

Our Quest for  
Freedom  
and Other Essays

Paul Cudenec

with the participation of

W.D. James



winteroak.org.uk

Copyright © 2024 Paul Cudenec and W.D. James. The authors formally retain copyright over this work but permit non-commercial reproduction or distribution

*ISBN: 978-2-9575768-7-6*

## CONTENTS

Preface by W.D. James: Spirit Rebels	vii
Preface by Paul Cudenec	xi
Our Quest for Freedom	1
1984/2024 – The Hidden Hope in Orwell’s Warning	37
Wisdom Natural and Divine	54
Resisting Global Tyranny: Nationalism, Religion and the Golden Chain of Tradition	67
A Yearning With No Name	78
A Matter of Life and Death	84
When Will the Real Opposition Emerge?	89
Seizing a Free Future	98
Seven Reasons Why I Am an Anti-Industrialist	104
Marxist Doublethink and the Disabling of Resistance	111
Prisoner 1141183891920	119
Seeing the Whole Truth With a Three- Dimensional Outlook	122
Turning Our Backs on the Left-Right Racket	127
Traditionalism, Anarchism and the Urgent Need for Righteous Revolt: A Dialogue	136



PREFACE BY W.D. JAMES:  
SPIRIT REBELS

Increasingly, the subject of Paul Cudenec's thinking and writing is the human spirit. I suppose that has always been the case, but more recently it seems to have come into sharper focus and that is reflected in this collection of essays and other writings. Spirit rebels. That can be read as saying both that it is the nature of spirit to rebel and that those who follow the spirit become rebels. The human spirit, and the larger cosmic spirit of which it forms a part or in which it participates, has largely been absent in serious recent discourse. Cudenec is helping to correct that omission.

A recurring theme in these writings is the spirit's sense of longing, nostalgia, and gut feeling that it was meant for a different sort of world than the one we inhabit where, he argues, that layers of physical, social, and psychological control have been erected to stifle the human spirit.

The Germans have a word for this sense: *Sehnsucht*. Anthony Esolen, in *Nostalgia: Going*

*Home in a Homeless World*, suggests that this deep inner longing for the world we were meant to live in comes as a revelation and “spurs us on to the journey,” the quest, to discover that foreign land and the meaning it holds for our existence. It is as a memory lodged in the dim places of the human spirit that calls out to be recognized.

A second major theme is freedom. We are in danger of undervaluing freedom if we think of it as only a political value. It is of the nature of spirit to be free. “The spirit bloweth where it will.” The awakened spirit seeks to realize itself. To become who we are meant to be requires freedom. As Cudenec points out, the entire project of the regime of the “criminocrats” can be seen as a forestalling of this spiritual awakening.

The Christian existentialist Nicholas Berdyaev was one of the few other modern thinkers to understand this. He suggested that our lives, as persons (body-soul-spirit unities, as opposed to quantifiable individuals), are a constant striving. A striving for what? As spiritual beings we are capable of rising up above ourselves and the world as it currently is: we are “ecstatic” beings. In rising above our (current) selves, we create something new. That is the essence of the spirit’s work: creativity is its proper mode of being. He said: “The creative act is always the dominion of spirit over nature [in

the sense of material determinism] and over soul, and it presupposes freedom.” He went on: “Such things as statism, nationalism, scientism, communism, etc., are always a transforming of person into a means and a tool.... For God the person is an end, and not a means.”

It is the spirit that dreams and creates poetry, art, music and myth. This is the language in which spirit speaks to spirit and calls forth a new, truer, community, culture and ethos.

It is also not wrong, I think, to express this awakening and beginning upon the journey in terms of conversion, though perhaps Cudenec would be hesitant there. According to Donald Attwater, in *Modern Christian Revolutionaries*, to come into unity with the spirit, to be converted, is also to be revolutionized. He notes that “in the first place it [revolution] is a matter of the mind and spirit.” Anyway, I think it is salutary to recover the spiritual vocabulary of radicalism as reflected in these essays.

Cudenec presents the “quest” in heroic and spiritual terms. It is the quest for the “grail”; that being the power to become what we are meant to be. That will take action. Not just utilitarian, calculating action. Action infused with spirit. In the concluding dialogue he calls for a “political-spiritual revolt.” In the title essay he teaches: “Your purpose is to play your part in the uprising against evil.” Against what he also

calls “the death-entity.” In doing such, he accurately recognizes the nature of our situation. It is not merely against oligarchs and tyrants that we struggle but against what we should properly term dark spiritual forces.

A final theme that stands out is anti-industrialism. This may seem tangential to the other themes I have noted, but I think it is actually related. Cudenec himself notes that opposition to industrialism plays a central part in his overall attempt to articulate a holistic political philosophy. For Cudenec, industrialism is the material manifestation of artificiality, alienation, mechanism, materialism, and moral evils like usury. It is not, he is clear, a neutral technology.

In what follows, Cudenec, like a prophet, calls for us to become spirit rebels. In doing such, he situates himself in the radical tradition of Marguerite Porete, Thomas Müntzer, and Gerrard Winstanley. The return of the (human) spirit is what the times are calling for.



## PREFACE BY PAUL CUDENEC

When one constantly decries the state of the modern world and calls for the founding of a free and healthy organic society, it is inevitable that readers are going to ask how exactly this might happen.

The answer is a complex one and, in many ways, has been the subject of everything I have ever written.

But here, in the new essay *Our Quest for Freedom*, I present my thinking on the issue in the space of a mere 35 pages.

As you will see, I suggest a process involving a number of interrelated stages: Realising; Remembering; Yearning; Exposing; Explaining; Proposing; Meaning; Motivating; Becoming; Inspiring; Preparing; Boycotting; Building and Defending.

There are hints at answers to the same question in the other essays featured in this compilation, of course.

In *1984/2024 – The Hidden Hope in Orwell’s Warning*, I write, for instance: “It’s up to us to draw inspiration from our ancestral memory of

natural order, to see through the system's lies, to band together in small groups and form knots of resistance that will keep the tattered flag of freedom flying proudly in the years to come.

“We have to do so without any hope that victory will necessarily be achieved in our lifetimes, but must simply aim to do all that is needed in order that, in Orwell's words, ‘the next generation can carry on where we leave off’”.

And I conclude *Wisdom Natural and Divine* by stating: “This deliberate and self-interested cancelling of age-old knowing and understanding, and of the deep sense of morality innate to our species, has to be ended and then reversed.

“Humankind needs to again pay heed to the voices of the birds, the animals and the green trees of Paradise; to return home to nature; to become once more a simple hair in the locks of our divine and infinitely wise Friend”.

I also spell out my personal vision quite clearly in *Resisting Global Tyranny: Nationalism, Religion and the Golden Chain of Tradition*: “Free peoples, close to nature, living simply, peacefully, honestly and humbly; cherishing their own specific traditions and cultures and yet understanding the bigger picture of their belonging to greater human, natural and cosmic wholes – this is the world that I would like the children of tomorrow to

inherit”.

In the next essay, *A Yearning With No Name*, I muse on the difficulty of trying to set out a philosophical position using the language of a system that has declared that this particular political position does not even exist!

I add: “The forbidden point of view that the system tries so hard to hide is, at its core, nothing less than common sense, the natural inclination of humankind”.

Long-term optimism is voiced in *A Matter of Life and Death*, in which I identify “a long-awaited turning of the tide which will eventually see the energy of life and goodness restored to its rightful place at the centre of human existence”.

I predict: “Natural order – fresh, green and vital – will grow up in the ruins of the death-system, leaving humankind free to fulfil its true potential”.

But my short-term concerns about the authenticity of certain current strands of the so-called “resistance” are reflected by the question *When Will the Real Opposition Emerge?*

I launch a theme which I continue through subsequent essays when I state: “The system is inherently industrialist and so if we want to be rid of the system we have to be rid of industrialism”.

A necessary step in *Seizing a Free Future*, I go on to argue in the next piece, is to see through

“the official narrative of industrialism as real progress and of ‘development’ as both desirable and necessary”.

One, in particular, of the *Seven Reasons Why I Am an Anti-Industrialist* deserves, I think, broader consideration in the context of a fundamental re-evaluation of the meaning and value of so-called “development”, sustainable or otherwise.

I write: “When governments are persuaded to borrow money for ‘badly-needed’ industrial infrastructure, or modernisation, for Great Leaps Forward and Five Year Plans, the only way they are ever going to keep paying the interest on the debt is if there is further economic ‘growth’ financed by further loans from the same sources.

“These financiers also happen to own the materials required for all this industrial development, for which they are paid with the money they have lent, at interest, to the government in question. Industrialism is the physical manifestation of usury, the way in which the system robs as well as kills”.

Within the framing of the criminocracy, it simply is not *possible* to plausibly oppose industrialism and development.

The pro-industrialist, pro-development “opposition” on its right flank is thus mirrored by a pro-industrialist, pro-development “opposition” on its left.

In *Marxist Doublethink and the Disabling of Resistance*, I remark that Marxism, for all its useful analysis, ultimately represents an ideological dead end.

“It describes and criticises the current system, but does not provide us with a way out of it”.

The next piece is a satirical rendition of the points I was making in the previous essays, with an imaginary industrialist jailer asking *Prisoner 1141183891920*: “How do you think you could ever cope outside this prison, if indeed an outside even existed? Do you think food grows on trees? Or that drinking water just spurts out of the ground? Fool!”

*Seeing The Whole Truth With a Three-Dimensional Outlook* urges the replacement of binary vision in the political dimension with an approach that recognises binary opposites only in terms of the essential qualitative notions by which we can judge the world around us.

I conclude: “Once armed with this holistic perspective, we will quickly see where this modern world is situated on the scale of quality and can begin to take steps to put things right”.

*Turning Our Backs on the Left-Right Racket* is a look at the ideas of French political philosopher Jacques Camatte, written for the Organic Radicals website.

Once a Marxist, Camatte has for many

decades been a staunch critic of the ideology, warning that it is, in fact, “a theory of development”, aiming for a mere “transition” into “a new mode of production where productive forces blossom”.

I very much agree with him that “Communism was affirmed in opposition to bourgeois society, but not in opposition to capital”.

Finally, *Traditionalism, Anarchism and the Urgent Need for Righteous Revolt: A Dialogue*, is an in-depth conversation that I enjoyed with the philosopher W.D. James, himself a former Marxist, in fact.

Here I again stress the utter futility of any form of “resistance” or “opposition” that does not challenge the system, its structures and its thinking to the very core.

## OUR QUEST FOR FREEDOM

### **Realising**

A deep sense of the intrinsic lack of value in modern life always lurks somewhere in the hearts of those of us trapped within it.

This is often felt unconsciously, without even being recognised for what it is, but can become more tangible in a variety of guises.

Personally, I can identify the beginnings of that feeling in my reaction, as a child, to the advertisements that sometimes accompanied the TV programmes I enjoyed.

I wouldn't have used the terms at the time, of course, but I could see that they were vulgar and inauthentic.

Their existence arose purely from material greed – the desire to persuade other people to hand over their money for a product that evidently, left to their own devices, they would not have chosen to purchase.

Different approaches were deployed to this effect, ranging from the basic one of an apparently honest person telling us how good the

product was, to glossy image-based efforts associating the product with social or sexual success or more sophisticated humour-based sales pitches.

The first kind was obviously easier to see through, and mock, than the last, but it did not take me long to become aware of the appalling gulf between the surface of whiter-than-white honesty or nudge-nudge complicity and the actual reality of the whole thing being a scam, a lie, with nothing but filthy lucre at its heart.

I had been brought up to be truthful and had been taught by my parents that to misrepresent yourself and your intentions in the pursuit of self-interest, particularly financial self-interest, was a source of shame.

They had been devastated to discover that some friends and I had spent an afternoon knocking on neighbours' doors and asking to do "odd jobs" on behalf of a youth organisation to which we did not belong.

Even though we had done the "jobs" in question, our dishonesty was a sin and we were made to knock again at the doors in question, this time to apologise and return the coins with which we had been remunerated.

So how could it be, I must have been asking myself somewhere inside, that the adverts on the telly were allowed to do much the same thing?

What did it say about the television channel as a whole that it allowed its airtime to be used



to peddle this deceit?

What did it say about our society that we tolerated this, that we considered it acceptable for people to be relentlessly assailed by hypocritical money-motivated lies while they were trying to watch a comedy series, film or football match?

TV can also offer a glimpse of the sheer *wrongness* of this society through its 'news' output.

For years and years somebody has accepted the vision of the world it presents as being broadly sound, or at least based on an institutional duty to try to tell the truth to the public.

Then something happens that makes them alarmed, outraged or angry and they go to the city to take part in a massive protest, alongside thousands upon thousands of like-minded people.

They are inspired by this demonstration of strength and solidarity.

*Now the world knows how we feel! Now they'll have to listen!*

On getting home, they switch on the TV to enjoy the coverage of this momentous event.

Only there is nothing. Or ten desultory seconds. Or some cop or politician saying what bad people these were.

This can be a turning point. Why did that happen? Who decided that it should be so? Is everything in 'the news' like that? What is 'the news' anyway, come to think of it? What is it

there *for*?

More than that, many of us can smell the hypocrisy of television not only through its adverts and its news, but through every single flicker on its sinister screen.

From its carefully-constructed aura of authority that enables it to define our reality, to its fake bonhomie, its gaslighting denial of the true relationship between it and its public (“*see you next week!*”), its incessant infantilisation, its sickly visual opulence and its non-stop war on our inner silence and self-awareness, its mission is to turn your brain into mulch.

But it’s not just through the media that we can see the ugly reality of this society – it is constantly staring us in the face if we care to look.

Traffic jams and supermarket car parks. Surveillance cameras and razor wire. Low-flying aircraft and giant billboards.

The relentless routine of drudgery, school days, work days, fleeting moments of freedom before it all starts up again.

Waiting, waiting. Waiting for the weekend, waiting for the good times, waiting for the end times.

Our friends, our conversations, our families. *Is there something missing, here? Can’t we go a bit deeper?*

Why is that I feel everything is just passing me by, that I am not actually *living* as I want to

live?

The novelties, the adrenalin rushes, the manufactured moments of maximum pleasure – why do they change nothing, why do I still feel so *dead* inside?

*Is this really me? Is this all there is? Was there nothing else to know?*

In 2020 this society showed its true face. This was not just on the TV, although the TV played its part. The monster stepped out of its mind-control screens and into our living rooms.

It ripped us apart from our loved ones, smothered and choked us, dragged us screaming from our little everyday freedoms and locked us up, locked us down, in the chilling intention of its dark tyrannical future.

A lot of people realised.

## **Remembering**

How can it be that so many of us knew, deep down, that there was something not right about this society, even without the help of Bill Gates and Klaus Schwab?

We have, after all, never known anything else. Generations of us have lived this reality. What point of comparison do we possess, that enables us to make an unfavourable judgement on the contemporary world?

When we are born, we do not know what

kind of world we will emerge into.

We were not expecting this world. We were not made for this world.

That's why we can end up being so unhappy. Why they have to try to shape us, break us, diminish us, so that we fit in with their project.

This society is not natural, but artificial. It has been constructed so as to order human life in a way that suits certain interests, the interests of those who regard us as their cattle, their human capital from which they can become still fatter and more powerful.

They haven't finished with us yet, either. Next step is to concentrate us into cages that they can't call camps, for fear of equivalence exposed, but instead term "smart cities".

Each stage in their "progress" has hauled us a step further away from our natural freedom and a step closer to their final solutions.

But inside, we remain natural – at least those of us who have not volunteered to have their genes manipulated by the powers-that-lie.

Inside, we still have the image of a certain environment into which we expected to be born.

We expected to be loved, held, cherished; to gently come to know the ways of our people and of nature; to be well-nourished physically, emotionally and culturally, so that we might grow up clear and healthy, ready to blossom into the creative, co-operative, courageous person we were

always meant to be, so that we might pass on this well-being and wisdom to future generations, so that we might have played our humble part in the human unfolding.

This didn't happen. This didn't happen at all. It could never have happened in the debased society in which we were raised.

But that expectation is still there within us, somewhere, even if it is buried beneath a thousand toxic layers of hurt, fear, shame, craving, guilt, resentment, bitterness and boredom.

That expectation, a sort of flickering image, a ghost-like notion of a world we have never known, manifests itself in different ways for different folk.

It can be a fantasy, something to which people can escape in dreams or fiction, or an elusive illusion which they try, and fail, to actually grasp by travelling, by moving home, by starting again.

For some of us, it is a paradise lost, a golden age of the past stolen from us and to which we would deeply love to return, if only we could.

For others of us, it is a dreamed-of future, a golden age that could be ours if only we could find the courage to seize it.

For a few of us, it is all of these. It is an archetype of how we are meant to live, of what human life is supposed to be like.

When we look inside our hearts and see that

flickering image, we are *remembering* who we are.

## **Yearning**

We have seen that there is a fundamental dislocation here, a deep gulf between the reality of contemporary society and the way in which we are *meant* to live.

In so many ways, the modern system is the exact opposite of what we really crave. It is the inversion of healthy and natural life.

It disempowers us, on every level, stifles and stunts us, forces us to repress our deepest feelings, intuitions and desires in order to fit into its gridwork of conformity and obedience.

It is the cage in which we are kept, it is the shackles with which we are bound, it is the gag that silences us.

There are many who lack the vitality and integrity to resist this and resign themselves to their incarceration.

But we are also many who refuse to be defeated. We hold on to our vision of *something else* outside of this grey gulag and refuse to let go.

A tension therefore emerges between the real circumstances in which we find ourselves and the place where we desire to be.

This tension – between what is and what could be – is our *yearning*.

This word nicely brings together the two ways in which we remember the archetype of authentic living which we carry within us.

As well as meaning a nostalgic, even melancholic, longing for something in the past, it also indicates a strong desire to do something in the future.

It is said to originate from the indo-european root word meaning 'gut' (along with 'hernia', for instance) and thus speaks of our gut feeling, our gut instinct, a voice that calls to us from our physical bodily being.

It provides us with a powerful internal motor to move on from our realising and remembering and to set off on the quest to reclaim our freedom.

## **Exposing**

We are not going to achieve our quest without persuading others to join us.

The initial task presented to us – one which many of us have long embraced – is to expose the existence of a global ruling system and, at one and the same time, expose its essential wrongness.

While people may well have that *feeling* of things not being right of which we have already spoken, it usually takes more concrete evidence to move them to action.

Their initial action will probably, indeed, be to share the information that we have brought to their attention.

It is relatively easy to find and communicate information that undermines the current system.

This is because of the very nature of the system and of those who have constructed it and who control it.

If we were living under some imaginary feudal tyranny, this approach would not necessarily work.

The question would ultimately be one of allegiance. A prince or king claims authority over the land and exercises it in the way he sees fit.

While his means may be cruel and his motives less than pure, there would still be some who supported him.

He's our king, they would say. He's a strong leader, we respect him, we love him.

An old-fashioned king doesn't even pretend to represent the interests of the serfs. He relies on a shared view of the world in which he is in charge and they simply follow.

Today's criminocrats are different, partly because they insist that they are "democratic". They have invented an elaborate coded language of virtue-signalling to dress up their agenda of control as sugary benevolent gifts to the population.

They cannot simply declare a kingly right to



rule (*constitutional' monarchies don't count, here!*), because they do not even own up to being our rulers.

There is thus an essential hypocrisy which is ripe to be exposed – the hypocrisy of tyrants who pretend they are something else.

A second way in which today's criminocrats are different is that they are criminals. Real criminals. Their power has been achieved through lying, cheating, stealing, murdering, threatening, blackmailing, bribing and concealing.

They have never altered this behaviour to reflect the fact that they have achieved the power they were originally seeking. They have never decided to become benevolent rulers acting in the general interest.

And they never will, because they are nothing but liars, cheaters, thieves, murderers, intimidators, blackmailers, corrupters and concealers. They know nothing else.

There will *always* be some ill-doing of theirs that can be exposed because their whole existence is based on doing ill.

And there will *always* be evidence to be had of them *concealing* their ill-doing, because concealment is part of their culture.

As well providing a constant source of material for those exposing their activities, our rulers' criminal nature also amplifies the deeper

impact of such revelations.

For the vast majority of humankind, activities such as engineering wars to make money, deliberately poisoning people or trafficking children for sex are utterly beyond their acceptable moral limits.

In fact, we can find it *unbelievable* that other human beings could sink so low as to behave in such a way.

This is because our innate sense of how we could and should be living includes a moral code, a natural sense of right and wrong, which precludes this kind of behaviour.

The criminocrats have no such ethical code: they have cut themselves off from goodness and their only guiding star is their own callous self-interest.

When we become aware of this enormous divergence between our natural way of seeing things and our rulers' corrupted one, we are still further alienated from the system in which we live.

Now we know why we do not *feel* right in this world. It has been built according to a morality that is entirely alien to us, to our innermost beliefs.

And yet it hides that rotten core behind a glittering facade of "progressive" do-gooding.

It's those adverts on the TV again – a smarmy, smirking besuited liar holding a knife

behind his back, beckoning us into a planet-sized prison sprayed with gold paint and bedecked with rainbow bunting.

What are our *guts* telling us about him?

## **Explaining**

As well as describing to other people the horrific reality in which we find ourselves today, we also need to explain to them how it was that we got here.

It is astonishing how many simply imagine it has *always* been like this.

The system fosters historical ignorance and even a falsified history that depicts the encroachment of criminocratic domination as a positive phenomenon.

We are told that everything that has happened to us was somehow inevitable and right. 2024 could only ever have looked the way it is today and 2050 can only be the way the criminocrats tell us it is going to be.

Over the last decade, I have tried to shed some historical light on how we came to be where we are today, particularly in *The Stifled Soul of Humankind* (2014) and *The Withway* (2022).

The key, indisputable, fact is that humans were once free, in the way that all wild living creatures are free.

The condition into which we have sunk does

not really show humankind as being the cream of creation or the peak of evolution.

Animals often eat each other, of course, and can take a primal pleasure out of killing for the sake of it. Let's not romanticise them.

But have you ever seen a fat adult crow sitting on top of a tree, having his food brought up to him by a dozen other birds who seem to feel the need to obey his commands?

Have you ever seen a young deer frolick happily through the sunlit woods but then suddenly stop short, check the time on its digital antlers, and go trotting glumly back to a dark cave to spend the rest of the day tapping figures into a computer database?

Have you ever seen a fish in the water approached by burly fish bailiffs and told that if he doesn't cough up the river-rent he will be thrown up on to the bank to die?

Layers and layers of control have been built up over the years to crush the human spirit, layers which are not just physical, but psychological.

We find it quite *normal* that we are slaves, cut off from our natural and communal belonging and at the complete mercy of a gang of powerful criminals.

We regard it as quite *acceptable* that any signs of resistance to that state of affairs are quickly hammered into invisibility by the iron fist of illegitimate "authority".

We consider it *inevitable* that future generations, our offspring, will continue to be herded and prodded and abused and milked and medicated and culled and consumed by those with all the power that money can buy and all the money that power can provide.

## **Proposing**

Once we have explained to people that our freedom has been stolen from us, it seems logical enough to propose that we take it back!

But it only works in that order. You have to dig the foundations before you build the house.

When we have realised what kind of world we are living in, and heading further into, when we have remembered that notion of a different way of being and felt our yearning for it, when that has prompted us to expose the ill-doing of power and to share the history of how it came to dominate us, then – and only then – can we suggest that we do something about it.

Otherwise, what sense does any of it make? How can you ask someone to help make a better world if they have not understood what is wrong with the world in the first place and what factors were responsible for that?

Change for the sake of change is not good change. Change for the sake of change is often the kind of change favoured by the criminocrats

themselves.

The tightening of their control is always a “reform” and they know no better way to grab more power than by means of a “revolution”.

Our quest for freedom does not start in mid-air, or in the pages of some dry book of theory masquerading as radical truth.

Our quest starts from our guts, from our souls, from our memories, from our brains, from our hearts.

What we propose is a *return* to freedom which is not a turning-back in time but a rediscovery of the way we are meant to be, the archetypal way of being.

We propose the pursuit of our yearning, a nostalgic search for a future we had and lost, a deep desire to live once more in line with everything we know to be right and true and natural and beautiful and just.

## **Meaning**

Something that has disappointed me for many years now is the flatness of the language with which would-be radicals try to attract support to their cause.

One common type of article reads like a school essay, carefully shying away from anything that might sound like strongly-held opinion or emotion.

Another type is just stuffed full of jargon (whether woke or workerist) which is guaranteed to repel anyone who has not already been inducted into their particular agitcult.

I suppose this is because “radical” movements today are not really what they purport to be. The criminocracy has such enormous financial resources, in addition to its control of the state and its policing and intelligence forces, that it is quite capable of hijacking and then controlling any dissident movement that emerges.

Its representatives – full-time and trained for the task – will then be able to direct not just the content of the material published by the group in question, but also the tone in which it is expressed.

Flat, dull, lifeless prose, stripped bare of all poetry and dreaming, will only ever appeal to exactly the kind of flat, dull, lifeless individuals who are the perfect recruits for a movement whose aim is not to ignite revolt, but to bury it.

Our communication cannot remain on the surface of this society, trying to convince others on the basis of reality as defined by the system, using the system’s logic, the system’s language, the system’s syntax.

We need to go deeper, speaking to our fellow human beings through the invisible, underground, mysterious nervous system of our collective organism.

*We need art! We need poetry! We need music!  
We need myth!*

We can talk without fear of interruption or censorship here because the system is too dead to understand this intuitive and intangible living language of the World Soul.

This is why, incidentally, it cannot allow a work of art to speak for itself and always requires endless words, from the artist or by critics, to reduce to its limited understanding something that could only ever be said otherwise.

When I say “myth”, you are probably thinking of the ancient kind, which tell stories which apparently refer to persons and deeds belonging to the distant past.

But, in truth, these myths were simply formulations, in story form, of the archetypal needs and yearning of the human soul.

In different cultures, these naturally take on different superficial forms, but, as the likes of Carl Jung, Joseph Campbell and Mircea Eliade have shown, there are core themes that are universal.

Just as myths can take on different appearances depending on geographical or ethnic context, so can they take on different appearances depending on the era in which they emerge.

New myths are currently being born to carry us through the great battle for human freedom which lies ahead.



Fellow dissident thinkers like Crow Qu'appelle and W.D. James are telling us that we *need* these myths and they are absolutely right.

We need them in order to go beyond all the realising and explaining and proposing and to turn our yearning into doing.

Most of us are looking for a meaning in life and for many of us the contemporary “meaning” of material success, wealth or comfort just doesn't do it.

In the same way as we see this degraded modern world through the eyes of the archetype we remember within, so do we regard modern pseudo-meaning.

Without necessarily being able to identify this, let alone express it, what we want is the meaning inherent in the human soul, the meaning that has been choked and held down by all those layers of psychological control.

This is a meaning that lives in the very essence of our potential as an authentic human being.

This same meaning was, long ago, expressed, shared and handed down to future generations in the form of myths.

We can often recognise our selves – our deep selves, our lost selves – in these stories when we hear them today.

They are not set in the physical world we know, but in a world that at the same time be-

longs to the past and to eternity.

This archetypal reality, this mythological reality, can act as the template on which we can create meaning for our own lives.

Of course, this sort of thinking is very much frowned on in today's society, in which all sense and depth have been demolished and replaced with a postmodern shopping mall selling safe off-the-peg identities with which we can label and define ourselves in line with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.

*All the more reason, then, to embrace it!*

Our shared myth is the story of a people suffocated. A vast, odious, stinking giant has enslaved us, destroyed our land, consumes our children with barely-concealed sadistic delight.

The people are scared of the giant. When the earth begins to tremble with the sound of his approach, they scuttle into their huts and huddle together in silence, afraid of attracting his malevolent attention.

This sorry state goes on for years, and all the time the giant becomes worse and worse, fatter and fatter, uglier and uglier, as he tightens his control and exploitation.

Then, one day, a strange thing happens. A small girl suddenly can take no more. While everyone is hiding from the giant, as usual, she suddenly pushes her way out from under her mother's skirts and makes for the door of the

hut.

“Wait! Come back!” call her parents, but it is too late.

She strides out into the village square, looks right up at the giant and, hands on hips, shouts as loud as she can: “Go away, giant! I hate you!”

What happens next? Does the giant crush her with his rainbow-coloured jackboots? Do other children, or young men and women, rush out to her defence, to join in this seemingly impossible act of defiance and resistance?

We don’t know, because the story has not yet been written.

But, in any case, the small girl is a hero. And she always will be.

She has stepped out of the realm of archetypes, the realm of potential, the realm of right versus wrong and good versus evil, and she has incarnated the values of that realm – made them physically real – in the world in which she lives.

With that act, she has *become* something. She has become herself. She has become what she was always meant to be. She has become both truly human and truly alive.

## **Motivating**

Our culture’s story is a tragic one and has to be told so that we understand the gravity of where we stand – *or, rather, where we cower!* – today.

But our story, our myth, also tells how we get out of this. It tells us that all the heroes who step forward, regardless of whether they become martyrs, form part of a victorious struggle.

The role of a martyr is not to win a war, but, with their life-sacrificing courage, to encourage others to risk everything for the sake of our freedom.

The role of a myth is not just to tell the story of what has happened to us and what we would like to happen next, but to help make that reality become true.

A myth is no more a mere story than a prophecy is a mere prediction. Both have the purpose of shaping reality, forging the future.

As well as manifesting the archetypal desires within us, they articulate the will with which we can meet those desires.

They are our yearning made explicit, projected ahead of us into the place into which we long to advance.

They are our hope, but not of the kind that passively waits for someone else to come and save us.

They are hope as determination, hope as faith, hope as meaning.

This hope shimmers ahead of us on the path. It is real because we have put it there. It is part of us, in fact, reaching out tentatively to feel and touch the future for which we yearn.

It is our Holy Grail and our own holy essence, the best part of us, combining our sense of righteousness and our will to action, which we send ahead of us to light the way and guide us to greater things.

Our quest is to become again what we always really were.

Our quest is to be free, as *individuals*, to express all that we are, all that we value, all that we desire.

Our quest is to be free, as *communities*, to express all that we are, all that we value, all that we desire.

Our quest is to reclaim the power to create our own lives, our own cultures, our own future.

Nobody has the right to take that away from us. Our myth, the joyful expression of our own inspiration, tells us that we are going to seize it back.

*Our freedom! Our culture! Our future!*

## **Becoming**

When we look around us, or even within us, we may find it improbable that from these inadequate individuals there might emerge the power to rise up against the giant Leviathan and bring an end to his rule over us.

It is a common claim made by those who would thwart our rebellion, in fact, that human

beings are not capable of acting righteously, bravely and selflessly and that they will never be able to live together harmoniously, peacefully and happily.

The absurd flaw in this argument is that it is based on the mistaking of contemporary human beings with the natural variety.

We know the damage that has been done to us by this system. It has uprooted us from everything that we were born to be, blinded our finer senses, pitted us against each other in envy and hatred so that it might better dominate and control us.

It has turned us into limited egotistical beings whose only purpose in life is to gather around them the empty symbols of material wealth and status, in the despairing hope that this will somehow enable them to stave off the reality of their eventual death.

But this is not who we really are. We do not have to remain forever trapped in that lower state of being and each of us can take steps, on the individual level, to shed the grey skin of modern mediocrity and emerge in triumph as a man or woman born of nature.

You do not need me to tell you how we might do this. The process is at the heart of all traditional thinking and, indeed, at the heart of the innate archetypal wisdom within you.

Firstly, you realise who you are. You realise

that you did not come from nowhere but that you are the continuation of a large organism, the ephemeral blossom on the eternal tree of life.

As such, as part of a larger entity, you have a purpose, a role to play. Part of that purpose is simply to live, to *be* the way in which that great being breathes and sees and feels and touches and loves.

*That will always be so. There is no real living without joy!*

In better times, your purpose would also be to add to the happiness, creativity and health of the parts of that organism that you can influence – your family, tribe, community and culture.

It could be to anchor that society; to help provide food and shelter, substance and stability; to care for others; to nurture, teach and protect the young.

But today, at this moment of unprecedented existential crisis for our species, your purpose lies elsewhere.

Your purpose is to play your part in the uprising against evil.

And in order to play your part, you are going to have to go deep into yourself and become the person you need to be.

You are going to have to go even further than knowing that you are part of the Whole, with a purpose to play.

You are going to have to understand that

this purpose is infinitely more important than you are.

You are going to have to re-imagine yourself in terms of the purpose.

You are going to have to leave behind you all the childish comforts of “me” – of “my” hopes, “my” habits, “my” tastes, “my” fears and “my” hesitations.

You are going to have to strip yourself metaphorically naked and step into the golden sun-water of purification.

All that you are now is the purpose you serve and the beating of your heart.

They are no longer even two separate things, being combined in a jubilant ecstasy, a timeless present moment, of sublime self-giving.

True life is self-being and self-giving. You give yourself life by being what you have to be. You become spiritually beautiful by being true and natural and free and courageous.

You no longer fear death and have thus become as powerful as it is possible for a human being to be.

## **Inspiring**

When you change the way you see your life, you also change the world around you.

When the world fills with people who live for greater purpose and not for their own little self-



interest or self-preservation, it is not the same world.

It is no longer bound by the rules of the system, it is no longer confined within the flat playing pitch of the game the criminocrats have rigged to win for perpetuity.

It has opened out, taken on another dimension, the dimension of spirit that the system has tried hard to banish for so many centuries.

It knows it has to try to block spirit, because it knows that it is spirit that will defeat it.

The system is, in itself, the negation of spirit.

It is the thwarting of life, the denial of truth, the blocking of the light.

When it is forced to defend itself on the level of spirit, there can only be one result. It will be defeated.

When you become life-as-purpose, when you surrender your being to spirit, you hammer a nail in the coffin of the criminocracy.

You also inspire others to join you, to become as powerful as you are.

They don't have to have heard about what you have become, or read about it, or seen any direct effects.

Because we are all part of one living organism, they *know* what you have become, in the same way that I know that the circulation is coming back to my toes after a frozen walk in the

snow.

When you serve spirit, and thus life and humankind, you become a tingling in the World Soul, a pulse of energy sent into billions of other hearts that reminds and awakens and inspires.

Humanity, real humanity, smothered and half-dead for so long, stirs in its drug-induced sleep and starts to twitch its foot, wriggle its fingers.

The spirit is flowing back into its veins. It is waking up and it wants nothing else but its freedom.

## **Preparing**

Modern life is designed to be congested and complicated.

The ruling rip-off merchants have sold us so much surplus material on the basis of the “needs” they have manufactured that many people are quite lost.

They do not think they could live without the devices and infrastructures built purely to disempower, exploit and control them.

Ridding ourselves of these attachments is a key part of our preparation for the battle to come and the free world that it will deliver.

The best way to fulfil all your needs is to reduce them to the bare minimum.

Simplifying your life is hacking off one of the

ropes that keeps you bound to the system.

What do we *really* need in life? We need food, water, shelter, heat in winter. We need each other – friendship, co-operation, culture, warmth and love.

I would say that we also need meaning in our existence, in order to be fully human.

But beyond that? Do we really need all their glittery junk, all the empty artifice of Guy De-bord's *Spectacle*, all the hypocritical gaudiness of Mike Driver's *Carousel*? [1]

Or is it rather that *they* need us to need all of that, to keep our heads turned away from truth and spirit?

All their industry – their economic growth and technological “progress” – is a prison in which they have trapped us.

It is, at the same time, the physical process by which their usury becomes real, by which they gobble up our lives and our world to further expand the global cyst of their sustainable greed.

Investment requires return. Money is debt. Debt bears interest. On and on turn what William Blake called the “cogs tyrannic” of their dark satanic industrial-financial mills, grinding our children's flesh into the pulp of their profit.

If we can't see beyond their world, if we can't rediscover our real needs, if our imagined future is nothing but a reformed version of *their* future, then we will never escape their tyranny.

If we try to build our own future using their tools, according to their designs, based on their assumptions, then we will simply build an alternative prison which they can easily come back and take over.

Their world is the physical manifestation of their outlook, that negation of true meaning and value that stands in such stark contrast to the vision that we all cherish in our hearts.

We will need to forget that evil world, shake ourselves free of its black spell.

We start anew. We start from the bottom. We imagine a world that corresponds to our inner notion of what is right and proper and natural and beautiful and then we work out together how that might come to be.

## **Boycotting**

In *La Belle Verte*, the remarkable 1996 film by Coline Serreau, visitors from another (green) planet explain to their Earthling friends that they exited their own industrial phase by means of a great boycotting of the system's products.

What happens if we refuse to work for the global mafia, refuse to spend their money, pay their bills?

What happens if we turn our backs on their toxic medicines, their devious distractions, their little luxuries, their carefully cultivated habits

and dependencies?

What happens if we refuse to listen to them, acknowledge them, speak their language, play their game?

What happens if we stop co-operating, believing, submitting, obeying – if we finally stop accepting the utterly unacceptable?

## **Building**

You don't necessarily need to have a written plan before you start building something, but ideally you should have a general idea of what you are planning to do and what the end product should look like!

Our building for a free future therefore necessarily starts with imagining it.

By coming together to discuss this, by exchanging ideas, we are in fact creating a culture.

Because this culture stands outside all the thinking of the current system, and bases its outlook on completely different, even opposite, principles, it is a counterculture.

Fellow freedom fighter Crow Qu'appelle has called for “a strategy of cultural inversion (creating a counterculture by consciously rejecting the values of the dominant culture), exodus (exiting mainstream society), and ethnogenesis (turning a counterculture into a permanent culture)”. [2]

From this, it is clear that a sense of *purpose*

forms as much a part of this counterculture as it does of the individual who devotes his or her life to spirit, truth and freedom.

It is a *conscious* rejection of current society – an “inversion” that is, in truth, merely the reversal of this society’s inversion of natural order.

Our rejection has the *conscious* purpose of exiting this society and creating something real and long-standing outside its control.

This kind of idea has been around for a long time of course, but I have noticed that it is one that has been seriously revived in the 2020s.

There has been a reaction in the human soul against the grim future presented to us by the Covid-pretextted Great Reset, a strongly-felt yearning to live otherwise.

In practical terms this means seeking a simple, self-sufficient life beyond the urban matrix of control.

We can all take immediate steps in that general direction – for some useful suggestions in this respect I would point readers to a new blog, *At the Grassroots*. [3]

It quotes Bill Mollison in pointing out: “To let people arrange their own food, energy and shelter is to lose economic and political control over them.

“We should cease to look to power structures, hierarchical systems, or governments to help us, and devise ways to help ourselves”. [4]

It also quotes Jules Dervaes of urban-homestead.org: “Growing food yourself has become the most radical of acts.

“It is truly the only effective protest: one that can – and will – overturn the corporate powers that be.

“By the process of directly working in harmony with nature, we do the one thing most essential to change the world – we change ourselves”. [5]

So the psychological change that we need in order to revolt goes hand in hand with a physical change, the embracing of the need for simplicity and self-sufficiency as the purposeful foundation of a counterculture that aims to cut itself free from the system.

## **Defending**

While the message advanced in the quotations from Mollison and Dervaes is appealing, it does not tell the whole story.

The system does not want us to be free. Its very existence depends on the fact that we are dependent on it, enslaved to it.

That’s why it threw us off the land in the first place, that’s why it condemned the simplicity of our needs and our lack of interest in accumulating wealth as “poverty”, our natural ways of life as “backwardness” and our relaxed, unhur-

ried, approach as “laziness”.

The system needs always to encroach. It *is* the act of permanent encroachment, theft, destruction.

If you and I declare ourselves free tomorrow and say that we will have nothing more to do with the system, it will send its shock troops to crush us, for fear that our defiance will spread like wildfire.

But if hundreds, thousands, of small groups of people do the same thing simultaneously, all across the territory, the system is going to have logistical problems in crushing us all at the same time.

If it knows that in each case it will be facing people ready to resist, with all they’ve got, then its worse nightmare will be coming true.

This scenario appeals to me, although that’s not to say that we should stop resisting otherwise, in whatever way seems best in certain places, at certain moments, for certain people.

Everything from political organising to physical sabotage can play a role in creating the resonance of rebellion.

But, at some stage, the uprising has got to become physically real, it has to try to shake off the authority of the system once and for all.

Declaring ourselves free and then defending that freedom to the death, if necessary, seems to me like the best possible plan of attack.



It gives our resistance an anchor, a moral high ground, that can be absent when we are merely sniping and screaming at power.

This doesn't seem a likely thing to happen, though. I know that.

That's why the suggestion comes right at the end of this essay. All the other stages of the quest have to happen as well, for it to become a real possibility.

If people don't understand the extent of the problem with contemporary society, if they don't understand who they really are, if they are not prepared to risk everything, then our bid for liberty will fall short.

Sufficient numbers will have to have realised what this world has turned into, remembered what it should have been and started consciously yearning for what it could once more become.

We can help win them over by exposing the corruption of the system, explaining how we got here and proposing that we do something about it.

Our rebel myth will offer both meaning and motivation, empowering people to become what they have to be and spreading the inspiration to countless others.

Only then can we, together, build, prepare and boycott. Only then can we embark on the mass physical defiance that will be our heroic

and historic reclaiming of a free future for humankind.

[1] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2023/12/23/the-carousel/>

[2] <https://nevermoremedia.substack.com/p/the-dangerous-ideas-of-georges-sorel>

[3] <https://atthegrassroots.blog/>

[4] <https://atthegrassroots.blog/2023/12/31/our-way-of-thinking/>

[5] <https://atthegrassroots.blog/2023/12/31/a-revolutionary-act/>

## 1984/2024 – THE HIDDEN HOPE IN ORWELL'S WARNING

Forty years have now passed since the year in which George Orwell situated his imaginary dystopian society.

The novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was never meant to be a literal prophecy, of course, but, for the first three-and-a-half decades after its publication in 1949, it held a powerful hold on the public imagination, at least in Britain.

When I was growing up in the 1970s, the four figures “1984” were a terrifying byword for the totalitarian future that we all somehow knew was just round the corner, if we didn’t remain vigilant.

I think that Orwell’s book, along with Aldous Huxley’s 1931 novel *Brave New World*, helped stave off the advent of the kind of world they were both warning us against, by making it abundantly clear that nobody, regardless of political affiliation, welcomed such a future.

The date lost much of its power, of course, when the year came and went. Suddenly 1984 was just part of everyday life – it was the year

that your girlfriend left you, that you passed your driving test or that Everton beat Watford in the FA Cup Final.

And although many of us still remained concerned about the prospect of a Big Brother state strengthening its grip, there was no longer the sense of counting grimly down to that fateful year – instead people started looking forward to the bright new future heralded by The Year Two Thousand.

Now, however, the date 1984 has passed back into a semi-abstract condition, especially for all those born after that date, and the title of the book seems much less important than the content, which is all too relevant today.

Some of the outer form of the story is admittedly now rather dated. Re-reading it for the purposes of this article, I was struck by the way in which Orwell is very much describing a bomb-damaged post-war London that had already disappeared by the time I was born and which he imagines being inhabited by a white working class (the “proles”) that has now been largely displaced.

The idea that “one literally never saw” foreigners walking the streets of London [1] would already have sounded a little strange in real-life 1984, let alone today!

I also noticed a bit of a plausibility flaw in the plot, in that Winston Smith, having taken

such painstaking care never to be seen talking to his lover Julia in public, merrily brings her with him to meet O'Brien, whom he merely hopes is on his side.

He then blurts out, within seconds of arriving at the official's home: "We are enemies of the Party"! [2] and goes on to agree to "corrupt the minds of children", "disseminate venereal diseases" and "throw sulphuric acid in a child's face" [3] if asked to do so by the underground resistance known as the Brotherhood.

*Would anyone really do that?*

But these are small quibbles in comparison with the uncanny way in which Orwell foresaw so much of the psychological control and manipulation we are enduring today.

For instance, we can immediately recognise, in the pages of the novel, those who are currently imposing the Great Reset and its United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.

"What kind of people would control this world had been equally obvious. The new aristocracy was made up for the most part of bureaucrats, scientists, technicians, trade-union organisers, publicity experts, sociologists, teachers, journalists, and professional politicians.

"These people, whose origins lay in the salaried middle class and the upper grades of the working class, had been shaped and brought

together by the barren world of monopoly industry and centralized government”. [4]

Likewise with the extent to which their control is exerted: “Even the Catholic Church of the Middle Ages was tolerant by modern standards. Part of the reason for this was that in the past no government had the power to keep its citizens under constant surveillance...”

“With the development of television, and the technological advance which made it possible to receive and transmit simultaneously on the same instrument, private life came to an end.

“Every citizen, or at least every citizen important enough to be worth watching, could be kept for twenty-four hours a day under the eyes of the police and in the sound of official propaganda...”

“The possibility of enforcing not only complete obedience, but complete uniformity of opinion on all subjects, now existed for the first time”. [5]

The globalist agenda of the current criminocracy is also clearly depicted: “The two aims of the Party are to conquer the whole surface of the earth and to extinguish once and for all the possibility of independent thought”. [6]

The three warring zone of Orwell’s multipolar world have ideologies that are only superficially different: “In Oceania, the prevailing philosophy is called Ingsoc, in Eurasia

it is called Neo-Bolshevism, and in Eastasia it is called by a Chinese name usually translated as Death-Worship... Actually the three philosophies are barely distinguishable, and the social systems which they support are not distinguishable at all". [7]

Orwell's fictional tyrants even indulge in the same long-term date-related planning for their ramping up of control, declaring that by 2050: "The whole climate of thought will be different. In fact there will be no thought, as we understand it now. Orthodoxy means not thinking – not needing to think. Orthodoxy is unconsciousness". [8]

They are out to abolish natural human life – "all children were to be begotten by artificial insemination (artsem, it was called in Newspeak) and brought up in public institutions" [9] – and are proud of the success of their social distancing project – "we have cut the links between child and parent, and between man and man, and between man and woman". [10]

Alongside this goes the mobilising of indoctrinated youth to impose the official dogma. "It was almost normal for people over thirty to be frightened of their own children. And with good reason, for hardly a week passed in which The Times did not carry a paragraph describing how some eavesdropping little sneak – 'child hero' was the phrase generally used – had overheard

some compromising remark and denounced its parents to the Thought Police”. [11]

The myth of Progress plays an important part in maintaining social licence for this fictional totalitarian regime.

“Day and night the telescreens bruised your ears with statistics proving that people to-day had more food, more clothes, better houses, better recreations – that they lived longer, worked shorter hours, were bigger, healthier, stronger, happier, more intelligent, better educated, than the people of fifty years ago. Not a word of it could ever be proved or disproved”. [12]

Central to Ingsoc’s psychological control over the population is the invention and development of Newspeak, a politically-correct jargon aimed at inserting the Party’s worldview into the very terms needed to think and communicate.

To talk and write using words in their original sense was regarded as Oldspeak [13] and thus *doubplusungood* [14] and might even lead to an extended stay in a *joycamp*. [15]

Newspeak serves an important role in the regime’s criminalisation of freedom.

Alongside the well-known Ingsoc concept of *thoughtcrime* there is also *facecrime* – “to wear an improper expression on your face (to look incredulous when a victory was announced, for example)”. [16]



Orwell adds: “To do anything that suggested a taste for solitude, even to go for a walk by yourself, was always slightly dangerous. There was a word for it in Newspeak: *ownlife*, it was called, meaning individualism and eccentricity”. [17]

Alongside the mental techniques of *doublethink* and *crimestop*, which I describe in another article, [18] we find *blackwhite* – “a loyal willingness to say that black is white when Party discipline demands this” and also “the ability to believe that black is white, and more, to know that black is white, and to forget that one has ever believed the contrary”. [19]

*Vaccines are safe and effective. Women can have penises. Critical thinking is dangerous.*

Even when old words are not actually abolished, they are stripped of their essential meaning.

Orwell explains: “The word *free* still existed in Newspeak, but it could only be used in such statements as ‘This dog is free from lice’ or ‘This field is free from weeds’. It could not be used in its old sense of ‘politically free’ or ‘intellectually free’, since political and intellectual freedom no longer existed even as concepts, and were therefore of necessity nameless”. [20]

This manipulation has a real impact in creating a safer and inclusive social space which is free of disinformation, hate speech or any kind

of conspiracy theory or denialism: “In Newspeak the expression of unorthodox opinions, above a very low level, was well-nigh impossible”. [21]

One of the most memorable lines from the novel is the Party’s insistence that “who controls the past controls the future: who controls the present controls the past”. [22]

Any inappropriate content that has previously been published has to be sent into oblivion down the memory hole.

“It is intolerable to us that an erroneous thought should exist anywhere in the world”, [23] stresses Inner Party man O’Brien and we learn that no item of news or any expression of opinion which conflicts with the needs of the moment is “ever allowed to remain on record”. [24]

The result is a totally disorientated population. “Everything faded into mist. The past was erased, the erasure was forgotten, the lie became truth”. [25]

“In the end the Party would announce that two and two made five, and you would have to believe it. It was inevitable that they should make that claim sooner or later: the logic of their position demanded it. Not merely the validity of experience, but the very existence of external reality, was tacitly denied by their philosophy. The heresy of heresies was common sense”. [26]

O’Brien’s words take on a certain postmodernist tinge when he insists: “We control

matter because we control the mind. Reality is inside the skull... Nothing exists except through human consciousness". [27]

Above all, the ruling mafia want to conceal the unpalatable reality of their control. "All the beliefs, habits, tastes, emotions, mental attitudes that characterize our time are really designed to sustain the mystique of the Party and prevent the true nature of present-day society from being perceived". [28]

Fake opposition is another tool used by Ingsoc to trick and crush potential dissidents, in particular the cartoonish figure of arch-subversive Emmanuel Goldstein, author of a book called *The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism*, [29] who has a definite whiff of Karl Marx about him.

Rather than being denied the oxygen of publicity by the regime, as one might expect, his face and words are constantly served up on the telescreens as a hated binary opposite of Ingsoc figurehead Big Brother.

"Goldstein was delivering his usual venomous attack upon the doctrines of the Party – an attack so exaggerated and perverse that a child should have been able to see through it, and yet just plausible enough to fill one with an alarmed feeling that other people, less level-headed than oneself, might be taken in by it", [30] writes Orwell.

Although Goldstein is “advocating freedom of speech, freedom of the Press, freedom of assembly, freedom of thought”, he does so in “rapid polysyllabic speech which was a sort of parody of the habitual style of the orators of the Party, and even contained Newspeak words: more Newspeak words, indeed, than any Party member would normally use in real life”. [31]

Deliberate and malignant inversion of meaning is as much a part of Orwell’s dystopia as it is of today’s world, most famously with the Party slogan “War is peace. Freedom is slavery. Ignorance is strength”. [32]

Ingsoc and the other similar global ideologies are said to have grown out of philosophies to which they still pay “lip-service”, while reversing their original ideals in “the conscious aim of perpetuating unfreedom and inequality”. [33]

“The Party rejects and vilifies every principle for which the Socialist movement originally stood, and it chooses to do this in the name of Socialism”. [34]

“Even the names of the four Ministries by which we are governed exhibit a sort of impudence in their deliberate reversal of the facts. The Ministry of Peace concerns itself with war, the Ministry of Truth with lies, the Ministry of Love with torture, and the Ministry of Plenty with starvation”. [35]

Combined with this demonic inversion of value comes a malevolent obsession with power, all too familiar to us today.

O'Brien declares: "The Party seeks power entirely for its own sake. We are not interested in the good of others; we are interested solely in power... We know that no one ever seizes power with the intention of relinquishing it. Power is not a means it is an end. One does not establish a dictatorship in order to safeguard a revolution; one makes a revolution in order to establish the dictatorship. The object of persecution is persecution. The object of torture is torture. The object of power is power". [36]

In another of the chilling phrases for which *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is so renowned, he adds: "If you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face – for ever". [37]

It is important to the regime that its control is so complete that it becomes impossible even to imagine that it could one day come to an end.

O'Brien tells Winston: "If you have ever cherished any dreams of violent insurrection, you must abandon them. There is no way in which the Party can be overthrown. The rule of the Party is for ever. Make that the starting-point of your thoughts". [38]

The sense of powerlessness imposed by the Party seems to work on Winston, at least with regard to the prospects of his personal micro-

rebellion, and he considers it “a law of nature that the individual is always defeated”. [39]

The fact that he ends up betraying his principles under torture in Room 101, denouncing Julia and conceding that he loves Big Brother, can leave the reader with a heavy and disempowering feeling of defeat and I have long considered this to be a flaw in the book.

But a closer look reveals that there is something else going on there as well, a deep counter-current of hope flowing against the tide of totalitarian repression.

Some of that hope is seen by Winston in the 85% of the population known as the “proles”, even though their gullibility and lack of imagination frustrate him: “They needed only to rise up and shake themselves like a horse shaking off flies. If they chose they could blow the Party to pieces to-morrow morning. Surely sooner or later it must occur to them to do it? And yet – -!” [40]

He also finds encouragement in the ability of someone such as Julia to see through the lies peddled by the regime, despite the towering wall of deceit it has constructed around its activities.

She startles Winston “by saying casually that in her opinion the war was not happening. The rocket bombs which fell daily on London were probably fired by the Government of Oceania itself, ‘just to keep people frightened.’”

[41]

The human capacity to see the truth and to remain faithful to it in the most difficult of situations is key to Orwell's despite-it-all variety of hope.

“Being in a minority, even a minority of one, did not make you mad. There was truth and there was untruth, and if you clung to the truth even against the whole world, you were not mad”. [42]

He also describes an innate feeling of right and wrong which enables us to sense that there is something deeply awry with the society in which we are living.

Winston, reflecting on his own unease, muses: “Was it not a sign that this was not the natural order of things... Why should one feel it to be intolerable unless one had some kind of ancestral memory that things had once been different?” [43]

It is this source of hope beyond the fallible and mortal individual to which Smith tries to cling during his interrogation.

He tells O'Brien: “Somehow you will fail. Something will defeat you. Life will defeat you... I know that you will fail. There is something in the universe – I don't know, some spirit, some principle – that you will never overcome”. [44]

Orwell, his health fading as he wrote the novel, could project no prospect of immediate

change on to his fictional society.

However, he has Winston say to Julia: “I don’t imagine that we can alter anything in our lifetime. But one can imagine little knots of resistance springing up here and there – small groups of people banding themselves together, and gradually growing, and even leaving a few records behind, so that the next generation can carry on where we leave off”. [45]

*These are not the words of a man who has surrendered to despair.*

But the most important element in this concealed counter-current of Orwellian optimism is something I only noticed in my most recent re-reading.

The appendix, ‘The Principles of Newspeak’, looks back on the Ingsoc period in the past tense, from the vantage point of a more distant future in which the Big Brother nightmare has evidently come to an end and in which some kind of freedom and common sense have been restored.

It remarks, for instance: “Only a person thoroughly grounded in Ingsoc could appreciate the full force of the word *bellyfeel*, which implied a blind, enthusiastic acceptance difficult to imagine to-day”. [46]

So over the horizon there is a “to-day” in which the “blind, enthusiastic acceptance” of totalitarianism is not only a thing of the past,



but even “difficult to imagine”.

Confirming the point, the unknown writer of this pseudo-historical account notes that “the final adoption of Newspeak had been fixed for so late a date as 2050”. [47]

These are the very last words on the last page of the book and Orwell is telling us here, right at the end of his account, that the Ingsoc regime fell before it was able to achieve its long-term agenda of completely erasing human freedom!

*The Party could be overturned! The boot didn't stamp on a human face for ever!*

And how was this possible, in the face of the overwhelming full-spectrum control of people's lives and minds that Orwell describes to such terrifying effect?

It can only have been by people refusing to let go of the truth and having faith in the spirit of the universe that will eventually prevent death from prevailing over life, slavery over freedom, or power over humanity.

Orwell must have written *Nineteen Eighty-Four* out of desperate, inspired, need to play his part in the struggle against the forces of darkness which lay ahead.

He did what he could and, as I said, for many years his warning helped hold back the advance of tyranny.

Now it's up to us to take the baton of deep

defiance that he is holding out to us, across the decades.

It's up to us to draw inspiration from our ancestral memory of natural order, to see through the system's lies, to band together in small groups and form knots of resistance that will keep the tattered flag of freedom flying proudly in the years to come.

We have to do so without any hope that victory will necessarily be achieved in our lifetimes, but must simply aim to do all that is needed in order that, in Orwell's words, "the next generation can carry on where we leave off".

On the other hand, who knows?

Maybe the fall of the system is coming sooner than we might think.

Orwell has Winston remark that "the only victory lay in the far future". [48]

But then he wrote that 75 years ago.

Perhaps that far future is now!

[1] George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1958), p. 96. All subsequent page references are to this work.

[2] p. 138.

[3] p. 140.

[4] pp. 164-65.

[5] p. 165.

[6] p. 156.

[7] pp. 158-59.

[8] p. 46.

[9] p. 56.

[10] p. 214.

[11] p. 23.

[12] p. 63.

- [13] p. 32.
- [14] p. 39.
- [15] p. 247.
- [16] p. 53.
- [17] p. 69.
- [18] 'Marxist doublethink and the disabling of resistance'. See below.
- [19] pp. 169-70.
- [20] pp. 241-42.
- [21] p. 249.
- [22] p. 199.
- [23] p. 205.
- [24] p. 35.
- [25] p. 63.
- [26] pp. 67-68.
- [27] pp. 212-13.
- [28] p. 168.
- [29] p. 150.
- [30] pp. 13-14.
- [31] p. 14.
- [32] p. 25.
- [33] p. 163.
- [34] p. 172.
- [35] p. 172.
- [36] pp. 211-12.
- [37] p. 215.
- [38] p. 210.
- [39] p. 111.
- [40] p. 59.
- [41] p. 125.
- [42] p. 173.
- [43] p. 51.
- [44] pp. 216-17.
- [45] p. 127.
- [46] p. 245.
- [47] p. 251.
- [48] p. 111.

## WISDOM NATURAL AND DIVINE

I have been greatly interested by a book that I was kindly sent by a friend, *The Speech of the Birds* by Farīdu'd-Dīn 'Attār. [1]

This is an English-language presentation, by Peter Avery, of a masterpiece of medieval Persian literature.

*Mantiq'u't-Tair*, to use its original title, explains and illustrates the Sufi tradition's Path of Love to spiritual enlightenment with the help of numerous allegorical tales, mostly involving birds.

For instance, we learn of the hoopoe:

*“A crown there was of the Truth upon his head.  
Swift of perception was he, having entered the  
Way:  
Having of good and of evil become aware”*. [2]

A strong moral code sets the direction of the path ahead, with a reference to Moses' advice in the Qur'an to “act uprightly, and follow not in the way of those who cause corruption”. [3]

Authenticity is key and Avery explains how one bird tale is taking aim at the general type of the fake ascetic, “the devotee who uses a show of piety to attract worldly gain, and, instead of seeking seclusion and occupying himself in private prayer, hobnobs with rulers and men of influence, whom he sets out to impress with his sanctimonious bearing”. [4]

Declares ‘Attār:

*“So long as you are left in self-conceit and self-delusion,  
Far from the Truth, far far away you are left”*. [5]

A focus on material possessions forms part of this self-delusion, with the Sufis regarding lack of worldly goods as “a sign of readiness for the receipt of mystical knowledge”, [6] Avery observes.

The text states:

*“So long as you do not divert yourself from power and property,  
Not a moment will mercy show its face to you.  
Turn your face at once from all,  
To become, like the brave, free of all”*. [7]

And in a message, from 800 years ago, to those who today have the hubris to imagine that their wealth and power will last for ever, ‘Attār warns:

*“Though all the world might seem securely yours,  
It vanishes in the twinkling of an eye”. [8]*

The prime task in the Way followed by Sufis is to free themselves from the grip of the *nafs*, the carnal soul, which they believe is the equivalent of the devil within us. [9]

*“Grant the annihilation of my dark, carnal self”.*  
[10]

The means by which this can be achieved will vary enormously between individuals, as Avery sets out.

“Individuals perceive and express the reality of existence in a manner personal to themselves.

“Consequently conflicting views on form and substance arise, but the Sufis believe that by the Path of Love these conflicting views and contradictions can be cancelled out and the individual, freed of them, realise eternity without beginning (*azal*) and eternity without end (*abad*) as one”.  
[11]

Sometimes this spiritual process is presented as a reduction of the ego to the bare minimum.

*“When your person becomes as slender as a hair,  
There will be room for you among the locks of the  
Friend”. [12]*

But often it is depicted as a metaphorical death of the lower self, which will free the transcendental self to gain eternal life. [13]

*“Become nothing, so that you might be suffused with Being:*

*So long as you are, how can Being enter into you?”* [14]

*“Be lost in Him. This is the infusion.*

*Whatever is not this, that would be superfluity”.* [15]

*“Since all is one there are no two:*

*Neither does an I arise here, nor a You”.* [16]

*“If you’re a whole man, lost to the whole.*

*Seek the whole. Be the whole. Become the whole. Choose the whole”.* [17]

While this pursuit of oneness with the divine is evidently the main subject of *The Speech of the Birds*, there is a fascinating sub-text around nature, as can even be seen in the title.

Birds are presented individually, in the context of the various allegorical stories, but also collectively and mythologically in the shape of the Símurgh, which Avery tells us is a name of the mythical Iranian Phoenix.

“The word can be read as a compound of *sí*,

‘thirty’, and *murgh*, ‘bird(s)’. The Símurgh comprehends but also transcends all the birds of creation”. [18]

He cites Reynold A Nicholson’s finding that “in Persian mysticism the símurgh represents God or the soul as a mode of Divine being... and is supposed to dwell on Mount Qaf”. [19]

Nature is much more important to the Islamic tradition than many in the West might imagine, as has been confirmed by Sufi perennialist philosopher Seyyed Hossein Nasr. [20]

He said in a 2014 radio interview: “The Qur’an addresses not only human beings, but also the cosmos. It is much easier to be able to develop an environmental philosophy.

“Birds are called communities in the Qur’an. Human beings, bees, it is so easy to develop an authentic Islamic philosophy of the environment”. [21]

Referring to the Prophet Muhammed, ‘Attār writes of:

*“The call of living creatures when he revealed, His witnesses the calf and the lizard were”*. [22]

Avery remarks in his commentary: “The allusion is to the miracle attributed to the Prophet in his avoidance of being poisoned when a roasted calf containing poison was offered him and he stopped eating after consuming only a morsel be-



cause, as he told his companions, the dead animal had spoken to him and warned him that its meat had been poisoned to cause the Prophet's death. There is also a legend that the lizards conversed with the Prophet". [23]

Cats also make an appearance in the birds' tale, with a reference to the companion of the Prophet Muhammed known as Father of the Kitten because he used to sit in the Prophet's presence with a kitten on his shoulder or head.

Adds Avery: "There might also be allusion to stories of cats owned by Sufi Shaikhs, which passed into legend on account of actions that were taken for miracles inspired by God. Because of Abú Huraira's love of cats and the Prophet's tolerance of being accompanied by a cat, Sufis cherish them". [24]

'Attār further reflects that Sufi feeling for the feline when he notes:

*"Sometimes He makes the road revealed by a cat".*  
[25]

The spiritual closeness to nature displayed in the text goes beyond birds and animals to include vegetation.

Avery describes how, according to tradition, the Prophet Muhammed used to preach while leaning against an old date palm trunk, until this was replaced by the *minbar* or staired pul-

pit.

“On his adoption of the pulpit, the tree-trunk’s lament resembled that of a woman hankering for a lost lover, husband or child...

“The tree was in fact treated like a mortal: it was buried as a human would be and the legend has it that on the day of the Resurrection it will be resurrected and allowed to flourish forever ‘among the green trees of Paradise’”. [26]

*The Speech of Birds* also gives a nod, in the following verses, to one of the oldest mythological characters of the Middle East, Persia and India, known as Khizr, Khidr, Pir Badar and Hızır, among other names.

*“If you come in and come out of the self,  
The way towards the inner meaning you’ll find  
through wisdom.*

*When wisdom conducts you towards spiritual  
meaning,*

*Khizr will bring you the water of life!”* [27]

Avery writes: “Sufis see in Khizr an example of the Perfect Man, holy in the sight of God and exemplar of all ages, to be a guide to those who take to the Path in quest of the Divine, hence the allusion in ‘Attār’s verse to how the Ring Dove might through Khizr have access to the water of life.

“In popular belief, wherever this forever

youthful holy person, whose name, Khizr, means the Green One (the ‘Green Man’), places his foot, verdure will sprout”. [28]

One of the birds’ voices we hear in the book is that of a caged green parrot:

*“I, in this iron prison left encased,  
Am from desire for the Water of Khizr pining.  
I’m the birds’ Green Man. Hence I’m green-clad.  
Would that I were able the Water of Life to  
drink!”* [29]

I took a close look at Khizr, and his links to the likes of Hermes, John the Baptist and St George, in my 2017 book *The Green One*, (available as a free pdf). [30]

I identified behind all the diverse forms a mythological manifestation of the vital spirit of nature and life.

Now I can also see an obvious connection to the Símurgh, that “mode of Divine being” in nature. Writes Avery: “The magical power of his feathers, when strewn on the ground, caused trees to fruit, and grass to grow”. [31]

The Símurgh’s reputed dwelling-place, Mount Qaf, is “the mountain which girdles the world and is said to be of emerald, so that in the mornings when the sun shines upon it, it emits green rays”. [32]

When we also consider the “green mantle” in

which the Prophet Muhammed reportedly usually slept, [33] we can glimpse the truth in Nasr's claim that authentic Islam is a "green religion".

But the great themes of *The Speech of the Birds* and, in general,

*"The valley of gnosis, a valley without beginning or end"*, [34]

are, of course, not unique to the Sufi tradition.

Avery stresses: "A Christian saint has said, 'All mystics speak the same language, for they come from the same country'.

"So much is this true that startling parallels between the utterances of western and eastern mystics seem to make, certainly at least in this context, the epithets oriental and occidental superfluous". [35]

Or, as, 'Attār puts it:

*"All is one Essence but in varied categories:  
All one language but of differing idiom"*. [36]

The central shared spiritual insight is that we humans are part of the greater cosmic whole and also, within that, part of nature, which is a physical manifestation of that one indescribable all-embracing entity.

Our belonging is thus to something beyond our immediate senses and our immediate sense

of subjective identity.

*“However much you haunt external forms, you’re on the quest of imperfection.*

*Beauty is in the Unseen. Seek you beauty from the Unseen”.* [37]

For Sufis, true being is sourced in *zát*, the essence which they regard as the reality of the universe, with *sifát* being the superficial, ephemeral “attributes” of that essence, such as our sense of individual identity.

“The difference between *zát* and *sifát* is that *zát* is not subject to change, but the attributes are”, says Avery. [38]

Understanding of *zát*, of this underlying essence, is often condemned by modern thinkers as the *thoughtcrime* of “essentialism”.

The reason for this, I would argue, is that the idea of innate natural order is anathema to those who limit our grasp of reality so as to more easily rule over us.

The universe is one living organism and thus has its own underlying structure, an eternal and unchanging essential pattern which, while itself invisible, is made manifest in everything from the behaviour of animals to the innate human sense of ethics.

The moral code that sets the direction of the Path of Love arises from the collective uncon-

scious that we can all access when we free ourselves from narrow egotism.

Societies founded on this moral code, the human interpretation of the natural and cosmic pattern, find cohesion and organic order from below: in their culture and customs, their ways of thinking and living.

Not only do they have no need for self-appointed “authorities” setting down artificial laws and restrictions to shape society in the way that they see fit, but their very existence amounts to resistance against any such imposition.

While, in reality, such societies are never perfect, their moral code explicitly condemns as unacceptable the outlook and behaviour of those obsessed with gaining material wealth and social status, thus limiting the activities and influence of such rogue individuals.

One of the great long-term projects of the global criminocracy has therefore been to destroy these traditional societies and their beliefs, to deny the existence of natural harmony, wisdom and ethical values in order to justify and impose their greed-driven work-camp world of disempowerment, destruction and dictatorship.

This deliberate and self-interested cancelling of age-old knowing and understanding, and of the deep sense of morality innate to our species, has to be ended and then reversed.

Humankind needs to again pay heed to the

voices of the birds, the animals and the green trees of Paradise; to return home to nature; to become once more a simple hair in the locks of our divine and infinitely wise Friend.

[1] Farīdu'd-Dīn 'Attār, *The Speech of the Birds, Mantiqu't-Tair*, presented in English by Peter Avery (Cambridge: The Islamic Texts Society, 1998). All subsequent page numbers refer to this work.

[2] p. 65.

[3] p. 465.

[4] p. 477.

[5] p. 262.

[6] p. 465.

[7] pp. 185-86.

[8] p. 196.

[9] p. 464.

[10] p. 25.

[11] p. 466.

[12] p. 354.

[13] p. xix.

[14] p. 382.

[15] p. 19.

[16] p. 332.

[17] p. 78.

[18] p. 441.

[19] p. 473.

[20] [orgrad.wordpress.com/a-z-of-thinkers/seyyed-hossein-nasr/](http://orgrad.wordpress.com/a-z-of-thinkers/seyyed-hossein-nasr/)

[21] Islam and the Environment, CBC Radio,

[www.cbc.ca/radio/ideas/islam-and-the-environment-1.2914131](http://www.cbc.ca/radio/ideas/islam-and-the-environment-1.2914131)

[22] p. 29.

[23] p. 434.

[24] p. 426.

[25] p. 11.

[26] p. 442.

[27] p. 63.

[28] p. 469.

[29] p. 75.

[30] Paul Cudenech, *The Green One* (Sussex: Winter Oak, 2017).

[31] p. 472.

[32] p. 470.

- [33] p. 458.
- [34] p. 311.
- [35] p. xviii.
- [36] p. 14.
- [37] p. 201.
- [38] p. 434.



## RESISTING GLOBAL TYRANNY: NATIONALISM, RELIGION AND THE GOLDEN CHAIN OF TRADITION

I have always felt an extreme dislike for globalisation.

It flattens our cultures, annihilates our autonomies and steals our futures. It rips up the roots of our belonging and flings us into the greedy gaping jaws of its all-devouring world-wide Machine.

Why then, some opponents of globalisation might ask, having also noticed my enthusiasm for Indian spiritual warrior and nationalist Sri Aurobindo, [1] am I not myself a nationalist?

On a particular and personal level, this is partly because I am English, or British. Here we see the first problem I have with nationalism – I don't even know how best to describe my nationality!

Moreover, in either case, what is the entity against which English or British nationalists should be asserting their sovereignty?

With the EU out of the way, this would presumably be transnational and global institutions

like the WHO, the IMF, the World Bank, the Bank for International Settlements, NATO, the WEF and the UN.

While I, like many others in my native land, long regarded the USA as the source of this globalist imperialism, the truth is, in fact, on our doorstep.

As reflected in the fact that the Great Reset was officially launched by the man who is now King Charles III, [2] the global criminocracy [3] has deep historical connections – administrative as well as financial – with London.

So a primary target for the independence-asserting efforts of an anti-globalist English/British “nationalism” should be London itself.

I am now placing “nationalism” in inverted commas because this is clearly no longer what we are dealing with: a nationalist struggle for English or British independence from London is a strange notion indeed!

In truth, our freedom-affirming anti-globalist energy must necessarily go beyond the question of national independence to target the structures and impositions within that national framework which are the root source of global exploitation.

Although this reality is particularly clear with regard to Britain, the principle remains the same for other countries, even those with a history of being the victims, rather than the pro-

ponents, of imperialism.

The idea of loyalty to a nation has always been used to distract attention from the enemy above, the ruling clique whose self-interest usually eclipses any sense of solidarity with the people as a whole.

Today, as we know, the ruling political class everywhere has furthermore been directly “penetrated” by globalist networks [4] and thus represents the primary immediate enemy for all anti-globalists.

This remains true, of course, even when these politicians pose as nationalists and use the language of nationalism to gain support from the public!

There is much that is problematical about nationalism, such as its role in justifying the existence of a central state and the “national” uniformisation which was crushing organic autonomies and cultures long before globalisation.

Nationalist passions (whether British, German, Russian, Ukrainian, Palestinian or Israeli) [5] are also regularly exploited to gain consensus for bloody conflicts in which the losers are invariably the peoples concerned and the winners the usual global financial parasites.

“Nationalism” would clearly have to be of a particular kind in order to see off global control and contain within its thinking the understanding that although nationalism might appear

today to be the antidote to global imperialism, it was historically a stepping stone in that direction and can still serve as a veil for concealed ruling-class adherence to globalist agendas.

Such is the criminocracy's reach and domination that it is able to take over and redirect pretty much any political or philosophical movement that arises to challenge its rule.

This appears to be happening to perennialism, or Traditionalism – an understanding of the shared core of the world's religions that also potentially provides us with a powerful source of morality to counter everything the vile globalists are trying to impose on us.

The alarm bell is sounded by Sufi Traditionalist Charles Upton in his 2022 book *The Way Forward for Perennialism*.

He warns: "As a parasite on Truth, evil forms its own inverted metaphysics, and inverted morality as well; it forges its own Counter-Tradition and Counter-Initiation with scraps and fragments of doctrines purloined from the Primordial Tradition, and from the various Divine Revelations that are its branches". [6]

"The doctrine of the Transcendent Unity of Religions, true as it is, cannot be announced to a world ready to believe it, but not capable of understanding it, without giving aid and comfort to those who are working to homogenize the world's faiths into a One-World Religion, and con-

sequently destroy them, partly by means of a Satanic counterfeit of this very ‘meta-doctrine.’” [7]

Upton fears that the perennialist idea is being reduced to a kind of global pseudo-spirituality designed to prop up the planned one-world government.

Against this threat, he reminds us of his Traditionalist insistence that while a perennialist awareness of the transcendent unity of all major religions is important, it does not, itself, amount to a religion.

In order to find vertical depth, as well as horizontal range, one needs to follow the path of a particular tradition, he says.

Titus Burckhardt spelled out the somewhat limited possibilities on offer from the Traditionalist menu: “There is no spiritual path outside the following traditions or religions: Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism and Taoism; but Hinduism is closed for those who have not been born inside a Hindu caste, and Taoism is inaccessible”. [8]

In principle, I understand the significance of engaging seriously in one spiritual tradition, rather than merely indulging in a religious pick-and-mix, but in practice I come across a couple of problems.

The first, as with the question of nationalism, is on a particular and personal level.

Given my cultural background, the most obvious spiritual path for me to have taken would have been Christianity.

Today I can see the light in this faith shining out through sacred art, music and architecture, as well as through the words and actions of Christian friends.

But as a boy, I found neither spirituality nor inspiration in the flat and dreary religion I encountered via Methodist Sunday School and Church of England school assemblies.

I have subsequently felt the Christian church to have played a key historical role in stifling the human soul, in denying our belonging to nature and in blocking authentic spiritual understanding. [9]

The obvious contemporary corruption of Christian institutions by the global criminocracy (whether the Roman Catholic Church [10] or the Church of England [11]) hardly encourages me to revise this opinion.

It's not just Christianity, either. There seems to have been no shortage of "sharia scholars" coming forward to approve Covid jabs in the name of Islam [12] and the United Nations is proud to be "blending Islamic finance and impact investing for the Sustainable Development Goals" [13] by creating a Global Islamic Finance and Impact Investing Platform. [14]

Upton seems well aware of all this and his

answer is to go beyond corrupt current institutional forms to reconnect with the Tradition itself, as passed on over the centuries.

But even here, I have my doubts. For instance, while Christians trace their faith back, via the apostles and the oral tradition, to the words of Jesus Christ, the gospels we know were carefully selected to present a certain line.

Was the Christian faith not already being corrupted when it was shaped into a suitable official religion for the Roman Empire?

In general, are not all religions mere forms, intended to communicate greater truth, which can ultimately be hijacked for other purposes?

Is there not a risk, if we attach ourselves too closely to those human-manufactured forms, that we will lose sight of the sacred essence?

I see a clear parallel here with the way that we have to go beyond the corrupted forms of nation-states in order to reconnect with the essence of the impulse we have been taught to label “nationalism”.

There is a connection between the Traditionalist principle that “the religions are both intrinsically one and necessarily multiple” [15] and the notion of “nationalism” transformed into universal self-determination, on every level.

There is a difference, as well, in that the spiritual path sees our ultimate identity in the higher One, while that of political self-determin-

ation emphasises an empowerment from below – our freedom to be ourselves, as individuals and communities.

But there is no contradiction, only complementarity, and it is perhaps in combining these approaches that we can best protect both from corruption.

A rooted anti-globalism enlightened by an awareness of wider belonging would less easily fall into the trap of narrow chauvinism.

And a spirituality with universal scope, but aware of the importance of cultural, political and economic self-determination, could not readily be co-opted to serve an imperial-globalist agenda.

More than that, I would say that both impulses are rooted in a deep sense of what feels right – they correspond to the archetypal sense of justice that is innate to our species, the yearning to take *The Withway* to somewhere we can call home. [16]

Upton identifies a revival of this point of view among today’s younger generation – “Christians, Muslims, the religiously unaffiliated, and even agnostics” [17] – who are rejecting postmodern woke dogma in favour of ideas both old and true.

“A large and growing body of sophisticated philosophical speculation and social analysis is being generated to serve and express this turn toward Tradition”. [18]



This latter observation seems highly significant to me, since it is not just the form of religion that has been corrupted by the empire of modernity, but also our ability to think.

I have written elsewhere that the nominalists of the Middle Ages led us into a philosophical dead end of imagining that “reality exists in the human mind, and nowhere else”, as the Big Brother regime insists in George Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

I explained: “Nominalism, or the *via moderna* as it was known for a while, represented a challenge to the certainties of the original old-think – or *via antiqua* – which had been inherited from classical Greek philosophy and before that from a *catena aurea* or golden chain of thought stretching back into remotest antiquity”. [19]

The *via moderna* of the globalists’ postmodern woke dogma recognises no such thing as essential truth, the universal human spirit or our innate desire for freedom born of belonging.

We therefore need to turn back to the old-think of the *via antiqua*, seize hold again of the *catena aurea*, so as to be able to understand and express the possibility and desirability of a new Golden Age corresponding to innate human needs and to the harmony of all things.

Free peoples, close to nature, living simply, peacefully, honestly and humbly; cherishing

their own specific traditions and cultures and yet understanding the bigger picture of their belonging to greater human, natural and cosmic wholes – this is the world that I would like the children of tomorrow to inherit.

And it is also, of course, the complete opposite of the nightmare future being lined up for us by the past-erasing globalist beast.

[1] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2023/09/20/a-spiritual-warrior-against-the-empire-of-greed/>

[2] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/04/15/charles-empire-the-royal-reset-riddle/>

[3] Paul Cudenec, *Converging Against the Criminocrats: Essays and Talks for the New International Resistance* (2023)

<https://winteroakpress.files.wordpress.com/2023/09/convergingagainstthe-criminocratsweb-1.pdf>

[4] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uOuLQDRCexs>

[5] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/10/14/a-crime-against-humanity-the-great-reset-of-1914-1918/>

<https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/03/09/the-great-reset-phase-2-war/>

[6] Charles Upton, *The Way Forward for Perennialism: After the Antinomianism of Frithjof Schuon* (Philmont, NY: Sophia Perennis, 2022), p. 35.

[7] Upton, p. 104.

[8] Titus Burckhardt, *Mirror of the Intellect* (1987), p. 251, cit. Upton pp. 175-76.

[9] Paul Cudenec, *The Stifled Soul of Humankind* (Sussex: Winter Oak, 2014).

[10] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2022/05/30/francis-a-pope-of-the-poor-a-pope-for-the-environment-or-a-pope-of-the-global-elite/>

[11] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2023/07/12/the-church-of-england-enslaving-gods-children/>

[12]

<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2021/feb/18/muslims-wary-covid-vaccine-religious-reason>

[13] <https://www.undp.org/policy-centre/istanbul/news/blending-islamic-finance-and-impact-investing-sustainable-development-goals>

- [14] <https://gifiip.org/>
- [15] Upton, p. 11.
- [16] Paul Cudenec, *The Withway: calling us home* (2022).
- [17] Upton, p. 199.
- [18] Upton, p. 199.
- [19] Paul Cudenec, *Nature, Essence and Anarchy* (Sussex: Winter Oak, 2016), p. 23.

## A YEARNING WITH NO NAME

There are certain things that, even though they very much exist, cannot readily be described in the language available to us.

Our attempts to do so therefore risk coming across as contradictory or even nonsensical.

As Huston Smith puts it in his book *Forgotten Truth*: “It is as though, unable to say green, we are forced to say that a leaf is both yellow and blue while being neither”.\*

While Smith was talking about metaphysical concepts, it strikes me that the same applies on the level of political thought.

I have, for instance, always found it impossible to describe my own political position in terms of a flat “left-right” scale.

I could, following Smith’s formula, say that my stance is both left and right while being neither.

I would rather insist that I don’t recognise the validity of the left-right dichotomy at all and refuse to allow these labels to be attached even to parts of my outlook.

But I would still have got no further in

describing, in positive terms, what it is that I believe.

After all, the very same words could be used by somebody who cuts across the phoney left-right divide in a very different, even completely opposite way to me – someone, for instance, who wants to combine elements of fascism and communism to help forge an authoritarian global industrial empire!

For 30 years now, I have been using the word “anarchism” to describe what it is that I believe, while all the time being aware that my understanding of the term is not necessarily shared by others, inside or outside that ideological umbrella.

Over the last decade I have felt the need to specify that my version is “real anarchism” and a lot of what I have written has been an attempt to promote that concept.

But at the same time I have increasingly felt that what I am trying to describe is really even broader, and deeper, than that.

I tried to get this across in *The Withway* and also through the organic radicals project, which I was happily able to prepare before the launch of the global Blitzkrieg in 2020, which rather distracted my attention!

This has not just been about presenting a certain point of view, a certain interpretation of the world and a certain vision of the future, but

also very consciously about identifying a tradition or current of thought that has been rendered almost invisible in contemporary society.

This current is real in itself, independently of the label I have somewhat randomly given it and of the inevitably limited scope of my efforts to describe it.

In fact, this is the point of the organic radical initiative: to assert that this way of thinking exists and is both coherent and legitimate, that it is a possible point of view to hold.

This self-awareness is itself part of the organic radical stance: hence the inclusion on the site of profiles of Michael Löwy and Charlene Spretnak, academics who have identified the same current without, of course, applying the same label.

W.D. James is currently doing excellent work in describing this tendency with his own terms and references, in his series of essays on “egalitarian anti-modernism”.

I don’t think it is by chance that we lack the political language to describe the position in question.

In order to manufacture sustainable consent for its vile 21st century prison-society, the system has to present it as the only possible reality.

It has therefore built a very narrow and inward-looking framework of thinking which regards anything not based on its own self-validating assumptions as being insane, criminal or simply impossible.

This box, as I picture it, has been getting smaller and smaller over recent years and the rate at which it is doing so has been accelerating.

We have now reached the point where the system condemns you as being a purveyor of “hate”, as having passed beyond the pale of possible legitimate opinion, for recognising the existence of real women or for calling for an end to the massacre of thousands of civilians.

But the process itself is not new. For instance, it has long been considered impossible to challenge the very existence and legitimacy of the State and its authority: the only possible debate being regarded as who should wield power over us and how they should best do so.

And we are never supposed to challenge the wisdom and long-term feasibility of the “inevitable” advance of Progress, economic growth and industrial development: the thought-box only allows us to discuss the means by which all this should be managed.

For the last half-century or so it has also been declared out of bounds to analyse and expose the secretive machinations and manipulations of power – so called “conspiracy

theory”.

The only language we are offered to describe those who transgress in any of these ways – let alone in all of them! – is that of ridicule or demonisation.

If you defend truth, freedom and life, you risk being described as an “extremist”, a “reactionary”, a “nutter” or even a “terrorist”.

More likely, perhaps, is that you will be totally ignored, or that you will be summarily lumped in with others who don’t share your views, so as to contaminate your outlook.

But the most important thing from the system’s point of view is that you cannot be seen to be representing a coherent point of view that, in its own language, does not even exist.

The reason why this position cannot be officially recognised is, I think, because it is one that would be very widely held, if people were able to free themselves from the effects of propaganda.

Of course people don’t want to be treated as “human capital” by corporate slavemasters and locked down in smart concentration camps.

Of course they don’t want to be lied to and cheated throughout their lives, so that a tiny gang of crooks can ramp up their wealth and control.

Of course they don’t want their children and grandchildren to be butchered or raped by



sociopaths who take a demonic delight in abuse, torture, death and destruction.

Of course they would rather see a world free from tyranny, where the rivers and seas weren't polluted, the land not desecrated, where they could dwell peacefully and happily in their own communities, enjoying together the precious gift of being alive.

The forbidden point of view that the system tries so hard to hide is, at its core, nothing less than common sense, the natural inclination of humankind.

In its political form, it also involves an understanding of the way in which this common sense is being deliberately stifled and of the importance of awakening it, of allowing it to thrive, to inspire us, to guide us out of this stinking and toxic industrial-totalitarian swamp into the fresh green foothills of a decent future.

Just because this idea, this yearning, can never be expressed in the language of the system, doesn't mean that it isn't always alive in our hearts.

\* Huston Smith, *Forgotten Truth: The Common Vision of the World's Religions* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1992), p. 109.

## A MATTER OF LIFE AND DEATH

The way in which divide-and-rule tactics are continually used to create confusion and control has become increasingly evident since 2020.

More people than ever have woken up to the fact that these manufactured horizontal divisions within populations serve primarily to conceal the existence of a split which can be imagined as vertical.

This is the conflict between the ruled and the rulers, between the 99.9% and the 0.1%, between the dispossessed and the dispossessors, between the slaves and their slavemasters, between below and above, between the people and the power that oppresses them.

It can also, I believe, be understood as a conflict between life and death.

Let me explain why I say this.

Human beings are, as readers might have noticed, living entities. We come into being through the processes of nature.

In the same way that a tiny acorn contains the potential to become a mighty oak, we carry the seed of our potential within us: our “growing

up”, from the embryo stage through childhood, adolescence and adulthood, is the self-realisation of that potential.

We are not machines. We don't need to be “programmed” in order to become the human beings we were meant to become, any more than a tree needs to be taught how to sink roots or grow branches.

Ideal circumstances allow us to fulfil our innate potential, to be all that we could have been. In reality, of course, circumstances often thwart that potential: constant interference from external factors, such as society's attempts to restrict and programme us to suit its requirements, can leave us stunted, lop-sided, frustrated, bitter and unfulfilled.

Because individual humans are living entities, groups of humans can also be living organisms.

The relationship between an individual and an organic community is a symbiotic one: the individual contributes his or her unique potential to the community and the community, in return, provides the structure, solidarity and support through which the individual can find fulfilment.

Culture, of the authentic kind, is an expression of this natural belonging-together of individuals in a community.

Human beings and our communities form part of the wider living natural world on which

we are dependent for our survival and well-being.

The understanding of our belonging to a larger living organism was part of human consciousness for hundreds of thousands of years.

We have also long had the idea of a level of aliveness above that of the physical world, an all-pervading sense of purpose and goodness that we can find impossible to name.

All of this then, is our living, our self-fulfilment, our freedom to flourish as intended by nature and the unnameable force of good.

Against it stands an entity, the entity of death, which has somehow taken over human society and sets out to destroy each and every aspect of our living.

It refuses to allow individuals to develop according to their own nature, either physically or mentally. From the moment we are conceived, it never stops monitoring, scanning and measuring us, pumping our bodies full of its toxic substances, hammering us into shape, crushing our desires, locking us down in its thought-prisons, chaining us to its concrete floor so that we can never soar high above its work-camp reality.

It thinks it owns us. It resents anything we do, say or think that lies outside its control. It doesn't even like babies being born naturally and

now wants to deny our biological reality and extend its cruel monopoly to the process of reproduction.

Its societies are dead things, in which its top-down control stamps out any possibility of choice, self-determination or the expression of a culture which comes from the shared human heart.

For the death-entity, the living world is nothing but a resource for the expansion of its poisonous power.

It parades its contempt for nature with its giant machines that rip into her flesh, with its vast and ugly industrial infrastructures that scar her face, with the defecations of its development that pollute and infect her organs.

And then, with a snigger, it justifies the next wave of its destruction with the lie that it wants to “save the planet”.

It sees no beauty in life, no value in life, no meaning in life.

In its negation of all that is good, it revels in its power to do evil.

It rubs its hands with glee as men, women and children suffer and die in their thousands, nay millions, in its spectacles of horror and then sells us back our sorrow as a ticket to its next infernal show.

That has been the story until now, in any case.

But I suspect that the death entity has now gone too far in its arrogance, surrendering the invisibility that was necessary for its deceit-dependent domination.

We are thus entering a new phase in the conflict, a long-awaited turning of the tide which will eventually see the energy of life and goodness restored to its rightful place at the centre of human existence.

Natural order – fresh, green and vital – will grow up in the ruins of the death-system, leaving humankind free to fulfil its true potential.

## WHEN WILL THE REAL OPPOSITION EMERGE?

It doesn't surprise me in the least that Jordan Peterson and his ARC organisation are nothing more than controlled opposition, as has now been decisively demonstrated by two articles [1] by Michael Ginsberg and Ursula Edgington and a video [2] from Sonia Poulton.

These fake rebels have not even separated themselves from the politicians and institutions behind the Great Reset, let alone from the underlying financial-industrial complex that is at the root of the problem.

As Michael and Ursula write, [3] the ARC Advisory Board [4] members' "close associations with the WEF, WHO, Gates and Big Pharma, as well as corrupt overseas regimes are all hidden in plain sight".

This has been, as Sonia remarks, a "really interesting period", because "there's been so many people who've come through that gap of the culture wars and, bit by bit, we're discovering that they are not who they claim to be".

I saw the same, a few months back, with

Robert Malone, [5] who is advancing the same industrial-imperialist agenda as the World Bank!

Fellow *Nevermore* contributor Margaret Anna Alice has also now seen through [6] this high-profile “freedom fighter”, whom she had previously gone out of her way to defend.

Alexandr Dugin, the Russian thinker marketed to a certain niche milieu as offering a deeply radical alternative to Western ideology, also turned out to be a fraud. [7]

The same is true of the BRICS phenomenon that Dugin promotes, designed to appeal to people who are aware of the corruption of “the West” but who are being conned into cheerleading for the same global mafia masquerading as a “multipolar” alternative.

Remember that the official 2023 BRICS declaration uses the term “sustainable development” 21 times and states: “We reiterate our commitment to enhancing and improving global governance”. [8]

This general phenomenon is something that was concerning me at the start of 2022, when I warned that the awakening rebel energy of the Covid-sparked truth and freedom movement had to be rooted in a real understanding of the long-term issues at stake.

In my book *The Withway* I wrote that a political space had opened up since March 2020 in which it was possible to voice and share the



kind of fundamental critique of the global system which was previously considered extremely marginal.

I tried to show that the nightmare imposed upon us under the Covid “emergency” was merely the logical conclusion of our departure from the natural order and the associated domination of power, greed, money and industry.

And I warned of the danger of leaving intact all the infrastructures of oppression, all the weapons of control, which had brought us to this sorry point.

I asked: “Do we want them to be taken up and used against us again by a slightly different gang of rulers, or by the same old gang in one of their regular new disguises?”

We haven’t even got as far as getting rid of the old rulers, but it seems likely that anyone stepping forward as the “new broom” sweeping the world clean will, indeed, be disguised representatives of that same old gang.

We live in a maze of political lies, as I wrote in 2021, [9] where any surge of real opposition to the system is always captured by those who have all the power that money can buy and all the money that power can provide.

It seems to me that this hijacking of political movements, so easy when you have unlimited finance and the machineries of the state at your disposal, serves three distinct purposes:

*\* It stops them from challenging the system's domination, either by undermining them from within or by diverting them from an approach considered dangerous by those with power.*

*\* It turns an opposition movement into a weapon of the very forces it initially set out to oppose, while it still gathers support from people rallying to the now-false flag of its original message.*

*\* The anti-social activities of that corrupted movement can eventually be used to contaminate the reputation and appeal of genuine groups and initiatives who are still true to the original aims of the now-captured movement but, by appearing to be associated with it by labelling or language, are dismissed by other genuine opponents of the system as also being controlled.*

We've seen this happen again and again throughout modern history. Look at the way that grassroots popular opposition to repression and the rule of wealth was turned, by Karl Marx and his comrades, into a cult worshipping the state and industrialism, which regarded human beings as mere "workers", units of potential productivity.

When this cult eventually seized power in Russia, it destroyed the beginnings of grassroots popular control that had emerged in the revolutionary period and then set out to crush the peasantry, "modernise" the country and reorganise people's lives to suit the needs of

“socialist” industrialism.

I’ve already written about the way in which the anti-industrial *völkisch* movement in German-speaking Europe, spurned by the industrialist left, ended up being partly co-opted by the Nazis. [10]

Although the Nazi project was unmistakably ultra-industrialist, the fact that they tricked some anti-industrialists into supporting their rise to power has since been used as a stick with which to beat contemporary anti-industrialists!

A similar thing has happened in recent years with the environmentalist movement. This has been systematically taken over by system-funded NGOs, diverted away from any talk of defending nature from industrialism, made to focus entirely on the “climate” agenda and thus transformed into an astroturf marketing agency for the system’s Fourth Industrial Revolution.

The corrupted “environmentalism” promoted by the WEF et al is trying to use the excuse of “saving the planet” in order to impose a totalitarian hi-tech (*and thus very ungreen!*) global data-slave economy.

As a result, some opponents of that slave system react angrily to those of us who genuinely want to save nature from the destruction carried out by the same forces claiming to be providing “solutions”, and accuse us of being on the “side” of the WEF... Once again, we see phase 3 of the

manipulation.

How anyone, from any perspective, can swallow the lie that the criminocratic global entity is really “environmentalist” – or wants to de-industrialise the world, rather than just shift the geographical core of that industry – is beyond me.

Everything that it says and does, everything that it *is*, revolves around industry.

If the very name of its Fourth Industrial Revolution is not enough of a clue for you, maybe ask yourself what is the key word in the term “United Nations Sustainable Development Goals”?

It’s not “sustainable”, as they would like us to assume, because that’s just an adjective to describe the hoped-for durability of so-called “development” – aka industrial destruction.

If you imagine that this financial growth is going to be somehow “dematerialised” by the digital matrix being deployed for the commodification of both nature and humanity, then please remind yourself that there is nothing “green” about the infrastructure needed to build their “inclusive” and “innovative” planet-sized prison and neither is there anything “clean” about the electricity that would be needed to keep it humming and watching and tracing and policing.

Industrialism – the turning of living tissue

into dead matter in the interests of profit and control – is the physical reality of the system.

All the time that this physical reality endures – and also expands, for it cannot survive without that “growth” momentum – the system will also endure.

We might have a shiny new management team parachuted in, talking about sustainability and multipolarity and equity and diversity, but they will still be employees of the same old global owners.

It is no coincidence that all the captured “opposition” movements I have mentioned have been pointed in the direction of accelerating industrialism.

Although they are different in some aspects of their ideology, they all really amount to different roads with which to reach the same destination.

Industrialism is everything that is bad about this world: it *is* the degradation, it *is* the enslavement, it *is* the racket.

The system is inherently industrialist and so if we want to be rid of the system we have to be rid of industrialism.

This is not currently a popular stance to take! I wouldn’t win any election, anywhere, standing on an anti-industrial ticket.

Because industrialism is the means by which the system exists, our rulers have gone out of

their way to ensure that most people never question its domination.

A world without industrialism is dismissed as impossible (“*you can’t turn the clock back!*”), undesirable (“*they want to drag us back to the stone age!*”) and dangerous (“*think of all the lives saved by modern technology and medicine!*”), with its proponents depicted as insane, naive, reactionary and/or hypocritical – just for finding ourselves living in a modern world that we don’t like!

Even if we understand that a non-industrial future is our only hope, it can still remain a little frightening – most of us are descended from several industrially-conditioned generations who have gradually forgotten what it means to live outside the cogs of the masters’ machine.

But at the same time it is also, if you think about it, a deeply appealing prospect. A post-industrial world (*because yes, we would still be going forward in time, not back!*) would have no smart cities or arms industries or power stations or shopping malls or airports or corporate media or chemical factories or WEF or WHO or IMF or UN or World Bank.

It would, however, have fresh air, clean water, healthy soil, trees, plants, animals, birds, insects, sunshine, rain, rivers, mountains, meadows, beaches – and, amidst all of that heaven-sent beauty, men, women and children

living with quiet dignity, simple joy and a natural love of freedom.

When an opposition movement finally emerges with that vision in its heart, we'll know that it's for real.

- [1] <https://informedheart.substack.com/p/more-musings-on-legatum>
- [2] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bVXZlZ9cJRQ>
- [3] <https://actionabletruth.substack.com/p/alliance-for-responsible-citizenship-truth>
- [4] <https://www.arcforum.com/advisory-board>
- [5] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2023/07/19/robert-malones-global-industrialist-agenda/>
- [6] <https://margaretannaalice.substack.com/p/letter-to-robert-malone>
- [7] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2023/10/24/alexandr-dugin-a-globalist-pawn/>
- [8] [https://www.gov.za/sites/default/files/speech\\_docs/Jhb%20I%20Declaration%2024%20August%202023.pdf](https://www.gov.za/sites/default/files/speech_docs/Jhb%20I%20Declaration%2024%20August%202023.pdf)
- [9] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2021/06/15/a-maze-of-political-lies/>
- [10] <https://winteroak.org.uk/2021/06/10/fascism-three-brief-insights/>

## SEIZING A FREE FUTURE

A lot of interesting comment and debate has been sparked by my essay ‘When will the real opposition emerge?’

So, before going any further, I would like to clarify one particular issue concerning cause and effect.

Yes, of course I am well aware that behind industrialism lies the corrupt and usurious financial mafia operating the global Great Racket.

But although we can certainly identify this criminocracy as the culprit, it is industrial development which is the actual physical act of violence with which it is carrying out the murder of our natural world and of human freedom and well-being.

And if you see a murder taking place, it’s generally a good idea to try to stop it!

Here, I would like to look at two questions which have been raised about the post-industrial future I am suggesting.

*i. What would this future look like?*

*ii. How could we get there?*



At the risk of disappointing, my answer to the first question is that it is impossible to tie down exactly what it would look like.

This is because it would necessarily vary enormously from place to place, with differences in environment, climate, culture and individual desires naturally resulting in diverse forms of post-industrial living.

There would no doubt be farms, hamlets, villages and, probably, small towns existing in symbiotic harmony with the surrounding hinterland.

In some places people might live in separate family groupings, coming together only to barter and exchange their surplus produce and to celebrate local festivals.

In others they might prefer communities where children are raised not just by their parents, but by a plethora of aunts, uncles, cousins and friends.

Some post-industrial humans would want to farm, others to gather, hunt and fish. Some would stay close to their crops and others would embark on seasonal wanderings, finely attuned to the cycles of nature and weather.

Some groups would be inward-looking and somewhat closed to outsiders, except perhaps for the purposes of marriage, while others would welcome travellers with open arms and benefit from the regular infusion of new blood.

Some might recycle and renovate certain

fragments of the industrial age – pedal-powered electric guitars or biofuel motorbikes – some would use tools such as watermills, windmills and pumps, while others would seek out even simpler ways of living.

I would add that this new-old way of living, although inevitably more stable than the ever-accelerating downward spiral of toxic industrialism in which we are currently trapped, would not be static.

Life is not like that. Things tend to change over time. People can adapt to new circumstances, learn from experience or from their neighbours.

They may one day decide – at their local “moot” or gathering – that communal cultivation of the land isn’t working for them and that it would be better if each family looked after their own patch... or the reverse.

They may decide that they no longer need the products they were getting in trade with the folk from the next valley and decide to forge closer links with communities down on the plain.

Although people would be deeply, even spiritually, aware that the disastrous road to industrialism must never be taken again, they might sometimes introduce some new innovation, having carefully considered the implications for the natural world and the seven generations to come.

On the other hand, they might come to see

their agricultural lives as being unnecessarily over-complicated and artificial and thus set off to embrace the wild.

The freedom to do what we wish, without centralised control, is essential to the future many of us yearn for.

Democracy is a corrupted word, like so much of the political language with which we try to formulate our ideas, but in its real sense it has to be the foundation of a healthy organic society.

When individuals and communities – *which, after all, consist entirely of individuals!* – can decide among themselves how they would like to live, this is a democracy worth having.

As those preferences and values became more deeply embedded in the collective consciousness of the community, over several generations, we would see the re-emergence of the rich tapestry of distinct rooted cultures that covered the world until the globalist bulldozers rolled in.

There would not be, and could not be, any standardised religious dogma or infrastructure, but because all humans source their wisdom and values from the same collective soul, and the same essential truth, there would be a universal metaphysical foundation underlying the multiple beliefs and customs of differing peoples, affinities, histories and geographies.

This real democracy, this self-determination, is also the key to the second question as to how

we might get from where we are now (*gulp!*) to where we would like to be.

The initial move would be to collectively decide that we have had enough of this relentless train ride into the depths of hell and to pull the metaphorical communication cord to bring the “progress” of the machine to a halt.

The next phase would be to agree that we need to pull back from our current levels of industrial destruction and to shift the locomotive into reverse.

When we finally concluded together that we had now pulled safely away from disaster, we would get out of the train and wander off into the countryside, in various directions, to build new lives.

This would ideally be a gradual process, carried out over many decades rather than in a catastrophic collapse, thus allowing us to gently adapt to life outside of the high-tech prison. Part of this adaptation would be a natural, instinctive, adjustment of population levels to match the feeding capacity of the territory in question – most species have this ability.

There’s a major obstacle in the way of all this, though – authority.

For as long as we are trapped inside the authority of the system, we will never be allowed to determine how we live. Bear in mind that they don’t even want us to have the right to decide

what to do with our own bodies, let alone with our world!

So the first thing we need to do is to break free from the grip of that authority, actively wriggle and refuse our collective way out of its control.

As part of that process and in order to encourage others to do so as well, creating a critical mass, it is important to expose the corruption behind the facade of legitimacy with which the system tricks people into going along with its domination.

We should also make it clear that we are not resisting authority just for the sake of it, but because we understand that it is blocking our right to live as we want to, in the embrace of natural order.

For this point to be reached, we – sufficient numbers of us, anyway – will need to have thought about all this and seen through the official narrative of industrialism as real progress and of “development” as both desirable and necessary.

We will have to be motivated, urged on in our resistance, by a profound and resolute desire for this post-industrial world.

The first step of the long journey towards a free future is to start saying – loudly and numerously – that it is out there waiting for us if we have the courage to go and seize it!

## SEVEN REASONS WHY I AM AN ANTI-INDUSTRIALIST

Having written a couple of recent articles advancing an anti-industrialist position, I have been reminded that this viewpoint is very much a minority one, even amongst those with whom I am generally in agreement.

I know that to many it seems like an utterly outlandish proposition. “*What, no electricity? We’d all just die!*”

If my mission in life was to gain popularity, followers and subscriptions, I would no doubt be well advised to keep quiet about this subject, write about something else and try to come across as a bit more mainstream.

But that is not at all the aim of my writing, through which, for many years now, I have been trying to evolve and communicate a holistic political philosophy in which opposition to industrialism plays a central part.

So I’m going to have another shot at explaining why I think the way I do on this rather important issue.

I’m presenting my reasons in a very personal

way because I want to make it clear that I am not trying to impose them on anyone else.

I don't expect people to necessarily agree with me or to miraculously change their mind on a subject of such vast significance merely on account of a few words.

However, what I would like to do is to help open up discussion on what has long been a taboo subject and has lately been pushed still further into inaccessibility by the cynical abuse of the language of anti-industrialism by industrialists peddling a fake-green agenda.

I hope that readers will at least agree that it is generally unwise to keep rushing headlong in the same direction without ever taking the time to make sure that it is the right one!

So. I am anti-industrialist:

### **Because industrial life just doesn't feel right**

In my teenage years, I started to notice that something was deeply wrong about the world in which I was living. Initially, I internalised this feeling, concluding that it was me who was in some way weird or inadequate, but I eventually managed to convert it into a defiance, a conviction that it was because this world was one without values that my own thirst for values set me apart from it.

But what was it that was fundamentally wrong with the contemporary world and what were the values I needed to embrace in authentic opposition to it? I thrashed around desperately for years trying (*and failing*) to answer these questions and I don't think it is coincidental that the picture only began to become clearer when I finally escaped the grey suburban world of Greater London and started the next phase of my life in Sussex.

This was, needless to say, still part of the broader industrial world! But I suddenly had daily access to nature, which had previously been an occasional weekend or holiday treat. I could walk out of the newspaper office at lunchtime, down a beautiful old street, past the parish church, over a wooden bridge and – what joy! – into the lush green woods and fields of the southern English countryside.

Our minds and spirits are moulded by the physical reality around us. What kind of thoughts and attitudes are going to be created by the constant absorption of harsh, artificial, grey, linear forms; of brutal, loud, mechanical noise; of exhaust fumes and polluted urban air?

And what will be the reaction of a human soul to regular exposure to the harmonious, diverse, colourful beauty of nature; to the gentle music of rustling leaves, flowing water and birdsong; to the scent of earth and flower, of the



fresh air blown in from the distant ocean?

More and more, I could feel a qualitative difference between my experience of being alive when surrounded by nature and when in a town or city. A sense of belonging to nature won my heart and thus threats of urban encroachment into that nature were now effectively threats to my own extended body.

### **Because industrialism is murder**

There are, of course, entities, interests and motivations behind industrialism. Industrialism is not the murderer, but it *is* the murder.

### **Because they tell me I can't be**

You're not really allowed to be an anti-industrialist. It's not supposed to be a position that can legitimately be held in the 21st century. People will sneer at you, make up insults, tell you to shut up. For people like me, that's all the encouragement we need to double down on our belief!

### **Because technology is not neutral**

It's not the tool, they say, but the way it is used – and the person who uses it – that is the problem. But tools are made to serve a specific purpose. A machine gun is made to kill people. It can't be

used to make cheese or darn socks. Factories were invented to increase productivity and drive down labour costs, to make more money from the “human resources” available to the owners. Industrial Technik was made to exploit and control people and can’t be used to empower and liberate them.

### **Because industrialism is not an advance in human evolution**

The myth says that humanity has been enjoying steady progress for many thousands of years, its capacity for innovation allowing it to invent various means with which to make life richer, safer and more enjoyable. Trying to deny this tendency would therefore be to block human genius, to prevent us from fulfilling our evolutionary potential, from marching on towards our triumphant destiny. And yet the reverse is true. Industrialism does not channel or encourage human genius, it stifles and crushes it. People are reduced to the limited roles they play in its machineries, deprived of autonomy, of the possibility to follow their own consciences, to shape their own lives, to participate in any meaningful way in society. Community as a living organism depends on the sensitivity, intuition, creativity and ethical antennae of the individuals that make up its flesh. Industrial society is a dead thing, a zombie be-

ing. Human intelligence, spirit and awareness are paralysed and the population decays into numbed, dead-eyed, dull-witted subservience.

### **Because industrialism is the physical manifestation of usury**

When money is loaned into circulation as interest-bearing debt, a spiral of necessary “growth” is conjured into existence. When governments are persuaded to borrow money for “badly-needed” industrial infrastructure, or modernisation, for Great Leaps Forward and Five Year Plans, the only way they are ever going to keep paying the interest on the debt is if there is further economic “growth” financed by further loans from the same sources. These financiers also happen to own the materials required for all this industrial development, for which they are paid with the money they have lent, at interest, to the government in question. Industrialism is the physical manifestation of usury, the way in which the system robs as well as kills.

### **Because industrialism is so obviously central to the New World Order**

Klaus Schwab of the WEF wrote two books about the Fourth Industrial Revolution. The underlying

structure of the globalists' plans for the years ahead is provided by the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. Development is the same thing as industrialism. Political movements controlled by the system invariably promote industrialism. The system's buzzwords like "innovation" and "inclusivity" refer to the expansion of the industrialist matrix. Without industrialism – and the surveillance and control that it provides – there could be no New World Order. Opposing industrialism is, today, the same thing as opposing the New World Order.

## MARXIST DOUBLETHINK AND THE DISABLING OF RESISTANCE

One of the big questions facing all of us trapped inside today's increasingly totalitarian global system is 'How did we get here?'

How was it ever possible that human beings, once as free as every other wild creature on the planet, were able to be captured by a small minority of their own kind and reduced to a degraded and disempowered condition of complete dependency on their jailors?

There are some interesting clues in A.L. Morton's *A People's History of England*, first published in 1938.

He looks back to the origins of tribal society in the Stone Age, in which an egalitarian ethos prevailed: "The food that was gathered for the social group, the animals that were hunted, the fish that was caught, were jointly produced and jointly consumed". [1]

He describes small kinship groups, probably "uniting the descendants of common great-grandparents", which exchanged goods, primarily food, with other groups and also sought mates

outside their own tribe.

“The kin was, in fact, a group of tremendous social cohesion. A man without kin was like a fish without water, helpless, doomed”. [2]

Morton writes about the migrations of the Celts across Europe and to Britain, more than 2,000 years ago, in the shape of “large tribes, composed of free warriors under tribal chiefs, accompanied by considerable numbers of women and children”. [3]

He notes: “While Celtic tribal society cannot be described as classless, its class divisions were not sharply marked or of decisive importance. The difference between chief and free tribesman was one of degree, rather than of kind”. [4]

But, over time, there was “a gradual weakening and break up of tribal society and its eventual replacement by feudalism”, [5] beginning a process which was ultimately to see the English people “driven from the land” by the arrival of industrialism. [6]

Morton identifies a key stage in this long-term loss of freedom as coming after 600AD, when central power began to reemerge after a hiatus following the Romans’ departure.

Social divisions were already increasing, private property in land was beginning to take shape and the state, growing out of the military conquest and division of the country by the Anglo-Saxons, was “superseding the looser tribal

organisation that served the English in their German homeland”. [7]

The historian then declares: “Such a process, marked by the acquisition of special powers by a minority and at the expense of the remainder of the people, is in fact the only way in which society can advance beyond the tribal stage and must, for all its harshness, be regarded as essentially progressive”. [8]

*I found this passage absolutely shocking!*

It is, in fact, a text-book real-life instance of the mental process that George Orwell terms *doublethink* in his novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, this being “the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one’s mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them”. [9]

Morton is plainly aware that the process he is describing was a bad thing, referring to the “harshness” of the “acquisition of special powers by a minority and at the expense of the remainder of the people”, but he cannot bring himself to end the sentence without expressing the view that at one and the same time it was a good and necessary thing!

We also see unfolding, in real time, as it were, in the writing of this sentence, the technique by which *doublethink* is achieved, which Orwell calls *crimestop*, the ability not to allow oneself to think in ways unapproved by the Party.

What inner voice is Morton obeying when he declares that the domination of the majority by a little powerful clique “must” be seen as “progressive”?

It is worth recalling that Orwell called the ruling ideology of the Big Brother regime Ingsoc, short for English Socialism, even though he was himself a sort of English socialist, albeit of a libertarian and culturally-traditionalist variety.

He did so because he could see the authoritarianism, dogmatism and intellectual dishonesty that characterised the communist left.

He had been appalled by this after fighting with the socialist POUM and the anarchists in the Spanish revolution, only to find his freedom-loving comrades, who had refused to obey orders from Stalin, being smeared by communists as “fascists” who were secretly working for Franco.

I can't help being reminded of the way that those of us who spoke up for freedom during the Covid clamp-down were (and still are) subjected to similar lies and insults from contemporary equivalents on the left.

Morton, our *doublethink* historian, was a Marxist, and a conscientious one at that, judging by the way that he feels the need to apologise for the inclusion in his bibliography of many books “written by non-Marxist historians, with a standpoint which I believe to be quite mistaken”.



[10]

Furthermore, *A People's History of England* was “adopted quasi-officially as the Communist Party’s national history”. [11]

Morton had a keen interest in William Blake and William Morris, two organic radical inspirations whose overlapping vision was a long way from Marxist orthodoxy and who were deeply opposed to state control and industrialism.

But he had to write, evidently against his better instincts, that the emergence of a central state (and capitalism) was a “progressive” thing because that is how Marxist dogma says socialism will ultimately be achieved.

The inner voice stopping short his historical crimethink was the internalised one of the Party, which in his case was the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB).

It is certain that many people have learned much from the economic and social analysis of Karl Marx and his multitude of disciples, such as Morton.

*But the trouble is that the ideology is a total dead end!*

It describes and criticises the current system, but does not provide us with a way out of it.

As Morton’s remarks illustrate, the existence of the state and of industrial “progress” are

essential to its idea of how communism will arrive, even if an eventual “withering away” of the state is theoretically imagined.

The state is the structure used by a power-hungry minority to impose its control and domination of the majority – its laws, its tax-gathering, its policing, its surveillance, its brainwashing education.

When this power-hungry minority indulges in usury to sustain and amplify its power, this manifests in physical terms as “development” or industrial “progress”.

Marxist ideology fails to challenge either of these phenomena, instead claiming, as Morton spells out, that they are necessary stages on the glorious road to communism.

Furthermore, you “must” not suggest otherwise, on pain of being denounced by the communist *thinkpol* as reactionary, utopian, counter-revolutionary or fascist.

When you add into the mix the general Marxist hostility to any kind of spirituality, you are looking at an “oppositional” ideology that totally fails to oppose the essence of the system it pretends to combat.

All it proposes is a different method of managing the same dehumanising machineries of state and development.

Anarchists have been on to this for a long time, of course.

Mikhail Bakunin (1814-1876) accused the Marxists of ignoring a number of “natural traits” such as “the intensity of the instinct of revolt, and by the same token, of liberty”. [12]

Gustav Landauer (1870-1919) described Marxist dogma as “the plague of our times”, [13] bemoaning “the grotesque wrongness of their materialist conception of history” [14] in which they reduced everything to “what they call economic and social reality”. [15]

Emma Goldman (1869-1940) called Marxism “colourless and mechanistic” [16] and said she had witnessed in Bolshevik Russia “the best human values betrayed, the very spirit of revolution daily crucified”. [17]

And, a bit more recently, Fredy Perlman (1934-1985) argued that Marxism was “a pseudo-resistance which was in fact an instrument for the final reduction of human activity to a mere variable of Capital”. [18]

Over recent decades, anarchist movements and thinking have been increasingly corrupted by Marxist influences and polluted by so-called “libertarian communism”.

Although it is not the same thing as contemporary woke ideology, I do think that this communist tendency undermined, confused and weakened anarchist understanding to the point that it became vulnerable to take-over by toxic corporate-complicit dogma.

Anarchism was basically dragged down to a lower level by Marxism, which has fundamentally failed to provide us with a vision of human history that sees beyond the limits established by the system.

Indeed, you could say that Marxism *is one of those limits*, a gatekeeping ideology which, by insisting that the theft of our natural freedom is a necessary and “progressive” advance, turns us completely away from any attempt to seize it back.

[1] A.L. Morton, *A People's History of England* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1999), p. 6.

[2] Morton, p. 6.

[3] Morton, p. 5.

[4] Morton, p. 8.

[5] Morton, p. 5.

[6] Morton, p. 14.

[7] Morton, p. 25.

[8] Morton, p. 25.

[9] George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1958).

[10] Morton, p. 464.

[11] <https://grahamstevenson.me.uk/2008/09/19/a-l-morton/>

[12] Mikhail Bakunin, *Marxism, Freedom and the State*, trans. by K.J. Kenafick, (London: Freedom Press, 1990), p. 50.

[13] Gustav Landauer, *For Socialism*, trans. by David J Parent, (St Louis: Telos Press, 1978), p. 32.

[14] Landauer, p. 123.

[15] Landauer, p. 56.

[16] Emma Goldman, *Living My Life*, Vol I, (London: Duckworth, 1932), p. 9.

[17] Goldman, *Living My Life*, Vol II, p. 757.

[18] Fredy Perlman, 'Progress and Nuclear Power', *Anything Can Happen* (London: Phoenix Press, 1992), p. 76.

## PRISONER 1141183891920

Hey, you there! Prisoner 1141183891920! How dare you dream of a life outside your cell?

You were born in here, like your parents and your grandparents before you, and you'll die here too, locked up and locked down at His Majesty's Pleasure. For ever.

You've never known anything else and we're telling you now that there's nothing else to know, so stop filling your head with those stupid anarchist fairytales.

There is no world beyond this inclusive and innovative institution. There never has been and there never will be.

That's why we are proud to provide a climate-friendly window-free environment – it's a daily reminder that our reality is the only one.

You need this place. You are totally dependent on us.

Look at you! You do nothing for yourself. You sit there all day, lazily chained to that huge metal ball.

Your water is brought right to you, with the medication already nicely mixed in!

Your insect-based gruel is thrown lovingly at your feet by the Care Team officers!

Your mattress, blanket and all-purpose bucket are all lent to you at very competitive rates of interest!

We even send someone to hose you down and save you from your own wretched filth, once a year without exception!

How do you think you could ever cope outside this prison, if indeed an outside even existed?

Do you think food grows on trees? Or that drinking water just spurts out of the ground?

*Fool!*

You'd soon be dying of starvation, thirst and also of boredom, without ClinkTV24 to compulsorily fill your mind.

How do you think you would get your weekly vaccine boosters without the JailJab Squad at your beck and call?

Do you really think you could live a decent and happy life without the electricity that lights your cell day and night, that powers our safety-ensuring Smart Surveillance System, and that is discharged regularly and benevolently into your brain by our Equitable Educational Experts and their award-winning Corrective Impact Prods?

Your utopian delusions are an infantile disorder, Prisoner 1141183891920!

Freedom can never exist, you naive

numbskull!

Or maybe you're not as stupid as you look. Maybe you're too bright to really believe in all that childish anarcho-nonsense.

Yes, that could well be it! Deep down, you don't want to leave the prison, because you know it's impossible – you want to run it!

All this talk about liberty is just a cover for your own selfish ambition!

You're just like us, really, aren't you? You want to be us, you want our power.

So, on top of everything else, you're a hypocrite, Prisoner 1141183891920!

You're a liar, a fraud, a would-be tyrant hiding behind a thin facade of ridiculous idealism and prisonphobic hate speech!

Fact-checkers confirm that your disinformation and deceit represent a clear and present danger to the sustainability of the Global Narrative.

You are therefore cancelled.

*Security. Servility. Silence.*

## SEEING THE WHOLE TRUTH WITH A THREE DIMENSIONAL OUTLOOK

I am frequently disappointed to see people clinging rigidly to binary positions, imagining that opposing one particular nasty militarist empire, corrupt political party or manipulative dogma automatically involves throwing one's lot in with the rival that has been presented as its polar opposite.

And yet, at the same time, I have often declared myself to be firmly on one side of a pair of polar opposites, such as being for truth against lies, for right against wrong and for life against death.

*Does this therefore mean that my viewpoint is contradictory?*

The first thing to bear in mind is that there is always a third element implied by the existence of any two things or concepts, namely the relationship between them.

This relationship describes not just the differences between the one and the other, but also the context in which they co-exist.

If you make two dots on a piece of paper, for



example, and then draw a line between them, the line shows the distance separating the dots, but it also connects them.

If I say that the table is to the left of the sink, I am not only indicating the different spaces they occupy, but also describing the context in which they can be seen together.

Sometimes we describe the relationship-of-difference in terms of physical attributes rather than spatial positioning. The green umbrella is bigger than than the black one, we might say, identifying two physical differences, while at the same time reinforcing the essential similarity of these two objects in both being umbrellas.

But there are other instances where the distinction that we make relates to quality, rather than to mere size, colour or shape.

We might describe one person as being more honest than another, one sculpture as being more beautiful than another, one argument as being more just than another.

In order to make such judgements, we draw on our understanding of certain essential values.

These values tend to be defined in binary terms – honest versus dishonest, beautiful versus ugly, just versus unjust.

As with other binary pairings, there is a thematic link underlying the contrasting qualitative opposition.

Black and white are opposites, but also

united by their belonging to a monochromatic reality, as corresponding basically to the absence or presence of light.

Beautiful and ugly both refer to aesthetic appearance often considered to reflect intrinsic quality.

Because we are dealing here with values, tools for judgement, these oppositions are obviously necessary.

We have to be able to hold in our minds the two ends of the qualitative scale, know that they exist, so as to be able to judge the position, on that scale, of the thing we are assessing.

These important essential concepts, the two points at either end of the qualitative scale, amount to the third element that I mentioned as always being implied by the existence of two things or concepts.

They mark out the relationship between the two, the context in which their qualitative value can be ascertained.

But this qualitative dimension has been heavily undermined in contemporary thinking.

On the physical level these absolute terms are indeed often not literally applicable, because they belong to the higher and abstract level of essence.

And since our degraded modern thinking does not recognise the validity of essence (regarding any such recognition as the

*thoughtcrime* of “essentialism”), it therefore denies that these qualitative notions are real in any sense.

It insists that because human behaviour is a complicated matter, we cannot use the tools of “good” or “evil” to assess it; that beauty and ugliness are purely subjective labels with no fundamental meaning; that truth is always relative; that because there is such a thing as grey, there can be so such thing as black or white.

When this necessary binary tool for qualitative distinction is cancelled by our culture, people’s ability to think is disabled.

Denied the qualitative dimension, their outlook is reduced to the point where they can only see fundamental opposites on the lower level of physical form.

To refer back to the start of this essay, this is how they come to favour one particular nasty militarist empire, corrupt political party or manipulative dogma over another.

They are blinded to the awareness that the issue lies not with the superficial differences between the empires, parties or dogmas in question, but with the qualitative similarity that they are all nasty, corrupt or manipulative.

This is also how people might come to the erroneous conclusion that it is contradictory to oppose binary thinking on the horizontal scale of

physical form and, at the same time, to use binary terms as a means of describing the vertical scale of quality.

Their confusion stems from the fact they they cannot even see the existence of the qualitative dimension, because their thinking has become flattened to fit a one-dimensional world in which that dimension is deemed not to exist.

We therefore have to rediscover a three-dimensional outlook which enables us to see behind the facade of modern life, behind the Spectacle that has been constructed to deceive, divide and disempower us.

We have to incorporate into our thinking – our political as well as metaphysical thinking – the understanding that truth, meaning, beauty, goodness, nature and essence are all real.

Along with this, we need to understand why it is that such concepts have been declared illegitimate by a contemporary pseudo-philosophy which has evolved within a system built on lies, emptiness, ugliness, evil, artifice and superficiality.

Once armed with this holistic perspective, we will quickly see where this modern world is situated on the scale of quality and can begin to take steps to put things right.

## TURNING OUR BACKS ON THE LEFT-RIGHT RACKET

*“Revolution will make itself felt in the destruction of all that is most ‘modern’ and ‘progressive’”*

Jacques Camatte (1935-) is a political philosopher who rejects both Marxism and industrial capitalism and has influenced the green anarchist movement in the USA.

Writes Alex Trotter, who edited a collection of his essays: “Camatte advocates regeneration of nature through the end or radical curtailment of civilization and technology, and a new way of life outside the capitalist/socialist mode of production”. [1]

Camatte himself insists: “The human being is dead. The only possibility for another human being to appear is our struggle against our domestication, our emergence from it”. [2]

Originally involved with the International Communist Party, and influenced in particular by Amadeo Bordiga, Camatte has over many decades forged a very particular philosophy.

Notably through the review *Invariance*, he

has kept his thinking distinct from what might appear to be the similar strands of thought from the Situationists or the Frankfurt School, although he does refer approvingly to organic radical inspiration Ferdinand Tönnies. [3]

Like many in France, Camatte started to question Marxism about the time of the 1968 worker-student uprising, explains Trotter. [4]

He came to see that the much-idolized proletariat was very much part of capital's all-embracing system, as were the various "radical" political groups.

Writes Camatte, with Gianni Collu: "All forms of working-class political organization have disappeared. In their place, gangs confront one another in an obscene competition, veritable rackets rivaling each other in what they peddle, but identical in their essence". [5]

Even informal groups become rackets, he says, with recruits inevitably conforming to an agenda and outlook set by influential individuals.

"What maintains an apparent unity in the bosom of the gang is the threat of exclusion. Those who do not respect the norms are rejected with calumny; and even if they quit, the effect is the same". [6]

"Each gang of the left or the right carves out its own intellectual territory: anyone straying into one or the other of these territories is

automatically branded as a member of the relevant controlling gang”. [7]

“The critique of capital ought to be, therefore, a critique of the racket in all its forms... The theory which criticizes the racket cannot reproduce it”. [8]

For Camatte, hope lies not in political revolution but in deserting the system: “We must abandon this world dominated by capital, which has become a spectacle of beings and things”. [9]

Humans in the West have been “domesticated by capital” [10] since the 19th century, he says, and we need a deep-rooted turning away from its full-spectrum control.

“Our revolution as a project to reestablish community was necessary from the moment that ancient communities were destroyed”. [11]

He envisages “the destruction of urbanization and the formation of a multitude of communities distributed over the earth”, [12] with the creation of “a world where all the biological potentialities can finally develop”. [13]

Camatte writes: “A species in harmony with nature is needed”. [14] “The global human community can only exist on the basis of multiple and diverse communities, founded upon the specific historical and geographical foundations of each zone”. [15]

All this requires a vision vastly broader than the narrowly-restricted ideological terrain

usually defined as acceptable by the left.

“The reader should not be astonished if to support this amplitude we refer to authors classically tagged religious, mystical, etc” [16] he writes, in view of the fact that “capital is fundamentally a profanation of the sacred”. [17]

He argues that “the left-right dichotomy” has ceased to matter because “in one way or another they each defend capital equally”. [18]

“All the movements of the left and right are functionally the same inasmuch as they all participate in a larger, more general movement toward the destruction of the human species”. [19]

Camatte identifies the way in which the ongoing encroachment of capitalist development needs to destroy the barriers represented by “traditional social relations and previous ways of life, including previous ways of thinking”. [20]

“The species is being restructured in order that the despotic community of capital can be imposed and realized”. [21]

And he has particularly condemned Marxist enthusiasm for industrial drudgery, the “capitalization of human beings” [22] in which people are “all slaves of capital” [23] and accordingly reduced to the dehumanised status of “workers”.

Trotter explains that, for Camatte, “when human beings are seen primarily as producers



and laborers, they become nothing but the activity of capital”. [24]

Camatte warns that Marxism is, in fact, “a theory of development”, [25] aiming for a mere “transition” [26] into “a new mode of production where productive forces blossom”. [27]

“Communism was affirmed in opposition to bourgeois society, but not in opposition to capital”. [28]

He says that with the Bolshevik revolution in Russia, the limited “revolt of the proletariat” ultimately “aided capital in its movement toward real domination” [29] by reshaping – *resetting!* – society to suit the needs of its own production.

“We have got to remember that capital, as it constantly overthrows traditional patterns of life, is itself revolution.

“This should lead us to think again about the nature of revolution and to realize that capital is able to take control of social forces in order to overthrow the established order in insurrections directed against the very society that it already dominates”. [30]

In a key passage very much representing the organic radical outlook, Camatte writes: “Revolution can no longer be taken to mean just the destruction of all that is old and conservative, because capital has accomplished this itself.

“Rather it will appear as as a return to

something (a revolution in the mathematical sense of the term), a return to community, though not in any form that has existed previously.

“Revolution will make itself felt in the destruction of all that is most ‘modern’ and ‘progressive’ (because science is capital).

“Another of its manifestations will involve the reappropriation of all those aspects and qualities of life that have still managed to affirm that which is human”. [31]

Decades before the full emergence of the “woke” phenomenon, Camatte identified a “disintegration of consciousness” on the left caused by a splintering of any overall critique of the system into narrow campaigning for particular minority causes.

Notes Trotter: “All of these movements grouped around partial demands have lent themselves easily to recuperation by capital’s material community”. [32]

In the 1970s Camatte was already condemning leftists who supported “progressive” technology such as artificial reproduction, the precursors of today’s transgender/transhumanist cultists.

“They are unable to see that a scientific solution is a capitalist solution, because it eliminates humans and lays open the possibility of a totally controlled society”, he said. [33]

“These people seem to believe in solving everything by mutilation. Why not do away with pain by eliminating the organs of sensitivity? Social and human problems cannot be solved by science and technology. Their only effect when used is to render humanity even more superfluous”. [34]

He astutely warned in 1973, long before online education was possible: “Teachers and professors are, from the point of view of capital, useless beings who will tend to be eliminated in favour of programmed lessons and teaching machines”. [35]

Although Camatte has declared it “increasingly imbecile to proclaim oneself a marxist”, [36] one of the elements he has retained from Karl Marx’s thinking is the term *Gemeinwesen*, meaning the human essence, the common being of the human species, similar to the idea of “withness”.

He writes: “The separation of the human being from the community (*Gemeinwesen*) is a despoliation. The human being as a worker has lost a mound of attributes that formed a whole when he was related to his community”. [37]

“The human being is an individuality and a *Gemeinwesen*. The reduction of the human being to his present inexpressive state could take place only because of the removal of *Gemeinwesen*, of the possibility for each individual to absorb the

universal, to embrace the entirety of human relations within the entirety of time”. [38]

- [1] Alex Trotter; 'Introduction', Jacques Camatte, *This World We Must Leave and Other Essays*, ed. Alex Trotter (New York: Autonomedia, 1995), p. 9. All following page references are to this work.
- [2] Jacques Camatte, 'The Wandering of Humanity' (1973), p. 88.
- [3] Camatte, 'Against Domestication' (1973), p. 96.
- [4] Trotter, 'Introduction', p.8.
- [5] Jacques Camatte & Gianni Collu, 'On Organization' (1972), p. 26.
- [6] Camatte & Collu, 'On Organization', p. 29.
- [7] Camatte, 'Against Domestication', p. 96.
- [8] Camatte & Collu, 'On Organization', p. 32.
- [9] Camatte, 'The World We Must Leave' (1976), p. 170.
- [10] Camatte, 'The Wandering of Humanity', p. 48.
- [11] Camatte, 'The Wandering of Humanity', p. 71.
- [12] Camatte, 'The Wandering of Humanity', p. 66.
- [13] Camatte, 'The Wandering of Humanity', p. 70.
- [14] Camatte, 'The World We Must Leave', p. 156.
- [15] Camatte, 'Echoes of the Past' (1980), p. 204.
- [16] Camatte, 'The Wandering of Humanity', p. 73.
- [17] Camatte, 'Echoes of the Past', p. 197.
- [18] Camatte, 'Against Domestication', pp. 94-95.
- [19] Camatte, 'Against Domestication', p. 95.
- [20] Camatte, 'Against Domestication', p. 111.
- [21] Camatte, 'Echoes of the Past', p. 207.
- [22] Camatte, 'The Wandering of Humanity', p. 40.
- [23] Camatte, 'The Wandering of Humanity', p. 68.
- [24] Trotter, 'Introduction', pp. 13-14.
- [25] Camatte, 'The Wandering of Humanity', p. 77.
- [26] Camatte, 'The Wandering of Humanity', p. 77.
- [27] Camatte, 'The Wandering of Humanity', p. 86.
- [28] Camatte, 'The Wandering of Humanity', p. 47.
- [29] Camatte, 'Against Domestication', p. 112.
- [30] Camatte, 'Against Domestication', pp. 112-13.
- [31] Camatte, 'Against Domestication', p. 113.
- [32] Trotter, 'Introduction', p. 12.
- [33] Camatte, 'Against Domestication', p. 94.
- [34] Camatte, 'Against Domestication', p. 93.
- [35] Camatte, 'Against Domestication', p. 111.

[36] Camatte, 'The Wandering of Humanity', p. 70.

[37] Camatte, 'The Wandering of Humanity', p. 64.

[38] Camatte, 'The Wandering of Humanity', p. 69.

TRADITIONALISM, ANARCHISM AND  
THE URGENT NEED FOR RIGHTEOUS  
REVOLT: A DIALOGUE

*An in-depth conversation between W.D. James  
and Paul Cudenec.*

**W.D. James:** What first attracted me to your thought was your bringing together of Traditionalism (or Perennialism) and anarchism. How did you first come upon the Traditionalists and what interested you in that line of thought?

**Paul Cudenec:** I first came across René Guénon by chance, if there is such a thing, when my ex-wife spotted the title of his *The Crisis of the Modern World* in a second-hand bookshop and, knowing my views (*only too well!*), thought it might interest me. It obviously did and I quickly got hold of other Guénon works such as *East and West* and *The Reign of Quantity and the Signs of the Times*. I was excited at finding a solid intellectual and metaphysical basis for what had, until then, been more or less an instinctive personal dislike of modernity, fuelled by green anarchist

thinking.

I also felt that there was a compatibility here with anarchist ideas. No, in fact, I knew this to be the case because they slotted so perfectly together in my mind, along with the thought of the likes of Carl Jung and Joseph Campbell that I had been exploring at the time. I first quoted Guénon in the form of footnotes to *We Anarchangels of Creative Destruction*, a piece of writing which I distributed as a free A5 pamphlet at the 2011 London Anarchist Bookfair and which can today be found in the book *Antibodies, Anarchangels and Other Essays*.

Looking back, I see that I was enthused by his definition of progress as “a profound decadence, continuously accelerating, which is dragging humanity toward the pit where pure quantity reigns” and his insistence that the modern world’s “development of industry and machinery”, seeking to “dominate matter and bend it to their service” only led to our slavery.

I still mentally picture industrial development as resembling “the movement of a mobile body running down a slope and going faster as it approaches the bottom”.

Guénon voiced perfectly my own intuition that the world of industry and business operates on a lower level than that which humanity is capable of achieving, that its domination of our world amounts to a debasement of the human

condition.

In contrasting the “solely material and sentimental” aspirations of contemporary anti-culture with the traditional metaphysical pursuit of truth, Guénon helped me to express the important understanding that the modern world involves not just the loss of freedom and closeness to nature that was expressed in green anarchist literature, but also a loss of intellect.

I was relieved to find that Guénon regarded nationalism as essentially opposed to the traditional outlook and I recognised a distinctly anarchist note in his declaration that “the great ability of those who are in control in the modern world lies in making the people believe that they are governing themselves”.

His insights into the agenda behind modernity were also a perfect fit for me. He writes, for instance: “Let there be no confusion on this point: if the general public accepts the pretext of ‘civilization’ in all good faith, there are those for whom it is no more than mere moralistic hypocrisy, serving as a mask for designs of conquest or economic ambitions”.

It was only later, thanks to reading secondary literature, notably by Mark Sedgwick, that I discovered Guénon’s personal connection to the Sufi anarchist Ivan Aguéli and the intellectual anarchism of his fellow Perennialist Ananda Coomaraswamy.



By January 2012 I was writing about “rediscovering anarcho-perennialism”, citing a particular parallel between Traditionalist thought and the writing of the German-Jewish ‘mystical’ anarchist Gustav Landauer. From that point onwards, the Perennialist element became one of the main pillars of my personal philosophy.

So how about you, W.D.? What path led you to an interest in Traditionalist thought?

**James:** I’m starting to think everyone comes across the Traditionalists without meaning to. In my case without even recognizing it at first.

Back in school, a group of friends and I were trying to think our way out of philosophical materialism. I was writing my dissertation trying to make connections between European romanticism on the one hand and the American transcendentalists and pragmatists on the other, showing that both of the latter were trying to confront what at the time I was calling ‘sociological skepticism’. By that I meant the acidic effects of modernity on cultural, social, and political cohesion and meaning.

Unfortunately, I lost my optimism about the prospects of that project before I defended my dissertation (though I did defend it), largely because of a couple of theologians I read as part of that project: Paul Tillich on religion and

cultural cohesion and Reinhold Niebuhr as a critic of the pragmatists. I felt that the religious language these guys could bring to the issues was actually very helpful. It was also a religious language laden with metaphysical concerns.

I also discovered that I loved Plato and his ideas on the order of the soul and of the cosmos.

With my group of friends, we were reading religious scholars like Mircea Eliade and Rudolf Otto. Somewhere as part of that we got to reading Huston Smith's *The World's Religions* and I ended up loving his *Forgotten Truth*, which is a very readable outline of the Traditionalist framework.

However, I was just thinking of him as one more scholar of religion, not realizing that there was the whole background of Traditionalism that he was operating from within. What I loved about Smith was the parallel between Platonic philosophy and the metaphysics he was arguing lay behind all the major world religions. That really added scope to that basic view, and I was pretty much hooked.

Since then, I've delved into other Traditionalists like Guénon, Seyyed Hossein Nasr, and Lord Northbourne. They provide a good critique of the modern world and a versatile hierarchical view of reality that keeps things connected with the transcendent. I think one needs some sort of elevated worldview, probably

rooted in pre-modernity, to struggle along in this world of ours and to make sense of it.

Speaking of hierarchy though, this is where your ideas were especially provocative for me. I was used to the interpretation of the Traditionalists that understood them as supporting the idea that cosmic metaphysical hierarchy (say, the 'great chain of being' idea: something like 'the absolute' on top, then humans in the middle linking the transcendent/spiritual realm with the earthly/material realm and ultimately with something like sludge on the bottom of the chain) implied a social hierarchy as well.

In this regard they sometimes reference the Hindu caste system (with its priestly class on top, then a military class, then what we might think of as businesspeople with ultimately those beyond the pale at the bottom) as a social system reflective of Traditional metaphysics, but you take quite a different path with it.

Traditionalists who would fall within a group of thinkers I have classed together as 'aristocratic anti-modernists' in my recent writing would defend the political hierarchy interpretation. For instance, Alexander Dugin, in *Political Platonism*, presents the Traditionalist metaphysics in terms of the contrast between the One (the unity at the top of being) and the Many (the unformed sludge at the bottom). I think he is

right that this is the basic Traditionalist metaphysics. The lower aspects of reality must stay in touch with the unity at the top to maintain cohesion, order, purpose, and meaning (you could think of the One as the Spirit that animates the many, Nature I suppose).

On his view, modernity is the severing of the connection with the One and the liberation, or really, just the cutting loose, of the Many, which is just chaos. Politically, he draws anti-liberal and anti-democratic (which Aristotle had defined as rule by the Many) conclusions arguing that the modern world is a 'Devilopolis' (the city of the Devil, in that it has abolished metaphysics and fallen as low as it is possible to fall metaphysically).

I'm sure you disagree with that sort of political conclusion. Do you agree with the basic idea that the Traditionalists support a metaphysically hierarchical cosmos though?

**Cudenec:** Yes, the idea of 'higher' and 'lower' levels is obviously very much part of traditional metaphysics. What I disagree with is the idea of slapping that notion inappropriately on to the social and political realm.

I've had this discussion in the past with anarchists who have reacted angrily to my use of the terms 'higher' and 'lower' in a metaphysical context, taking this as a contradiction of our

shared political viewpoint. I suppose they would argue that just as the idea of God as Supreme Authority has been abused to justify supposedly god-approved worldly authority, so does the notion of metaphysical hierarchy risk reinforcing social hierarchy. And, yes, your example of the Hindu caste system could easily be invoked by anarchist anti-Traditionalists to back up that point.

Personally, I don't believe that metaphysical notions of higher and lower find their social equivalent in hierarchies as currently understood in our society. After all, one of the key metaphysical hierarchical distinctions (often stressed by Guénon) is between quantity (low) and quality (high). Political or social hierarchy, in contemporary society, is based on political and economic power, which from a Traditionalist point of view equates to lowness! We therefore have to look elsewhere for the earthly manifestation of metaphysical hierarchy than in the purely quantitative distinction between the powerful and the powerless, the materially rich and the materially poor.

I would say that the real hierarchy among human beings is qualitative, which does not at all relate to quantitative status. Indeed, traditional religions tend to regard quantitative achievement (being rich, for instance) as being at the low end of the qualitative scale – take Jesus's

comments about a rich man's chances of going to heaven. Authentic spiritual-ethical codes (such as that proposed by Sufism) often positively present the shedding of material wealth and status as a necessary step in achieving a higher place on the qualitative hierarchical ladder.

For me, the co-option of the metaphysical concept of hierarchy to justify material wealth and power is thus nothing less than its complete inversion!

**James:** Yes, showing that holding to a hierarchical metaphysics does not entail mapping that onto a social hierarchy seems essential to me.

Before I encountered your thought, I assumed anarchists would tend towards an anti-metaphysical position by necessity. Maybe I picked that idea from Bakunin or somewhere; the 'no gods, no masters' idea. I had taken 'no gods' to imply no transcendent order. You helped me see though that a well-founded anarchism needs a principle of natural, metaphysical, order to support the faith that we can create good social order organically (ie, we don't need the state, Leviathan, imposing order through the exercise of power). Maybe that should be sort of obvious and maybe is to everyone else in the world, but it came as a sort of revelation to me that made me rethink my understanding of anarchism as a position.

I was still skeptical that the Traditionalists could be reconciled with anarchism though. So, it came as a surprise when you pointed out in one of your books that Ananda Coomaraswamy, a core member of that school, had actually proposed anarchism.

I was familiar with Guénon's *Spiritual Authority and Temporal Power*, where he outlines what I took to be the standard Traditionalist position supporting a social hierarchy. There he references both the Hindu caste system and Dante's defense of the two swords of Papal and Imperial authority in the context of medieval society. More recently when I went back to look at Guénon's argument more closely, I was pleased to find that he suggests in a previous age (what we would probably think of as a 'mythical golden age' but which I think he accepts as an actual historical age) humans were universally enlightened by metaphysical truth so that the spiritual and temporal were united and that there was just one caste. So, at least in some past situation, he was suggesting that the metaphysical hierarchy was reflected in an egalitarian social structure.

What Guénon situated in the past, Coomaraswamy was willing to locate in the future as an aspiration. In his essay 'Individualism, Autonomy and Function,' he defends the repudiation of tyranny and

government authority. He distinguishes two approaches an anarchism might take. The first he calls the way of 'self-assertion'. One rebels against the imposition of power to preserve individual autonomy. However, taking that approach results in chaos because we are just left with unconnected individuals all jealously defending their liberty but without any shared principle of order or cooperation.

The other approach he calls the way of 'self-renunciation' which centers on the rejection of a 'will to govern.' He says this is the way, and the form of anarchy, compatible with spontaneous order. However, for that to emerge there has to be a shared understanding of our natural unity. In that essay he says the necessary commitment is to a metaphysics of 'monism': essentially that all is ultimately one.

He says the future project is to develop this into a universal awareness which will spawn new religious forms which will make spontaneous social order possible. He concedes that might be a hard thing to accomplish, but basically says, 'hey, why not aim for the ideal—at least you'll move in the right direction'.

That bowled me over. A Traditionalist explicitly advocating anarchism and talking about new religious forms which would still be connected to the primordial intuition of metaphysical truth!



**Cudenec:** Indeed! The fact that this is so surprising today is, I suppose, a reflection not just of the oft-corrupted contemporary presentation of Traditionalism, but also of the direction that anarchism has taken over the last century. For me, this aspect of simultaneously looking back and forward to a golden age – with the current situation merely a temporary blip to be rectified by revolutionary activity – is an essential element of the overall anarchist idea.

But the vision of anarchism held by people today, even by those who adopt that political label, is so reduced and degraded that that kind of spiritual depth is no longer visible. That has been part of my mission over the last dozen years, in fact – to try to influence contemporary anarchist thinking to the point that its adherents could appreciate what Coomaraswamy was saying.

Ultimately the aim would be to reunite anarchism with the metaphysics of which I think it is the political form. Unfortunately, this hasn't really worked, in that 'mainstream' anarchists (*whatever that could possibly mean!*) have rejected my interpretation of the philosophy. Sometimes I think they are correct and that, whether I like it or not, historical anarchism has always been heavily influenced by scientism, materialism and the progressivism of the general left. It was when I was in one of those phases

that I decided to present my own version of anarchism as organic radicalism – thus abandoning the struggle for ‘ownership’ rights of the anarchist philosophy.

But at other times I feel that the anarchist tradition contains so much value that I should continue to embrace it. I also don’t like the idea that I could be pushed out of the anarchosphere by individuals and groups that I don’t regard as really espousing anarchism!

Any thoughts on that, W.D.?

**James:** I got interested in organic radicalism from the Traditionalist angle, not the anarchist angle. So, I’m definitely something of an outsider looking in at the struggles you are talking about, though my respect for anarchism has grown.

As you have previously expressed it, organic radicalism is a development of anarchism which subsumes anarchism and develops it further just as anarchism had subsumed socialism and developed it more fully. So, to be an Organic Radical would mean one is also by necessity an anarchist and a socialist. It’s sort of like a set of Russian nesting dolls. The outer one fully contains the inner one but also makes it ‘bigger’.

At least the orgrad label is yours, so I’m hesitant to contest your interpretation on any point. However, part of your idea is that you aren’t creating a school of thought but

rediscovering and developing a very old tradition of thought within the contemporary context and expressing it in ways that make it accessible for building a future. I think that is right. Viewed in that way, I wonder if it isn't better to think of it more as a pool into which various streams flow? Certainly you could get there from the anarchist stream. Maybe you could get there from the socialist stream without really adopting anarchism? Maybe there are other streams as well. If anarchism is the politics actually implied by traditionalism, could you get to orgrad first, then develop anarchist tendencies later?

Personally, I feel the orgrad pool might be fed by many rivers. This is not to make it so vague that it ceases to have meaning. The central ideas are the central ideas. I just think that in our current political context a lot of things are opened up and a person might get to that pool of ideas via any number of paths. If that set of ideas is true, one would expect people to converge on them from various directions: that is how the magnet of truth operates. What do you think of switching metaphors from Russian nesting dolls to the pool fed by streams?

In terms of your agonized relationship to the rest of contemporary anarchism, I think the general principle of fighting for value where you find it applies there. Not everything of value is nicely tied up in one bundle. If you see a lot of

value in the anarchist tradition, as you clearly do, fight for it. Hang on to it. There is not a superabundance of good things in our civilization right now. Personally, I don't want to give up anything good without a fight. At least some anarchists seem to get what you are offering and are really turned on by it. At least some of the others don't actually seem to be people who are into imaginative or profound ideas. Maybe they will be at some point. For now, they probably aren't your audience.

People with intellectual integrity will respect you for that. People without that integrity aren't too much worth worrying about. Fight for what you love! What else are we going to fight for?

**Cudenec:** You're right that if the philosophy I am seeking to revive amounts to a political manifestation of something old and true, then its discovery is not going to be dependent on any particular contemporary political path. Perhaps my initial presentation of the orgrad idea was too closely based on my own political trajectory, which passed through anarchism to reach where it is now.

As you know, I have recently been exploring the idea of convergence, the flowing of diverse authentic streams into the one pool that you were talking about. It seems to me, for instance, that behind nationalism, if you strip away all the

flag-waving subjectivity and cultural boasting, there must lie a core motivating value of something like self-determination. “We must have the freedom to live our lives in the way we wish, without being told what to do by people whom we not regard as part of our community”.

This principle, applied more broadly, is shared by anarchism. What is perhaps missing from certain anarchist visions, however, is a valuing of traditional heritage and cultural belonging. These are often regarded as vestiges of an old order, standing in the way of social advance and those who emphasise their importance are thus condemned as ‘reactionary’.

The organic radical attitude is, on the other hand, that specific traditions and cultures are bulwarks against the tyranny of centralised power, which is why they have to be removed by those who wish to dominate and exploit us. From this perspective it becomes clear that those on the left who applaud the sweeping away of traditional cultures, customs and codes are – consciously or not – collaborating with the destructive activity of centralised power.

This is a criticism of the ‘left’ usually associated with the ‘right’, but which in no way contradicts or undermines the parts of the orgrad outlook that would generally be considered ‘left-wing’.

In this way I think that orgrad, as well as

voicing the view that the old 'left' and 'right' categories have no meaning, actively shows this to be the case, by presenting a coherent philosophy which embraces aspects of both.

**James:** I agree that a healthy nationalism is probably largely about self-determination. That could be seen in many of the anti-colonial and liberation movements of the 20th century: valuing and reviving the 'local' culture was often part of those struggles, in opposition to the imposed culture of the colonial power.

I'm particularly fond of local and regional (that is subnational) cultures. That is probably more aesthetic than explicitly political: I like local cultures, local music, local dialects, local food, etc.... It's just a better world when there are lots of differences. Those do pose obstacles to the globalizing machine though, so tend to come under attack and have their material basis undermined.

Of course, the vexed issue of 'identity' is bound up with these sorts of ideas.

In general, I'm a diversity within unity sort of guy. That is also a version of the 'one and the many' metaphysical issue mentioned earlier. You can go too far toward either side: too much unity or too much diversity. With people, I think yes, we are human first (unity). But isn't it marvelous how many ways that shared humanity has

manifested itself historically in all the different cultures, religions, etc... that we have built (the many).

If you say there is only difference, then it's hard to figure out how we'd ever come together or on what basis we would foster mutual respect. If you say there is, or ought to be, only unity, then that ends up being oppressive to those who wish to retain their particularity and, I think, dehumanizing as the particular is also a part of what it is to be a human. Both sides are real and valuable.

So, when that is applied to the issue of identity, I see problems with both what would usually be thought of as the 'left' and the 'right' approaches that put too much emphasis on the 'many/difference' side. I think that is actually very common currently and they end up feeding off of one another, driving us to a very bad place socially.

However, I don't think the answer is a bland universalism where all difference is erased: I associate that with the neo-liberal effort to reduce us all to consumers, including consumers of identities—superficial identities you get by buying certain products. I think a healthy identity is always going to be a back and forth play between the unifying theme of our shared human nature and the diversifying theme of particular cultures and histories. In various

contexts, one or the other will come to the fore, but never in such a way that it eradicates the other.

How do you think the issue of 'identity' fits into all of this?

**Cudenec:** 'Identity' is yet another one of those slippery terms that means different things to different people! I'd apply it to our overall sense of who we are, which would include our family history and background, the culture inherited from our family, the culture absorbed during our lifetimes, the places we have lived, the food we have eaten, the people we have known, the work we have done, the thoughts we have thought, the dreams we have dreamed... Our individual identity is thus unique, but parts of it overlap with that of others, opening up areas of affinity that are often hard to pin down or label.

Our personal identity is also always evolving, along with the circumstances that help shape it. Although I have friends in the UK whom I have known for 30 or 40 years, the friends in my everyday life today are not the same as they were even 10 years ago. Although I am English, the people I have been closest to in life have often had different roots. I still feel great attachment to the English countryside and what's left of its traditional rural culture, but I also feel spiritually connected to the hills, forests



and rivers of the Cévennes by which I am now surrounded.

The question of anybody's identity is infinitely complex, which is why it is so ridiculous to reduce it to a question of being 'black' or 'white', 'Muslim' or 'Jewish', 'British', 'French', 'American' or whatever.

This ties in with what you were saying about local cultures. While I can see that nationalists want to protect culture from global standardisation, their fetishisation of 'the nation' can blind them to the fact that this entity is also a central, standardising, culture-crushing one.

The same would be true on any level. If local culture involved declaring that in Ourshire we should all think and talk and dress and behave in Our shared way, it would be a microcosm of the centralising nation-state. An organic community would naturally involve the emergence of an Our way of seeing and doing things, but this has to come from below.

Something living and ever-evolving can perhaps be described, with a certain approximation, but it certainly can't be defined from above and then regarded as if it can never amount to anything more than that definition.

I agree with you that a 'bland universalism' is not a healthy approach to identity, but I think that this kind of one-size-fits-all 'universalism' is a reduction – yet another modern degradation! –

of what the idea really implies. Contemporary thinking always seems to be setting up fake binary oppositions for which the only solution is some sort of middle-ground compromise that betrays the essence of both the original insights.

I see that there is an unnameable Whole which contains the successive Russian dolls of the universe, the earth and the human species. But I also see that this Whole is only actually alive through the individual beings at the reality-fronting level of this cosmic reality. You and I (and all our fellow creatures) are the nerve endings by which it feels, the lungs with which it breathes, the brain cells with which it thinks, the feet on which it walks.

The diversity of our identities, inclinations, intuitions and interventions is the organic living of the Whole. There is no contradiction between universality and particularity, any more than there is a contradiction between a forest and the trees within it, the physical form of a book and its contents, or a political movement and the individuals who make it up.

**James:** You've alluded several times to the fact that orgrad doesn't fit into contemporary political categories very well and specifically to how many contemporary anarchists have issues with bringing in the metaphysical and spiritual aspects of it.

I think that probably has to do with how orgrad transcends any narrow conception of politics. It is at least ‘metapolitical’. It’s been a long time since it was normal to situate a politics within a larger metaphysical and spiritual framework. However, it seems to me that is a particularly urgent need in our time.

Can you say a bit more about why especially the spiritual part is absolutely essential to orgrad (and maybe a bit more about what ‘spiritual’ means in this context)?

**Cudenec:** The spiritual aspect is, firstly, the metaphysical framing that enables a holistic political understanding. If there is such a thing as a living Whole embracing absolutely everything, then the same concept naturally follows down the metaphorical ladder. There is such a thing as a living planet, there is such an organism as humankind, authentic bottom-up communities do amount to (shifting, overlapping, ever-evolving) living entities.

Secondly, this conception also brings with it a sense of coherence and purpose. The universe is not just some random swirl of matter caused by an inexplicable explosion, which has happened to spawn what we identify as life, but is the self-manifestation, the coming-into-being, of the living Whole. There is inherent pattern and purpose within the cosmos, the living world

and human beings. This purpose forms part of the structure of the human mind, if often only on the unconscious level.

The importance of spirituality to the individual is that it encourages them to be receptive to this innate meaning and purpose, an awareness of which goes hand in hand with an awareness of our ultimate belonging to the Whole. The aim for each of us, in our lives, is to carry out the purpose for which we were intended, as part of the flowering of the Whole on the terrestrial plane.

The ideas of beauty, good and nature are often closely related in human minds, alongside the notion of freedom, which is our ability to do (individually and collectively) what we wish to do, what feels right to do, what we were always meant to do.

One of the blockages to this natural, good and beautiful mode of being, in harmony with the overall purpose of the Whole, is our individual ego. This, obviously, is why spiritual traditions emphasise the need to overcome the hold it can have on our thoughts and behaviour.

The individual also faces an external threat from the ego-centred power of other individuals who conspire to prevent him or her from having the freedom to act naturally, in accordance with overall good.

In a contemporary context this obstacle is

the system in all its aspects – its authority, its policing, its expropriation, its industrialism, its brainwashing... Overcoming his or her own ego is not going to be enough to allow the individual to act freely in these conditions, as there are solid physical restrictions in the way.

At this stage, spirituality is therefore obliged to take on a new form. Instead of simply being the wisdom to live naturally and properly, as part of the unfolding purpose of the Whole, it has to become the determination to break down the obstacle in its way, so that life can again thrive as it is meant to.

This pro-active spirituality, this warrior spirituality if you like, allows us to channel the positive energy of the Whole.

When we put aside the ego and its fear of death, we become a powerful means by which the Whole can overcome a blockage to its healthy evolution. We fully and consciously become what we always really were – a part of the Whole.

When we make our body and brain available to the Whole, it can live through us in order to reassert the goodness of its natural unfolding.

The uprising that we so urgently need, in order to bring down the criminocracy, can only happen if sufficient numbers of us take that spiritual step.

Authentic political revolt therefore depends on a widespread spiritual awakening that allows

people to become the means by which life and goodness can reassert themselves against malevolent elements impeding their natural unfolding.

An understanding of this is central to the organic radical vision, I would say.

**James:** Well, that is rather elegantly stated, I must say. I like that basic dynamic of both the ego and structures of domination being blockages and, hence, calling us forward to a spirituality of both wisdom and a warrior element.

The second aspect suggests to me the need for what we might think of as noble character: the formation of a character with sufficient strength and vitality to take heroic action (risk, self-sacrifice in service to a worthy cause, that sort of thing).

If that is roughly correct, there is what might appear, superficially, to be a contradiction between a politics that is essentially egalitarian and the need to cultivate nobility of spirit. I don't think there is actually any contradiction. Certainly, any revolutionary or rebel in history who fought and sacrificed for an egalitarian cause had to have many heroic virtues to stay the course.

Is that in line with what you are saying?

**Cudenec:** I would say that any erroneous im-

pression of a necessary contradiction here can only stem from the degradation in the use and understanding of language that tragically appears to be part of the general cultural and intellectual decline in the modern industrial world.

It is quite normal that one word should have several distinct possible meanings – you only have to browse through the definitions offered by a dictionary to see how frequently that is the case.

Normally, human intelligence allows us to sort out the particular meaning that has been intended by the user of that word, through understanding the context, both in terms of syntax and of broader sense.

The fragmentation of understanding in contemporary society, which can only ever see the whole as a mere accumulation of parts and never the parts as mere aspects of the whole, means that context becomes increasingly inaccessible, like the metaphorical wood hidden by the trees.

People, particularly those over-attached to rather narrow and dogmatic positions, tend to grasp hold of one meaning of a word and then desperately cling on to it, refusing to accept any other possible meaning, like a dog with its teeth fiercely clenched on to some stupid piece of wood it has picked up.

An ‘egalitarian’ society can mean a fair one,

in which everybody has the equal opportunity to fully participate and flourish, regardless of their background.

But it can also be a society where the term is used to justify central state control, to thwart individual initiative, to treat human beings as identical units and to hammer out all traits that distinguish them from one another.

It's not that one term is right and the other wrong, but that we need to listen to how exactly it is being used, by whom, in conjunction with what other terms and for what ends.

This is not usually too difficult. If it is deployed by the Chinese Communist Party, for instance, or by the likes of the WEF (although such circles tend to talk rather about 'equity' and 'equitable', presumably because they have a sly financial sense in mind), we will understand, from the context, that they mean the state-enforced, standardising, kind of egalitarianism.

If, however, the term is used by freedom-loving people who oppose centralised power wielded by the state or dominant interests, then we will interpret it in its liberatory meaning.

There are, however, people of a particular political background who will always interpret 'egalitarian' in the negative sense, choosing to wilfully ignore context in the interests of clinging on to their well-chewed ideological stick. They thus impede the evolution of discussion and



thought beyond the level of binary division at which they have become stuck.

With regard to the term 'noble', I am very aware of the sense in which it applies to the old ruling class, those with inherited wealth and power who regarded, and no doubt still do regard, themselves as entirely superior to the serfs and plebs whose labour they exploit in order to maintain their lives of luxury and plenty. That's why I don't generally use the term!

I am also, of course, very aware of the positive sense of the word, as applying to thoughts, actions or people motivated by a sense of justice and value beyond self-interest, a 'higher' kind of being.

There are, however, people of a particular political background who will always interpret 'noble' in the negative sense, choosing to wilfully ignore context in the interests of clinging on to their well-chewed ideological stick. They also thus impede the evolution of discussion and thought beyond the level of binary division at which they have become stuck!

It is these entrenched context-free mindsets that see contradictions where there are none. In fact, I would say that a truly noble outlook would undoubtedly embrace the fairness implied by positive egalitarianism!

This question has led us back into territory we were exploring earlier on, concerning

hierarchy. I suspect that, regardless of what has been said so far, there might remain some doubts in your mind about the fundamental compatibility between anarchism and Traditionalism. If this is the case, maybe you would like to set them out so that we can discuss them?

**James:** I'd like to push a little further into something you just said first. I see what you mean about the term 'nobility.' I suppose the sense in which it refers to the titled nobility might be the primary association for many Europeans. In the States we've never had a titled nobility. Our Rockefellers and Carnegies, and now our Gates and Musks, were never thought of as nobility (at least not by the rest of us anyway). Their power has consistently been recognized and they may be broadly admired for their financial successes, but we pretty much know they are plutocrats. So, I think the broader meaning of 'nobility' is probably what would come first to most Americans' minds.

But I'm not really concerned with the word really, just the reality. I pushed in that direction in my last comment because I had one of my pet ideas in mind. I think there are no cultural institutions that are really calling young people to, let's say, 'heroic' endeavor, but I suspect that if such a call were made, a lot of them would

respond positively.

The institutions that should convey that message, the schools and the churches in particular, by and large are not. Increasingly those institutions adopt at best a therapeutic stance, or are so milquetoast that they don't succeed in inspiring anyone. Even the military is proving incapable of this. Sports is about the only place left in the lives of many of the young where someone really expects some sort of excellence of them. Hence, I suspect if a movement or a philosophy called for heroic venture, it would speak to a lot of people and fill a cultural and existential vacuum.

But to your question about Traditionalism and anarchism. I think the issue turns on your assessment of the human potential for spiritual enlightenment. Above you talked about a broad cultural movement that would bring this sort of metaphysical awareness and open up a channel for massive political revolt. I think an anarchist has to be pretty optimistic about the capacities of all human beings, so it makes sense to me that you might approach Traditionalism from anarchism. I agree with you: all anarchists should be Traditionalists!

From the Traditionalist side, I think things look differently. Most of the Traditionalists seem to hold the view that only a relatively small percent of people will develop genuine spiritual

vision. Hence their distinction between esoteric religion being for this group and exoteric religion being for the majority.

Most of them seem to, under most circumstances, support the idea of a spiritual hierarchy with relatively few enlightened ones on the top. They then translate that into a political hierarchy whereby that spiritual elite can provide the vision for the society as a whole. For the many not so enlightened it is beneficial to be incorporated into this sacramental hierarchy. So, I could see most Traditionalists not becoming anarchists, but some have.

If this is more or less what many Traditionalists believe, I think they have made a mistake about the religious traditions they value. Many of the major world religions, and I think Christianity preeminently (which is seldom held up by the Traditionalists as the normative model), contain the notion that spiritual realities upset worldly hierarchies.

Jesus was quite explicit that no kingdoms in this world are the Kingdom of God and that that Kingdom turns our this-worldly values on their heads. The beatitudes and virtually every parable he teaches transmit this message and work a transvaluation of the values of the rich and powerful. The Traditionalists do a great service in helping us recover a primordial and solid metaphysics. I think they are weaker in

their derivation of the ethical implications of that vision.

As far as anarchism goes, it's the anarchism you point to that has a strong spiritual component and a worked-out metaphysics of natural order that interests me. I'm still trying to come to grips with the classic anarchist theorists. I'm onboard with the critique of political hierarchies that enable the exploitation of people. I'm also increasingly onboard with the 'freedom-loving people' aspect. I'm pretty much all-in on the critique of the modern state.

I think I'm still finding anarchism as necessarily overly optimistic about the prospects of living well with no authority though. My sympathies are there. I think people, especially 'ordinary' people, incline towards goodness and that good social structures would reinforce this but that our social structures do the opposite.

I'm probably opening up a can of worms here. I believe in sin, and I don't think most anarchists do, and maybe can't. I'm not talking about any moralizing, nit picking, conception of sin. I mean 'original sin'. Augustine boiled that down to 'love of the self' over reality (let's say the Good, the True, and the Beautiful — he says God; same thing more or less in my view).

And he also offered a critique of political exploitation by saying that sin leads into the *libido dominandi*, the desire to dominate others

which is the driving force behind empires and all that.

To an extent you seem to have referred to this, in a way at least, when you talked earlier about our need to overcome our egoism and evil political structures. Anyway, I think that malady goes pretty deep in our being and most likely can't be universally overcome. I think an adequate politics needs to account for that. I suppose I'm with Chesterton on that: he said it was the only Christian dogma that there was actually empirical proof of.

Put from another angle, there is a reason we need wisdom and spirituality and all that. We don't just innately have them because we got issues.

Am I misunderstanding anarchism? Or am I just beyond the anarchist pale in being skeptical about the perfectibility of the species?

**Cudenec:** As far as I can see, the Judeo-Christian idea of original sin doesn't actually refer to our innate condition – it was something bad that happened to us in the Garden of Eden, from which point on we were in need of redemption, right?

That is not so far from what I was saying about the way that the dominant ego came to block us from having awareness of our belonging to the Whole. Because I equate nature and the

living – the unfolding of the Whole on the terrestrial plane – with good, I regard humanity's innate condition as one that is naturally good.

I would locate the source of the wrong path we have taken as something other than the innate human essence, something like a disease that has corrupted it. Because we are trapped in a state of ego-centred non-understanding, because we've got 'issues', as you say, we do now need to be directed to a path of spiritual wisdom in order to get out of that degraded state.

Initially, this improvement, this 'progress' in the real sense of the word, would just amount to shaking off the disease that has been afflicting us, in order to regain our natural, good, condition. But that's not the end of the story, because I think that part of humankind's innate condition is that we have a potential for spiritual growth that could take us to barely imaginable heights.

This innate potential is currently being completely blocked from emerging because of the stunted state in which we have become stuck. But the political-spiritual revolt against that condition could clear away the blockage by taking us back to our innate condition of potential excellence, and then allow us to take the path we were always meant to take towards much greater things.

Evolution would be back on the right path. A society built on the denial of ego, the understanding of larger belonging, on the love of beauty, truth, nature and freedom, would have as its deepest purpose the real organic improvement of our species.

The holy grail of this society would, I suppose, be some sort of idealised eventual perfection, even though that will always remain impossible on the physical plane.

But obviously it would look nothing like the false 'perfection' envisaged by eugenicists and industrial transhumanists. It would not involve the denial and destruction of nature, but the flowering of humanity as a harmonious part of the gloriously unfolding living universe.

To pick up on other points you made, I think that Traditionalists are indeed sometimes missing the insight that venerating institutions and dogmas that have been shaped by, and are deeply entwined with, the dominant system is never going to lead us out of the modern prison to which they are avowedly opposed.

What they can learn from anarchists is that a definite rupture is needed, the destruction of the many layers of repression and domination that prevent us from knowing the empowerment of deepest belonging.

And yes, this coming insurrection will inevitably require mighty levels of courage,



idealism and willingness for individual self-sacrifice. I agree that a call for heroic endeavour in this battle is badly needed and is perhaps the only way to unleash the levels of righteous resistance needed to break through to the future that should be ours.

**James:** I'm really glad I opened that can of worms! We might use different terminology, but I think we are actually (surprisingly) largely in agreement. We've got the Garden of Eden, the Holy Grail, and "political-spiritual revolt" all packed in there. How can this be any better?

The future you are envisioning is of course itself a spiritual vision. I suppose a version of millenarianism. I've got nothing against that. I suppose our current situation doesn't feel much like the eve of the Millennium though. It feels more like an ending than a beginning (though the possibility of the beginning of an even worse version of what we already have is not off the table – at least lots of very powerful people are working towards that). But perhaps all endings are actually beginnings: new things become possible when old things pass away.

In the biggest sense possible, where do you think we are as a civilization right now?

**Cudenec:** I have had the feeling since I was about 14 years old that this civilization, if we can

really call it that, was heading rapidly downhill. Apart from the odd moment when the system (wrongly) appeared to be on the point of welcome collapse, I've had no reason to revise that opinion!

I don't know whether we are now fairly close to an end, or whether that end will only come after an even worse period. In either case I think that our awareness of the nature of this Leviathan, and the philosophy that can be forged from a deep opposition to it, can be the seed for the new beginning which lies ahead.

It's for that reason that I am disappointed in those who quite correctly target one aspect of the sickness afflicting our societies but, perhaps through fear of losing short-term credibility or support, shy away from condemning the whole thing.

Not only will this half-baked compromise delay the disappearance of this system, merely encouraging it to adapt parts of its agenda to avoid such criticism, but it also ducks the historical responsibility of providing future generations with a clear picture of what went wrong, why it went wrong and how humankind can avoid ever falling into the same stupid trap again.