

From Christian Anarchism to a Universal Holism

In my previous writings, for as unserious as they will be taken, for as much as they will be scorned as some sort of improvisations which do not slightly stand against any proper theory, I think I gave the slight impression of being somewhat of an anarchist or at least prompting a destructive philosophy which may or may not be somewhat rescued by some kind of spirituality.

This is somewhat the impression I might have given, and yes this impression could be very well supported by the fact that indeed all the intellectuals I have been almost magnetically attracted to have been thus far labeled as Christian anarchists. Despite the massive post-modern criticism that those white dead men have been exposed to, in my autodidact upbringing I cannot deny I have pivoted around folk such as Thoreau, Ellul and Tolstoy whose words and lives have to some degrees been etched in my reasonings.

I have disregarded somehow the idea that one ought to necessarily be Christian and that Christ, in my way of thinking, was part of a more general scattered anti-imperialist movement, he was with Seneca and Musonius and many other stoic/cynic thinkers a philosophical prophet warning humans against the epicurean failure of a newly born empire.

Similarly, in the whole of human civilizations and its history these sort of prophetic figures have always emerged to attempt to lead the mass back to a life according to nature. I already made in my writings many parallels to highlight how even Thoreau and Tolstoy are two characters leading to an alternative in a moment of great and dramatic transformation. We could apply similar parallels to smaller and more remote and unknown civilizations.

Now I am not here to make a fair justice about the theory I am trying to set forward, I am just trying to highlight a cultural phenomena of which I am also a member, a phenomena based on a particular moment of time in which small democracies turn into more or less direct forms of empire, a moment in which few stands out of a crowd precipitating towards such imperilization, the very few that in their much unpopular work set an alternative to a more less imminent collapse.

In this respect all this paragraphs I have written, I not only believe that the appellative Christian should be removed but also anarchist overall. What I mean to say is that culturally speaking the prophetic figure I am referring to is not barking against society nor he is literally prophesying any kind of apocalypse, he is simply advocating for a life spent more in accordance to nature, more frugal and less inclined to the on side pleasure oriented and on the other side enslaving life bringing society overall so astray.

This advocacy is not shouted in squares to the mass but it stands out as a constantly blinking star firm over the hurricanes of transformation. The prophetic figure is thus a stoic, and his mayor work is his or her own life most firm as some kind of a lighthouse for the very few who have the capacity to spot it in the dominating and electrifying chaos of total transformation.

In my understanding then the philosophical figures I am referring to are warning against the magical promises brought forth by the new forms of imperialistic automations and attempts to show how to not make miracles then but how he or she can create authentic magic just by simply living and proliferate in accordance not to more and more imperialistic and nature oppressing social rules but according to the natural rules he or she is able to identify in his or her life.

So while the social establishments make its fake magics as much as much as it sold the miracles of a super hero Jesus for centuries, the real Jesuses are those who simply show the miracle of life by demonstrating how prolific it can be by simply adhering to it alone without all the miracle apparatus promised by the establishment in return for our enslavement.

In this respect it makes little sense to also use the appellative anarchist; while being cynical about the ever more sophisticated social rules our philosophers do not believe in a no rule state but in rules that are more in accordance to nature or rather they believe that the very life in accordance to nature shows the common sense he or she needs to not only take care of his or her self and surrounding but also of entire communities, bringing them back on track.

As I claimed many times the very idea of turning a philosophy of returning to nature into a new form of empire was the greatest and most undermining invention of a Roman empire that still lives to our days. Even the most anti-religious establishments are filled with pseudo Christian morality from which we ought to stand out as individuals simply concerned not in the dogmatic preservation of the dogma that rises from it but fully concerned to the effect that these very generated dogmas have on the actual society in bringing them more and more astray from a life according to their own nature.

Stoic philosophers of today do not need to study and read but simply need to live most simply and most simply abstain from the imperialistic algorithms of enslavements in order to fully grasp where and what the imperialistic society as a whole is going to hit. It is not a philosophy nor a religion of consolation as that very much appreciated by the governing classes, it is not the liquor of a right wing anti-tranformation politics, it is the water that will be given to the surviving social members once the wall will be hit in full

speed, it is the water that will bring them to some sense.

For now, in the impossibility of reestablishing a connection to nature as a whole, so much social members have been tighten up to imperialistic governance, my question is thus how to proceed. There is a vertical top down regiment from which not a single geographical municipality can escape and no anarchic revolution can really set forth without great violence. Our philosopher is relegated to the function of being constant in his or her life example to which people may or may not be attracted yet is he or she just supposed to maintain such constancy only in the event of a natural collapse of governance?

So much is any form of imperialistic governance with all its automated regimentality going against nature that our philosophy knows of its inevitable fall. Yet is he or she not even to boost this fall a little? I believe that he or she ought to be a constant work and that any early confrontation may in fact damage the constancy of such work and may in fact bring he or she away from the most essential element of whole, his or her life spent entirely in accordance to his or her nature, entirely and constantly in dialog with it and with its many manifestations rising from both within the philosopher, around him or her and beyond it.

I believe that the sort of shamanic philosophical figure I have in mind is the master of such communication. Not a guru with special power or extraordinary sensitivity but just simply a bare human fully reconnected to a natural mechanism from which the technological society itself fully detaches us from. It is not such a mystical divine channeling I am advocating for but a simple day to day intense relation to the whole of our existence; not then the constitution of a super human but the dissolution of the self into the whole.