

Non-Political Thinking:
An Introduction to Mechontology for Disruptive People

by Juan Diego Blanco Gómez
Menorca Millennials, June 2015

A car is a political object —any car, not only a police car. Thinking a car is a political action. When we think a car, as any other thing, we make Politics, that is to say, coercive and hierarchical ordering. “Ordinary” (from Latin, “ordo”, order) language obliges us to use the grammatical devices of subject and predicate in order to say something and, by means of these, the logical devices of substance and accident in order to conceive it. Therefore, Language —at least the Indo-European one— and Logic are Political devices, as we cannot ordinarily think that a car could be an ordered set of elements without an ordering instance, the substance, in the same way as we cannot conceive a town or a nation without a mayor or a president.

We could even say that a car —any car, not only the Popemobile— is a religious object, because Politics, in essence, is religion. As with cars or towns, we cannot ordinarily think Creation without a Creator, Order without an Orderer. It is not a coincidence that the same word in ancient Greek, *demiurge*, was employed for naming both God and a politician; besides, hierarchical derives from “*hierós*”, which means “sacred”. Of course, we don’t need to be conscious religious people for thinking politically. Language and logic are indeed hierarchical. Likewise, we don’t need to confess any faith in animism, the first religious expression of humankind, for thinking that a wheeled vehicle —invented by the second half of the 4th millennium BC— has a soul —the ghost in the machine—, which is its substance, its ordering principle. Language and Logic are indeed animist.

This religious/animist and political condition of Language and Logic is not surprising at all. Protolanguage could have been appeared with *Homo habilis* (2.3 million years ago), *Homo erectus* (1.8 million years ago) or *Homo heidelbergensis* (0.6 million years ago), before its mature development with *Homo sapiens*, 100,000 years ago. And it is hard to believe that, during this large period of time, Language and Logic could not have been shaped by the hierarchical way of living and believing of our ancestors. Of course, animism have almost vanished from History; humankind has almost learnt to live without Ghosts, but animism, in spite of Behaviorism, still lives and works in our everyday Language and Logic.

Aristotle, the first logician in History, did know that there was no soul (*anima*) in non-animated things, but the great philosopher was forced by the latent animist condition of Greek language to believe that all things are composed by substance, their formal ordering principle, and accidents, their material ordered properties, in perfect parallelism with the grammatical division of subject and predicate, and, in turn, with the political division of rulers and ruled —the *zoón logikón* (the rational animal) is the *zoón politikón* (the political animal). We do know that there is nothing like a soul in a car; however, we cannot ordinarily think the thing expressed by the substantive “car” without believing, unwittingly, that there is something, its substance, that, while ruling it, makes it sustainable. This is our animist/political way of thinking.

Politics is everywhere, because Politics is a way of thinking. There are policies, politicians and policemen: all this is external Politics. There are also Language, Grammar and Logic: all this is internal Politics. Actually, there is just one Politics, the same Hierarchy under which we live and with which life is thought. So we have a Political Ontology or an Ontological Politics which rules our lives and thinking. This is why, as mentioned above, a car is a political object and the fact of thinking it is a political action: when we think a car, we behave like a politician imposing order to society. Our knowledge, imposing substances and substantives to things, is an Episteme, which etymologically means, unsurprisingly, imposition. Politics is all over, but, as we shall see, Political Thinking is over.

Now, let's take a taxi—it is only a metaphor. It is not hard to deduce that, if a car is already a political object, a taxi is a hyper-political thing, and that if thinking a car is already a political action, thinking a taxi is a hyper-political deed. Certainly, a taxi is a car and all that could be thought and said from the latter can be thought and said of the former. We also face here the same Politics, the same unconscious animism: there is a substance/soul in what is called "taxi" which makes the taxi an ordered set of elements. Nevertheless, a taxi is more than a car. Cars were used by people for millenniums in order to carry passengers. Taxis only appear when cars were licensed by political power to function as such, as it seems to have happened in both London and Paris in the early 17th century.

The first taxi rank appeared in London in 1636, but it was only possible because, one year before, the "Hackney Carriage Act" was passed by Parliament to legalize the service. A further "Ordinance for the Regulation of Hackney-Coachmen in London and the places adjacent" was approved in 1654 and the first hackney-carriage license were issued in 1662. A taxi is not simply a car; it is a hyper-political substance imposed to the political substance of a car. What makes a taxi be a taxi? It is just its license, the second political "soul" which overlaps the first political "soul" of the car. Of course, the counterpart of the license is the "tax" that the taxi owner or driver must pay to the political power. Oddly enough, "tax" means both charge and order, like in "taxonomy", the very realm of Politics.

At that time, ordinary Language and Logic continued to be, invariably, substantialist and therefore animist. Notwithstanding, Philosophy, namely, extra-ordinary Language and Logic, shifted from ancient Realism to modern Nominalism and its sundry versions (Empiricism, Rationalism, Idealism). Realism stated that substances are real as they are in the things themselves. On the contrary, Nominalism stated that substances are only the names with which we identify things. Animism, nominalists said, was wrong: there is no any inherent ordering principle, "soul" or substance in the objects of consciousness; it is consciousness itself the ordering, the political principle. Obviously, Politics also became nominalist: a taxi is not a taxi; it is only a car, named as a taxi, stated as a taxi.

This statement on the taxi is inseparable from the State, the new form of social organization which appears at the age of Nominalism. The State is the great and only "stater" in society. A taxi is what is named as such by the State. From the ancient slavery, when the life of the slave belonged to the master, and from the medieval serfdom, when the property of the vassal belonged to the lord, society shifted to the modern tax system, by means of which neither life nor property, too much realistic, belonged to the State, but something more nominalistic, people's time, when this time is declared as public by the State. The State works exactly as God for Protestantism, well known as a nominalistic theology: no man is saved, only declared as saved by God.

Once again, it is not just a coincidence: the new State is founded in the divine and absolute, hierarchical power of the Monarch, a power which is, above all, the nominalistic power of declaring that something is good because is legal—not legal because is good—or that a car is a taxi, not because it is a car that can be used as a taxi, but because it is licensed as a taxi, in a perfect tautology. The animist/political condition of ordinary Language and Logic became an extraordinary theological-political ordering device. The substance is no longer inside things; it is given by a godlike Authority in the very act of granting authorization. Thomas Hobbes, who mocked Aristotelianism all his life, had to consider that "a Commonwealth without sovereign power is but a word without substance and cannot stand".

If Politics was everywhere because it already was a way of thinking, now, by means of the State, this way of thinking turns into a hyper-political conception of life. On top of the Dictionary, which defines things as cars, appears the Law as a Super-dictionary, which re-defines cars as taxis. In the same way, the old Political Ontology shifted to a Hyper-Political Ontology or a Hyper-Ontological Politics, in which the substance, explicitly identified as the Ruler, "predicates" the predicates, identified as the citizens, the ruled. A giant Administration, regulating and redefining everything, began to work as a net. In fact, it was the first network. However, a few centuries later, Politics is going to discover that a new network could defeat it.

Let's leave the taxi and let's take an Uber car —another metaphor. A taxi is, from its very beginning, a hyper-political car, regardless of its current degree of regulation. Apart from its political condition as a car, dictated by Language and Logic, we cannot ordinarily think that a taxi could be a taxi without an ordering instance, Politics, the new Substance, in the same way as we cannot ordinarily think order without an ordering instance, an Ordinance. But now there exists Uber (and a bunch of Uber-like companies), whose cars —for the moment, not UberPop/UberPool cars— could be conceived, for the first time in History, as para-political objects, requiring from us, consequently, a para-political Thinking in order to fittingly understand them. A Uber car is not a taxi, since it (or its service) is not dictated as such by the State, and hence it is para-political.

Not being a taxi, one is tempted to call a Uber car a parataxis —a well known literary technique consisting of insubordination to subordination: "Veni, vidi, vici". And the social clash was unavoidable: since 2009, when it was founded, Uber's story, alongside its success, is a worldwide story of conflicts around a crucial issue: license, that is to say, Politics. Street hails or not, metered fares or not, safety or unsafety, the conflict is simply political: a car that works like a taxi but is not named as such by politicians —significantly, in 2011 Uber had to remove "cab" from its former brand name because "cab" was already politically sanctioned. Uber, *de facto*, has begun to work like the State, auto-licensing, ordering transportation by means of its own substance, a new substance, a new network.

Working in net like a taxi: Uber shows us that the old paradigms of Realism and Nominalism have been substituted by Networkism. As we know, ordinary Language and Logic are not able to not be animist, but Philosophy has finally learnt from Physics that beyond the properties and behaviors of things there is nothing like a substance that makes them sustainable. Mass, volume and density, for example, work like substances one for each other, in a circular and mutual inter-definition. Things have no substance; things are auto-referential systems, namely, networks. The substance is the network. Patently, Uber could not exist without the Net, but Net, in turn, could not exist without this thinking revolution of Networkism and all its variations: System Theory and Emergentism, Chaos Theory, Connectionism and Network Science.

Facing the vertical and substantialist ordering of Politics, the new thinking paradigm points to reality as a horizontal, non-substantialist and self-ordering network of nodes and links, from atoms to civilizations: emerging self-regulating systems, biochemical order out of chaos, mind as interlinked non-mental units, social adaptive systems, collective intelligence, scale-free networks... Politics encounters Para-Politics; taxis, Uber. The network of taxis vertically sustained by the State collides with the network of Uber cars horizontally sustained by the network itself. An Uber car is not simply a pre-political car used as a taxi; it is a para-political car, freed from the old political network thanks to a new, para-political network. Politics is simply aristocracy —by birth or poll, lifelong or temporary; Para-Politics is simply democracy.

The relationship between Networkism and Materialism is not negligible. Sharing the world with religious and spiritualistic cultures and individuals, Networkism seems the first global irreligious and materialistic Philosophy in the history of humanity, since it seems that there is no need of any Transcendence to produce or explain "order". Order is immanent: in spite of the remaining substantialism of ordinary Language and Logic, we can think an ordered set of elements without an ordering instance, Order without and Orderer, Creation without a Creator. Autopoiesis, one of the networkist key concepts, challenges Poiesis —the creation of God. Clearly, this religious "crisis" echoes the incipient political crisis nowadays. Uber is just one of its heresies: a para-political order challenging the transcendent, "sacred" order of Politics.

The Networkist revolution is so deep that Ontology should be replaced by a Diktyology —from Greek "dictyon", mesh. Ontology, political or hyper-political, focuses on things as substances, treating their properties, actions and relations as subordinate to substance. Networkism, on the contrary, focuses on nodes and links, the new substances and accidents, with no subordination; this is its democracy, its Para-Politics. But Politics survives in Para-Politics. What could happen if nodes and links, denying the old inequality, were not equal, but in a very different sense? Political Thinking will never understand its defeat.

And now, a final metaphor: let's leave the Uber para-taxi and let's take a blablacar. After the political car, the hyper-political taxi and the para-political uber-car, we have the non-political or me-political blablacar —from Greek "me", which means "non". Of course, a blablacar is still a car and thus a political thing, according to ordinary Language and Logic, as repeated so many times. However, as opposed to an uber-car, a blablacar is me-political and not only para-political. Blablacar is not a rival for State, like Uber; it is an alien to State. It does not compete against Politics; it is just indifferent to Politics. Blablacar (like another clump of similar companies or services, such as UberPop or UberPools), shifting from ride-sourcing to ride-sharing, unfolds a true me-political social action, which invites us to think in me-political terms.

Again, one would be tempted to call "metaxi" a blablacar, but it sounds like either ridiculous —Metaxa is a Greek brandy— or offensive —Metaxism was the Greek version of Fascism. In any case, a blablacar is a non-taxi that works like a taxi. Since its foundation in 2006, this ride-sharing platform facilitates the conversion of any driver in a passenger carrier by simply sharing rides. Politics, obviously, has nothing to do with it. Blablacar does not compete, like Uber, for being a licenser, an auto-licenser; license is simply pointless. Blablacar is achromatic, or rather coloring, not falling under the grayscale (White-Gray-Black) economic-political gradient. The Networkism of Uber is still political; truly, it is not the taxi which makes the rides, but network nodes still make them. Blablacar, on the contrary, is me-political: the rides make the network.

Networkism is yet burdened with Ontology and hence with Politics, as it still thinks in terms of subjects/substances and predicates/accidents. Certainly, nodes and links become equal, with no subordination, since a network is in fact the inter-dependency of both nodes and links; nonetheless, for Networkism nodes are seeing as link-makers. Anyhow, there is another version of Networkism, which we may call Relationism, which maintains strictly the opposite: nodes and links are equal, but links are node-makers. The tip of the iceberg of this Relationism is the Actor Network Theory, which, criticizing the anthropocentric vision of social networks, claims for the radical equality of humans and non-humans, focusing on their mutual "translations", the genuine kernel of networking. Blablacar is just a ride translation system.

The underwater portion of the iceberg of Relationism are two theories, by Alfred North Whitehead and Gilbert Simondon, which are still waiting to be developed for and incorporated in Network Science as they deserve. According to both authors, there are no things, only events, as seen by Gilles Deleuze, but identified as relations. For Whitehead, events do not "happen to" things: rather, events themselves are the only things —an event is not one of the predicates, but the very thing itself. Simondon, meanwhile, affirms what he calls a "realism of relations", whereby a relation is not an accident with respect to a substance but rather a prior and constitutive condition of substance. As a tour de force of Networkism, Relationism could state that, while Uber rides, Rides are blablacaring —a nonsense, due the limits of animism.

Inasmuch as the preeminence of nodes vanishes in favor of links, Politics becomes Me-Politics. As Blablacar demonstrates, it is not the absence of taxes in sharing economy which precludes Politics, not even the Tofflerian transition from vertical to horizontal models, from centralized to decentralized processes, from tree to mesh topologies. It is the real core of Politics which is undermined: we can now think non-politically, because we can not only conceive an ordered set of elements without an ordering instance; actually, we can think Actions without Actors, since Actions make Actors. The inversion of theism is blatant: Creation makes Creator —a theory, by the way, subscribed by the jesuit Teilhard de Chardin. But perhaps a me-political future, based on a technological anarchy, could be "the age of spiritual machines".

This still pending thought revolution of Relationism within Networkism, already incipiently visible in sharing economy, is simply the end of Ontology, and consequently of Political Thinking, up to the point that even Diktyology should be replaced by a Schesiology —from Greek "schesi", relationship. However, a rigorous me-political way of thinking could not be confined to the realms of Network Science or Actor Network Theory, of technological or sociological investigation and implementation. The improvement could only be radical if it is "logical", by means of a new Logic capable of getting over the hidden obstacles of Political Thinking. Me-Politics could only be thinkable thanks to a true me-politico-logical thinking.

The necessity of a new Logic, in formal as well as in informal terms, seems evident: we have new physical, biological, mental and social phenomena to be explained more accurately, and new processes and techniques to be strengthened by means of this improved explanation. For now, we have a new Being and an old Thinking, still dominated by an old Speaking. Language is not neutral at all. It is not a hammer for every nail; it is a "nail-maker" —as Abraham Maslow said: "If the only tool you have is a hammer, you tend to see every problem as a nail". Language shapes our conscience unconsciously. It is the "Blub paradox" by Paul Graham, talking about developers and programming languages: "They're satisfied with whatever language they happen to use, because it dictates the way they think about programs".

We must extend this criticism to every language and, above all, to our ordinary Language, the "natural" Language of logicians, because it invisibly conveys a Logic that must and can be criticized and reformed. Language is not neutral; on the contrary, it is belligerent. Its dictation is not only psychological: it is, as we have seen with cars, taxis, ubercars and blablacars, political. Natural language is not natural; it is artificial — the difference between natural and artificial is artificial; the difference between nature and culture is cultural. Our ordinary Language is animist because men were culturally animist; it is political because there have been States. And so our effort should be the opposite of that undertaken by Noam Chomsky: instead of neutralizing language and begging for more Politics, de-neutralizing language and begging for less Politics.

Less Politics, or at least, but mainly, less Political Thinking. We emphasized it previously: there are policies, politicians and policemen, external Politics, but there is also an internal Politics, which commands our thoughts and our way of thinking, our Logic, and that is not only poor for explaining reality and strengthen our possibilities, but an obstacle to reach them. Perhaps Politics is still useful; Political Thinking is useless. It obliges us to see substances beyond accidents, order as the product of a transcendent instance or link-maker nodes. What is the logical structure of these insights, the common denominator shared by these perceptions and expressions? The answer is as simple as disturbing: Logic, the classical or standard Logic, unaltered from Aristotle, its beta, to Russell, its GA.

Everyone knows it —but everybody knows with it, too: classical Logic is the system based on the law of the excluded middle and the law of noncontradiction, forbidding the principle of explosion —*ex falso quodlibet*. It is formally axiomatized on Set Theory by means of its crucial concepts of inclusion and membership, but what is not fully realized is that, in this way, classical Logic is an Echonto-Logic —from Greek "echein", to have— and that its laws could be reduced to a single law: a continent cannot be contained by its content or a content cannot contain its continent. For classical Logic, to be is to have and to be had, as shows the etymology of "to behave". This is why Bernard Bolzano said that the canonical form of the identity is the membership. Echontology is the very essence of this Logic.

"This is a car" means that this belongs to or is had by the set of all cars. "This car is yellow" means that yellowness belongs to or is had by the set which is this car, and neither the set of all cars can be had by this car nor this car can be had by yellowness. Ontology is Echontology, since all is conceived as continents and contents that must never be confused. The law is almost divine, as Petrus Comestor, a twelfth-century French theologian, said: "In principio creavit Deus coelum et terram, id est continens et contentum" [In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth, that is to say, the continent and the content]. Classical Logic, as well as its partner, ordinary Language, is a Continental Drift and hence a Geopolitics, as we already know: there is no element without a Set, content without Continent, ordering without an Orderer.

However, classical Logic, the Echonto-Logic, is not "natural", but cultural, though not unnatural. In fact, we could see Echontology as the logical expression of our instincts of possession and belongingness, of having and being had, of "tenance" and "pertenance". One can even imagine an echontogenesis: these "ordering" instincts, culturally reinforced up to the point of becoming ideologies, are the weapons to fight against our supreme enemy: chaos, dis-order (disease, violence, and finally death). Of course, chaos is unavoidable, but we have Echontology to forget it; there is no order, cosmos —even the laws of Physics break down at singularities—, but we have a cosmetic. As Peter de Vries said, "Life is a zoo in a jungle".

We are so echontological accustomed to think in the order as the rule, that we employ “disorder” to name chaos —like the ancient Romans named “negotium” (business) what was not “otium” (leisure). It does not matter if it is a complexity (what is unorderable), an anomaly (what escapes from order), or a contradiction (what destroys order); chaos is always a defiance of Echontology, although it has learnt to deal with these versions of chaos with, amongst others, Chaos Theory. Nevertheless, there is another version of chaos that Echontology has never known how to deal with. It is not complex, but simple; it is not anomalous, but trivial; it is not contradictory, but fertile. The classics called it *aporia*; the medievals, *insolubilia*; the moderns, *antinomy*. We call it paradox.

Every paradox is a contradiction, but not every contradiction is a paradox. Echontology always tries to equalize them. Its solution to paradox is always their dissolution. Its rejection consists of forbidding the universality of thought, set or language and imposing a political hierarchy of meta-thoughts, meta-sets and meta-languages in order to avoid, respectively, the logical, mathematical and semantic contradictions when self-reference appears, and the distinction of continents and contents disappears. This “matryoshka dolls” strategy was that which Bertrand Russell followed, after rediscovering paradoxes and making Mathematics reach a severe crisis, the *Grundlagenkrise*, echoed in Physics by the paradoxes in Quantum Mechanics. The echontological orthodoxy made Science get out of the crisis, but Science would no longer be the same.

Science had to admit that, as Karl Popper said, “all clocks are clouds”, becoming more modest, less deterministic and “ordered” (and so more powerful). In any case, paradox seemed to vanish from theory forever. The victory of Echontology looked undeniable. Or maybe not. A very cold winter morning of 1991, this philosopher in residence discovered in the shelves of the library of the Belgian University of Louvain a couple of books by the most cryptic thinker he ever met, François Laruelle. Non-Philosophy, as Laruelle calls his theory, did not deserve any review then, albeit (or because) it was absolutely disruptive. The philosopher became a friend of his, published the first book on his work, and one day, singing in a band after teaching IT and translating Lope de Vega into English with a Hungarian buddy, he invented Mechontology.

The philosopher died and was reborn as the mechontologist in residence —but, as far as he knows, there are no further. Then he extracted the paradoxical logic of Non-Philosophy, consolidating it by means of Paraconsistency and Dialetheism by Graham Priest, the most daring non-classical Logic, and began to practice a hopefully well structured array of methodical rules on the old or new philosophical topics: Ethics, Politics, Knowledge, Being or blablacars. What is Mechontology? It is merely a way of thinking that takes paradox as both its object and protocol. It sounds solemn, but hitherto Mechontology was only known by some stoic relatives and an even more stoic dozen of pupils in private lessons —the mechontologist aspired to be known as the most unknown man in the world, as only a paradox lover could confess...

Mechontology, as its “me” indicates, is of course a negation of Echontology. It must be noticed, however, that this negation works as the “non” of Non-Euclidian Geometry or Non-Philosophy. Echontology is thus only negated as a Whole and transformed in just a Part of the Whole of Logic and Thinking. Paradox is not simply mental; it is physical, ethical and social, and even more crucial, it is not the periphery of Reality, but its very centre —in order to stress its true scope, Mechontology prefers “mechonticity” as opposed to “paradox” due to the restricted mental denotation of the latter. Echontology sees reality as an ordered zoo; Mechontology, as a chaotic, paradoxical jungle. Echontology is not wrong; it is just insufficient, since the jungle is much broader than the zoo, and even zoos are jungles.

The echontological law: “a continent cannot be contained by its content or a content cannot contain its continent” is just a case of a more general, mechontological “law” that admits that there are continents that do not contain contents, that are self-contained or that are contained by their contents. The echontological law protects us from chaos, and gives birth to Politics. The mechontological law protects us from a fictional cosmos, and gives birth to Mepolitics. Echontology only can see taxis and taxes; Mechontology can see metaxis and metaxes. Could Mechontology contribute to clarify and accelerate, amongst others, the still pending thought revolution of Relationism within Networkism as its new Logic?

It seems so: what are non-substantialist and auto-ordered networks or node-makers links but real paradoxes, mechonticities? As in the story of Baron Münchhausen, who raised himself up out of the swamps by his bootstraps —from which it is derived the term “bootstrapping” in computer technology—, Nature is a global *causa sui*, a self-sustaining process of organ-makers functions, thing-makers relations. Micelles, anthills, brains, Wikipedia or Blablacar, or society as a whole, as showed by Niklas Luhmann —another of the main sources of Mechontology together with Xavier Zubiri— are living instances of 1) continents that do not contain contents, since X springs from non-X-like units, 2) self-contained continents, because the units are their environment, or, for the same reason, 3) continents that are contained by their contents.

Mechontology, as mentioned before, is a way of thinking that takes paradox as both its object and protocol, its subject and method. In contrast to Echontology, which refuses paradox, Mechontology treats paradox paradoxically, but it is not only a hopefully better description of things; it also tries to discover new paradoxical things or new paradoxical dimensions of old things. Mechontology is thereby heuristic. And this is why it could accomplish, mepolitically, the double mission of explaining more accurately new things, as well as strengthening new actions. On the contrary, Echontology teaches too little and weakens too much. Guided by its Political Thinking, since Logic as Language are not neutral, our ideas and projects are supposed to be neither clear nor forceful. Echontology is the old, poor, confusing and discouraging Logic.

Obviously, this perception of Echontology is a mechontological perception: we could only say something like that from a mechontological perspective, from a new, rich, illuminating and encouraging way of thinking. Actually, albeit unpublished, Mechontology has already proved its heuristic condition elaborating new theories on Ethics and Politics, but it can and must be used for thinking afresh anything, everything. It always departs from the fact that things are echontologized, forced by our animist Language to be seen as contents of continents; afterwards, it mechontologizes this fiction, making explode the conceptual rules of contents and continents. What finally emerges is paradox, the real essence of anything, everything. Against the political idealism of the dictionary, Mechontology shows the mepolitical realism of life.

It is not necessary to add that Mechontology is not a finished work. It looks like more a thinking startup — even if it does not aspire to be acquired by a large Philosophical company— and so, perhaps, it could have something to say for its business counterparts. Mechontology, of course, cannot be very inspiring about business itself: Lean, Minimum Viable Product, Incubator, Accelerator, Combinator, “Friends, Family And Fools”, Angel Investor, Venture Capital Series, IPO... all this is as cryptic as François Laruelle. Nevertheless, it could describe fittingly what new entrepreneurship is doing. Startups practice Mechontology indeed, maybe unwittingly, like Monsieur Jourdain, the famous character by Molière, “qui faisait de la prose sans le savoir” [who was speaking prose without knowing it].

Scrum, NonSQL, crowdfunding or “Menorca Millennials” are already mechontological. They are non-substantialist, non-political, networkist and relationist ways of doing. But apart from describing, Mechontology could also be prompting. Startups know well that success is a matter of technological and financial skills, but that only begins with and lasts thanks to ideation. Ideas are the true disruption; Thinking is innovation. That being said, it is crucial to emphasize that Thinking, the “ideomaker”, is not neutral, since it can shape politically or non-politically our ideas, that is to say, make them fictional or real. Why does Blablacar work? Because it answers “relationisticly” to the Relationism which is real society. So if reality is mepolitical, let’s think mepolitically, let’s disrupt Echontology, let’s reach paradoxically the paradox.

Mechontology, confident that it-disruption is nihilistic and bit-disruption is creative, also dreams of a Relation-Oriented-Programming, of a Neobartering funding, or of Apps for an Universal Pay-per-use. Meanwhile, Mechontology reminds disruptive people that the best disruption is Poetry. Who but poets are the rebels and warriors against Language? Read poetry. If reality is paradox, be paradoxical; if it is autopoietic, be poets. Facing ordinary Language and Echontology, which oblige us to think that a car is a political thing and that the set of all cars cannot be had by this car, Rainer Maria Rilke teaches us that “Eine Rose allein, das ist alle Rosen” [A single rose is every rose].