

## The Stages of Entropy: An End to Politics

*“If a lion could speak we would not understand him.” [Wittgenstein - Philosophical Investigations – page 223]*

Wittgenstein’s making the point that the way human beings think and speak is of a particular ilk, a particular nature, and if we could speak to lions we would find out that the world view is so different from the perspective of another species that it would be impossible to understand the lion, even if you could actually speak to them. For our purposes what this basically means is that there is a big difference between the expression of the natural world and the expression of the human world, the way that human beings express things is very odd and very different to the way the natural world expresses things, which is the world the lion represents.

So this is the first premise, i.e. where we start to view from, because the next stage is to look at the illusion - the belief in the idea of civilization as being a real thing. This is seen as being something which is irrefutable, so the way people live their lives, think about things, politics, economics, social structure, the transactional nature of relationships and money, everything, is associated with separate individuals trying to get on in the world. And according to this illusion, the world is completely like that, it’s completely real, it isn’t a kind of hiding of an expression of something, it is a real thing and as a result people don’t question it at all, it is an unquestioned expression. So that poses a problem in the way that we can actually communicate the points being made about the possibility of change, of the way of something changing, because it’s not going to be in the language of the civilized expression, it’s going to be in a different language, that of natural expression, which comes from an idea of Oneness rather than an idea of separation.

That way of talking and thinking is literally the difference between the lion and the human, it’s a totally different language, and what that requires in a certain sense is that people are open to that language, they’re at a ripe point where they’re able to see it/want it/acknowledge it. Otherwise what happens is that people will assert that there is another way of doing something and those assertions seem highly radical or rarefied or something which is completely alien. The difficulty is that while this may be an alien concept to civilization, in the larger picture it is the majority view. What I mean by the majority picture is that the world of the lion, the world of the natural environment and of the Universe and the Earth within it, is a huge quantity of energy which possesses the majority language, the majority way of being. And there is a tiny little dust speck which is human expression looking out of that box, saying that everything outside of itself is rarefied. Reality is actually quite the opposite way around, although from within the box of it you can’t necessarily see that, one believes reality to be something that is “made “ by the individual.

The difficulty in talking about this with a large group of people, thinking about turning politics around or turning the way that things work around, is inevitably impossible as things are at the moment. So we can have metaphors of this from the point of view of what we’re looking at. The problem that usually occurs is when people are thinking about making changes to a particular system or problem, i.e. the

Government's current intention to heavily strip money out of the Arts, especially from Faculties of Art in Universities, when people look like they're coming together to resist a particular political position, what's actually going on is that they're starting at chapter 25 of the document. That's the metaphor, it's like a book, we're going to have a revolution at chapter 25 of the book. Now the problem is that a revolution at chapter 25 means that the premises of the book, of the investigation, which happened in chapter 1, are all the same. The same metaphor is a scientific theorem, all of the premises are set at the beginning of the theorem, then after that any experiment you make is going to be limited within those original premises. If this is the case, then there's no possibility of actually seeing where you are in the big picture, you've already gone twenty-five chapters in.

Now this wouldn't work in true scientific investigation, although I'm sure this kind of science occurs to a large degree in the modern age. (Please see my previous article "Modern-Branch-science within Ancient-Root-Science" ). Let's for example take the modern scientific outlook: you come up with an hypothesis, test it out in the field in an experiment, see whether it applies to all situations, and if it doesn't it's wrong. Now let's see what happens if we then apply this to a model of the way politics and society function: we start with an hypothesis, we want to create a system which is designed to function in the most efficient way for everyone, we want everybody to essentially be in a state of relative happiness and we try to create this model based on that perspective. However this is the difference: if it doesn't work we don't just stick with what we've got and carry on because it's the "best model" we've got, it requires that you start at the beginning and alter the original premises and try again.

This is the main point, people don't seem to be willing to go back to chapter one and look at the original premises again, which is actually what's utterly required. What we've got at the moment is an industrial engine which has been created which is working at about ten percent efficiency. This means that the ten percentile of the people at the top of the function of industry, who essentially lead the government and everything else, those top ten percent are the ones being supplied with energy and what we want is the full one hundred percent being supplied with energy, so it's a very, very inefficient system. So what we call very "scientific", "logical", "pragmatic" and "efficient", is in fact completely the opposite. Society is actually something which is rarefied, highly structural, inefficient and not pragmatic, not possessing any of the features which we would consider, even at a general level, to be useful.

So we have to come up with another way of doing this, to literally "think" or rather "be" out of the box of thought and of what's going on and that's the problem, because as with the top ten percent of society, everything is skewed from the top hierarchy, the top of the chain command, heads of business, industry, politics et al, are the premises of society. If these premises are about "you" versus "me" i.e. a system of hierarchical separatism, then this is how the "experiment" on the rest of society will run, as a book on marketing brilliantly suggested "the fish rots from the head". As a result of it being a "you against me" separation-based system, the fundamental premises of the top hierarchy are going to be utterly different from those of the people under them, they don't all have the same vision or the same idea. I'm not talking about turning towards a Communist perspective here, which to a certain degree is about everybody having the same premise, I'm saying that rather there needs to be a

realisation of the reality of what the situation is, not trying to cover it over with another engineered system, such as Communism. It's no good saying we've got this engine and it doesn't work very well, let's kick it out and put another engine in instead, because you're still using engine-ideas; your engine might work at fifteen, twenty percent efficiency, but it's still not going to work at a hundred percent efficiency, not completely and utterly, revolutionarily differently.

It's not a jump between Newtonian ideology to Quantum physics, it's a jump between one aspect of Newtonian ideas to another. The Newtonian perspective and new science of quantum physics' perspective is in fact a reflection of our issue. At the moment the main difficulty is that quantum physicists are having a hell of a time trying to find a Unified Theory and the main reason is that they can't think in a different way, they're using Newtonian ideology in order to actually try to think of a different solution and you can't do that, another solution will have to be outside of those ideas. For example these ridiculous claims by science suggesting baseball is something which is impossible, that the speed of the pitch in relation to the batsman being able to hit the baseball is impossible for the neurones of the nervous system to function in relation to the ball being hit, is just an impossibility associated with what we can understand from Newtonian physics. Just as scientists need to understand how it's possible for a bumblebee to actually fly, its weight and wing speed don't match up to the prediction of Newtonian physics for a bee's flight. So we've got to really go through a big shift to look at something very differently to make this change.

So when we start looking from the notion of Oneness, which we could call a broad perspective, the main difficulty is then speaking to the people who have got the foreground rather than the background picture, who have the narrow viewpoint rather than the broad, because actually what happens is that when you're seeing from the larger point of view it makes the smaller point of view utterly irrelevant and that feels very disconcerting for the seeming "individuals" who now feel irrelevant. It's not that their points of view are irrelevant but actually when looked at from a larger perspective it becomes obvious that the narrow view is occurring in a closeted fantasy, rather than something which is happening in a reality. So for example, we could take a chaos theory example: people might say the best thing to do during the winter-time is make sure all elderly people are taken care of and their homes are warmed significantly so that everybody can "survive". But the broad picture is that in doing that, over the other side of the world three thousand people die, as a result of the global resources being drawn on across the other side of the world.

Now if we made the decision from the point of view of the closeted perspective, it's a very different viewpoint from the global perspective. We might decide to do exactly that, because people must have the facility to be warmed, but the point is there is a balance of consequence to that perspective which may not be apparent at the time one is making a particular decision. A "decision" in itself isn't really a decision as essentially this too is a closeted picture of the individual having a "free-will" or "choice". The point made here therefore is not trying to make a decision for the whole either, because "you" can't do that, but I'm trying to point out that when a so-called decision is made without looking at the broader perspective, one has no idea what the effect is. So it's not what it seems, politics and processes which are supposedly looking for the benefit of all, are not looking for the benefit of all. So what we actually need is a "system" which is utterly beneficial to all, which is quite a tall

order, considering you have a whole way of looking at something which is set up in particular way. You need a system which is looking at the broadest possible way of understanding something, the most efficient and pragmatic, a system which allows people to reach the idea that we want everybody to live in peace.

We're fed up of the polar-balancing idea of having a Left government for three or four years, people get irritated with that because it's a one-sided view, this results in a retaliation from the Right which then pulls all the politics to the Right, there's a continuous pulling to the Left and then to the Right, and eventually it ends up bang in the middle where essentially the politics are very similar, which is kind of like the engine of the car ticking over, it's like a stalemate, nothing's really changing. We need something which is neither Left nor Right and is certainly not in the middle of that Left and Right balance but is actually outside of that ("the middle way" of Buddhism is actually that which has no way, it is pathless), which underpins that and is larger than that constant to and fro absolute-yes and absolute-no position. That requires a massive step: well we've tried everything that the human mind from the perspective of separation has to offer, so what else is there? The answer, which won't necessarily be liked, is that what there is is the natural world around you. Everything that's been going on with human civilization and its ups and downs has been underpinned constantly by an environment of animals and plants and all sorts of situations which essentially have been going on for millions and millions of years, before humans and probably after humans. That's the other way of doing it, go from the majority rather the minority point of view and then your life becomes a lot easier.

So there is a beginning in the world at present for people to start realising that the way of doing things is not working, which is what some people call "collapse". It is a "collapse", but also a natural decay of something or entropy, literally the bacteria rotting things back down to their basic qualities, so that Nature can re-use this expression and the energy within it. That's really what's going on within society and the way people are thinking, because the old politics and ideas are gradually breaking down, but what occurs with this breakdown is quite fundamental because as soon as people get a sense of what is meant by Oneness, then the entire system of industry and politics and everything completely falls, breaks apart, because it's all part of a chain reaction. If you don't believe in separation, if you start to lose that massive underpinning, fundamental basis, then stages of change result and like a house of cards pulled from the bottom, the tower comes tumbling down. That's literally like somebody having an argument with somebody else, they're angry because there's the idea of separation going on - I've got this and you've got that and no I want this, and you want that, so there's a fight that goes on. But then one of those people, instead of being interested in the fight, instead starts to be interested about the nature that's around the person they're fighting with. This is very disconcerting for the person they're fighting, because they suddenly realise the other person isn't concentrating on the argument but rather their mind is wandering off, or is expanded beyond the argument and is looking around it. And that's almost like the person is being ignored and their anger seems to be irrelevant, but overall it results in the situation of there being nobody there to argue with, therefore no possibility of there being an argument because you have to have two people who are interested in separation for there to be an argument. And if one person stops being interested in separation then there's no argument.

Similarly, someone living in a city with a job, money, 2.5 kids, might go to a business meeting and suddenly realise this is all completely wrong from a really deep root level within their being, then walk directly out of the office, walk out from the city into the countryside and literally never look back. Now how could that happen? People have this and that to do and there's money and power and all the other trappings of modern life - but the interesting thing is this only applies if all of that is *believed* by everybody. If everybody stops believing in it then nobody goes to work and does the things they normally do, something else has to happen.

That leads on to how are you going to explain the problem to people, or in fact can anyone? From the perspective that I'm now speaking to somebody who understands what I'm talking about and is moving in the same plains, we have the "stages of entropy" or decay or disillusion of society, whatever you want to call it, towards the resolution of what we could call the suffering of the human being, which is their idea of being separate.

This kind of process has to start from either the microcosmic person, the so-called individual, or from the perspective of the human social body if you want to consider all humans as one body. Either way it's a process of realising that change has to come inside-out, it's not something you can apply an idea onto, you can't think about this and then go away and do it. It's got to come from within – outwards. From within really means not from the upper part of the body, not from the thought process, but really more from the actual physical body, from the sense, the feeling, the gut intuition, the instinct, however you want to describe that, all those processes together. Rather than our usual approach of top downwards, its base upwards. That's where the process begins to stir, that's very local. People talk about local change, not global change, but I'm talking about localising it right to a person's actual centre, because that's really as local as you can get. That's the only time where real change occurs, otherwise all you're going to do is produce the global problem at the local level and there's no point, instead of having big governments you'll have small governments, and that makes no difference, it's the same problem, just split. Interestingly this is exactly the problem with the internet and social-networking idea's which seem superficially to bring more people together, but actually have a tendency to create personal-government and ones own "individual world" on a website or networking page or game. This is a virtual-reality interaction and although it can bridge distance it always a false front to the natural senses that encourages the belief in separate individuals rather than a singularity. There is large amounts of free-knowledge and access to all sorts of things on-line but for what people deeply need it is often a desert of superficiality. It's still based in a fear-mentality, people haven't really changed, they've avoided something, rather than actual change it's a recycling of the old stuff. Even within society we can see that that's what we're doing, we're beginning to recycle and everybody thinks that's great, and within that spectrum of thinking it seems to be a very good idea to re-use materials. But again it's not looking beyond the end of the nose, it's really just looking at how do we keep industry going, how do we keep energy levels at the production they're at, so we can keep on producing, we can keep on moving forward. Well this isn't going to work, moving forward in the way we've been doing is still using our ten percent efficiency engine, which is no longer relevant.

When people actually start to really realise the fundamental fact that they are not separate, that there is no separation from each other or from the world around them, and that becomes something we don't even think about, but we actually feel it, that's when things will change. That's when the man will go into the office as normal, the begin to feel he is in an environment which is really caustic to his senses and will just want to get away from it. That's the kind of change we're talking about, people who are going: "I just can't do this any more, this just doesn't feel right", then another feeling starts to emerge which is a direction towards something very different.

The funny thing is you can't really live in the two worlds at the same time. People say there's a transition process from one place to another, but actually it's metamorphosis, total fundamental change back to an ancient way of being, not a "new age" futurism, and therefore not something which can be considered as a level of transition.

This is where certain things become very important and others become completely unimportant. So whereas previously money, getting a job, being a member of a social group, having a name, a status, a hierarchy, material possessions, all these things start to wane in importance. Now what becomes important are incredibly simple things: eating, sleeping, breathing, tasting, physical sensory touch, these things become primary. The environment, the wanting to move into natural surroundings becomes very important, it becomes increasingly difficult, almost sickening to stay within an industrial region, the requirement to perform within the industrial system becomes completely irrelevant. And with this comes change, you literally get people walking out of areas, no longer wanting to contend with the violence of industry, for that is exactly what it is, industry is a very violent thing, it's about two people opposing each other, one being separate from the other, there is opposition, there is fear about that opposition and an attempt to defend that.

One could say this is the possibility of the future process. Interestingly, there's a film that comes to mind, "Brewster's Millions", where Mr Brewster played by Richard Pryor, has to spend a huge amount of money and decides to spend it on a political campaign, which is called "None of the Above", which means that the people are saying none of the candidates are who they want to vote for. In a sense you could say it's abstaining from voting but it's a quite anarchic expression because it means it's a non-contention, it's not getting involved in the political agenda which is the one that's been going on and on for millennia. Anarchy here is often mistakenly thought to be a punk generation idea, which was simply a equally violent reaction to the violence of politics, totally within dualism. Anarchy in real terms is about peace, it actually means that which is without force, without direct command and therefore outside the separatist ideology of the political arena, it's coming from a broader perspective than this - the majority of nature.

So these are the issues and where that fundamentally leads is towards various things which become very important, i.e. the sensory feeling of the world. Also what becomes important when one is magnetised towards a direction of a certain way of being, there's a movement towards two things: the nature of children, of the infant, the way they learn and understand the world and how they interact, because until the age of two or three there's an ideal sense of being they're living through, a total acceptance of what's going on and a natural response to everything. This is what we need to connect back to. They become our teachers now, the roles are reversed.

Another reversal is that you have native or indigenous people, who were previously called primitive by the colonial society that came before, but who we must now recognise as a vital resource, a fundamentally important group for us to learn from. This is the fourth world community and they are the people we should look to in order to in order to reconnect to the reality of nature and to understand how to interact with it ecologically. If we consider the fourth world communities' engine versus our engine, ours is running at ten percent efficiency and theirs is running at a hundred percent, so these are the pragmatic solutions to the problem of what will go on in the future which we need to look at.

Therefore everything turns opposite: those things we feel are pragmatic, Newtonian and advantageous, beneficial to all, we actually notice are the opposite of all those things, they're not beneficial to all, only to a very small proportion, and are running at a very low efficiency. Even though we look at it from a very pragmatic view, we would find that the indigenous cultures are the ones who actually have a far more clearly-understood way of being than human beings, they are naturally not what their warped self-image or belief system tells them they are. Not only that, but the vast majority of these populations have far better mental health, are far happier, and this is well-known from all anthropological situations. The only time when there isn't happiness and there becomes major difficulty is when there is an influx of the Western machine involved in the lives of the indigenous people. Then it becomes a total struggle because they are relegated to the bottom of the heap of Western culture, even though the Western people in the skyscraper at the top of their game are also living with a great deal of sufferance. There is a big dichotomy here, so everything is opposed, it's a big 1984 landscape which is a total reality, Orwell was absolutely correct in this assumption that the Ministry of peace is the Ministry of war, the Ministry of love is the Ministry of torture and violence, so it's a big reversal.

A person cannot perceive this through an action they take or something that they try to do, it usually occurs without trying, by a spontaneous opening/act of nature, allowing a person to naturally ripen to whatever is happening which will cause this to occur. It is not now, and never was, in our hands. One requires no amount of worthiness or polishing, this process is not an achievement, it is simply a relaxation that allows one to see the background behind the foreground; relaxation is not an achievement, it is the antithesis of intended doing. To the person who understands the stuckness of knowing the sickness, but not knowing further than it, this is too what I feel. To the person who feels this is all nonsense and ridiculous, I too feel this. There is no answer to be found here, I have no solution but I know that the solution is not in humans "working" on themselves but through that which is broader than the human individual can imagine, the letting go and allowance of life to act through us rather than the act of pre-intended movement, this the Taoists call non-action or Wu Wei. From the Tao Te Ching:-

### *Chapter 71:*

*Feeling True ignorance is profound.*

*To be ignorant of this Truth yet to believe you have it, is sickness*

*If one is sick of sickness, one is not sick.*

*The natural person is not sick because she is sick of sickness*

*Therefore she is not sick.*

Interestingly a recent film called “Love and other Drugs” is a perfect example of the expression of coming right down to the base level end point of this article, which is that love is considered in this transactional way and really love is not that at all. Love is really something which is going on in the background of everything that we’re doing. Yet it’s seen, as we’d expect by the society we live in, as a particular commodity, a drug, just like adrenalin, which is about closeness of people to one another, but which can be bought and sold and given or stopped, which is an impossible situation, because love is unconditional. To realise the unconditional nature of love is to realise that fundamentally there is Oneness, without this a person is bound to an idea of love like a torturer coming and going in life, possibly deserting us at death...who knows....especially if our belief in a separate God is dwindling...what then? When love is known there is no notion of separateness.

David Nassim  
29<sup>th</sup> Dec 2010