

Human to Human Infusion

Too often I found myself dwelling with authors who have been challenging the establishment and proposed an alternative as well as a spiritual approach to our life on earth. I found myself instinctively siding with these authors, with their sensibility bringing them away from more or less corrupted evolutions of human civilizations. I have found in them the prophet of their time who have lead their contemporaries to at least doubt the progressive trajectory they were about to undertake.

These prophet-like authors have had the guts to renounce much of their social status and undertake a whole new path back into a nature from which their contemporary have uprooted themselves. I am aware of the criticisms that have been moved against them yet I cannot but show my respect for what they have done. Perhaps they have not been coherent to the end, perhaps they have had some sort of backing to support them but most certainly they at least attempted to give up all the commodities and comforts, the very commodities and comfort that are the cause of so many social intrigues and that overall today jeopardize not only our inner nature but also nature at large.

A new wave of human right advocate have completely managed to smash these white old men. I believe however that every society, no matter the race or the gender retain such shamanic like figures more or less proposing an alternative to the establishment of more or less explicit form of empires. With empires I not only mean political states imposing their authorities an legislations to their neighbours and beyond. I mean any institutional framework imposing anything, no matter how philanthropic this anything may be.

Today more than in our recent past any author who cuts away from any norm imposed by a set of institutional canons is more then ever cut out from the discourse and let to rot. I believe this is the worst of persecutions but I also believe that it is hghly necessary to challenge the intellectual apparatus and the norms, whatever these may be, that are almost algorithmically imposed and demanded on any form of cultural production. There is nothing of a renegade to this attitude. It is not a confrontational one but it is one of accepting to create an autonomous framework, once again an alternative to something smelling to much of empire.

No matter how dodgy and fallacious and weak this autonomous framework of ours can be, I believe that the very fact that we have been able to resist outside the mainstream is in itself the greatest challenge we can set to the rise of any empire. All these values and the new moral parameters that are coming about are just but the new religion of something we ought not to take place.

Thinking of these authors I have mentioned at the beginning of this essay, all of them as somewhat challenged and questioned civilization. I am thinking of Tolstoy, Thoreau, Ellul and others who be categorized as Christian Anarchists. In this brief essay I would like to challenge this notion as I believe that it is too limited and restricting especially as I see that a lot of these authors were more up to recreate a link between the civilized human and nature rather than advocating for a civilization with no governance.

While the very words Christian and Anarchism may have made sense to used together in a predominantly Western society, I want to argue that today they are too limiting. Pre-Christians and non-Christian figures can indeed take part to this going-back-to-live-according-to-nature current. I am thinking respectively of Seneca and Gandhi just to keep up with my mainstream references. To begin with then the adjective Christian can be quite limiting and distorting. Is really a Christian anarchist going to bless a symbol such as the cross? Does he or she need to worship it?

It is very likely that who fits in the category of a Christian anarchist has indeed lived a similar life to that of Christ. Jesus himself can be enlisted among the Christian anarchists as Ellul himself pointed out. I believe however that in a multicultural society where tensions are growing once again right due to religious differences, Christian Anarchism ought to drop the adjective. Tolstoy had already discussed this in his confessions, he discussed the need not to only be merely disciplined but also to have some spirituality to it and not simply as a consolation.

Along with tolstoyanism, transcendentalism could be a good adjective to replace the Christian yet they may be both too sketchy. Spiritual could also work as an adjective but it might get associated to some kind of a peace and love movement without an actual agenda. Well I do believe there should be an agenda and that should be that of unifying what governance and politics and ideological radicalized people are bringing apart under this social media paradigm.

There are great and dangerous divides which will one day or another bring to catastrophic new wars. Today wars are already happening near us, just with people siding for one or another flag, one or another ideology. Anarchism is vital to break loose such fanaticism yet also anarchism itself might not bring any viable solution; the power vacuum it creates might in fact be even more dangerous than the already existing tension which somehow democracies tend to contain.

Having experienced both the oppression of the left and the right form of governance, both the secular progressive and the religious conservative type of governance, I have realized that both tendentially coincide. They both are forms of power whose aim

become that of keeping in power at the expenses of our human nature. I am sure that individuals who have practiced self-reliance can do it without governance yet the concern is way too strong and that is that sooner or later one or more neighbours will grow greedy and enslave whatever self-reliant individual and/or community.

Total anarchism, the total dismantlement of governance seems also a rather far fetched dream. There can be cases of light governance in which individuals can indeed be free yet those are in fact in place in countries that run a kind of hypocritical colonial scheme; on one hand they brand themselves as fully liberal and on the other they enrich themselves of trades which enslave other people in authoritarian parts of the planet.

I am not here to make examples, you can just look for yourself at those countries that brand themselves as most human-right promoters. In this line of thought I am still asking myself what is the kind of agenda that is now possible emerging from Christian anarchism, emerging from the idea that governance and whatever ideology that drives it will but bring new forms of injustice and enslavement and, today wars and destruction of the natural resources so much in peril.

Possibly I am thinking of something completely opposite to anarchism. I am thinking rather than to create a complete vacuum, to solicit a complete union of all the various fractions, a complete cacophony all the various points of tensions, of all the many idols, whether political or religious or social or cultural. My idea is firm in the conviction that syncretism may be the only way out.

This syncretism should not be a merely literal amalgamation of content as the one conducted by empires in the past to appeased its conquered provinces. It should be a ritualistic and almost magical reincarnation of all these elements, a katharsis of some sort that only shamanic like figures can conduct.

The drive for a total syncrethism must emerge within us. Capital and our bourgeoisie state are just but a hinder to this. We ought to open up and take responsibility to project of blending races, genders and cultures. In our littleness we ought to really fuse like alchemists the souls of all the too many entities that one day will grow into enemies. We ought to do so as they are still young and as they can still be playfully combined.

We cannot and must not advocate for rights that are just creating new strands of power. We ought to embed and become all these differences. We ought to demonstrate not how good demonstrator we are, yelling and challenging power with more power. As much as we can we ought to produce the hybrid that transcends all possible discrimination, the very hybrid that can give hope for a new life on the face of the death

that will inevitably come if we keep on creating new flags and parties and institutions.

This is perhaps only what I feel, this is my reaction to all the movements and counter movements that blinds the brains of their followers. No borders should be set and yet the no-borders movement gains its power and set a new border for its members only. Perhaps here lays my skepticism towards any sort of institution and the necessity to operate at first as individuals seeking to fulfill their life mission, to fulfill their intuitive call and by doing that bring a much more interesting and unique and authentic fusion and infusion of life to the world.

The more we are to follow the schemes dictated to us by whatever nationalist and or socialist powers the less an original type of fusion can occur. Paradoxically even the states enforcing diversity generate a most rigid and predictable one which if not killing life it paralyzes it. If individuals instead have an appetite to pursue their spiritual sensibility they will cross oceans and truly give rise to the most splendid hybrids, silos of life for the generations to come.