

On Denationalized Universalism

From the time in which the possibility for any citizen of a state to govern the state has come true, the discussion has merely focused on what sort of agenda should be stressed forward. Contemporary debate has therefore more and more focused on whether governance should be favoring more one or another class. Even those political agendas that are not tailored to advance one class over another, they are agendas tailored to protect these classes by for example not allowing any more migrants to be part of a state so as to implicitly have more resources available for older and national classes.

All the political focus is thus consumed in a large orchestration of promises aiming to favor the electoral body, aiming to gain more votes from it based on the allocations of resources and rights it can get. In the richer countries however the citizens have reached such level of financial privileged the whole agenda is based on conserving such a state and pretty much only working on its branding, on its image as much as a rich man or woman would do once he or she becomes rich.

Rich countries are therefore like rich men, the new aristocrats fully focused on their appearance. They have almost forgotten the schemes they have set up to in fact maintain their wealth, schemes that no matter all the philanthropy they set forward to display are very much in operation. Yes we can say that under a rich country all citizens have all their rights fully respected but this is only at the expenses of all the poor countries, the peasants of the aristocrat states.

We cannot therefore take any pride in all the human rights the aristocrat states elaborates just as a surface on top of the mechanisms they have set up to maintain a certain geopolitical and geoeconomic unbalance. Anarchically speaking it is the very entity of a state that precludes the possibility for an equal share of resources especially when the many poor states try themselves to mimic the few rich states. It is right in this mimicking that the greatest forms of oppression are occurring today, it is right in this rush to attempt to gain an aristocratic look at least for the governing bodies of the poor states at the expenses of its people.

In this circumstance one can easily attempt to come up with new schemes of solidarity among states and a gradual and more fair yet very much artificial redistribution of resources and so forth yet once again state operates in the interest of those who wants to maintain certain privileges and only these states who have excessive wealth can share crumbs with others. Do anyway the poorer states wants to depend on these crumbs? The issue here is not to loose the focus on this sort of deadlock that the very formation of a state based globalization has created.

The breaking down of nations in favor for a myriad of communities that are not controlled by any sort of hierarchical power would be the way for humans to move out of this deadly political grip. It is a dream, it is indeed an ideal yet it is not an ideology pursuing certain theories, dictating certain rules and dogmas, imposing certain type of superstitions, it is just but how life should but how life cannot be mostly due to a technological progress which cannot allow a community to leave without the threat of a neighbour sooner or late seizing power over it with the use advanced weapons.

This is by far the only problem that could occur in thinking of a denationalized world along of course with the need for everyone willing to undertake such plan. Yet sooner or later it will be clear that states are like machines and machines ought to keep on running, they ought to keep on sophisticating at the expense of our own life on earth. Yes there is a time in which these machines set forward to look after the rights of its citizens but the machines keeps on, it cannot stop and it is doomed to bring its subjects in ever more unnatural realms.

If a state machine keeps on running undisturbed even if there are no consequences for the subject within it who can likely live in their beautiful bubble, the consequences can very emerge elsewhere, especially for those states that are more or less sustaining these bubble aristocrat states. There is such a sense of pride for the efficiency and discipline of a functioning state and its function its strictly determined from the malfunctioning of other bureaucracies, from the exploitation that can so well indirectly set in without making their hands dirty.

We can be so radical as to say that there is no wealth without injustice and that injustice today, in our more or less global reality is carried out in a very indirect and clean manner. This is why aristocrats states can have the luxury to focus on all their human right nuances and embellished dresses just fully obsessed to stare themselves on their expensive mirrors. A question here rises on how much one ought to bother up this unbalanced and unfair global situation.

Can one think that the rich states will like aristocrats sooner or later loose their minds and sort of loose in all their vanity their grip on the global power they pretty much unaware hold in their hands? Is this how we should conceive history, as a succession of people gaining power and then loosing it after being intoxicated by it? Or better is there still such an historical evolution in place or has the modern nations cemented the world order?

It is very likely that a certain world order has been in fact cemented and that changes hardly occur. This could lead to think of two situations. The first is that if change doesn't

occur within these cemented national framework the result is death. I mean that in such a world order turned stagnant by modern nations, the only way for life to procreate within it is for governance to continuously inject change. Having lost any identity with the natural environment, the middle class subject of a state ought to undergo a pretty much artificial mutation which enables it to survive its very stagnation.

This concept comes close to that of the propaganda of agitation that a tyrant ought to constantly set in order to also maintain his or her absolute power status. Now I extend this concept by saying that any form of governance ought to bring in a certain level of agitation this in accordance with its principles. Thus in a capitalist driven governance new subjects ought to be imported and new life styles ought to be promoted constantly for the market to keep on thriving.

We may or may not agree with the first situation I have hinted. The second situation is more traditional and coincides with a state that does not so much accept to inject unnatural mutations onto its society of clerks. Instead it feeds these clerks with the age old strong liquor of a national identity, it enforces the stagnation and commits suicide in just another manner but in the end bringing the nation into either civil war and or war against other nations or simply into death with an aging population slowly dying out.

Can one see other scenarios for nation states? Obviously any other more constructive and positivist scenarios can only be seen in the formation of a state but not once a state has reached its mature role especially within the global village it ought to more or less belongs to. And in the context of the global village a state has very little time to mature; a state, no matter how young it is, has to quickly come of age and quickly take up its role most likely as a servant of the old established nation aristocracy.

It is under these scenarios that one ought to strongly consider the idea of a world without nations, of a life without a state apparatus, a life that from passive ought to turn active and ought to take up the self-management of local reality in relation to and not isolated from many other global realities maintaining and not cementing themselves a sort of flux of universalism among them.

This scenario of self-governance brings forward a lot of challenges that ought to be tested out and that were never tested out given that as soon as self-governance has been established, a centralizing and state driven force has take over it. The first challenge is therefore this one, how can self-governance if it ever manages to establish itself can assure it can survive without being instantly engulfed?

The cemented constitutions of nations can hardly allow any such scenario and one can only await for them to implode. In the meantime it is necessary to experiment with self-

governance on an individual and small community set up, to develop tactics by which one can keep a foot in and a foot out of the system so as to also have the capacity to reflect on further implications of denationalized global scenario above all the handling of these massive technological apparatuses brought forward by the industrial revolution onward.

In the first place one should boost those technologies that may actually facilitate the possibility for a more autonomous existence understanding the impact of our reliance to for example technologies that do not require any human effort. The focus should be thus put on these technologies that not only make us active agents in our survival but that are also simple and long-lasting and easy to fix and to power with resources that are locally available, where possible.

Yet all this scenario is strictly limited by a nation state which not only would not benefit from such genuine and independent realities but also limit from the start its existence by turning de facto impossible to do any form of exploitation without a strict regulation. Now this regulation should be completely loosen for those who wish to undergo an autonomous survival without capitalist interest and most of all those who exploit natural resources in a manual and thus renewable manner, choosing the shovel over the excavator.

Possibly in the scenario in which we understand that the only way to coexist with the planet is to go back to a human scale, the one right we ought to really fight for is that in our will to become self-sustainable individuals all forms of top to bottom governance ought to be uplifted at least for these individuals. Perhaps not so many are in fact willing to set forth on such attempt yet these few can work as a great model for the many to pursue not only a physical but also an intellectual life without any imposed and numbing framework.

I am here therefore hinting at the very first of the right one ought to achieve, that of being allowed to be freed from state-governance to undergo a process of self-governance. Without this right we will keep on living forever in a limbo and our only option is to push forward in the underground, in the liminal crack still left ungoverned. I am here also talking about a rather mental indoctrination filled with easy and mainstream moralities that the very state set forward in correlation with its capitalist agenda.

At this point only examples are necessary and a new sort of underground culture promoting as well just plainly illustrating the attempts to be autonomous under the tighter and more pervasive governance we are experiencing and the shadow of more

conflicts and catastrophes that its bureaucratic and bureaucratizing apparatus is setting forward.