money *as* pure quantity is always *equated* to a purchasable good. And this is how the idea of value and equivalence *emerges* in the first place, which is so inextricably linked to money (*so inevitably that we have always considered it a given*). *Money* is the pure quantum *value* that we by equating it when buying *set* on every commodity and every good. Money forces our notion of value as a common "third party" that would be present in all goods. That all purchasable goods would already have their own value in their own right is the idea that money forces upon us – but forced only by the establishment of *money* itself. It forces us to assume that value is only to be paid for in the form of money because this value is in them, instead of – in truth – conversely that we only assume a value in the commodities because money has to be paid for them.

Based on the false assumption of a (monetary) value in goods also rest the theories that try to fix this value as a substantial quantity either to the goods or to the buying subjects: the labor theory of value and marginal utility theory. Neither of the two is therefore correct.

Ad III

As deep as the historical change in the social foundations reaches wherein people no longer primarily relate to society through personal obligation but through money, so far-reaching are the consequences that this brings about. Such consequences explain, among other things, even the most powerful phenomena of modern times: *state, capitalism, European expansion*.

State

This name, from the Italian *stato*, is used for communities only when they change from an association of persons to modern states, to sovereign and abstract states, controlled by personnel according to the "reason of state". This change too initially takes place in Europe alone and not for no reason at the same time that money arises there. It can be explained as follows: A society in which everyone mainly has to provision themselves by buying and selling therefore lives from the *one medium of exchange* that everyone must have at their disposal. This medium of exchange, money, represents the society-wide validated power to obtain by means of purchase the authority over other people's goods. But since money in and of itself does not consist of anything that could warrant this power, it must be guaranteed by an external power: a real power that must develop in order to be able to enforce that access power of money society-wide, and ultimately by force. This therefore socially *highest* power must no longer be in the hands of powerful people, of rulers who could use it in their own interests. It may, as abstractly existing itself, only be managed ideally by changing staff.

Such a kind of supreme power had until then made no sense and had until then existed nowhere: It is the modern "state". This state, as we know it, with this becomes at the same time the highest *economic* entity, since it must lie in its specific interest not only to secure money and the progress of money-based business, but also by all means to promote it. On the *success* of this business process, now also for its part mediated through money, also rests *state power*. The state is indeed not opposed to the power of money, rather the state exists *for* it and *through* it. Therefore the state binds the people who have been made its constituents to money, with everything that belongs to it. Everything that it lets its citizens decide beyond that must adhere to this strict requirement as part of the basic state order.

Capitalism

Its emergence could so far only be explained circularly and thus not at all: Either the appropriate disposition would have engendered the capitalist institutions or the appropriate disposition would have engendered the capitalist sentiment. Where the specific capitalist disposition or institutions would have come from remained unclear.

In a society in which everyone has to live from money as the one medium of exchange, everyone has to get money in order to be able to live from it.

But everyone only gets money (except through fraud and certain crimes that money particularly provokes) by selling *something* to others for *money*. In order to be able to sell such a *something*, he will usually have to already spend money himself, precisely because in such a society things, goods and services are *generally* only available for money. Consequently, everyone, to get money, with *something* that already *cost* him money, must get *more* money than it cost him.

Invested *money* must turn into *more money*. Anyone who does not make enough money-profit goes bankrupt and goes under.

The *compulsion* to make *profits* in money with money is therefore inevitably part of money and an economy that deals with money. In fact the propagation or *growth* of money can fail at any time, but is nevertheless necessary if money is to continue to function as money, namely, if it is not to lose its characteristic as money and its value through depreciation. In order to function *as money*, money depends on its use to lead to *more money*; this necessity, however, is the function of *capital*. To function as capital is therefore an immediate part of the essence of money: it is a given with the establishment of money and cannot be detached from money. Thus when money arises, capitalism arises with it: the need for money to increase, the need for it to function as capital.

Against the insight that money as such – impersonal and abstract – puts people under pressure and that this is part of its essence, there is a strong resistance today. An "essence of money" is denied and repressed in favor of the belief that people invented money and can model it accordingly to their whim: into money that cannot lose its value, into money that does not have to make a profit, into money that is compatible with its fair distribution, or simply into money that only does good because it flows exclusively into good undertakings. However, the harshness with which money follows its – so far insufficiently recognized – essence and with which it forces people relentlessly to follow its inherent logic, therefore, not allowing for any of the hoped-for modeling, shows the obvious course of history since money arose in Europe.

The European expansion = "The subjugation of the world"

With money arises a hitherto unknown logic which subjugates people's lives and according to which they are forced to act. Where there is money, people can no longer, as they could throughout the rest of history, get to the *goods* that let them live well. Instead, they must *previously* and *first of all* inevitably seek to get *money*, for which such goods can at best be obtained. But they get money – firstly – only by turning the *commodities* of this world in turn into money, namely into goods *for which* one gets money from others. But secondly: Since money is pure quantum with the compulsion to constantly increase *through its use as money*, namely through that valuing of parts of this world, the compulsion to do so is *boundless*. It subjects individuals all the way up to entire states to *competition* for money and thus to an effort to get money that can no longer be based on a need for goods, which would limit it. In contrast to the need for commodities, the need for money forces to constantly *transgress* every such limit. Since competition is not only *for* money, but also *with* money, through the effort by which one gets money and competes for it, the profits can never be big enough. They are a *means* of competition in which everyone must try not to lag behind and not to lose. But since the need for money – mediated in a consequently very harmful way – is at the same time a need for commodities, for which we have to scour the world in order to turn them into value and convert them into money, this means: The need for money forces a boundary-breaking seizure of this world.

This grasping is also blatantly obvious as soon as money arises historically, and emanates precisely from the countries where it has emerged. It is the "European expansion" that starts at that time and which until today, in all forms of so-called globalization, continues. It is basically a "subjugation of the world", as it is rightly called, yes, it is the first and only subjugation of the *entire* world. When it peaks in open colonization with all its bestialities, the representatives of their states expressly invoke as their justification that they would have to "set a value" on the treasures of the invaded countries, as the indigenous people would not be out to do so and would not understand anything about it – which was doubtless correct. The European states and soon their offshoot states, in a hitherto unknown way, grasp on to the entire world and tear the commodities out of every corner of the earth that they can get hold of: driven by the inevitable interest that the money logic subjects them to: Transform these treasures into money.

They do this, in a first phase, only where money can be obtained at all, namely in their own respective states, to where they take their booty. Soon, however, they also force the subjugated countries themselves to monetize their economies in order to be able to reclaim that money even directly and locally. They force these countries to money and the money economy, forcing upon them money and the associated capitalist economy, forcing them thus to likewise live dependent on money and purchase and sale. For this, the European and their offshoot states destroy mercilessly everywhere they come the local traditional ways of provisioning and economy. Single-mindedly, permanently, without exception, and without allowing the possibility to revert, they destroy the conditions for any kind of economic activity which throughout a long history of humanity until then, also in highly complex realms, endured without money and the imposed dependence on the money. These conditions include, in particular, the communal living in groups in which people were manifestly and very fundamentally committed *to one another*, as comprehensively can be proven for the times *before* the money.

The interest of money logic, which forces the transgression of all boundaries, corresponds to the limitless violence with which the expansive access to the world is pursued. It is a violence that did not make sense without money logic – with all the cruelty to which people were capable of also previously. The peoples subjugated by the money nations could not make *sense* nor see the *logic* of violence that must target an unlimited enrichment of *worth*. From there originates the *superior*, namely unlimited and in the logic of the subjugated incomprehensible, violence of Europeans. For them what so far would have been only absurd is now meaningful: to not only claim commodities from other peoples, but to force them with all violence also to *adopt* commodities: because then *money* is payable for them. In this way made – a famous example – the English nation imposed opium on China by war. *In this way* the triumph of money takes place – its global triumph.

Present times

That still the last spots on this earth are forced to work with money, that is, was brought into the dependence on money and money-gain, guarantees no one, certainly not the colonial countries released into "freedom" and compelled to an existence as "states", *success* in this kind of economy. This, among other things, impedes the superior competition of the states with the far longer capitalist lead. The result is masses of people who live in misery or who can no longer survive where they live, so they still flee from the mortal danger there.

The world is threatened with ecological destruction which – something too little seen – inevitably follows the logic of money competition: that for the consumption and the valuing of more and more parts of the world as *little money* as possible can be spent in order that as much *money* as possible and *more* comes out. So, the consideration of the world, when it comes to money, *costs money* – too much money, which it dare not cost.

And this dismal course of things is, in addition, currently particularly heavily threatened by a foreseeable economic crisis: a crisis not in the supply of goods, but the supply of *money* – and *therefore* the supply of everything.