

## **On the Pursuit of Human Autonomy**

Is there something missing to the idea of an anarchist society, meaning a society without any form of political authority, a society made up of self-organized communities? Reading anarchists books, especially the more canonical ones, one cannot but grow a dislike for not only the governing elite but all the middle class making their governance work.

Nineteenth century anarchism was pretty much based on the assumption that a non-governed humanity could co-exist only starting from the labour class and their international brotherhood. A middle class or an upper class person could only be part of these new society without chains, by fully devoting him or herself to the cause of the labour class.

As I wrote in my previous essays this vision is no longer achievable at least in western countries where practically speaking labour workers have been replaced by robots or most likely by eastern low-paid workers enslaved by paradoxically Communist or at least oligarchic countries. Thus while any anarchist experiment was always cut short by state-oriented parties and we do not know how it can in fact develop into, there are no longer the right subjects today to even attempt such an experiment.

Society as a whole, at least in the west, has become fully intellectualized and bureaucratized to the very bottom. As I said then the assumption that only labour workers have the ability to self-organize and establish rightful communities while the clerks of the middle class are too derailed to do so, puts western society in a corner, that of a stagnating and dying mediocrity.

The only labour left in fact for us westerner is that of learning to be independent from the nation state systems from which since we are born we are forced to be part of. I believe that this is the real and only attempt with which it is possible to be able to orient and self-govern ourselves. This is not a going to the wild experience and an attempt not to starve to death. This is simply and foremostly the idea of living without being part of the system.

Living without being part of the system doesn't imply not being part of it. We can be within it without contributing to it but contributing to our own re-orientation, the re-evoking of a lost nature which is at the very premises to a self-governance that is by far individualistic but it is only the first step enabling us to love all others, especially those who undertake the same path.

If Henry David Thoreau went into a lake cabin to rediscover such dimension, we can

keep on living our life and don't have to go far. It is not as I said a brutal attempt to survive in a more or less urban space. It is a most reflective attempt, an attempt which brings us to the very core of our humanness. It is nothing new, it is the recovery of the philosophy of the past fed up with sophisticated academics, it is a roaming about philosophizing and living our reflective lives unplugged from the rising of awful empires.

As a matter of fact every rise of any empire is characterized by cynic like philosophers unplugging from it, surviving within it without complying to its hegemony. I think there is a most stark anarchist component to this attitude. Our very survival not complying to any imperialistic attitude is the very beginning of not a social revolution but rather a personal revolution which will turn us into the true leader of any organic community if the possibility for its raise ever occurs.

My approach here is most anti-ideological, it obliterates any sort of metaphysical idea, any theory applied onto reality. On the contrary I am proposing to break free from the social constructs in which we have all more or less been bred and start off from reality itself without following any preconceived path, any social career but allowing our human intuition in combination with the serendipity that life offers to take the lead on us.

In this respect our existences alone will necessarily bring real life to people despite all the pre-given construct that so much hinder their development and turn them into conformists, already creatures that are not only already dead but to some degree also brings death by for instance consuming natural resources and so on.

We know by now that there have been always regenerating forces emerging spontaneously in the social fabric but all these forces have always been abolished by the very governing apparatus who has set to include them in its power house. In this respect what it is most powerful against the death brought about by power is a true philosophy, a philosophy that makes it a point not to comply with power.

This anti-power philosophy then has nothing to do with the official and power subsidized philosophy. The latter, even in its most critical form are but sophistication bringing its followers astray and much away from reality. Nothing that will emerge out of sophisticated minds can ever be of any good for a humanity that more than ever needs to gets its overheated head back to reality.

Also with the advance of technology there is less and less any hope that any form of governance can in fact rise from the bottom without being in fact imposed from the top. The consequences thus are ever more dreadful and the need for philosophical minds to challenge the cold and impersonal machinery of any state is imperative but it as well a

natural phenomena.

Perhaps this essay presents in fact the need to not so much officialize this trend and turn it into some sort of sect which in not ime governance will put under its wings, but it is an essay aiming to clarify to any individual their scope so as to make him or her more determined to pursue what at this point I would define as human autonomy.

Anarchism in this sense I don't think is something to pursue. Perhaps we shall rather look into more transcendentalist philosophies gaining their mean without the use of violence nor in a sense religiously and passively. There is something in the very attempt to follow our own nature which is most frictioning with modern life and thus with the political and financial mechanisms which governs it.

This is thus far my intuition, an intuition I followed out of my own experience trying not to comply with any artificial set up but rather devoting my life to the examining and taking care of my own nature ultimately avoiding any form of establishment and social gratification or recognition. This path has brought me to clash with what I believe hinders human evolution and this is literally the attitude of certain people to comply with the system, a system which uses up our life without the possibility to regenerate it.

I understood regeneration can only come from within us, following this path and seconding the spontaneous surprises that our liberated nature has to offer. Stoically speaking within the ever more pervasive presence of governance, our duty is that of exhausting ourselves to keep it running and aside from it we become increasingly free to follow a vicious life and increasingly less free to follow up to our virtue.

Following our virtue is but counterproductive for the state machinery and in this we ought to rather follow up a Zeno like republic in which each individual to self-govern in a planet without borders nor hierarchies ought to in fact keep up his or her own self-discipline. Therefore Bakunin assumption of the innate capability of all labour workers to govern themselves ought to be challenged on this ground.

I believe that in search for the right character that can govern him or herself we ought to combine Anarchism and Stoicism. This character could be described in fact as whom keep on learning all the skills he or she needs to live autonomously while also keeping up with a self-examination of his or her own reality and progress in such becoming autonomous.

The self-governing character in this respect ought to be the culmination of a fully independent human being, thus not only the Roman aristocrat who enjoys philosophizing but he is materially dependent to his slaves nor only the labour worker

who knows how to use his or hands perhaps only to accomplish a very specific task but he or she is hindered from pursuing his or her autonomy particularly in combination with his or her intellectual development.

Thus here I am not talking about the intellectual kind who both the stoics and the anarchists disliked, the sophisticated and pedant academics, I am talking about a kind of experience driven and highly reflective intellectuality emerging from one's own deeds, I am not talking about becoming some sort of annoying parrot of any theories or canons but rather a fresh and genuine mind developing in accordance with the nature each one of us is engineered with.

If this development is not set in motion, I hardly think there can be any possibility for free and self-governed communities. Also I too often notice a tendency to not wanting to bother with such a great struggle to undertake the path hinted by our nature. The most prefer to follow the others in the highways the cultural mainstream hegemony have already opened up with its own power scheme in mind.

Perhaps the vision I am trying to set forward now is really the one again of the more or less solitary cynic philosophers roaming the empire and always reminding others about their freedom to pursue their nature despite of all the tightening state impositions wanting to get rid of such free spirits. I therefore think perhaps the most daring thing we ought to do is really to pursue the freedom of fully developing our own nature.

Our goal then is to first of all set up this mission and with it find an incredible and never exhausting energy to help and assist and be, contrary to expectations, the most opt to help out and devote oneself to the raise of a natural community, a community of people who ought to have necessarily taken at least one of their feet out of the governing system.