

Defining the Real Character of the Noble Soul

Who are noble souls? Seneca would think of those who are like stars firm in the sky while the storm below takes its course. He thought of the storm in terms of ordinary people and the calamities occurring to them. This by far means that there are aristocrats and there are poor people having to live through many calamities.

In Seneca terms thus the economical status is not what makes a person noble. I mean look at all these folk we call today stars; there are pop-stars and many other celebrities and yet look what a stormy life they experience beyond their philanthropic deeds. Seneca implies that we ought to suspend ourselves from the worst of vices. If the worst of vice for Seneca is rage, the people's rage is the worst of the worst of vices. Today then social media, in this line of thinking is the worst vice coming to being.

To be noble then one necessarily ought to abstain himself from the social media chitchat, one ought to abstain himself from getting indignant and partake to the rage of the people acting so impulsively as piranha in a frenzy at the sight of blood. This does not mean that one ought to keep isolated. One ought to practice the other virtues. Now I am not here to list you all the virtues yet easily now we could see how little of these virtues are practicable.

Being democracy very much responsive to the people's mood thus their worst of inner vice, virtue itself cannot be practicable at the state level. There are too many examples today of humanitarian crisis let to rot and populist small emperors turning fully selfish. There are also great examples of philanthropists seating in a golden cage somewhere bringing services to third world countries not realizing the damage these services can cause in the long run.

Yet we can simply look around, at our neighbours for instance. There perhaps we can apply more of an helping each other attitude, this unless machines comes on the way. The more indirect is the virtue we want to apply the less effective and perhaps even more destructive it gets. The key is to be there in first person. Virtue is based on our personal effort, our direct involvement with a matter. So anything that attempts to solve something indirectly is yet another form of aristocracy to fight against, it is not a star but a piece of gold given to stray dogs to eat.

There is so little nobility of intention today, so little struggle to create something noble and worst of all so many obstacles to realize it. In the first place there is the skepticism of the people. Why wasting time and money for something and why should I even help you with it although I see that you are breaking your back? Only noble souls can help noble souls. Here I am also considering the definition that Nietzsche himself had of free

souls and if this one relates to some extent to what I believe to be a noble soul.

I believe Nietzsche would somewhat scorn the kind of noble attitude I am trying to propose here. Although I feel to be partially free, free from society at least, a self-taught man that society has no use for I also undertook my natural duty very seriously. I invented my duty or something Stoics like Marco Aurelio defined as a directive principle. I gave myself one. Certainly Nietzsche would have found something of a waste in my life yet Seneca perhaps might have appreciated certain aspects.

Seneca did receive letters from his followers. One of them I recall being very caught up in his administrative role for the Roman empire. Now it is interesting here the distinction that Seneca makes in terms of quantification. His follower wanted to give up this position in order to dedicate himself to philosophy and here Seneca writes that yes, what is the purpose of quantifying the amount of grain entering the Roman empire when there is ourselves to be quantified.

Stoically, to abandon society in order to dedicate oneself to let say philosophy does not mean at all to dedicate oneself to reading and commenting books. It means to fully dedicate oneself to a set of principles. Philosophers today are the antithesis of philosophers in the past. Philosophers today are the old sophists, philologists so much despised by the philosophers of the past. So coming back to our first question concerned with what it is to be noble I think to be noble means necessarily to abandon our social comfort, to live with little, an existential and most sustainable life wearing old clothes, keep clean but never cultivate our vanity.

Our aspiration will never match the one that any society, not even the most civilized one has designed for us. We ought to keep independent as independent was Socrates in Athens, roaming around the city free and noble in his soul. So many perhaps are like Saint Francis, Henry David Thoreau, Gandhi and God knows the thousands of unknown yet most important folk that has found the greatest of courage, that of stepping down from the regime, that of contenting oneself of a very basic life to maintain his philosophical principles and that I believe to strongly contrast all the evil of the Epicurean, luxurious empire.

In this respect yes I agree that Jesus was a star, a noble soul who managed to at last break the Roman empire apart. However the very fact that hundreds of years later a new empire was created under his name ought to be contrasted. It is the moment of new Stoic prophets challenging with their autonomous lives the human wordily ambitions. It is time to cheese to be part of the great imperial machine, it is time to become minor effective and functional machines, to act like them and here create the

total black out.