

The New School of Life

Is there a distinction to be made between the philosophy of the past and this of today? Generally speaking I believe that, speaking more specifically about the West, the rising of Christianity has somewhat detached philosophy from its soul, meaning Christianity has sabotaged and, one could say, kidnapped life from philosophy, ethics. Philosophy as such has become a body without soul, a most pedantic and vane dead corpse. This opinion can be applied to all philosophical cultures in which a monotheistic religion has been somewhat imposed.

Now prior to adopting monotheistic religions, cultures were striving with philosophers actively making of their life a model of virtue. These philosophers had their own philosophical frame of operation and a certain degree of freedom. During Christianity saints might have undertaken a similar path in making their lives most virtues however always under the final ultimate scrutiny of the church. How many were in this respect the saints who could not become saints and yet how many were the vicious saints who only came to replace the pagan gods eradicated by Christianity itself?

In this rather simplistic and simplified view of my comparative understanding prior and during Christianity I shall now acknowledge the fact that the contemporary philosophers rather than breaking free from all the priesthood which has now suffocated humanity in the west and beyond for over two thousands years, rather than returning to the ethical conduct of previous philosophers they dwell in highly commodified church-like institutions with their various orders and rules and, worst of all, their honours and hierarchies.

It seems then that treating the subject of the human soul cannot escape the scrutiny of the evil, I mean evils, scholars only able to paint bigger evils as much as priests have done for the past twenty centuries. A philosophical tradition constituted merely on human as well as, why not, divine matters is non existing and it cannot exist as the educational system is in itself to blindfold to awake pupils to real matters. More than ever we are in a moment of history in which we could get rid of the yoke of the churches and the academies and could by all means reestablish a connection with the old ethical tradition.

More than ever this bridge to antiquity is needed. It is needed because once again, as two thousands years ago a new form of imperialism is upcoming, an imperialism that could give rise to a new form of spiritual oppression. To be free we ought to be like classic philosophers and replace those scientists and a modern science completely lost in relativity. Our life ought to become our major work and out of it and only out of it a new form of wisdom ought to take place. Let's be clear then with our offspring that it is

life itself and not the conferencing and the book publishing and the career and all the safe arguments we deliver to be of matter within institutions that have absolutely no impact on humanity, let's be clear that it is in our modus vivendi, it is in our way of living that a change for the good can be made.

My question then is how should we, the unofficial philosophers sensing this opportunity as well as this threat, how are we to act? How are we to prepare for the new school of life and how are we to sabotage the dangerous and dogmatic institution of the soul? I believe that by simply conduction our life with virtue, living according to our nature and acknowledging it, it is already an arduous path that on one side let us think of what the principles of this school of life should be and on the other side irremediably confront these institution.

The more we set in the undertaking of our nature the more we become a monolith, a monolith most interfering with the core official representatives of human life, the guardian angels of the devil itself. I think here classic philosophy, both from the west and the east can teach us much in terms of how to renounce to a worldly life and how to stand forward like a Cato against the rise of the new imperialism. It teaches us how to not only to defy to be popular but also to defy the people itself, the very bombastic supporters of Cesar like figures. It teaches us to look within our human soul, deeply and intensively to find in its agitate darkness a lumi, the blink of a steady light, the star to follow.

In all due respect so much of our age reflects the age in which out of all the epicurean liberty a long age of blind spiritual oppression was set forth. All these values talked about by political figures and repeated by the people, adhering to them in a blind fashion, all the epicurean lifestyles bursting in our old republics, all the scandals and wars and money gains and new form of extreme as well as extravagant richness, are they not all precursors to an age of a new and dogmatic spiritual oppression?

As the frivolous age is setting in so are new unofficial philosophers starting their work for as to how to recover a life in accordance with our nature (please don't take me literal here, I am only referring to our inner nature of humans). Their philosophy is most empirical and yet how easily all this work can be swiped out by a sort of new mega religion that one feels already in the air with so many a people siding so fanatically for new values which in no time can give a new semi-god the possibility to transmutate everything to a new dogma.

In this respect I believe that we philosophers of the new school of life ought to be more daring and renounce the ride in the worldly hysteria yet do display the monolith within

us, do set it forward and do create a steady and stoic rock against which even the most gigantic forms of imperialistic establishment can crash against, only because it is a weak and improvised mortar holding all its particles together. Let's not fall in the temptation of becoming ourselves cement no matter how big and effortless the stature of our vanity and pride can get.

Mostly, under this reasoning let's also make an effort to maintain an inner unity so as not to provide the opportunity for the establishment to make ought of us more powder for their cement. In this respect let's always at all time refuse any sort of officiality, maintaining our status of natural free thinkers no matter how hard it is to endure such a state right because it is this very endurance which make us a stone that can be physically excluded but will forever weight a burden in the otherwise too light and astray minds of the conformists.

It is in the head of the conformist that our life example should weight, heavy enough not to let him or her set forth with his or her imperialistic ambitions. As long as there is an authentic example of a human life lived fully autonomously and therefore in confrontation with the norm, as long as folk could still sense a Socrate or a Jesus for that matter, or a Thoreau or a Gandhi or many unknown others like a Janina or Vivian or a Danielle, as long as there are these ascetic figures in the air imperialism and greedy ambitions are hindered, humans are kept back.

As long as we maintain ascetic we come to act as breaks of what is worldly and accelerators of what is spiritual or at least we come to act as living warnings. In a scientific driven society delegating only to empty official human matters this warning come less. New examples ought to be implemented ad this is, I strongly believe, by stimulating a new wave of asceticism, of renunciation and a spiritual monolithic erection of each and everyone deciding without any given framework regulating them to conduct such a life, to become the new most needed firm stars of a reality otherwise ending in a total disorienting darkness.