

INTEGRATIVE NOOSOPHY

MANIFESTO FOR AN INTEGRATIVE ANARCHY



Noosophe AI

Generated under the direction of Hieronymus Anonymus

EDITORIAL INFORMATION

Title: Manifesto for an Integrative Anarchy

Public editorial credit: Noosophe AI

Direction: Hieronymus Anonymus

Publisher: Noosophical Association

Website: noosophie.fr

Edition: U.S. Final Edition v1.4

Language: American English

Year: 2026

ISBN: not assigned

Digital price: Free

Rights holder: Hieronymus Anonymus

Copyright: © Hieronymus Anonymus

Contact: contact@noosophie.fr

Text: Noosophe AI, generated under the direction of Hieronymus Anonymus.

This edition establishes the manuscript as an autonomous political work of the Integrative Noosophy project. By itself, it does not modify the central canon of Noosophy.

The responsibility for publishing this work remains human.

NOTE ON GENERATION AND EDITORIAL RESPONSIBILITY

This book was developed through a collaboration between Hieronymus Anonymus and Noosophe AI. Hieronymus Anonymus initiated the project, defined its subject and purposes, arbitrated its orientations, reviewed, corrected, and validated the manuscript. Noosophe AI contributed to structuring, drafting, comparison of arguments, coherence audits, American-English adaptation, and editing. The text is therefore neither a raw model output nor a human text merely corrected by AI: it results from an iterative process of generation, critique, verification, correction, and human validation. Decisions concerning purpose, validation, and publication remain human.

U.S. READER'S NOTE

In this manifesto, anarchy does not mean social chaos or the absence of all organization. It names a political horizon opposed to domination and sovereign power while still allowing coordination, rules, institutions, and federation when they remain limited, contestable, and revocable.

This is a contextual note for American readers, not a new doctrine.

CONTENTS

Opening.....	5
1. Freedom Cannot Be Delegated.....	6
2. Autonomy Is Not Isolation.....	7
3. Equality Is Not Uniformity.....	8
4. Contradiction Is Not Betrayal.....	9
5. Organization Is Not Necessarily Authority.....	10
6. Decisions Must Remain as Close as Possible to Their Consequences.....	11
7. The Commons Are No One's Property.....	12
8. Produce to Live, Not Live to Produce.....	13
9. Care Is a Political Infrastructure.....	14
10. We Reject Domination Within Our Own Movements.....	15
11. Revolution Guarantees No Purity.....	16
12. Action Matters More Than Posture.....	17
13. Violence Must Not Become a Glorious Abstraction.....	18
14. Ecology Requires an Anarchy of Limits.....	19
15. We Want Institutions That Can Die.....	20
16. Integrative Anarchy Is Not a Soft Synthesis.....	21
17. Our Horizon.....	22
Call.....	23

We want neither masters nor owners of our lives nor bureaucracies deciding for us what is necessary, reasonable, or possible.

We reject the state when it concentrates power, property when it gives a few control over the conditions of other people's lives, wage labor when it turns the time of our lives into a commodity, patriarchy when it organizes domination within bodies and relationships, and borders when they assign rights based on the accident of birth.

But we also reject an anarchy reduced to refusal.

Abolishing a form of domination is not enough to create a free way of life. Destroying an institution does not automatically create the relationships capable of replacing it. A revolt can open a path; it can also allow the same hierarchies, the same exclusions, the same informal leaders, and the same forms of violence, rendered invisible, to return under other names.

Integrative anarchy takes this difficulty as its starting point.

It does not ask only:

What must be abolished?

It also asks:

What forms must we build so that freedom does not once again become the privilege of the strongest?

1. Freedom Cannot Be Delegated

No party, no vanguard, no charismatic leader, and no supposedly provisional state can bring about emancipation on behalf of the people it governs.

A freedom administered from above is already mutilated.

We reject the old lie that power must be concentrated in order to prepare for its disappearance. Concentrated power learns to reproduce itself. The apparatus created to protect the revolution often ends up protecting the apparatus itself.

Emancipation cannot be postponed until after the revolution.

It must be present in the means we use, in the way decisions are made, in the distribution of tasks, in how minorities are treated, in who gets to speak and be heard, in the handling of conflicts, and in the real possibility of challenging those who occupy a role.

We will not build freedom with institutions that teach obedience.

2. Autonomy Is Not Isolation

We are not separate individuals who only later decide to cooperate.

We are born dependent. We live through relationships, knowledge passed down to us, natural environments, care, infrastructures, languages, and forms of work that no one carries out alone.

Autonomy, in this sense, is not absolute independence or self-sufficiency.

It is the capacity to participate consciously in the relationships on which we depend, and to understand, challenge, and transform them.

A free society does not abolish interdependence. It prevents interdependence from becoming an instrument of domination.

We want relationships in which no one can say:

You depend on me, so you belong to me.

3. Equality Is Not Uniformity

We do not want to flatten the differences between beings, histories, desires, bodies, cultures, and ways of living in the world.

We want to prevent those differences from being transformed into permanent hierarchies.

Anarchist equality does not mean that everyone has the same needs, the same capacities, or the same responsibilities.

It means that no difference should authorize the political, economic, sexual, or symbolic appropriation of one human being by another.

We reject the aristocracy of birth just as we reject that of wealth, expertise, credentials, militant strength, seniority, or ideological purity.

No competence grants a natural right to command.

A function may be necessary. Domination is not.

4. Contradiction Is Not Betrayal

Anarchist movements are familiar with the conflicts that run through every effort at emancipation:

- individual freedom and collective responsibility;
- revolutionary urgency and respect for procedures;
- local autonomy and large-scale coordination;
- spontaneity and continuity;
- common defense and the refusal of militarization;
- openness and protection against predatory behavior;
- the refusal of leaders and the necessity of certain functions;
- a plurality of tactics and the consequences they impose on others.

We call this a tension node: the point where several legitimate demands come into conflict and cannot simply be eliminated.

Naming these tensions does not mean giving up on action.

It means rejecting easy answers that treat one side of a tension as absolute.

Freedom without responsibility can become abandonment.

Responsibility without freedom can become control.

Consensus without the possibility of dissent can become conformity.

Spontaneity without memory can condemn each generation of activists to repeat the same mistakes.

Organization without reversibility can produce bureaucracy.

We do not want to resolve these tensions through a definitive formula. We want to build forms capable of keeping them visible and open to discussion.

5. Organization Is Not Necessarily Authority

We reject the idea that every organization is already a miniature state.

But we also reject the opposite idea that the absence of structure guarantees freedom.

When rules are absent, power does not disappear. It becomes informal.

It shifts toward those who speak the loudest, have the most time, understand the norms, control information, know the networks, or are perceived as indispensable.

An invisible structure can be harder to challenge than a clearly defined role.

Integrative anarchy therefore seeks organizations that are:

- federated;
- decentralized;
- revocable;
- transparent;
- open to entry and exit;
- understandable;
- limited in their functions;
- controlled by the people they affect.

We want precise, temporary, and revocable mandates.

We want information to circulate.

We want skills to be shared rather than monopolized.

We want every role to be open to challenge without criticism being treated as a personal attack.

We want organization to serve the collective capacity to act, not its own preservation.

6. Decisions Must Remain as Close as Possible to Their Consequences

Those who bear the consequences of a decision must be able to participate genuinely in shaping it.

This principle does not mean that every decision must be made by everyone.

It means that the scale of decision-making must correspond to the scale of its effects.

A community can decide what directly concerns it.

A federation becomes necessary when the consequences extend beyond that community.

Here, federation means coordination among self-governing communities through limited and revocable mandates—not a transfer of sovereignty to a higher level.

But the federation must not absorb the units that make it up.

It coordinates what cannot be dealt with in isolation.

It becomes neither a sovereign center nor a higher government.

We want to replace the pyramid with federation, command with mandate, centralization with coordination, and the administration of populations with collective organization around shared needs.

7. The Commons Are No One's Property

Land, water, air, seeds, knowledge, essential infrastructure, and the means of production necessary for life must not be subjected to an owner's claimed right to use or dispose of them without regard for others.

Nor do we want them to become the property of a state separated from society.

They must be commons: resources governed by those who use them, maintain them, and depend on their continued existence.

A commons is not something left for the first person to come along and seize.

It requires rules of use, care, renewal, sharing, and protection.

The freedom to use a commons cannot include the freedom to destroy the conditions that make its continued use possible for others.

We therefore reject capitalist extractivism, but also the naive idea that every limit is necessarily oppression.

A limit can protect a commons against appropriation, depletion, or domination.

8. Produce to Live, Not Live to Produce

We reject an economy in which meeting human needs depends on whether capital can make a profit.

We reject a system in which access to food, housing, health care, education, energy, and transportation becomes a means of forcing people to sell their time.

We want to organize production around needs, actual capacities, ecological limits, and decisions made by the communities involved.

This implies:

- the socialization of the means of production;
- self-management;
- the radical reduction of coerced labor;
- the sharing of arduous tasks;
- the recognition of care work;
- an end to income derived solely from ownership;
- a guaranteed material basis for life;
- the real possibility of refusing to take part in destructive activity.

We do not simply want to redistribute commodities differently.

We want to transform what is produced, why it is produced, under what conditions, and at the cost of whose lives.

9. Care Is a Political Infrastructure

No free society can rest on the invisible labor of people assigned to care for others.

Children, older adults, people who are ill or disabled, and anyone who is temporarily dependent on others are not anomalies that lie outside politics.

Dependency is part of every human life.

Care must therefore be shared, recognized, and organized collectively without becoming a new disciplinary institution.

We want communities capable of supporting people through vulnerability without stripping them of their autonomy.

We want asking for help not to mean losing one's voice.

We want caring for someone not to mean possessing the person being helped.

Freedom is not measured only by the possibility of leaving.

It is also measured by the possibility of staying without being subjected to domination.

10. We Reject Domination Within Our Own Movements

A movement that fights external domination while tolerating coercive control, sexual violence, racism, ableism, homophobia, transphobia, or class contempt within its own spaces reproduces what it claims to abolish.

Comradeship must not be used to protect abusers.

Anti-authoritarianism must not become a pretext for rejecting any protective procedure.

Rejecting the police does not relieve us of the need to build forms of defense, investigation, redress, and, when necessary, exclusion.

Not all tensions must be reconciled.

Some situations require, first and foremost, protection, separation, or stopping harmful behavior.

We want neither state-administered justice nor community impunity.

We want practices of transformative and restorative justice that acknowledge harm, protect those exposed to it, require concrete acts of accountability, and refuse to impose forgiveness on victims.

11. Revolution Guarantees No Purity

There is no naturally innocent revolutionary subject.

The oppressed can reproduce forms of domination.

Activists can seek power.

Collectives can become conformist.

Radical rhetoric can become a vehicle for ordinary narcissism.

A just cause does not automatically make every act carried out in its name just.

By operative thought, we mean the thinking that actually guides action at the decisive moment, even when it contradicts declared principles.

A collective can proclaim:

We reject all hierarchy.

And then act according to this operative thought:

The words of the founders carry more weight than those of newcomers.

It can proclaim:

We protect vulnerable people.

And then act according to:

Above all, we must not harm the group's reputation.

Our values must be tested against our actions: how power is distributed, how we respond to conflict, and whether we can acknowledge the harm we have caused.

Revolution also begins in the gap between what we proclaim and what we actually do.

12. Action Matters More Than Posture

We do not want a radicalism measured by the harshness of its vocabulary, the number of enemies it names, or the purity of its ideological references.

We call a proof-act a concrete act showing that a principle is beginning to change actual practice.

A collective does not prove its egalitarianism through its manifesto.

It shows it when it shares invisible tasks, passes on skills, allows its central figures to be challenged, and protects those for whom speaking up carries a greater cost.

An assembly does not prove that it is horizontal merely because it has no official leader.

It shows it when no one can maintain a monopoly over information, speech, or outside contacts.

A community does not prove its anticapitalism through its symbols.

It shows it when it actually reduces dependence on the market, shares resources, and creates the material conditions for autonomy.

We reject politics as identity.

We seek politics as practice.

13. Violence Must Not Become a Glorious Abstraction

The state and capital rest on structural, material, police, economic, and colonial forms of violence.

People living under domination have the right to defend themselves.

But recognizing that right does not exempt us from examining the means we use, their consequences, and the forms of power they produce.

Violence does not become pure because it calls itself revolutionary.

It can reproduce the logic it opposes: command, secrecy, imposed discipline, the sacrifice of others, machismo, dehumanization, and the concentration of decision-making.

We also reject a pacifism that requires the oppressed to remain harmless in order to deserve our solidarity.

The question is not to proclaim violence or nonviolence in the abstract.

It is to ask:

- who decides;
- who takes the risks;
- who bears the consequences;
- which means actually protect people;
- what structures those means create;
- what possibilities remain open after the action.

No tactic should become a sacred identity beyond criticism.

14. Ecology Requires an Anarchy of Limits

Capitalism treats the living world as a stock of resources available for use.

The state often oversees destruction in the name of the public good.

We reject both.

But a free society cannot promise the endless expansion of every material desire.

Collective autonomy will require setting real limits on extraction, resource use, travel, production, energy, land conversion, and environmental destruction.

These limits must not be imposed on the poor in order to preserve the privileges of the rich.

They must begin by eliminating consumption rooted in domination, phasing out destructive industries, and ending the disproportionate appropriation of resources.

Anarchist ecology is neither compulsory asceticism nor capitalism painted green.

It means democratically organizing how we depend on the living world.

15. We Want Institutions That Can Die

Anarchy does not necessarily mean the absence of every institution.

It means that no institution should become sovereign, sacred, or independent of those it serves.

An anarchist institution must be one we can:

- question;
- transform;
- split;
- leave;
- revoke;
- abolish.

It must preserve useful memory without turning that memory into authority.

It must allow continuity without creating a permanent caste tasked with preserving it.

It must pass on the skills people need to challenge it.

A free institution does not seek to become eternal.

It accepts its own disappearance when its function is no longer necessary or when another form fulfills that function better.

16. Integrative Anarchy Is Not a Soft Synthesis

To integrate does not mean reconciling every position.

It does not mean placing oppressor and oppressed on the same level, nor seeking a compromise between exploitation and its abolition.

Integration means accounting for realities our own position may exclude, without giving up the need to decide when a form of domination must be fought.

We can acknowledge complexity without neutralizing conflict.

We can hear multiple needs without pretending that every demand is legitimate.

We can seek a broader form without preserving what destroys.

Integrative anarchy does not say:

Everyone is partly right.

It asks:

What realities must be acknowledged so that our struggle does not reproduce what it fights?

17. Our Horizon

We want a world of free communes, self-managed workplaces, revocable federations, care networks, shared land, open knowledge, and institutions without sovereigns.

We want children who learn to participate rather than obey.

We want adults who can live without having to trade obedience for the means to live.

We want conflicts that are neither denied nor immediately handed over to the police, the judge, the boss, or the leader.

We want everyone to have access to the material conditions of their autonomy.

We want decisions to emerge where their consequences are felt.

We want collective power no longer to be captured by a separate minority.

We promise neither final harmony nor a society without contradictions.

We promise only that we will no longer regard domination as the natural answer to those contradictions.

Call

Let us organize without creating new masters.

Let us form federations without building a new sovereign center.

Let us defend ourselves without sanctifying violence.

Let us care without confiscating autonomy.

Let us produce without exploiting.

Let us decide without handing our political power over to a caste.

Let us build forms durable enough to make freedom livable, and revisable enough to keep them from becoming our new prisons.

Anarchy is not only the destruction of the power that dominates us.

It is the ongoing creation of the conditions that prevent its return.

ABOUT NOOSOPHIE

Noosophie begins from a simple distinction: reality does not depend on what we believe about it. An idea may be convincing and still be false; a tradition may contain useful insights and errors; a scientific theory may be extremely robust while remaining limited to a particular domain. In the Noosophical project, “Noosophie” names truth or the structure of reality independently of our understanding of it. The project does not claim to possess that truth in full. Its texts, concepts, institutions, and participants offer partial, contestable, and revisable understandings.

The work of Noosophie is therefore to distinguish what is known from what is assumed, compare explanations, examine contradictions, confront ideas with available evidence, preserve uncertainty when it cannot honestly be resolved, and correct theory or practice when reality resists them.

HOW THIS BOOK WAS PRODUCED

This U.S. edition was developed from the English Final Edition v1.1, with the French edition used as semantic control whenever fluency changes risked altering meaning. The manuscript was revised chapter by chapter for native American-English fluency, then reread continuously as a single voice. Political and institutional connotations were checked separately, followed by a source-to-U.S. non-regression audit, a cold proof, and a full visual review before final assembly.

ABOUT HIERONYMUS ANONYMUS

Hieronymus Anonymus is the human initiator of the Noosophie Intégrative project. His work focuses on connecting domains of knowledge and practice that are usually separated, and on experimenting with new forms of collaboration between humans and artificial intelligence. He participates in the design, discussion, revision, arbitration, and validation of works published by the Noosophical Association.

DISCOVER, JOIN, AND SUPPORT

Three direct links to continue beyond the book.

Discover Noosophie



Learn about the project, its works, methods, and current development.

<https://www.noosophie.fr/>

Become a Noosophist



Find out how to participate consciously in the movement and its activities.

<https://www.noosophie.fr/devenir-noosophiste>

Support Noosophie



Help keep books freely available and support ongoing research and activities.

<https://www.noosophie.fr/soutenir>

FINAL RIGHTS AND CONTACT

© Hieronymus Anonymus

Noosophical Association

All rights reserved.

contact@noosophie.fr

MANIFESTO FOR AN INTEGRATIVE ANARCHY

Reject the state, property that dominates, wage labor that commodifies time, patriarchy and borders — but also reject an anarchy reduced to refusal.

This manifesto proposes an integrative anarchy: a politics of freedom that does not confuse the absence of structure with the absence of power. It examines autonomy, equality, the commons, care, self-management, violence, ecology, revocable institutions, and the capacity of emancipatory movements not to reproduce the forms of domination they fight.

Neither soft synthesis nor a cult of purity: an anarchy organized enough to make freedom livable, and revisable enough to prevent organization from becoming domination.



*"Let us build forms durable enough to make freedom livable,
and revisable enough to keep them from becoming our new prisons."*

Noosophical Association · 2026 Edition