

The Political System as a Self-Organizing Information System

Christian Fuchs

Institute for Design and Technology Assessment
Vienna University of Technology
Favoritenstr. 9-11, A-1040 Vienna
Austria
email: christian@igw.tuwien.ac.at

Abstract

Political self-organization is a reflexive, self-referential process where political agents coordinate their actions in such a way that political power structures emerge and are differentiated, these structures enable and constrain political activities and stimulate further political practices.

Acknowledgement: This paper is based on research done within the framework of the project ‘Human Strategies in Complexity: Philosophical Foundations for a Theory of Evolutionary Systems’ funded by INTAS (#0298) and supported by the Austrian Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Culture.

1 Introduction

Social self-organization is a reflexive, self-referential process where social structures and human actors produce each other mutually, structures enable and constrain the activity of individuals and groups that changes structures [Fuchs, 2003a]. Structures are medium and outcome of social actions (ibid.).

2 The Self-Organization of the Political System

The political system deals with collective decisions that refer to the way life conditions are set. Politics encompasses a dual process of decision-making and authorisation of actions: Decisions are made on the basis of available resources in order to assure the functioning of society. These decisions either take on coded or non-coded forms. Once a decision is reached the next step is to execute it. And executing decisions always means that members of the society are authorised to act in a particular manner. This authorisation involves both enabling and constraining actions.



Figure 1: Political Self-Organization

On the political level of society, we find political relationships that individuals enter based on political forces.

In modern societies these are political groups (political parties and political organizations in civil society) and relationships between these groups that follow organized procedures (political discourse, elections, protests, parliamentary discussions etc.). By such relationships, a specific disposition of political power is formed and political conflicts may arise. This results in the emergence and differentiation of political forces. The important political force is power. Power can be defined as the disposition over the means required to influence processes and decisions in one's own interest, domination refers to the disposition over the means of coercion required to influence others, processes and decisions. Power is a social force in the sense that it can be considered as a materialization of the relationships of political groups. Domination always includes sanctions, disciplinary mechanisms, repression, threats of violence and an asymmetric distribution of power, it is a coercive, institutionalized social relationship of power. Domination can't be distributed in a symmetrical manner, it always involves an asymmetrical distribution of resources and possibilities, it necessarily is exerted on someone against his will. Collective decisions (such as laws), power structures (such as government, parliament, councils etc.), political institutions (such as ministries, bureaucracy, courts, public offices and departments) reflect the existing power relationships and the existing distribution of power. Politics does not necessarily involve leadership as suggested by Max Weber.

Domination always includes sanctions, repression, threats of violence and an asymmetric distribution of power. In political relationships it is determined how power is constituted, distributed, allocated and disposed. Political forces are the foundation for political relationships and they are differentiated and developed by political relationships. In modern society, basic political relationships are laws and the state. Political re-creation is a double process of agency (decision procedures) and enabling/ constraining. This is the basic cycle of political re-creation/self-organization (fig. 1). In relation to available power resources, decisions are being reached in politics, in order to organise the functioning of society. Political relationships result in the emergence of new power structures, these structures enable and constrain the actions of the human beings in a society and result in new political activities that set themselves goals of changing or maintaining existing rules and dispositions of power. On the structural level of the political system we find a mutual relationship of political relationships and political forces:

The active relationships between political groups (governmental parties, opposition parties, non-parliamentary opposition and support groups) result in the emergence of new political forces/power resources (decisions, laws, rules, political institutions, allocation of offices, appointment of civil servants etc.). These forces enable and constrain the political actions of political groups and result in further political commitments, new goals, ideas, etc. Politics is a dynamic system that is based on the permanent emergence of new power structures. Political agency is a creative activity that results in new properties of society, based on knowledgeable, reflective human actions new political realities are constructed and established. Based on the fundamental human properties of creativity and innovation, politics itself is a (re-)creative system that permanently reproduces itself in and through political agency. Politics has to do with the establishment of social connections that can be organised in order to influence decisions. Power as a political force hence can in the terms of Pierre Bourdieu also be described as social/political capital [cf. Fuchs 2003b]. Power as a structural feature of society both involves connections in terms of political groups and materializations of these relationships.

Luhmann describes the self-referentiality/autopoiesis of politics as decisions producing further decisions [Luhmann, 2000: 105, 147, 431]. This concept neglects the importance of human knowledgeable, creative actors in social systems and of the duality of structure that enables the autopoiesis of society. A decision stimulates further decisions and communications, but it doesn't *produce* them because decisions are the result of the synergies between political actors. Hence a process of political self-organization as illustrated in figure 1 seems to be more realistic than one where decisions and communications constitute the political system and human beings are only outside observers.

3 The Self-Organization of the Nation State

In modern society, the state is the organizational unit of political self-organization. It is based on organized procedures and institutions (representative democracy) that form the framework of the competition for the accumulation of power and political capital. Various groups compete for gaining power, an increase of power for some groups automatically means a decrease of power for other ones. The state is a form of political self-organization that is based on asymmetrical distributions of power, domination, the permanent constitution of codified rules (laws) in the process of legislation, the sanctioning and controlling execution of these rules and the punishment of the disobedience and violation of these rules (jurisdiction). Political parties/groups want to shape these processes according to their own will and hence compete for influence and the accumulation of power.

The basic process of self-organization of the state is based on competitive relationships between political groups that result in a certain distribution of power and the permanent emergence of new features of this distribution (laws, regulations, cases, filling of public offices and civil services according to specific political interests etc.). These new emergent qualities enable and constrain political practices, political engagement for stabilizing or changing a certain constellation of power. Political practices that constitute the

modern state include running for political offices, elections, parliamentary debates, the working out of bills, the passing of laws, political discussions (also in everyday life), political media coverage (press, television, radio, Internet etc.), protests (petitions, demonstrations, strikes etc.). Existing laws and political events (the outcomes of the enactment of laws and the processes of establishing new laws) stimulate political organization, they result in new, emergent properties on the level of political groups, i.e. in new ways of thinking and acting that try to stabilize or change the existing distribution of power. The development of the state is not a static, but a dynamic process, it is based on the permanent political interactions of various political groups that result in the emergence of new political capital/power structures that stimulate further political actions which try to stabilize or change the existing distributions of power. Competition and accumulation of power are fundamental aspects of the self-organization of the modern nation state.

The state should not only be understood as the unity of parties that run for elections and are represented in parliament and the institutions these parties form in order to exercise power. One shouldn't ignore the importance of non-parliamentary groups in the autopoiesis of the political system. They are an important location of power and legitimisation. Antonio Gramsci stressed that the state means "political society + civil society". This is the integral meaning of the state that I concur with. The state consists of two major subsystems: the system of political rule and the system of civil society. The system of political rule is constituted by the parties that are represented in parliament, official political institutions such as parliament, government, ministries, public offices, police, military, courts, secret service. This system forms the core of the process of constituting and enacting laws. Civil society is the system that is comprised by all non-parliamentary political groups. These groups either run for elections, but are not represented in parliament due to their reaching not enough votes or not running for elections because they rely on non-parliamentary forms of political practice. Political groups that are part of civil society represent certain aims and interests and try to influence power relationships in such a way that their ideas and interests are represented. Their chief practice is the lobbying for certain political ideas (lobbying doesn't only include procedures of influencing powerful political actors that are based on personal and cultural relationships as well as on economic resources, also all forms of protest can be considered as a type of lobbying for certain ideas and material interests). The self-organization of the state can only be accomplished by complex interactions between the system of political rule and civil society, it is not solely comprised by interactions within the first. The two subsystems are structurally coupled, i.e. each perturbs the other, but can't determine the practices and structures of the other to a full extent. Lobbying as the main practice of civil society is a perturbation for the ruling system, it will result in a change of existing structures, i.e. a sort of response, but it is not determined how this change will look like, to which extent this change will take place and whether it will be a rather important, major change or a rather unimportant, minor change. In many nation states, referenda that can be initiated by civil society are a sort of non-parliamentary political procedure: Certain groups of civil society can

initiate it and the citizens can support it by signing the referendum. If such a referendum takes place, parliament must react to it, but it is not determined in advance how it will react. Lobbying also includes the membership in political parties of members of a group that belongs to civil society. Political events that take place within the system of rule (new laws, appointments etc.) perturbate civil society in the sense that the organizations of civil society form opinions and views concerning these events. Political events stimulate political practices. It is not determined whether or not this will result in support or opposition. Certain political events can cause political mobilizations within civil society that support or protest against certain events in the system of rule. It is not determined in advance what will happen, how civil society will react to new emergent properties of government. It is determined that such emergence will result in further political practices within both subsystems of politics, but not in which ones. Politics contains both aspects of chance and necessity. The notions governance and civil society have to do with voluntary political action in order to advance common purposes.

Elections are important mechanisms of stabilizing and changing existing distributions of power within the state. Political parties compete for votes that determine the distribution of power within the system of rule. Elections and economic markets have certain similarities. Joseph Schumpeter stressed that modern democracy is a product of the capitalistic process and Anthony Downs' main hypothesis was that parties in a political system are analogue to corporations in a profit-based economy. Both the economic and the political self-organization of modern society are based on accumulation and competition. A central feature of modern representative democracy is the accumulation of power and votes, the central motive of politicians is the pursuit of power in order to realize their political ideas and programs. Politics in modern society is oriented on its exchange value: Political decisions and positions that are based on a certain amount of votes are exchanged for an increase or decrease of votes during the next elections. The political process that is based on elections can be described in the form V-D-V' or P-D-P': votes-decisions-more votes, power-decisions-more power. However, the accumulation of power is uncertain because an election is an evaluation of the work of politicians and only if the voters are satisfied with a government they will increase the government's power. This means that in the formula $P' = P + dP$, dP can be negative or positive, there can be either an increase or a decrease of power for each party that runs in an election. Politicians hope that after the end of a legislative period their work will be evaluated positively and they will increase their power. Elections are based on the exchange of representation/decisions and votes, they are procedures for increasing and decreasing the power of political groups that are part of the system of rule. Parties also try to increase their (political and economic) power by increasing the number of memberships.

Elections take place all couple of years, this means that the distribution of power within the system of rule changes slowly, this subsystem of politics is reproduced in a process of slow, conservative self-organization whereas the self-organization of the whole state system permanently reproduces itself due to synergetic interactions between

political groups that result in new qualities. If one compares the self-reproduction of the modern economy with the self-reproduction of the system of rule one discovers that the economic reproduction process (i.e. the accumulation of money capital) takes place permanently, i.e. the total amount of economic capital is permanently increased and re-distributed. This is a very dynamic process. Political power also changes permanently in the sense that new political groups, laws, views, ideas, regulations etc. emerge, but the distribution of power between the elements (i.e. parties) of the system of rule only changes slowly. Chance and discontinuity is only introduced once every couple of years into the system. Representative democracy and its electoral system are based on conservative types of self-organization that result in certain dichotomies and asymmetrical distributions of political power. It functions based on dichotomies of government/opposition and parliament/people. This means the constitution of exclusiveness and the delegation of the competence of reaching decisions to certain political groups. In the representative political system we are confronted with asymmetries and dichotomies in a double sense. First, the dichotomy of electorate/elected politicians. Second, the dichotomies or binary codes of government/opposition and majority/minority. The organization of the state functions in accordance with the principles of exclusion and competition, the political laws that are produced are exclusive social structures. Dynamic types of political self-organization where decision power is re-distributed and re-produced permanently occur in organizations and systems that are based on the principles of direct democracy and self-government. In such systems there is a more symmetrical distribution of power and all individuals concerned by certain collective decisions participate in the constitution of these decisions. In processes of discursive communication they try to reach a consensus on certain decisions. In modern society, laws are constituted by a certain subsystem of politics (government, parliament), such a type of political autopoiesis is inherently hierarchical, asymmetrical and a type of top-down-constitution of decisions.

Enlarging the scope of participation in political systems means shifting the system's self-organization towards more dynamic states that are based on symmetrical distributions of power and bottom-up-constitutions of decisions. Such political systems are dynamical, decentralized and have a networked, co-operative, participative character. Co-operation is a form of human co-action that involves mutual dependence, benefits of all actors, shared goals, reaching of goals in a more quick and efficient manner than on an individual basis, communication about goals and conventions in order to reach a common understanding, concerted use of existing structures in order to commonly produce new structures, mutual learning, the common production of new reality, interconnectivity, mutual responsibility and a high degree of networked, interconnected activity [Fuchs, 2003c]. Parliament, the party system, representative democracy and elections are important aspects of many modern states, but they are not necessarily part of the state as fascist and totalitarian rules have shown. In such systems, the system of democracy is abolished and substituted by a one-party system, repression against opposing forces and dictatorship. Both the fascist

systems in Italy and Germany and Stalinism were based on a State system without democracy and were inherently modern societies in the sense that they were based on the modern mode of economic self-organization, i.e. capital accumulation.

The self-organization of the state is closely related to the self-organization of the economy not only in the sense that both are based on accumulation processes. Economic self-organization means the accumulation of money capital: These accumulation processes are autopoietic or self-producing in the sense that the system reproduces itself by increasing the quantitative amount of its elements, i.e. it transforms its elements and herewith creates its unity. In the economic cycle of self-organization this means that from an initial quantity of capital more capital is produced. Capitalism is based on self-increasing, self-valorizing, self-expanding cycles of capital accumulation where capital is produced by labour power and in wage labour processes. These autopoietic economic cycles are based on private property and wage labour relationships.

The state regulates economic self-organization, i.e. its own self-organization organizes certain necessary conditions of economic accumulation. The maintenance and actualization of property rights is an important aspect of the self-organization of politics that enables the self-organization of the modern economy. The state and the economy are structurally coupled and mutually dependent, the economy is in need of certain laws that enable economic accumulation, the state depends on economic accumulation and the taxes derived from capital and wage labour. Economic and political self-organization are mutually dependent and coupled, their autonomy is only a relative one. This means that in order to make capital accumulation possible for a certain period of time, political regulation of the economy is necessary. The state realizes in its self-organization certain general conditions necessary for economic self-organization. The economy can't cope with its own complexity, it can't organise itself all the conditions necessary for its self-organization. Hence the state takes over certain of these tasks and integrates them into its own self-organization and helps to reduce the complexity of the economy. These activities of the state can include welfare, wage policy, labour legislation, subsidies, taxation, property rights, regulation of competition, antitrust laws, contract laws, research politics and subsidisation, central bank policies etc. The capitalist economy is a crisis-ridden, antagonistic system that in its development produces "market failures". The state tries to compensate for these failures in many respects. The basic conditions of economic self-organization secured by the self-organization of the state can also include the organization and maintenance of infrastructures like transportation, energy supply, communication, education. These infrastructures *can* have and frequently do have a public character, but this must not be the case as the privatization and deregulation of public infrastructure that has taken place in many countries in recent years shows.

The state holds a centralized control/monopoly of the means of violence and is organized within a certain natural and social territory. The self-organizing processes of society take place within strictly defined boundaries. Means of violence are used in order to secure the self-organization of society, the state protects society from external and internal

influences that threaten its self-organization. The nation state is based on a certain territory, it has natural and social boundaries that are defended with the threat of using violence. The self-organization of modern society takes place within this bounded territory. The nation state is a precondition of the organization of an economic system of accumulation because regulatory rules and the organization of the infrastructure of the economy is efficiently possible only within a bounded territory that is controlled by a system that monopolizes the means of violence. The development of the modern economy and the modern state system was a process of co-evolution, hence both are based on similar principles and depend on each other. Economic self-organization is based on wage labour, the effective organization of wage labour relationships is only possible within a bounded territory that is controlled by the nation state. The modern nation state is both based on the notion of the individual as citizen that has certain basic rights and the idea of the individual as private owner of property and labour power.

The organization of the modern economy, i.e. of separate, controlled markets for commodities and labour power, is only possible within such a bounded territory that is secured and defended by the state. The bounded territory is also necessary for maintaining a unified administrative apparatus. The state's monopoly of violence consists of both internal defence (police, legal system, secret service) and external defence (military, secret service). The differentiation between internal and external aspects of defence of the system's boundary has resulted in the differentiation between the police and the standing army. Political colonialism means the enlargement of the border of the state by making use of violent means. Warfare is the central means of the state for defending and enlarging its bounded territory. Where the enlargement of economic spheres was coupled with warfare activities of the state one formerly talked about imperialism. Today many countries worldwide (although not all) abhor from entering warfare with other nation state, there is a certain degree of pacification of international struggles characteristic for the post world war II-situation. This also has to do with the development of extremely dangerous nuclear, biological and chemical weapons that can't be used by one side without suffering the same destruction as the enemy. This paradox situation has made international relations more dangerous, but has also advanced dialogue to a certain extent. The horror and terrors of the military expansion of the autopoiesis of National Socialism have shown to many countries and political communities that violence is not an adequate means of international relations and communication. However, even after the end of the cold war period not all states and groups are willing to engage in civilized dialogue, but make use of armed interventions and attacks in order to enlarge their spheres of influence. The aim of these interventions is the steering of the self-organization of certain states and regions by certain other self-organizing nation state systems that consider themselves as central forces and actors of the self-organization of the world society. Enlarging economic influence today is mainly an economic process within the self-organization of the world market and the world economic system. Corporations enlarge the boundaries of

their self-organization and hence their influence by globalizing and decentralizing production.

The state system that as a central feature is based on violence and the threat of using violence doesn't use violence as an end in itself. It is structurally coupled to other self-organizing subsystems of society and makes use of coercion in order to guarantee the self-organization of overall society and of its subsystems (economy, politics, culture). Both a bounded territory and violence are central features of the state. Legitimization is another aspect of the nation state: the existence of the means of violence in the hands of the state and their usage must be explained and justified. The legitimization of violence has become a permanent affair of politics. One can observe this phenomenon especially during times of warfare and its prearrangements.

Anthony Giddens (1985) stresses that the emergence of the "internally pacified state" that centralizes the means of violence and hence prevents armed struggles between opposed classes was accompanied and enabled by a large expansion of the apparatuses of surveillance and bureaucratic administration. Giddens argues that the nation state is a "power container" [Giddens, 1985: 13] that stores and concentrates authoritative and allocative resources and that with the rise of capitalism the nation state replaced the city as the most important power container.

Whenever a system organizes itself, it produces information. Re-creative, i.e. social systems, reproduce themselves by creating social information. Social structures store information about society. Social information structures contain information about past social actions and the history of a social system, they reduce the complexity of the system and simplify future social situations because by referring to social information the foundations of social action do not have to be newly constituted in each social situation by human agents. Power structures are the political type of social information (political information), technologies, means of production, property and goods constitute economic information and definitions (norms, values, traditions, ideologies) cultural information. The nation state is a container of structures and hence not only a power container, but also a meta-storage mechanism: It stores and concentrates structures that store information about society. The nation state is a meta-storage of social information structures.

Giddens' theory of structuration suggests such a usage of the term information in the social sciences [Giddens, 1981: 35, 39, 94f, 144, 157-181; Giddens, 1984: 180-185, Giddens, 1985: 13f, 172-197]. He argues that there are storage capacities in society which enable the existence of institutional forms which persist across generations and shape past experiences that date back well beyond the life of any particular individual. Allocative and authoritative resources can be stored across time-space distances. Storage of authoritative resources involves the retention and control of information. In non-literate societies the only "container" storing information were human memory, tradition and myths. Writing and notation have allowed a certain time-space distancing of social relationships. Other forms of storing information that have followed and have caused further time-space distancing are cities, lists, time-tables, money, money capital, nation-states, communication and

transportation technologies in general and especially the rapid-transit transportation and electronic communication technologies (including electromagnetic telegraph, telephone and computer mediated communication). Social information advances the time-space distancing of social relationships. [Giddens, 1985] emphasizes the relationship between surveillance and the nation state. He argues that the nation-state and surveillance have become the fundamental mechanisms of integration of modern society. "Surveillance as the mobilising of administrative power – through the storage and control of information – is the primary means of the concentration of authoritative resources involved in the formation of the nation-state" [Giddens, 1985: 181]. With capitalism, a global world system emerges. The modern state makes use of surveillance in the sense of gathering information about the subject population in order to allow overall organization and control. Information gathering includes data on births, marriages, deaths, taxation, criminal records, demographic and fiscal statistics, 'moral statistics' (relating to suicide, divorce, delinquency and so on) etc. and results in the power of the state and bureaucratic organization. Computer technology expands surveillance in the sense of information control. Modern technology also allows a technical control and supervision of workers that is a much more anonymous form than face-to-face supervision that was used in the early days of capitalism. In capitalist societies, administrative organizations such as business firms, schools, universities, hospitals, prisons etc. are centres for the concentration of resources and the nation-state is the most important power container allowing a massive concentration and control of resources. Aspects that have been involved in the consolidation of the administrative unity of the nation-state include the mechanization of transportation, the severance of communication from transportation by the invention of electronic media and the expansion of documentary activities of the state. With electronic modes of storage, the second and third aspect would have increasingly emerged. The nation state is a power container, a meta-storage of social information structures and a system that implements the self-observation of society. In order to maintain and reproduce itself and to foster the various autopoietic self-reproductions of its subsystems, society must observe itself. Surveillance understood in Giddens' sense of information gathering about the activities of the citizens is a central feature of the nation state's observation of society. These processes of observation are based on information-generation and -processing, statistics and lists are traditionally employed for organizing these processes. The rise of computerized information technology gives new means to the state that are employed to optimize information gathering and processing, i.e. the self-observation of society. Computer networks and databases are a powerful means for self-observation and increase the potential power of the state. Digital information can easily be combined, linked and connected. Hence the new electronic means of self-observation pose not only new possibilities, but also a threat of establishing a dense network of control and totalitarian forms of self-observation. The expansion of storage capacities generates power, complex power structures require responsible management.

In order to simplify the self-observation of modern society that is organized by the state, the modern state is based on an individualisation into individual citizens, labour forces, commodity owners, private owners and voters. The individual is granted certain rights such as the rights to organize, express himself, vote, run for public office, assemble himself with others, make use of different sources of information and to choose his own religion. These citizenship rights are necessary conditions for the economic and political self-organization of modern society, Giddens stresses that civil rights “are intrinsically linked to the modes of surveillance involved in the policing activities of the state. Surveillance in this context consists of the apparatus of judicial and punitive organizations in terms of which ‘deviant’ conduct is controlled” [Giddens, 1981: 205]. The state as a modern organization is based on the definition of membership, it organizes the rights it grants to individuals along the differentiation between citizen/non-citizen. In order to maintain a border of the modern state system it is necessary to define who is allowed to live, work, vote and contribute to economic, political and cultural self-organization. The nation state is necessarily based on exclusion and a differentiation of membership status. The members of a territorially bounded society have different rights that are determined by their status and along the definition of citizen/non-citizen. The definition of membership is necessary in order to construct national markets for commodities and labour forces. The formation and maintenance of a bounded territory is based on the formation and violent maintenance of a difference between the system and its environment. This border between system and environment defines a differentiation between inside and outside of society. In order to legitimise and maintain itself, the state system must describe itself. National identity is the result of the self-description of society. The state constructs a common identity of its members in order to create the unity that is necessary for maintaining the autopoietic processes that constitute a society that is organized within national boundaries. In describing itself society refers to and fosters constructed symbols of unity such as language, traditions, origin, money, culture. The existing boundaries of a nation state are a result of various conflicts, wars and international treaties. Originally culturally, economically and politically relatively autonomous groups of people have been artificially united within one nation state. The existence of various minorities and regional traditions, idioms, symbols, practices and habits is an expression of the artificial character of the nation. A united, centrally controlled territory is in need of an identity that legitimizes the common sharing of a part of space-time by a vast number of people. This organization and unification of space-time is a necessary condition for the economic and political autopoiesis of modern society. The nation is a symbolic, imaginary community that functions as the self-description of the state and is the result of the process of describing society that is organized by the state. The education system is an important institution in establishing and maintaining the ideological self-description of society.

The self-organization processes of the economy and politics of modern society are both in need of active human agents (labour force and citizens). One role of the state is the

facilitation of population growth by managing population policy. All social self-organization processes within society are in need of biological autopoiesis in the sense that the reproduction of the species is necessary for supplying active human beings that enter social relationships in order to maintain and reproduce self-organizing social systems. The biological autopoiesis of the human being is in modern society coupled to the self-organization of the economy and politics, people have to enter and actively participate in these systems in order to survive and maintain their own biological and social autopoiesis. The family is the germ cell of economic and political self-organization, its autopoiesis produces human beings that sustain the self-organizing social processes of modern society.

The self-reproduction of modern society is necessarily based on a definition of membership/exclusion concerning membership, national identity and the family. The state organizes these three integrated and interrelated elements of modern society. The construction of artificial, imaginary identities concerning origin, ethnicity and gender are central features of the ideological function of the state. The description of society generated by the state produces clear cut identities along the lines of origin, ethnicity and gender and assigns certain roles to each identity and its opposite by fostering the difference between these roles. Each identity generated in the process of self-description comprehends itself in opposition to other identities that are frequently perceived as threats. The state’s involvement in migration and territorial control has ‘racial’ implications, its involvement in organizing citizenship ethnical implications and its involvement in family policy gender implications.

The modern state regulates the economy, it organizes and defends the autopoiesis of society within a bounded territory by making use of the monopoly of the means of coercion, it organizes the self-observation, self-containment and self-description of modern society and is a meta-storage mechanism of social information.

References

- [Fuchs, 2003a] Fuchs, Christian. *Structuration Theory and Social Self-Organization*. In: Systemic Practice and Action Research, Vol. 16 (2003), No. 2. pp. 133-167.
- [Fuchs, 2003b] Fuchs, Christian. *Some Implications of Pierre Bourdieu’s Works for a Theory of Social Self-Organization*. INTAS Project “Human Strategies in Complexity”-Research Paper. In: European Journal of Social Theory, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 385-406.
- [Fuchs, 2003c] Fuchs, Christian. *Co-operation in Complex, Self-Organising Systems*. In: tripleC (<http://triplec.uti.at/>), Vol. 1 (2003), No. 1, pp. 1-52.
- [Giddens, 1981] Giddens, Anthony. *Power, Property and the State*. London/Basingstoke. Macmillan
- [Giddens, 1984] Giddens, Anthony. *The Constitution of Society*. Berkeley. University of California Press.
- [Giddens, 1985] Giddens, Anthony. *The Nation-State and Violence*. Cambridge. Polity Press
- [Luhmann, 2000] Luhmann, Niklas. *Die Politik der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt/Main. Suhrkamp.