

Ernesto Guevara Higuereñs

What the last century has revealed is that in one way or another ideologies are but another entry to imperialism. Christianity has already shown this thousands years ago; a religion so much about forgiveness and non violence has created an absurd an oppressing imperial machine spreading its tentacles all over the world and destroying a beautiful tapestry of micro-cultures that were populating it.

While we can quite undoubtedly affirm that any empire and any monotheistic religion erase the natural multiculturalism that can arise without an imposed and centralized dogma, the same reflections can apply exactly to any ideology spreading its way through the globe and later becoming institutionalized and enforced onto others.

Even then the most anti-imperialistic of ideologies such as Marxism and Post-colonialism but also Feminism and the Negritude movements in general cannot but lead to new forms of imperialism if the renunciation for power is not embedded within it. Bakunin, the father of anarchism saw this clearly and his understanding would have spared us with the ridiculous rise of communist states becoming in the end just far more oppressive and imperialistic than they originally were.

In all my rather scattered and never so well developed thinking I allow to keep fluent and progressive without the application of the reliance to any given dogma, I have come to adhere to the idea that not so much anarchism is the key to the defeat evil on earth, literally the empire and its way of destroying what is so beautiful about our nature and that is the development of authentic and original micro-cultures.

I think that rather than the chimera of anarchism, the school of thought I came closer to have been stoicism, a Roman type of stoicism that from the start has been so much against the idea of developing the republic into an empire. Most importantly stoicism, compare to anarchism as the advantage of preparing the subject solidifying its inner self which I think is most essential if one ought to go stateless.

In other words I believe that there is no need for so much of a fight against any imperialistic state if one is determined to develop his or herself, whether stoically or either way inspired by the many transcendentalist movements that have always accompanied the rise of whatever empire. The very development of oneself is per se the biggest challenge to governance. What empires cannot in the least tolerate is any form of autonomy.

The way in fact a state relates to already existing autonomies is with all effect the thermometer to measure how much it is inclined to develop into an empire. Now it is

clear that also the free and democratic west is setting forth to impose its set of dogmas which excludes and suppresses autonomies not by direct persecution but by exclusion from its all inclusive ethical drive.

In this respect what we ought to develop is inward a strong and powerful and deep understanding of our own selves. This will offer us the possibility to sense the rise of any form ideological as well as counter ideological empire. The constitution of an autonomous self is thus the only way to be aware of the increasingly regimental framework that governance builds around us It is the only humans can sense and react against it.

Without a cultivation of our selves, without a rooted awareness of our existence in not time we are likely to be sucked in an rather innocent ideology which justify a governance which, in its increasing establishment will come to unavoidably turn into an oppressing empire, an empire contraddicting thus its very ideological foundation.

What we ought to be aware then is not so much what an ideology says but how, by being implemented and turned official it will cause great evil not matter how angelic its premises are. The only solution to all this is not to comply to any ideology in particular and keep a strong awareness of the self and the surrounding.

It is not a form of entrenchment I am proposing here. To the contrary I would say that those who perfectly comply to a framework are the entrenched one. This is rather an act of going to the world, stay out of all its offices and bureaus, be free and yet in this being free be much aware of the increasing oppression and the sort of retaliation that governance in general will set up as soon as, on its way to step p its emperialistic ambitions, autonomies will be oppressed.

I am not sure here as to whether heroic figures like Che Guevara can be good example to describe how to react to an empire becoming ever more oppressive as in this case the Yankees empire putting its yoke on whole south and central America.

Generally however I am convinced that it is a mistake to call the Che a Marxist especially today when a Marxist represents a most laid back professor with his or her secure salary only making sure to keep up the leftist dogma. These forms of Red Bourgeois as they called them in the former Yugoslavia are but living contradictions.

In Guevara's last diary we can see a man marching like a Roman with his small groups of soldiers eating and drinking whatever they could. We see a Guevara renouncing a comfortable power position and we read in fact of a Guevara being called the New Bakunin.

Perhaps we shall keep this in mind and that is that the revolution, or better the guerrilla warfare ought to be a continuous one, a noble one that does not kill imprisoned soldiers but set them free and pays off for any of the looting. Guerrilla is most of all not a form of terrorism but foremost a partisan creation of autonomy out in the wild.

Meaning that the highest challenge again we can give to an empire is our non-compliance, our getting back to nature which can also be done not by literally going into a jungle but also by dwelling in the harsh and pristine environment with ourselves and from this environment set up some ways to nourish us.

It is not then the idea of fighting the empire shooting at it but rather that of becoming somewhat like the Cynics of the Roman empire, the Diogenes refusing power and contenting themselves of their status scorning any emperor and accepting our destiny, knowing that to a force always there will be a counter force reacting to it and eventually taking the new lead.

If the situation gets so tensed that the empire does not allow us even this sort of autonomy, it is better to get ready and put at least one foot in the wild and there maintain not so much a selfish reliance but rather the human integrity away from the corruption implicit to any empire.

Establishing our nature then become the key to at first stay awake from the ideological numbness that is as we saw the precursor of any empire and then it will allow us to preserve a human integrity, our nature in its integrity throughout an inevitable power corruption that can only result into a war where the only real heroes are never the main representatives but those who have to somehow clean up the mess in the partisan warfare.

Reading the errand of Julius Cesar and those of Che Guevara one sees many a common aspects. Cato Uticensis was in fact the stoic who opposed the making of the Roman empire in the hands of Cesar. He killed himself in Utica while Guevara was killed more or less directly by the Yankees in Higuera.

Now it is always a question whether Guevara, who considered what to do in his forties after the end of the guerrilla, whether if he would have succeed in the liberation of the poor south American nations he would have also turned into a sort of Cesar or would have rather died keeping up the impossible task of defeating the north american imperialism.

All considered his attempt to liberate Bolivia was suicidal, in a way he like Cato did commit suicide and it is therefore to be considered a Stoic example to follow in a times

in which the empire become so oppressive to not even offer the possibility for any form of autonomy to its enslaved mass.