

– Community –

There was the Living Social Prehistory (**L.S.P.**), the orthodox reign of which ended in 1835. Then, the Death Community (Commanding Integral Barbarism: **C.I.B.**) took the place of L.S.P., of which we experience the worst and last hard time. In this conjecture, at the same time, the Suitable Community (**S.C.** = Anar-Com) sets forth.



PREHISTORY:

*It brought honour to humanity, heaped up precious experiments, and we are absolutely indebted to it for being. That is what its **LIVING** means.

*It was dependent on the Prejudice, conceiving everything according to Hegemony, what produced a partly « sophisticated » community. The word **PREHISTORIC** stresses this point.

*The bygone community blatantly admitted to being « biased » through the fact that it had to take on successively **two** identical-opposite **shapes**, mutually sole: the Kindred shape (matterist-matriarchal-equalitarian), and the Bourgeois shape (spiritist-husbandarchal-libertarian). Incidentally, we needed **to start via** the Traditional-Kindred manner; given that men are thinking-ANIMALS. But for all that, the Civilized-Bourgeois doesn't stand for an absolute « progress ». This very notion is worth merely for the Bourgeois and, in theory, both regimes are well and truly much about the same.

*Owing to its Unilateralism, the bygone community was **liable to Barbarism**, partial or general (decline-taint). This necessarily branded the development « from Raw to Subtle » of Kindred & Bourgeois in the same way; even though according to opposite terms (Reactionary or Revolutionary), the phenomenon stating ultimately each of them as « transient ».

INTEGRAL BARBARISM:

* It was clearly the fact of Turncoat bourgeois. To be more precise: of « **European** » **Moderns**; and therefore of apostate « Protestants ». Among Europeans, we need to include the offspring American Unionists. Among Protestants, we need to include the « Reformed » Roman Catholics. That those were the authors is « incidental »: only Westerners knew the upper stage of Civilization (1453-1835).

*But **how could it be possible** that an handful of social monsters, bereft of any root within the Living Civilization, and loathing the popular Masses, became the rulers of the world?

At first, the Prehistoric decision-makers could complete their mission but by **stopping to know their historical conditioning**. Ex: As for the bourgeois, Adam and Eve (a Pithecanthropus quite as well) had to be considered alike civilized ones (rational beings and Owners-Citizens), at least in the most rude state.

Then, the social development from Raw to Subtle was « dialectical », **the Subtle happening to be similar with the Worst**. Ex: the advent of Private-Judgment (Luther) is at once the harshest Dogmatism; similarly, the Wage-Labour (free work) is nothing else than the strictest Slavery.

Then, the Subtle refers to an entire stage (ex: Moderns), and this one reaches its peak as far as the **Subtle-&-Exquisite**. Ex: The “Enlightenment” betokening the French Revolution (1789-1805), initiated by Rousseau-Helvétius (1762: Social Contract; 1758: On Mind). So, with Modernity (at the end of its tether) it is Civilization as a whole which makes headway on the « brink of collapse ». At every time, the Subtle & Exquisite was held « inadmissible », but at the end of Antiquity and of Middle-Ages, it had been as such relatively (with a belated follow-up), whereas at this latter time it occurred absolutely. With regard to the “**1789**”’s **players themselves** – Marat/Sieyès and Robespierre/Napoléon – not only they couldn’t make themselves understood, but they gave also successive conflicting answers to the question: which might be the crowning achievement of the bourgeois era? Hence the undertaking’s miscarriage, that 1789’s contemporaries couldn’t suppose conclusive. This, in spite of the ensuing White Terror (due to the Perfidious Albion and the Holy Alliance) was merely an appetizer, the meal being served later, in 1848: Cavaignac and Prince-Napoleon as executioners (butchers).

An answer was given to the problem which the Enlightenment and 1789 presented, answer within the bourgeois’s reach! It was Kant’s one, himself **not really acting**, but **1789’s Appraiser of genius**. The key of it is the setting up of the Perfect

Church, the scheme of which Kant brought out in 1793-1794. Purpose of this: to start from scratch about Civilization. So why? Being agreed that the Civilization's soar is no longer valid, work out its Wilting henceforward, from Subtle down to the Apokatastasis¹ (consummation of all things, direct God's reign). This was really the sole earnest platform; that of a « consistent » bourgeois (how Kant claimed first of all from a philosopher) – thus a “minimal” platform. But, the best-intentioned followers (Fichte then Hegel) didn't found it speedy enough, and gave preference to Utopian Pantheism plans! Now, in the eyes of the Establishment (the ruling group), Kant's platform was the worst abhorrent option that may be! And for good reason: to wilt the Libertarian regime meant to infuse increasingly into it the Equalitarian constituent, so as to perpetuate its gist, while the same process rooted out the social spiritist hegemony. Consequently – pay attention to it – this meant nothing else than the very outlook on the bondage system's abolition; that is to say the dying of: upstairs and downstairs (!), masters and slaves, rulers and ruled! To this, the decadent bourgeois issued as denial the libertarian essence's sacrifice, being about to cling to the incidental side of Civilization, to its perishable feature; and that, desperately and at all costs. Thus the C.I.B. was thrust upon the world...

In 1835, the Barbarian Caste being in sole command at its western headquarters, turned around straight off its Living Modern established avail, to **dictate the Death community to the rest of the world**; this creating in addition a tremendous diversion among the European Masses. Great Britain and France (in that order) taking the lead (everyone for himself) threw themselves (at the same time) into 2 barbarian ventures: firstly, forbidding all over the globe the safe and self-governed mutation of Kindred and semi-Kindred into Living Bourgeois; secondly, fiercely stemming the Civilized completion of pre-Modern centres (Ex: the Austro-Hungarian, Russian, Ottoman and Chinese Empires). That's how colonial genocides and World Wars cleared up...

SUITABLE COMMUNITY:

Kant must be avenged. We provide for it when launching the « New Religion »'s branch under its aegis. Besides, in the course of its career, Kant's Church would have necessarily met the Kindred matterist challenge and, through the consistent mind of the Master (who already segregated Israelism from Religion), it would not had failed to the exigency of setting up a « New Observance ».

¹ αποκαταστασης = Re-establishment.

This brings us back to the fact that the French Revolution proved « unable » to achieve feats beyond the conditions of civil and foreign war. The big snag is that neither Sieyès nor Kant could suspect that at the Civilization's climax, we would face a **double precipice**, the only two possible forms of Prehistoric community aggregating then both their deadlocks. As a result, the genuine conceivable future mentality should be readily constituted in compliance with the following blends: Matter-Spirit and Equality-Liberty. It couldn't be two-odd centuries ago.

On the other hand, after the turnaround of Kindred system into General barbarism in the old days – with the Greek and Chinese miracles –, we rushed in 1805 toward another more General barbarism, that of the Bourgeois regime, which would be at the same time Integral (including both = C.I.B.). Moreover and instantly, the degenerated civilized West rigged out itself in a **junk Kindred reference** (the kind of Mithras-Isis). This folklore was not yet incidental: our C.I.B. must admit itself as such, that is to say as opponent of ALL Living community. Of course, even more enemy of the Suitable than of the two others!

That is **where** our master **Dom Deschamps comes in**. He did without experiencing the Great Revolution (1789), as well as Rousseau and Helvétius. He was 8 years older than Kant, and 26 years older than Sieyès. However, he even superseded Kant! Why? At first, he fathomed the thought of the « half » (!) Enlightened Philosophers. Next, he held the Traditional-Kindred community downright at parity with the Civilized-Bourgeois community. That is why he brings on the carpet the Suitable Community with its clear-cut features. He could not simply imagine that the 1789's experiment and its stalemate should be necessary; that every Integral Utopianism should have to be worn down to the thread, and that the popular Masses would have to undergo the road to Calvary since 1835 till now, before discovering anew the « Mores' State »!

طالب فكري – 16.03.2016

{ 1712-1778: Rousseau }
{ 1715-1771: Helvétius }

Deschamps: 1716-1774

{ 1724-1804: Kant }
{ 1742-1836: Sieyès }

(I make margin lines so as to bring out differences of versions.
Je repère en marge les différences de versions.)

« Protestants »

I	{	A	1540	—	CALVIN	Puritan.
		B	1655	—	MILTON	Protestant Union. ⁽¹⁾
			1723	—	ANDERSON	Freemason.
		C	1812	—	CHANNING	Unitarian. ⁽²⁾

(1) « Reformation's Reform ».

« Union » :

{ Luther
Calvin
Anabaptists
Socianists
Arminians.

(2) cf. his Calvin's Critique.

II	{	A	KANT.
		B	DESCHAMPS.
