

Anchors of Nature and Time

20/03/2021

Enforcing thought, the reinforcement of the self, the preservation of a current version of the soul, for its development into something else. As by design from what is natural, the human being can enact these actions of preservation towards development in a continuous fashion. It is in its essence a strange and somewhat confusing phenomenon, that in turn is very much only available to beings capable of a superior and deep creative, intelligent and logical thought. There and then human beings are the only ones able to assume this process of anchor-and-advancement.

But, if one wants to move their anchor to places where life has less presence than anywhere else, how could that be accomplished? It sounds impossible simply because the human is a product of nature. Perhaps, it being capable of many “Beyond Nature” type feats, mentally especially, it can achieve a sense of departure from life while alive, but I suspect that it is impossible completely to make it out of life, per say. Would enabling physical suffering to take place, such as through a severe form of asceticism, make one attain this strange ideal? But would it even be worthwhile?

It has been heard that severe asceticism can enable the spirit to reach places beyond what is thought possible. And yet spirituality in itself has a strange connotation to it. Those who practice it, what is it that they believe in that makes them believe in esoteric, immaterial and mystical presences?

Through the deconstruction and decadence of judeo-christianism through these later centuries, it is a lot easier to see the world for what it is, and what it represents to the naked eye. Systems of beliefs prop up to fill something; a yearning towards what isn't present, perhaps. Even in a materialistic/atheist world, luck took the role of the mystical in some way. And sometimes it can be very hard not to believe in what cannot be seen. This need to explain everything through sciences is the perfect deconstruction tool, even for itself. This possibility to understand the world and what lies beyond our star can be a shattering experience; and was, at a time where the unreal was taken as all forms of power and currency. Constructions of the human are flawed and bound to decay. Constructions from Nature are perfect in their cyclical frames. Here, through the inclination of Nature to manifest itself through its creations, the human can interpret patterns that arose from Nature, and recreate them under different names and systems. The story of judeo-christianism and its still-occurring decay at present is a perfect example of the imperfect perfection of these natural systems. The cyclic is perfect because it enables itself to be imperfect; yet the human seeks to perfect these imperfections so that whatever is created and made can be eternal.

However, Humanity, whenever it takes part in the creation or maintenance of these systems, never seem to take into account its own intrinsic link to Nature. It is inevitable that decay occurs, no matter what is made. As long as the human has a hand in it, in some way, shape or form, it is bound to, sooner or later, fail and fade. Humanity is the whole of what humans can be, and if only the “good” and “virtuous” humans were to create, it would not make up for what will occur. After all, the start of the decay happens often because of events unrelated. A spark somewhere, minuscule as it may be, starts a fire that eventually spreads out to an entire system, and sometimes cannot be snuffed out. May it be by another human touch, or by Nature, or by Time. The cyclical nature of everything is not exactly a product of Nature, but rather a product of what exists. If Time was no factor, eternity would be guaranteed. But through the study of nature, we can observe patterns of repetition; finite fractals that give way to an end to life. Rebirth occurs but not always; And eventually rebirth becomes impossible and gives way to unlife.

This strange repetition of life and death throughout creations of any kind: man-made; natural on this Earth; or coming from the beginning of the universe, all of them leave way to an end. Even the end has an end; outside of Time, which allows existence to be, and then matter to exist, to move, to be inert and untranscendental.

Ruin is the key component... or rather the framework that is forgotten. All systems, all things that occur, naturally or willed, will disappear. And yet, why, out of all of what exists within the universe, are we conscious of the factor of life? It is a wonder still, if Nature is an anomaly or not. That in itself is utterly confusing to me, and the existence of existence itself seem to have no answer. Here however I preach to the decay and a return to nothingness; as it was, as it will. The aftermath of life is unlife. As humans, are we a microcosm of Nature itself, are we ultimately agents of entropy? If that is the case, we leech out of Nature senses, and with no explicit knowledge of it, our actions imitated the cyclical nature of Nature, faster and more often, in an increasing multiplicity. A grand play on organisms, living or not; on all things natural.

Systems of belief, philosophies, understandings... Are all meant to understand and navigate a world of life. A Natural world. Perhaps we are meant to understand what it is to live; perhaps we are fully intended, if something beyond exists that willed *us* into being, to live life and to die out. To replicate the fullness of Nature in all that it creates, its cycles, in our ways. It seems that we are replications of Nature, in a physical form with all of this immaterial will from Nature.

I wonder now, are we really children of Nature? Is “Mother Nature” not our mother after all? Through what it is that has been written here, and my previous writings, all of this could concord to a simple “no”, yet it would be more complex. Maybe we are implants to understand a process. Perhaps we are here to understand the universe for the sake of said universe, through the limitations of Nature within its realm. To consume Nature for the sake of what is beyond Nature, so that something like Nature cannot occur anymore. In which case, if Nature is an anomaly, what was Nature born from? Did it create itself, or did it take from Time something to replicate and expend on? It could be that, after all, Nature is a creation of Time, to understand itself as well. These explanations however mean to give a will to what seemingly has none. Or if it does, it is no will exactly. Yet, if we are implants from Time, or children of Nature truly, then perhaps we have an innate understanding of the beyond. Consciousness could be a fragment of the consciousness of unlife in itself. All is born from a void. Time reigns above what “All” would mean. Or does it then?

We, as humans, cannot understand eternity. A beginning and an end are concepts that give us meaning in themselves, because it helps to understand. Ruin is in part the enactment of this belief of cycles, except with an unending end: Eternity in unlife. It still needs to be determined, it seems, what unlife is. Is it the absence of material life, of all material, of the immaterial, the spiritual, the soul? Any word that describes what is beyond the material?

There are more questions than there are answers again, yet answers can be found in the questions themselves, as they provide a support to give in a deeper look at reality. Ruin might be this: the end of reality. In that sense, still I ponder, is Time beyond reality, is it reality itself? Nature as a byproduct of Time would not mean the end of Time, but a fragment of it. The physical is the realm that we can only understand, and the human has this tendency to reach beyond; the only form of life able to do so. However, what of dreams? Are they simply the enactment of past days and fantasies? What even could be the purpose of fantasy then?

All of this while the human plays with itself, messes with its own kin and all forms of life, to extract ephemeral forms that distract from the nature of Nature, of things, of all that is. It wills sometimes the unreal into reality, through art, through the simple creation and usage of language. The unreal is a natural part of a real human: that whom sees, speaks, hears, writes, sings, tastes, touches, senses, kicks, ingests, feels, angers, loves, lives, dies. In all of its natural components that gives way into the real, the unreal indeed can become a core component of the real. But then, again, if we are implants, replications, is unreal truly a fitting designation? Once the unreal is made real, then it becomes reality; what has yet to be real will become as such, and as its cyclical nature governs it, the unreal will take the mantle of life, and will die as well.

To finish this essay that was intended to question more than to answer, and to go back to the initial question, which was “would asceticism be worthwhile to attain answers”; It could be. But the only way to be certain is to live with this philosophy and try to seek answers under a different framework of thought: through the ideas of Ruin. However, if we truly are implants, then would it be needed to experience a severe version of asceticism? Yes in the sense that experience makes sense in this framework, as much as no, in the same sense.

The only thing that it does is how things are experienced. The weakened body and mind through the privation of needs and desires cannot logically enable a better transcendental understanding and experiencing of both the real and unreal. If balance is key to life, this philosophy does not match with this need for balance. As the cyclical goes, balance only gives life a longer time. To go away from said balance, to go over or under the line, only shortens said cycle. And yet, it is needed for the self to experience both so that balance can be understood. Then, some form of a temporary asceticism is required as well as an overindulgence; temporary as well, so that many questions can be asked and properly answered. Even if it is incomplete. The human was made to cooperate as it has been shown over and over since its inception, and to share what was created is a way to cooperate. What is shared, what is experienced, however cannot be all good or all bad. But all must be learned from nonetheless: Balance then seem to be closer to asceticism than hedonism in any form the latter takes. Severe asceticism then, is what might be required to understand this balance. But once the human experience the delicacies that can be found from life, it takes tremendous will to give up ongoing pleasures, as unneeded as they may be. This... apparent failing in the human, for where most do not wish to go towards harshness, where they let themselves be manipulated by outside forces, knowingly or unknowingly, was this intended by Nature or Time, or both, as well?

I suppose all of this was a way for me to choose how to go and live life. To accept my desires and not reject them, or to reject them and to accept bare existence with minimal comfort to enable myself to think and experience within the framework of thought I created, namely Ruin. To make Ruin a philosophical system, rather than a framework or system of thought. This attempt at securing this has not exactly lead me to this, but it seem to have shown paths that were not seen before. What happens from now on, the decisions that will be taken, will not exactly be too different from what was already in due process. But perhaps after these are seen through, things will change. I have yet to talk about the rejection of Humanity, but this text can be used as a base; a paragraph of it especially, to give way to deeper thoughts on the matter. That and the nature of Nature and Time, with the place of the human in it. To accept nothingness wholly, which means to see the human being as nothing more than a speck of what shouldn't have been, or to accept a strange role that makes as much sense as the former option; except this one feels better, and is easier on the soul and the self; and the world as well.