

On the shoulders of giants: differentiating charismatic leadership from the hallucination of “individuality” or “independence”

There is a huge differentiation to be made between the nature of charismatic leadership and the ideal of what we might consider as “being independent” or an “individual” “in your own right”. The fundamental root cause of dis-ease is the idea of individuality, that “I” am a separate thing from “you”. This subject-object situation is known as dualism and is the foundational hallucination that is also known as “the human-condition”. Whereas this state seems very real, every sensory experience and the nature of what we experience or “who” experiences it, is contrary to the belief that “I” is a reality. For more clarity on this, please see the experiments of Douglas Harding (www.headless.org), and the expression of Tony Parsons (www.theopensecret.com)

Whereas in modern society there is an ideal placed on people to be “independent” and to fight for survival, this has fundamentally nothing to do with an instinctual *sense* whereby humans live in small communities as part of interconnected groups which are not person-centered but part of a larger body, fingers of the same hand, so to speak. The *true* nature of leadership is the quality of charisma, the spark of movement or direction that is like the rudder of the ship. The rudder never pretends that it is the whole ship, it is simply the direction of the ship, or the impulse of that direction which aims to oversee and foster the expansion or prosperity of the whole, not disparate parts.

From an early age we are taught the importance of independence and doing things for “yourself” with scant consideration given to sensing the whole and connecting to those around you. Therefore the foreground is seen as more important than the background, the above more important than below, the face more significant than the feet, the focus is predominantly on separateness rather than Oneness.

The nature of separation is impossible, even in the world of modern physics, all things are utterly unified as an energetic sea. However while we may have some realisation of this at an intellectual level, for most people the sense of separation is a constant everyday reality. This is the fundamental reason why people perpetually seek so-called independence from those around them, in order to feel strong within a believed-in “self” image. The nature of this stems from a dis-eased form of the impulsive masculine principle – yang – this format warps and constricts everything we do, see and think and disrupts the whole of our nature. As a result we are taught that dependency, which is in fact just as much of a reality for the leader as it is for those who are led, is to be avoided and that it is more desirable to separate oneself from others and do things “our own way”.

For many people, “smart” phones and other modern gadgets are now “must have” tools of working autonomously. Ironically, modern methods of interaction and communication now fundamentally compartmentalize individuals, causing them to feel separate, people access your independent shell rather than realising we are all interwoven within a fabric of human society. It is much like the difference between cloth made from a single strand of material, and chain-mail used for war with independent links. Society as a result is at war with itself. Social networking has nothing to do with true connection, but while it

originates in a desire to connect, it has to contend with the stifling problem of having to interact as an “individual” and so being unable to connect no matter how many “friends” one has or how many personas.

The game of independence is very draining for the environment, which is also “us”. The refined energy required to create a smart-phone on one side of the world is likely to be the equivalent energy consumption of an acre of rainforest burned on the other side of the world. Heroes and heroines of innovation in the modern world are actually “destroyers of worlds”, there will always be consequential knock-on effects on the other side of the world, as there is always a balance occurring.

We should not regard dependency as an undesirable trait to be avoided, for it has a close connotation to unity and connection. It is in fact more real. Dylan pointed out that you always have to “serve somebody” but actually we are part of each other, or not even parts... we literally *are each other!*

For some, the notion of dependency conjures up situations such as living with parents into one’s 40’s, or being dependant on an abusive partner, or on drugs, income support, or a belief system or cult. These connotations stem from highly judgmental attitudes to behaviors and situations in society. Dependency itself is not a dis-ease state, whereas the fear of isolation when leaving home, or of an abusive partner, addiction to drugs, the requirement to hold onto beliefs, or feeling deeply guilty or stigmatized about having income support are the key dis-eases. All of the above are bought-into ideologies based on a sense of fear, on the idea that I need to be “independent” and “stand on “my own two feet”. However, both of those statements are fundamentally untrue: the “I” cannot be independent and furthermore the “I” itself doesn’t really exist. Therefore we have to re-evaluate the whole problem, at which point the tenets of society itself start to totally collapse and we find “ourself” in No-mans (or woman’s)-land!

Oneness isn’t dependency, it is simply Oneness, there are no parts. However, the word dependence leans more closely towards the nature of Oneness and independence simply isn’t real. When we take the business model of reality to be the cornerstone of how we respond to each other then society inevitably will always try to form little dictators out of everyone and make everyone separate from each other. The reality is that some people are charismatic leaders, others followers or more submissive, these are utterly natural expressions, no-one can be what they are not. We are all different expressions of a Singularity, fingers of the same hand. Nothing is independent or dependent, it is all One thing happening.

David Nassim
15/ 10/ 2011