**Drafted comments MK about Sari's paper "About the war on Gaza"**

Firstly: As you rightly say, thinking about all this is almost impossible, since one's mind is wiped away by facing all the cruelties. However, though this makes one's mind furious and it is almost impossible to think about all this, there is no other way, we must give the priority to our thoughtful minds the more our feelings are challenged - and not the other way round. I admit, reading your thoughts, my abilities to think were again challenged, similar to yours. We will handle this, the debate is too important.

Secondly, now my very drafted thoughts about your paper*:*

I want to refer to two quotations, one from your paper, the second one from your email:

*"I don't see any settler colonial project that was evicted only through negotiation before establishing a certain balance of power and this is often done by making this project so costly. Algeria succeeds its independence after 1.5 million martyrs." (paper)*

*"….for now I fully agree with you about the crisis of the nation-state yet we need to be careful how to have an ummatic/civilizational imagination while dealing with everyday problems of p*eople." (email)

In line with the current view among all critical thinkers all around the world, describing every phenomenon of poverty and oppression as an expression of lacking "*independence"*, your analysis "About the war on Gaza" in your paper has run its course: not only does it perceive the phenomenon of poverty and oppression also in the case of Gaza as a case of a non-existent statehood of the Palestinians, but it also follows in the strategy of their "liberators" in Gaza as a struggle for their own statehood phrased in your paper via your notion of fighting for "independence".

I firstly want to elaborate on my critique about this fight for independency, i.e. for a state for the Palestinians a bit - and sorry again for my slightly emotional way of phrasing things. And then, secondly, I will roughly draft a number of questions I think are is utterly crucial to be raised after looking at the history of the very successful fights for independence, which in the case of Gaza is – as I see it - still going on, fights for independency guided and used by the world powers for their world power politics, with all its wellknown dramas, known from the history of these fights for independence, including how they were used for the rivalries among the world powers .

Before drafting my questions: Why on earth do critics of this view of all evil in this world as a case of a continuation of colonialism not want to learn from 5o years of experience with all the de-colonisation projects and, in view of its results (I have to elaborate here on what they are), ask themselves whether the political strategy against poverty and oppression interpreted as a matter of their lacking statehood not even consider the possibility, whether there might be something wrong with this strategy for "independence", that is of a statehood? At least the simple observation that these projects for independence have led the way to a copy of the political conception of the ways conceptualizing and organizing societies adopting the concepts of the oppressors, doing these imitations without ever questioning their meaning and purposes and thus now carry out with their own new independent states the same poverty and oppression now under their own direction with their own state powers, is this not creating any hezitations about these projects for an independent statehood? And they, these new independent states, is it not obvious, that they do the continuation of poverty and oppressions as before for the benefits of the former colonial master states, who are indeed no longer colonialists like because it is not just one one powerful state any longer, but now the entirety of all the imperialists?
And then this independence? What has become of it? Never before have the countries constructed now as independent states been more dependent on the entirety of the world's

wealthy and powerful states. Unless you do it like China and become an imperialist yourself. Is that really what you advocate? Certainly not.

So, based on these historical experiences, substantial points to be discussed are these:

1. How did the projects for independence actually really go – what happened in all those historical examples towards independent states, in which their fights against the oppressors developed from their previous anti-capitalism to their wars for independency - with all its masses of dead people.

2. And what has come out of these wars? Did ordinary people with their "every days problems" - as you write - benefit from achieving independency? What they got was it not the continuation of poverty and oppression?

3. What are the contributions from the SU Marxism and it's ways of building an alternative society model ( the finally terminated and went back to capitalism) to the fatal conceptualization of the contemporary falsely coined enemy as a continuation of colonialism = no *real* independence state fighting for a really independent state,

4. And how come that a fight for a nation state ruled society for which the thousands of killed fighters are not a proof for a wrong fight for a wrong aim, but are even celebrated - with a religiously interpreted mission stemming from the uncivilized absolutism - as martyries?

5. We also should think about this: Are there contributions from critical sociology: the notion of a „crisis of the nation-state" – as you phrase it - is very much inline with contemporary sociology - is to my mind the very way to insist despite of all the historical experiences on the typical sociological idealism about nation states, an idealism constituting sociological thinking. And this is why - as you write - we have to be careful about the civilization progress nation states represent. Isn`t this a progress that you advocate to be careful about based on the comparison between democracy and absolutism, and this after 200years of living with the civilization progress of nationhood providing mankind with 200years of poverty and oppression more than ever before in history. What then is this civilization you say we must be careful about?

6. This is why we finally do have to raise the question, what *the essentials of a nation state* and the society governed by nation states really are and what is the rationale of such a society and this political body.

**Essentials of state/citizen societies and their explosives**
Some points against state constructed societies

a. Externalized deciding making: In state constructed societies, citizens societies, all decisions concerning the communal live are not made by the citizens, but by another subject, their political body. Though dealing with the life matters of citizens societies, citizens are not the subject of the process of defining the agenda, of what about decisions must be made nor of the decision finding and making, all this is made by another subject, externalized from the society to the state, and these externalized decisions made by their political body taken away from the citizens are binding for the citizens as if they were made by themselves. The social life and its objectives carried out by citizens are only theirs, not because they share them, but because they are forced to practice them, not because they want them, but because they must want them.

b. Decision making is not only externalized from the society towards a political body, the political body has an exclusive decision monopole over the concerns of these societies and what this political body decides is not only binding for the citizens, but is imposed on them by the forces of law with the power monopole of this political body, a decision power taken away from the

citizens to the political body and monopolized with the power monopole and imposed on them with this power monopole via threatening them with interventions of this forces of violence this power monopole holds. Citizens are never asked what they think about the decisions made about them and their lives, the decisions are made elsewhere, are imposed on them and are binding, the means to persuade them is the violence they are threatened with in case of not following them. The explosive violence incorporated in this way of making communal decisions beyond and for the community, imposed by power and denying any interventions by the citizens, is obvious.
(Citizen societies are involved in a decision making in which no decisions made about them is decided. It is choice, in which they chose between the decision makers which decision makers they want to execute the decision making about them, a choice in which the choice to not chose decision makers over their lives is not a choice. The choice without a choice are elections.)

c. The decision monopolists justifies the exclusion of the society from the decision making due to the inabilities of the society to arrive at any shared decisions, shared among the citizens of these societies, due to the conflicting interests between the citizens, not saying that the conflicting interests are interests imposed on them by the decision monopolists as the only way to carry out their life agendas.

d. Citizen are offered to pursue their live agendas as they like, given that they pursue their live agendas via and dependent on the availability of money in the hands of individual citizens. Money is not only a radical negation of materialistic live interests of citizens, this representation of a negation of materialism turns out to be the overall objective of citizen societies as a whole that rules citizens lives towards serving the rationale of money, the growth of this type of negative wealth. Using things for the consumption in this rationale of money is a violation of using it for its growth. These conflicts between the individual life agendas and the objective of citizen societies are conflicts giving birth to the violence in all social relations among the citizens, imposed on the society, domesticated by the power monopoly and directed towards the overall aim the decision monopolist sets as the criteria for the society ruling social live in these societies, the very growth of wealth ruling the live agendas of the citizens via their dependency on money for whatever they want as the exclusive means for pursuing any life aim and at the same time negating them.

e. Ruling any live agendas via money, the negation of material live interests, and its possession in the hands of individual citizens imposes not only the negation of material interests into the social relations between the citizens of these societies, but also conflictual relations between the citizens. If any social relations are carried out via the exchange of money all citizens use each other's live interests by negating them for the sake of appropriating money. The laws with which the decision monopolist forces the citizens to carry out the decisions it makes, are applied to anything and anyone citizen and rule how to carry out these conflicting interests towards the overall aim of these societies, the growth of this money wealth. (The distinction of these societies in different levels of money owners and what their relations are is too obvious…)

f. Citizen societies in a world of nation states: Due to their entire dependency on their decision and power monopolists citizens see their nation state as their guarantor for their existence and, hence, in a world of nation states they see other nation states and their citizens as a challenge for their existence. From this view the world is a battlefield of national societies fighting against each others about for jobs, that is of the existence (survival) of these national citizens societies. Nationalism and hence the demarcation and hostility towards other nationals and their state is a natural feature of citizen societies in a world of nation states, thus the reservoir of violence ready for their explosion if needed for the rivalries of these nation states…..

g. If this society with all its normal violence fuels this nationalism of its citizens, they anyway need to have to believe in their state as a means for them, because this is the only means they are given in a world in which citizens without a nation state are a nothingness , if this nationalism is fueled with racial disputes about whose state this state is and if these states mobilize this racism for their wars to sort this, who their citizens are, sort this out among nation state projects and do this in the process of building nation states and the building of their subordinated societies in this world of nation states and all their rivalries, the explosion of violence is no surprise. The fact that Genocide is condemned in such conflicts among nation states shows how easily this happens in these wars.
Conclusion: The violence we see in the war on Gaza is not because the two sides of this violence are lacking established one or two states, but because they are in the process of establishing state societies.

7. What is then this war on Gaza particularly about, who are the parties, not only the two fighting, but all those involved directing and using this war towards their aims and who is aiming here at what.

8. What then remains would be an alternative to fighting for independence. What else to fight for and against: And this needs also to be discussed because the fundamental flaw in the pursuit of independence is that it has completely lost sight of what it is all about: ending poverty and oppression. Just like in the SU, by the way, which replaced the fight against poverty with the fight for a workers' and peasants' state. And this is another issue, which massively influenced reflections about what is the enemy and how to fight against this….

9. And then finally, how do you better fight poverty and oppression than fighting for statehood? Since the world has forgotten this: What does this mean and how to do this?